



**City of Seattle**  
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

**Department of Construction and Inspections**  
Nathan Torgelson, Director

**CITY OF SEATTLE  
ANALYSIS AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR OF  
THE SEATTLE DEPARTMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND INSPECTIONS**

**Application Number:** 3020416

**Applicant Name:** 6921 Roosevelt Way NE

**Address of Proposal:** Tim Carter, Alloy Design Group

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL**

Land Use Application to allow a 4-story structure containing 68 small efficiency dwelling units and 4 apartment units (total unit 72 units). No parking proposed. Existing structures to be demolished.

The following approvals are required:

**Design Review with Departures (Seattle Municipal Code 23.41)**

**SEPA - Environmental Determination (Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 25.05)**

**SEPA DETERMINATION:**

Determination of Non-significance

- No mitigating conditions of approval are imposed.
- Pursuant to SEPA substantive authority provided in SMC 25.06.660, the proposal has been conditioned to mitigate environmental impacts.

**SITE AND VICINITY**

Site Zone: Neighborhood Commercial 2-40 (NC2-40)

Nearby Zones: (North) NC2-40  
(South) NC2-40  
(East) NC2-40  
(West) NC2-40

ECAs: None

Site Size: 10,226 sq. ft.

**Public Comment:**

The public comment period ended on February 8, 2016. In addition to the comment(s) received through the Design



Review process, other comments were received and carefully considered, to the extent that they raised issues within the scope of this review. These areas of public comment related to parking, traffic, housing density, housing/tenant diversity and the lack of a requirement to provide commercial/retail space on the ground floor along Roosevelt Way NE. Additional comments pertained to a concern that the project would be granted variances for building setbacks which were not requested nor granted.

## **I. ANALYSIS – DESIGN REVIEW**

### **CURRENT AND SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT; NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER**

The site is located at the southwest corner of the intersection of NE 70th Street and Roosevelt Way NE, in the Roosevelt Neighborhood. The site is just north of the commercial node surrounding NE 65th Street and Roosevelt Way NE, which consists of a mix of commercial developments, including a grocery store, and newer, mixed use developments, such as The Rooster and Kavela. Surrounding development to the west, north, and east includes a mix of small-scale residential uses. Roosevelt Way NE is a commercial corridor consisting mainly of a mix of 1-3 story older commercial structures. The Roosevelt Reservoir, the Calvary Christian Assembly, and Roosevelt High School are all in the nearby vicinity.

Immediately to the west of the site is a three-story commercial structure. Immediately to the south of the site is a recently remodeled three-story apartment building. Across Roosevelt to the east is a three-story self-storage structure with ground-level retail. To the north, across NE 70th Street is a one-story commercial structure.

The site is located approximately four blocks north of the Roosevelt Light Rail Station, currently under construction. I-5 runs one block west of the site, with access available from NE 70th Street. Roosevelt Way NE provides access north to Maple Leaf and Highway 522, and south to the University District and Eastlake.

### **FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE August 31, 2015**

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project numbers (3020416) at this website:

[http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design\\_Review\\_Program/Project\\_Reviews/Reports/default.asp](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 SDCl:

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

**Email:** [PRC@seattle.gov](mailto:PRC@seattle.gov)

### **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 August 31, 2015

### 1. **Massing, Design Concept, and Context Response:**

- a. The Board noted that overall the massing concepts and siting of the building respected the adjacencies and responded appropriately to the neighborhood context. (CS2-B, CS3-A)
- b. The Board supported the preferred option (Option 3) with a broken mass along NE 70th and a projecting corner mass. The intersection of the two masses should be resolved, especially where the roof lines interact. The Board recommended clarifying the overall massing, noting that cues could be taken from the simplified massing presented in Option 1. (DC2-A, DC2-B)
- c. The massing should respond to the internal programming. The Board recommended exploring a two-story lobby or bike lounge at the corner to create a more welcoming space and relieve the constrained proportions. However, the Board noted that the lobby/bike lounge could be located elsewhere, as long as the programming and massing makes a strong connection with the streetscape. (DC1-A, DC2-A, CS2-C, CS2-B)
- d. The Board preferred the massing at street-level along Roosevelt on Option 1, as it expressed a more commercial character and appears to engage the streetscape. (CS2-B, CS3-I, DC2-A, DC2-B)
- e. The bike storage should be located at grade for convenience, and could be located along the streetscape with a high level of transparency to provide an active, interesting use. (PL4-B, DC1-A)
- f. At the Recommendation meeting, provide more information regarding the buffer to the south, as well as the treatment of the west façade and walkway. Design these areas for safety and security. (PL2-B, DC2-B, DC4-C)
- g. The Board suggested exploring exterior walkways to reduce the area dedicated to circulation as a strategy for resolving the arrangement of uses and massing at street level. (CS3-A, PL3-B, DC1-A, DC2-A)
- h. The Board supported the amenity space located over the lobby at the corner, noting that it could strengthen the overall massing concept, enhance the relationship of the building to the street, and provide eyes on the street. (CS2-C, CS3-A, PL2-B, DC2-A, DC3-I)
- i. The Board supported the character sketches presented. (CS3-A, DC2-B, DC2-D)

### 2. **Streetscape & Street-level Uses:** The Board agreed that the spaces at street level should be designed to engage and activate the streetscape. The design and programming of spaces along Roosevelt Way NE should support active uses that establish a relationship with the pedestrian realm. (CS2-B, DC1-A, PL2-B, P PL3-II)

- a. Locating active uses at the corner is appropriate, as it works to engage the corner and is responsive to the massing. The Board noted that the bike lounge is the most active use in the proposed program, and supported locating the bike lounge at the corner. The use and programming of the lobby/bike lounge should be further developed to provide active uses that relate to the streetscape. The Board requested more information on the potential programming and design of the space. (PL2-B, PL3-A, DC1-A, DC3-I)

- b. The Board did not support the basement units along Roosevelt, as they felt it isolated the street-facing façade and was a detriment to the pedestrian experience. They suggested stoops, split stoops, or to consider live-work spaces that would offer a more commercial character. Any live-work should be designed to activate the street. (PL2-B, PL3-B, PL3-II, DC2-A)
- c. Bike uses should be prominent. The Board suggested switching the location of the laundry and office in Option 3 with the bike storage. (PL4-B, DC1-A)
- d. The Board supported the location of the waste storage on NE 70th, and encouraged the applicant to explore a split-level trash room to minimize the impacts to the pedestrian realm and valuable street frontage. (DC1-C)

#### FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS (February 8, 2016)

1. **Massing & Relationship to Context.** The Board discussed the development of the massing and the exploration of the corner expression.
  - a. The Board supported the single-story corner massing and taller clerestory windows presented as Option 1 on p. 10. The Board conditioned the clerestory windows to remain a minimum of 12” tall. The Board noted that the slope of the roof is less important to keep, and as long as the outward appearance remains the same. (DC1-A, DC2-A, DC2-B, DC2-C, CS2-C, CS2-B)
  - b. The Board questioned if windows on the south façade may have to be reduced per the building code, and noted that the expression of paired window grouping should be maintained. (DC2-B, DC2-C, DC2-D)
2. **Building Frontages and Entries.** The Board supported the design approach along each frontage and the detailing of the south entry. The north entry should be revised to read more prominently.
  - a. The south entry seems more prominent than the main entry to the north due to the large signage and contrast of design expressions. The Board conditioned that the north entry ensemble be revised to strengthen its prominence and improve wayfinding. The Board suggested adding signage (blade sign), accent colors, replacing the planter with a bench, or removing one window at the leasing office. Ideally, the design would incorporate a lobby into the entry ensemble. Additionally, the Board suggested adding a callbox at the south entry. (PL3-A, PL3-II, DC2-A, DC2-B, DC2-C)
  - b. The Board appreciated the removal of the sunken unit along Roosevelt, noting that the units at street level create a human-scaled rhythm and establish a relationship with the streetscape while providing adequate privacy. The Board supported the stoops and railings as presented. (PL2-B, PL#-A, PL3-B, PL3-II, DC2-A)
  - c. The Board was concerned with the viability of the planters underneath the awning, and conditioned that these be irrigated or replaced with an intentionally designed area that complements the amenity space for the units. (PL3-B, PL3-I)
  - d. The Board supported the location of the amenity area, but questioned if the space was large enough to accommodate both the bike lobby and amenity area. The Board also expressed concern over the potentially conflicting uses as combined bike storage and amenity area may reduce the security of the stored bikes. The Board encouraged working with the planner make sure that there is enough space for both uses to coexist with minimal conflict. (CS2-C, CS3-A, PL2-B, PL4-B, DC2-A, DC3-I)

- 3) Materials. The Board strongly approved of the high quality materials presented at the meeting, specifically noting the size of the metal profile, black windows, and the accent color used to express the circulation spaces.
  - a. The Board supported the distinct expression of the circulation corridor with bold colored panels and black window frames. (DC2-A, DC2-B)
  - b. The Board expressed concern over potential graffiti, and conditioned using anti-graffiti coatings where at ground-level where possible. (PL2-B, DC4-A)

## 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 Topography

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

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

**CS2 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-1. Site Characteristics:** Allow characteristics of sites to inform the design, especially where the street grid and topography create unusually shaped lots that can add distinction to the building massing.

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

#### CS2-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-1. Fitting Old and New Together:** Create compatibility between new projects, and existing architectural context, including historic and modern designs, through building articulation, scale and proportion, roof forms, detailing, fenestration, and/or the use of complementary materials.

**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-3. Established Neighborhoods:** In existing neighborhoods with a well-defined architectural character, site and design new structures to complement or be compatible with the architectural style and siting patterns of neighborhood buildings.

**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.

### ***Roosevelt Supplemental Guidance:***

#### **CS3-I Architectural Context**

**CS3-I-i. Streetwalls:** Streetwalls adjacent to sidewalks within the Roosevelt Commercial Core should be designed to incorporate traditional commercial façade components. This can be achieved by using narrow, traditional storefronts defined by vertical elements with multiple pedestrian entrances. This type of articulation is especially important for projects that occupy most or all of a block face. The following is encouraged:

1. Articulate the building façade and break down the mass of long façades into units or intervals through architectural design and detailing to reflect Roosevelt's historical building pattern.
2. Consider a variety of traditional methods to break up the mass of large buildings in order to provide for distinctly different architectural treatments at the ground or lower levels.
3. Incorporate design elements, architectural details, or materials in the building façade at the street level that are similar to those of adjacent buildings.

**CS3-I-ii. Architectural Features:** Features preferred in Roosevelt include the following:

- a. Building base emphasizing materials and/or texture that is different from the material(s) and texture(s) of the main body of the building
- b. Kickplate
- c. Ground floor storefront transparent windows that allow pedestrians to see activity within the building
- d. Ground floor display windows (where product displays are changed frequently to create interest along the street)
- e. Recessed entries on the street level and building modulation on the upper levels
- f. Transom windows
- g. Upper level windows that are interrupted by solid façade area
- h. Parapet cap or cornice
- i. Beltcourse
- j. Marquee or awning: marquees or retractable awnings are generally preferred
- k. Arcades
- l. Change in materials
- m. Variety in color and/or texture
- n. Building overhangs (where upper levels are brought closer to a front property line)
- o. Courtyards

## 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 through strategic placement of doors, windows, balconies and street-level uses.

**PL2-B-2. Lighting for Safety:** Provide lighting at sufficient lumen intensities and scales, including pathway illumination, pedestrian and entry lighting, and/or security lights.

**PL2-B-3. Street Level Transparency:** Ensure transparency of street-level uses (for uses such as nonresidential uses or residential lobbies), where appropriate, by keeping views open into spaces behind walls or plantings, at corners, or along narrow passageways.

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

### **PL3-A Entries**

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

**PL3-A-2. Common Entries:** Multi-story residential buildings need to provide privacy and security for residents but also be welcoming and identifiable to visitors.

**PL3-A-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-1. Security and Privacy:** Provide security and privacy for residential buildings through the use of a buffer or semi-private space between the development and the street or neighboring buildings.

**PL3-B-2. Ground-level Residential:** Privacy and security issues are particularly important in buildings with ground-level housing, both at entries and where windows are located overlooking the street.

**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.

**PL3-B-4. Interaction:** Provide opportunities for interaction among residents and neighbors.

### ***Roosevelt Supplemental Guidance:***

#### **PL3-I Human Activity**

**PL3-I.i. Pedestrian Amenity/Setback:** Roosevelt is looking for opportunities to encourage pedestrian activity along sidewalks within the Commercial Core. This is especially important because sidewalks along Roosevelt and 65th are considered too narrow. If not required with new development, applicants are encouraged to increase the ground level setback in order to accommodate pedestrian traffic and amenity features.

### **PL3-II Transition Between Residence and Street**

**PL3-II-i. Entrances:** Encourage the incorporation of separate ground-related entrances and private open spaces between the residence, adjacent properties, and street, especially for multifamily developments west of Roosevelt Way.

**PL3-II-ii. Landscaping:** Ground level landscaping can be used between the structure(s) and sidewalk.

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

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

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

## **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.

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

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

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

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

#### **DC2-A Massing**

**DC2-A-1. Site Characteristics and Uses:** Arrange the mass of the building taking into consideration the characteristics of the site and the proposed uses of the building and its open space.

**DC2-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 façades—including alleys and visible roofs—considering the composition and architectural expression of the building as a whole. Ensure that all façades are attractive and well-proportioned.

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

## **DC2-C Secondary Architectural Features**

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

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

## **DC2-D Scale and Texture**

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

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

### *Roosevelt Supplemental Guidance:*

#### **DC2-I Architectural Concept and Consistency**

**DC2-I-i. Commercial and Mixed-use Developments:** The architectural features below are especially important for Roosevelt’s commercial core.

1. Multiple building entries
2. Courtyards
3. Building base
4. Attractively designed alley-facing building façades including architectural treatments, fenestration, murals, etc.

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

### *Roosevelt Supplemental Guidance:*

#### **DC3-I Residential Open Space**

**DC3-I-i. Ground-related Common Open Space:** The Roosevelt Neighborhood values places for residents to gather. For mixed use developments, provision of ground-related common open space areas in exchange for departures especially to the maximum residential coverage limit is encouraged, in addition to other allowable departures. Open space areas can also be achieved in a variety of ways including:

- i. Terraces on sloping land to create level yard space
- ii. Courtyards
- iii. Front and/or rear yards
- iv. Roof tops

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

#### **DC4-C Lighting**

**DC4-C-1. Functions:** Use lighting both to increase site safety in all locations used by pedestrians and to highlight architectural or landscape details and features such as entries, signs, canopies, plantings, and art.

**DC4-C-2. Avoiding Glare:** Design project lighting based upon the uses on and off site, taking care to provide illumination to serve building needs while avoiding off-site night glare and light pollution.

## **ANALYSIS & DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW**

### Director’s Analysis

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

The Director’s decision shall consider the recommendation of the Design Review Board, provided that, if four (4) members of the Design Review Board are in agreement in their recommendation to the Director, the Director shall issue a decision which incorporates the full substance of the recommendation of the Design Review Board, unless the Director concludes the Design Review Board:

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

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

At the conclusion of the Recommendation meeting held on February 8, 2016, the Board recommended approval of the project with the conditions described in the summary of the Recommendation meeting above.

3 members of the 4 Design Review Board were in attendance and provided recommendations (listed above) to the Director and identified elements of the Design Guidelines which are critical to the project’s overall success. The Director must provide additional analysis of the Board’s recommendations and then accept, deny or revise the Board’s recommendations (SMC 23.41.014.F3).

The Director agrees with 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.

Following the Recommendation meeting, SDCI staff worked with the applicant to update the submitted plans to include the recommendations of the Design Review Board.

Applicant response to Recommended Design Review Condition:

1. The applicant responded with a memo on 4/4/16, noting, this memo confirms that the MUP plan set were updated to be consistent with the recommendation packet and conditions of approval provided by the Board. The updates consist of the following which were added as notes to sheet A3.0 of the latest MUP submittal plan set.

- a. The glazing at the clerestory shall be 12” in height.
  - b. Revise the design of the north entry ensemble to strengthen the prominence of this entry and improve wayfinding. The north recess will be widened to stress the prominence of the entry. A vertical fin sign has also been added above the north entry to assist in wayfinding (see A3.0). The windows at the office have also been rearranged to be more centrally located in the recess. See sheet A2.0.
  - c. The planters underneath the awning shall be irrigated, or the planted area shall be replaced with an intentional design that functions in a similar manner.
  - d. Anti-graffiti coatings shall be applied at ground-level where possible.
2. Additional Drawing Revisions include;
- a. Updated trash/recycling entrance to reflect improved landscaping and pedestrian-friendly elements, shown on sheet A2.0 and on the updated landscape plans.
  - b. The windows on the south and west elevations have been revised to be in compliance with the allowable openings per SBC Table 705.8 (Maximum Area of Exterior Wall Openings Based on Fire Separation Distance and Degree of Opening Protection), per revised elevations and Window Studies Diagrams sheet A3.1. The windows have been made smaller to be slightly under the allowed area of 25% for walls 5’ to less than 10’ fire separation distance.

The applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that all construction documents, details, and specifications are shown and constructed consistent with the approved MUP drawings.

The Director of SDCI has reviewed the decision and recommendations of the Design Review Board made by the 3 members present at the decision meeting and finds that they are consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines. The Director accepts the Design Review Board’s recommendation and conditions 1-4 and 5 shall be required

## **DIRECTOR’S DECISION**

The Director accepts the Design Review Board’s recommendations and [CONDITIONALLY] APPROVES the proposed design and the requested departure [with the conditions] summarized at the end of this Decision.

## **II. ANALYSIS – SEPA**

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

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated 10/5/2015. The Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) has annotated the environmental checklist submitted by the project applicant; reviewed the project plans and any additional information in the project file submitted by the applicant or agents; and any pertinent comments which may have been received regarding this proposed action have been considered. The information in the checklist, the supplemental

information, and the experience of the lead agency with the review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision.

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

Under such limitations/circumstances, mitigation can be considered. Thus, a more detailed discussion of some of the impacts is appropriate.

### Short Term Impacts

Construction activities could result in the following adverse impacts: construction dust and storm water runoff, erosion, emissions from construction machinery and vehicles, increased particulate levels, increased noise levels, occasional disruption of adjacent vehicular and pedestrian traffic, a small increase in traffic and parking impacts due to construction related vehicles, and increases in greenhouse gas emissions. Several construction-related impacts are mitigated by existing City codes and ordinances applicable to the project such as: the Stormwater Code (SMC 22.800-808), the Grading Code (SMC 22.170), the Street Use Ordinance (SMC Title 15), the Seattle Building Code, and the Noise Control Ordinance (SMC 25.08). Puget Sound Clean Air Agency regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. The following analyzes construction-related noise, air quality, greenhouse gas, construction traffic and parking impacts, as well as mitigation.

### Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Construction activities including construction worker commutes, truck trips, the operation of construction equipment and machinery, and the manufacture of the construction materials themselves result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant. Therefore no further mitigation is warranted pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.A.

### Construction Impacts - Noise

The project is expected to generate loud noise during demolition, grading and construction. The Seattle Noise Ordinance (SMC 25.08.425) permits increases in permissible sound levels associated with private development construction and equipment between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekdays and 9:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekends and legal holidays in Neighborhood Commercial zones.

If extended construction hours are desired, the applicant may seek approval from SDCI through a Noise Variance request. The applicant's environmental checklist does not indicate that extended hours are anticipated.

A Construction Management Plan will be required prior to issuance of the first building permit, including contact information in the event of complaints about construction noise, and measures to reduce or prevent noise impacts. The submittal information and review process for Construction Management Plans are described on the SDOT website at: <http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/cmp.htm>. The limitations stipulated in the Noise Ordinance and the CMP are sufficient to mitigate noise impacts; therefore no additional SEPA conditioning is necessary to mitigation noise impacts per SMC 25.05.675.B.

### Construction Impacts - Parking and Traffic

Increased trip generation is expected during the proposed demolition, grading, and construction activity. The area is subject to significant traffic congestion during peak travel times on nearby arterials. Large trucks turning onto arterial streets would be expected to further exacerbate the flow of traffic.

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

Pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.B (Construction Impacts Policy), additional mitigation is warranted and a Construction Management Plan is required, which will be reviewed by Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT). The requirements for a Construction Management Plan include a Haul Route and a Construction Parking Plan. The submittal information and review process for Construction Management Plans are described on the SDOT website at: <http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/cmp.htm>.

### Earth / Soils

Excavation to construct the approved structures will be necessary. Excavation will remove an estimated 1,080 cubic yards of material from the development site. Soil, gravel and similar materials may be imported to or exported from the site. Transported soil is susceptible to being dropped, spilled or leaked onto City streets. The City's Traffic Code (SMC 11.74.150 and .160) provides that material hauled in trucks not be spilled during transport. The City requires that loads be either 1) secured/covered; or 2) a minimum of six inches of "freeboard" (area from level of material to the top of the truck container). The regulation is intended to minimize the amount of spilled material and dust from the truck bed en route to or from a site. No further conditioning of the impacts associated with the grading/excavation impacts of the project is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies (SMC 25.05.675.D).

### Long Term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal including: greenhouse gas emissions; parking; potential blockage of designated sites from the Scenic Routes nearby; possible increased traffic in the area. Compliance with applicable codes and ordinances is adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation of most long-term impacts and no further conditioning is warranted by SEPA policies. However, greenhouse gas, historic resources, height, bulk and scale, public views, transportation warrant further analysis.

### Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Operational activities, primarily vehicular trips associated with the project construction and the project's energy consumption, are expected to result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant, therefore, no further mitigation is warranted pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.A.

### Historic Preservation

The existing structure(s) on site are more than 50 years old. These structures were reviewed for potential to meet historic landmark status. The Department of Neighborhoods reviewed the proposal for compliance with the Landmarks Preservation requirements of SMC 25.12 and indicated the 50year old structure(s) on site are unlikely to qualify for historic landmark status (Landmarks Preservation Board letters, reference number LPB 79/16. Per the Overview policies in SMC 25.05.665.D, the existing City Codes and regulations to mitigate impacts to historic resources are presumed to be sufficient, and no further conditioning is warranted per SMC 25.05.675.H.

### Height, Bulk, and Scale

The proposal has gone through the design review process described in SMC 23.41. Design review considers mitigation for height, bulk and scale through modulation, articulation, landscaping, and façade treatment. Section 25.05.675.G.2.c of the Seattle SEPA Ordinance provides the following: "The Citywide Design Guidelines (and any Council-approved, neighborhood design guidelines) are intended to mitigate the same adverse height, bulk, and scale impacts addressed in these policies. A project that is approved pursuant to the Design Review Process 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. Any additional mitigation imposed by the decision maker pursuant to these height, bulk, and scale policies on projects that have undergone Design Review shall comply with design guidelines applicable to the project."

The height, bulk and scale of the proposed development and relationship to nearby context have been addressed during the Design Review process for any new project proposed on the site. Per the Overview policies in SMC 25.05.665.D, the existing City Codes and regulations to mitigate impacts to height bulk and scale are presumed to be sufficient, and additional mitigation is not warranted under SMC 25.05.675.G.

### Transportation

The Traffic Impact Analysis by William Popp Associates, Transportation Engineers/Planners, September 16, 2015, indicated that the project is expected to generate a net total of 307 daily vehicle trips, with 29 net new PM Peak Hour trips and 23 AM Peak hour trips.

The additional trips would have minimal impact on levels of service at nearby intersections and on the overall transportation system. Concurrency analysis was conducted for nearby identified areas. That analysis showed that the project is expected to be well within the adopted standards

for the identified areas. The SDCI Transportation Planner reviewed the information and determined that while these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant; therefore, no further mitigation is warranted per SMC 25.05.675.R.

### **DECISION – SEPA**

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

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

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

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

### **CONDITIONS – DESIGN REVIEW**

#### *Prior to Issuance of a Master Use Permit*

1. The glazing at the clerestory shall be 12 inches in height.
2. Revise the design of the north entry ensemble to strengthen the prominence of this entry and improve wayfinding.

#### *For the Life of the Project*

3. The planters underneath the awning shall be irrigated, or the planted area shall be replaced with an intentional design that functions in a similar manner.
4. Anti-graffiti coatings shall be applied at ground-level where possible.

**CONDITIONS – SEPA**

*Prior to Issuance of Demolition, Excavation/Shoring, or Construction Permit*

5. Provide a Construction Management Plan that has been approved by SDOT. The submittal information and review process for Construction Management Plans are described on the SDOT website at: <http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/cmp.htm>.

David Landry, AICP, Land Use Planner  
Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

Date: August 15, 2016

DL:rgc  
3020416.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 Seattle DCI 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](mailto:prc@seattle.gov) or to our message line at 206-684-8467.