



City of Seattle

Paul Schell, Mayor
Department of Design, Construction and Land Use
R. F. Krochalis, Director

**CITY OF SEATTLE
ANALYSIS AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION AND LAND USE**

Application Number: 9901819
Applicant Name: Tim Walker
Address of Proposal: 514 19th Ave. E

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Master Use Permit to establish use for future construction of a four-story mixed use structure consisting of 44 residential units and 1963 square feet of street-level retail space. 54 parking spaces will be provided in and under the structure, accessed from the alley to the rear of the lot.

The following approvals and/or processes are required:

Design Review - Section 23.41, SMC with Development Standard Departure from:
Upper level residential lot coverage.

SEPA – Environmental Determination – Chapter 25.05, SMC

SEPA DETERMINATION: Exempt DNS MDNS EIS

 DNS with conditions

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

BACKGROUND DATA

Site Description

The site is located mid-block between East Mercer Street and East Republican Street at 514 19th Avenue East in the Capitol Hill Neighborhood. The property is level along 19th Avenue East and slopes down to the alley to the east approximately five to six feet. The site is zoned Neighborhood Commercial 1 with a forty foot height limit (NC1-40'), and the rear property line abuts an improved alley 16' wide which joins a 10' wide alley in a "T" intersection south of the site, allowing for access to 19th Ave. East and 20th Ave. East. The neighborhood contains a mixture of commercial, mixed use (residential and commercial) and single family uses. Adjacent zoning consists of NC-140' and Lowrise 1 (L1). St. Joseph's Church, Meany Middle School and Miller Park and Community Center are near the site.

Proposal Description

The site for this proposal is mid-block along 19th Ave. E, between E Mercer St. and E Republican St. The site is currently vacant with some fill in place. The zoning is NC1-40' (Neighborhood Commercial 1, with a 40' height limit), as it is along the 19th Ave. E block front, with L-1 (Lowrise multifamily residential, with a 25' height limit) to the east across the alley. The proposal is to construct a four-story mixed-used structure. Retail is proposed at the street level in two suites on each side of the residential entryway, with 44 residential units above, and two levels of below grade parking with 54 parking spaces with access from the alley. Structural building overhangs in the form of bay windows and decks will be proposed over the street right-of-way.

Public Comments

One comment letter signed by ten neighbors was received during the comment period. The letter expressed concern with the size of the project in respects to density and bulk and scale, traffic through the alley accessing the parking, and construction impacts such as noise, dust and traffic. Various members of the public audience spoke at times some praising the project, but some members of the audience objected to the scale of the project and the use of the alley to access parking. Neighbors directly across the alley and across 19th were pleased with the architect's responses to earlier concerns. The owner of the clinic across the street mentioned a concern about construction workers blocking her parking, an issue outside the scope of Design Review. The owner of the apartment to the south thought the design was well done and compatible with his structure, but some tenants were not in favor of the project as proposed. Some of the positive comments were directed at the quality of materials and the attention paid to the alley "front" of the building, which along with the landscaped terraces creates a complementary transition to the L-1 properties across the alley. Audience members liked the mix of unit types as well, stating that diversity of income levels and tenants added to the neighborhood mix. Some of the comments stated the opinion that more amenities should be proposed in exchange for considering relaxing the lot coverage standard. One neighbor appreciated the attention paid to the rear façade, but asked if the architect would consider brick there as well as the front instead of the split-face Concrete Masonry Units (CMU). Glare at the alley from parking lights should be minimized as well, the neighbors asked. The comment period ended July 26, 2000.

ANALYSIS –DESIGN REVIEW

Early Design Guidance

On October 20, 1999, the Design Review Board for Area 7 held an Early Design Guidance Public Meeting to review the site and vicinity, listened to the architect’s program objectives, and heard public comment, with the goal of identifying those City-wide Design Guidelines of highest priority to this site. The following responses to the design guidelines represent the Board’s priorities established at the Early Design Guidance Public Meeting:

PRIORITIES

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, the Design Review Board members provided the following siting and design guidance and identified by letter and number those siting and design guidelines found in the City of Seattle’s “*Design Review: Guidelines for Multifamily and Commercial Buildings*” of highest priority to this project:

A-2 Streetscape Compatibility - The siting of buildings should acknowledge and reinforce the existing desirable spatial characteristics of the right-of-way.

The proposed four-story structure should respond to the edge condition across the alley from multi-family zoned residential property, and should be keeping in character with the older buildings along the street. Placing the retail uses at the sidewalk is important to help keep activity levels high along the street. Interesting details and quality materials should be used where visible from the street. There is approximately 10’ of grade change down to the east. All parking access should come from the alley.

A-3 Entrances should be Visible from the Street- Entries should be clearly identifiable and visible from the street.

There should be clearly identifiable entries for the residential and commercial uses, with their own identities, and a clear distinction between them. Some Board discussion revolved around using the residential entry as an opportunity for some landscaping and gathering space. The commercial entries should make the businesses approachable.

A-4 Human Activity- New development should be sited and designed to encourage human activity on the street.

19th Ave. E is a minor pedestrian oriented arterial, and there should be activity and design that encourages pedestrian interaction. The Board liked the idea of retail close to the sidewalk, making for a safer and more enjoyable experience visiting the site, and more viable retail space.

A-5 Respect for Adjacent Sites- Buildings should respect adjacent properties by being located on their sites to minimize disruption of the privacy and outdoor activities of residents in adjacent buildings.

The Board discussed the existing building to the south, and how this project should deal sensitively with light, air, and privacy because that structure is built right to the property line. There was also discussion regarding the property to the north, which is well suited for improvements, and that property should be considered as well for light, air and privacy for future development.

B-1 Height, Bulk and Scale Compatibility – Projects should be compatible with the scale of development anticipated by the applicable Land Use Policies for the surrounding area and should be sited and designed to provide a sensitive transition to near-by, less-intensive zones. Projects on zone edges should be developed in a manner that creates a step in perceived height, bulk, and scale between the anticipated development potential of the adjacent zones.

Of particular interest to the Board are the front and rear of this project. As there is a less-intensive residential zone across the alley, the façade facing the alley should be, in effect, a second front. That façade should have all of the detailing, including decks, bay windows, and other items of architectural interest as any façade facing a street. There should be a good relationship with that residentially zoned property, including the possibility of landscaping along the alley. The street front façade should be inviting, with a clear relationship to the street and sidewalk that encourages activity at the street. The side facades should not be blank, but should have some windows or other architectural detailing.

C-1 Architectural Context - New building proposed for existing neighborhoods with a well-defined and desirable character should be compatible with or complement the architectural character and siting pattern of neighboring buildings.

There is a lower priority for this concept, as this is a neighborhood in transition, but some effort must be made to complement the existing building stock in the neighborhood.

C-2 Architectural Concept and Consistency - Building design elements, details and massing should create a well-proportioned and unified building form and exhibit an overall architectural concept. Buildings should exhibit form and features identifying the functions within the building.

The Board would like the proposal to use a strong base, with cornices and other details in the upper structure used to reflect the surrounding architecture. There should be an emphasis placed on unifying the design concept.

C-4 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.

The Board commented that materials and details were a given, as far as importance. The east side should have the same quality as the west side, and colors should be sensitive to the neighborhood, specifically, no “blah beige”.

D-1 Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances - Convenient and attractive access to the building's entry should be provided. To ensure comfort and security, paths and entry areas should be sufficiently lighted and entry areas should be sufficiently lighted and entry areas should be protected from the weather. Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.

The Board reiterated the importance of providing opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented entries that are clearly identifiable as entries.

D-6 Screening of Dumpsters, Utilities and Service Areas - Building sites should locate service elements like trash dumpsters, loading docks and mechanical equipment away from the street front where possible. When elements such as dumpsters can not be located away from the street front, they should be situated and screened from view and should not be located in the pedestrian right-of-way.

All trash receptacles and dumpsters should be screened and located adjacent to the alley within the garage.

E-2 Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site - Landscaping, including living plant material, special pavements, trellises, screen wall, planter, site furniture and similar features should be appropriately incorporated into the design to enhance the project.

The Board asked the applicant to consider landscaping and possibly open space near the sidewalk.

Recommendations:

The applicant is requesting departures for the amount of open space, landscaping of the open space, the general requirement for open space, driveway width, residential lot coverage, and possibly alley setbacks. At the early pre-design stage of the project, the board was generally not amenable to most departures unless the building was clearly better designed as a result of approving the departures. They will likely allow the narrowing of the driveway for the few commercial parking stalls. There was some consensus that some amount of departure would be possible for the open space, landscaping, and building coverage, but not a complete waiver of those standards. Board members chose to withhold any approvals until the final design is submitted for review and scrutiny.

Final Design Review Board Recommendations

Design Departures Requested:

The applicant is asking for modifications for upper level lot coverage for the residential portion of the building, the code allowing 64% coverage, and the applicant is asking for 72.5% to allow for a greater mix of unit types. Originally, the proposal was to seek departures from open space and landscaping quantities and location, driveway width and alley setback, but the current design meets those requirements and needs no modifications.

Meeting on December 13, 2000

Presentation

The presentation was provided by Tim Walker of WRP Associates, the architect and owner. The presentation started with a review of the last presentation elements including floor plans.

New information provided followed the Design Review Priorities as outlined in the Early Design Guidance Meeting and the Board discussion and comments at the October 20, 1999 meeting. These following responses were given during a presentation of color perspective, color elevations, and presentation boards - a packet of which was given to all Board and Staff members present. The Applicant's presentation is summarized as follows:

A-2 Streetscape Compatibility - The siting of buildings should acknowledge and reinforce the existing desirable spatial characteristics of the right-of-way.

- Mr. Walker explained that the structure was designed to reflect the patterns and rhythm of the neighborhood, with the structure built to the sidewalk in response to the commercial zoning and street level retail or office and taking cues from the design and materials of surrounding buildings.

A-3 Entrances should be Visible from the Street- Entries should be clearly identifiable and visible from the street.

- The pedestrian entry for the residential and commercial uses is directly from the sidewalk, with a clear identity. The vehicles enter from the alley only to reinforce the street entry identity.

A-4 Human Activity- New development should be sited and designed to encourage human activity on the street.

- Placing the entry at the sidewalk with minimal setback reinforces the pedestrian level activity, and invites interactions along the street. This makes for a more social and safe environment.

A-5 Respect for Adjacent Sites- Buildings should respect adjacent properties by being located on their sites to minimize disruption of the privacy and outdoor activities of residents in adjacent buildings.

- As above, the design reflects the patterns of the neighborhood, with colors chosen to complement surrounding structures while remaining a modern design.
- Courtyards are used on the side façades to soften bulk, provide landscaping and open space opportunities, and are placed in a manner that reflects the location of similar courtyards on the adjacent building.

B-1 Height, Bulk and Scale Compatibility – Projects should be compatible with the scale of development anticipated by the applicable Land Use Policies for the surrounding area and should be sited and designed to provide a sensitive transition to near-by, less-intensive zones. Projects on zone edges should be developed in a manner that creates a step in perceived height, bulk, and scale between the anticipated development potential of the adjacent zones.

- The terracing and landscaping of the rear of the building and incorporating “front” of the building design details at the alley help make a friendly transition to the housing across the alley.
- Certain of the details on the front of the building, notably the bay windows and façade details, are carried out on the rear as well, creating a structure that provides an orderly transition between the zones while maintaining the structures design integrity.
- Those same details reflect details in surrounding commercially zoned properties.

C-1 Architectural Context - New building proposed for existing neighborhoods with a well-defined and desirable character should be compatible with or complement the architectural character and siting pattern of neighboring buildings.

- As above, the design was chosen to complement the neighborhood, while looking ahead to the future, setting a context for future development.
- Materials include brick, bevel siding, bay windows and parapets much as the older structures in the neighborhood.
- Windows are set at the same levels as the building immediately adjacent to this one.

C-2 Architectural Concept and Consistency - Building design elements, details and massing should create a well-proportioned and unified building form and exhibit an overall architectural concept. Buildings should exhibit form and features identifying the functions within the building.

- See C-1 above.

C-4 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.

- See C-1 above.

D-1 Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances - Convenient and attractive access to the building's entry should be provided. To ensure comfort and security, paths and entry areas should be sufficiently lighted and entry areas should be sufficiently lighted and entry areas should be protected from the weather. Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.

- The entry is recessed, while the building is constructed right at the sidewalk, creating a lively environment with an area of repose, with a clear sense of entry.
- High quality materials will be utilized at the street, with lighting and other amenities designed to make the space comfortable and secure.
- The recess at the entrance will provide weather protection.

D-6 Screening of Dumpsters, Utilities and Service Areas - Building sites should locate service elements like trash dumpsters, loading docks and mechanical equipment away from the street front where possible. When elements such as dumpsters can not be located away from the street front, they should be situated and screened from view and should not be located in the pedestrian right-of-way.

- The dumpster and recycling will be located of the alley and screened.

E-2 Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site - Landscaping, including living plant material, special pavements, trellises, screen wall, planter, site furniture and similar features should be appropriately incorporated into the design to enhance the project.

- The courtyards on the side facades will be visible from the street.
- Street trees will be provided.
- The rear façade and terraces will be landscaped.
- Planters may be incorporated in the final design of the entrance.

Board Discussion:

The Board was pleased with the overall design, but questioned the modification for upper level lot coverage. Joy asked the architect why the Board should entertain the modification of lot coverage. Tim Walker replied that the difference, 800 sf of floor area per floor, would allow a wider range of rental units, adding more 1 and two bedroom units to the mix, and the scale would allow use of better materials. It was noted that 800 sf per floor would result in a total of 3200 additional square feet of units. When asked how the structure would change if the modification were denied, Mr. Walker replied that the courtyards at the sides would become larger, and some of the features such as bay windows would be removed. Board members stated that they felt the bays were important design elements and they should be saved if possible.

Board members asked to see color and material samples, and Mr. Walker presented a board with a color palette and samples. The materials include clinker bricks similar to what is used in the rest of the neighborhood, split-face CMU blocks, concrete tiles and muted green ceramic tiles. The sides of the structure will be faced with hardi-board planks in a dark yellow shade (umber), with accents in shades of tan and brown, rust, and a yellow-green tone. Window frames would be natural aluminum for contrast. The alley façade will be clad in split-face CMU mimicking the brick along the street, but giving a slightly different appearance. The parking would be screened with garage doors and the refuse collection area will be screened and secure within the garage. Landscaping will be used in the courtyards and rear terraces to soften the appearance of the structure, and along with landscaping on the roof, provide pleasant open space for the residents of the apartments.

Board Recommendations:

The Board expressed approval for the project design, but also expressed reservations about the requested design departure. Board members were pleased with the efforts to include elements of design found in the neighborhood and the use of materials. It was generally felt that the lot coverage exception requested was excessive, and did not create enough amenities to justify that amount of relief. The Board members agreed that the design fit well into the neighborhood and was respectful of the context, and materials and colors were well chosen.

The Design Review Board members recommended **APPROVAL** of the subject design and the requested development standard departures from the requirements of the Land Use Code, specifically as follows:

1. The Board **APPROVED** the project, with the condition that upper level lot coverage be reduced from the proposed 72.5%. Members agreed to allow some modification of the lot coverage, but no specific number was given, but gave a general direction of approving approximately half as much relief as was requested, leaving the final amount to the discretion of the Planner in charge of the project for DCLU.
2. The Board members present approved the project design as shown on December 13, 2000.

Director's Analysis

The Design Review Board agreed that the proposed design meets each of the Design Guideline Priorities except as discussed above. The Board recommended approval of the requested development standard departure as limited above, and as such, the Director gives the Board's recommendations substantial weight. At the December 13, 2000 meeting, at the Board's recommendation, the applicant agreed to: 1) reduce the upper level residential lot coverage to less than the 72.5% proposed; 2) retain the general appearance of the structure, but improve the detailing on the side facades nearest the street; 3) pay close attention to the courtyards relative to those on the adjacent building to the south; and 4) the Director accepts the Design Review Board's recommendations and approves the proposed design with the conditions identified below:

DECISION- DESIGN REVIEW

The proposed design is **APPROVED** with the following departures to development standards and conditions:

CONDITIONS AND DEPARTURES TO DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS-DESIGN REVIEW

Development Standard Departure

Design Departure: To allow the residential lot coverage above 13' to exceed 64% of the area of the lot. The applicant modified the proposal to slightly more than 68% coverage from the proposed 72.5%, which is more than is permitted under development standard 23.47.008D.

CONDITIONS

Design Review conditions are listed at the end of this report.

ANALYSIS-SEPA

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the Environmental Checklist submitted by the applicant (dated June 22, 2000), as annotated by the Land Use Planner. The information in the Environmental Checklist, the supplemental information submitted by the applicant, 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, 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 or circumstances (SMC 25.05.665 D 1-7) mitigation can be considered. Thus, a more detailed discussion of some of the impacts is appropriate.

Short-term Impacts

The following temporary or construction-related impacts are expected: decreased air quality due to suspended particulates from building activities and hydrocarbon emissions from construction vehicles and equipment; increased dust caused by drying mud tracked onto streets during construction activities; increased traffic and demand for parking from construction equipment and personnel; conflict with normal pedestrian movement adjacent to the site; increased noise; and consumption of renewable and non-renewable resources.

Several adopted codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code regulates site excavation for foundation purposes and requires that soil erosion control techniques be initiated for the duration of construction. The Street Use Ordinance requires watering streets to suppress dust, on-site washing of truck tires, removal of debris from the street right-of-way, and regulates obstruction of the pedestrian right-of-way. Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency (PSAPCA) regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. The Building Code provides for construction measures in general. Finally, the Noise Ordinance regulates the time and amount of construction noise that is permitted in the city. Compliance with these applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most short-term impacts to the environment.

Noise

Noise associated with construction of the building could adversely affect surrounding uses in the area which include residential uses. Because the need for mitigation is somewhat different for residential and commercial, noise impacts to each use have been analyzed separately.

Surrounding residential uses are likely impacted by noise throughout the duration of construction activities. Due to proximity of residential uses, the limitations of the Noise Ordinance are found to be inadequate to mitigate the potential noise impacts. Pursuant to the SEPA Overview Policy (SMC.25.05.665) and the SEPA Construction Impacts Policy (SMC 25.05.675 B), mitigation is warranted. The hours of construction activity shall be limited to non-holiday weekdays between the hours of 7:30 a.m. and 6:30 p.m. DCLU may modify the hours of construction to allow work of an emergency nature, low-noise exterior work (such as installation of landscaping or stucco), or work which cannot otherwise be accomplished during these hours by written approval of the Land Use Planner. Once the structure is enclosed, interior construction may be done in compliance with the noise ordinance and would not be subject to the Master Use Permit conditions.

Other low-noise, non-construction activities may be done at any time such as, but not limited to, site security, surveillance, monitoring for weather protection, checking tarps, surveying, and walking on and around the site and structure. These types of activities are not considered construction and will not be limited by the conditions imposed on this Mater Use Permit.

Construction Worker Parking

To assure that construction vehicles and equipment do not further limit on-street parking availability, the applicant/responsible party shall assure that the vehicle of construction workers, construction vehicles and equipment are parked on the proposal site for the term of the construction whenever possible (SEPA Construction Impacts Policy (SMC 25.05.675B)).

Earth

The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code requires preparation of a soils report to evaluate the site conditions and provide recommendations for safe construction on sites where grading will involve cuts or fills of greater than three feet in height or grading greater than 100 cubic yards of material. This site does not fall under steep slope environmentally critical area (ECA) requirements.

The soils report, construction plans, and shoring of excavations as needed will be reviewed by the DCLU Geotechnical Engineer and Building Plans Examiner who will require any additional soils-related information, recommendations, declarations, covenants and bonds as necessary to assure safe grading and excavation

Long-term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal including: increased bulk and scale on the site; increased traffic in the area and increased demand for parking; increased demand for public services and utilities; and increased light and glare. There will also be increased surface water runoff from greater site coverage by impervious surfaces; potentially decreased water quality in surrounding watersheds; increased ambient noise due to increased human activity; and increased energy consumption.

Height, Bulk & Scale

The proposed four-story project will be located in a Neighborhood Commercial 1 zone with a forty-foot height limit (NC1-40'). Development east of the property includes two-story residential buildings in an area zoned L-1. The maximum height limit in the L-1 zone is twenty-five feet, but that can be increased to 35' with a pitched roof. Properties adjacent to the site to the north, south and west are zoned NC1-40'. However, for the most part, development in the neighborhood commercial zones in the vicinity are under-developed with two and three-story mixed-use buildings.

The SEPA Height, Bulk and Scale policy (SMC Section 25.06.675.G) states that “*the height, bulk and scale of development anticipated by the adopted Land Use Policies...for the area in which they are located, and to provide for a reasonable transition between areas of less intensive zoning and more intensive zoning.*” Therefore, it is appropriate to consider height, bulk and scale impacts on development to the east of the proposal in the L-1 zone.

The Design Review Board requested that the applicant mitigate impacts of height, bulk and scale on the surrounding area by attention to detail of the east façade using high quality materials, bay windows, and adequate landscaping. The residential mass is set back fifteen (15) feet from the alley to reduce the apparent mass. The Design Review Board was satisfied with the treatment of this façade. In accordance with SEPA Policies related to height, bulk and scale, deference is given to the Board's recommendation because the project incorporates design elements which adequately address height, bulk and scale and transition to a less intensive zone, and no mitigation is required.

The Design Review Board concluded that the applicant adequately responded to the Design Review Guideline Priorities identified at the Early Design Guidance meeting and was supportive of the requested departure to the development standard as to residential lot

coverage. The Design Review Board reviewed the project's height, bulk and scale impacts and concluded that with the recommended condition the project would provide sensitive transition to adjacent residential properties. The Director finds no evidence to indicate that the height, bulk and scale impacts are not adequately addressed through the Design Review process and requires no additional mitigating measures pursuant to SEPA beyond the Design Review conditions identified at the end of this document.

Traffic and Transportation

A traffic assessment was prepared for this project by Lochner Consulting Engineers & Planners (September 21, 2000). The report analyzed existing and future Peak PM Hours Trip generation and was modeled using trip generation statistics assembled by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), *Trip generation Manual, 2nd Edition*. The report, which is on file at DCLU, estimates a generation of 19 Net PM Peak Hour Trips, existing plus new in the alley. The project will have only a minor impact on performance at local intersections, therefore no mitigation of project impacts is warranted pursuant to SEPA.

Parking

The proposal would include 1963 square feet of retail use, which could be converted to office use and 44 dwelling units-ranging from studio to two-bedroom units. The project includes 54 on-site parking spaces as required by the Seattle Land Use Code. The maximum parking demand anticipated from the apartment units and commercial units would be on the order of 66 spaces (based on a City-wide demand ratio of approximately 1.5 spaces per unit). Since the commercial and residential uses may share spaces and the peak demand on parking for the two uses do not generally intersect, the maximum spillover of parking into the neighborhood would be 12 spaces.

With parking on both sides of 19th Avenue East, there is an adequate supply of on-street parking in the neighborhood, with on-street parking often below capacity. The Lochner report indicates parking in the area is at 63% of maximum capacity, with 311 of 493 available spaces utilized on average, leaving an average of 182 available parking spaces to handle spillover. The SEPA Parking Policy (SMC 25.05.675M) states in part: "It is the City's policy to minimize or prevent adverse parking impacts associated with new development projects," and that, "Parking impact mitigation for projects outside of downtown zones may include but is not limited to: increased parking ratios." Pursuant to this policy, the project will not adversely impact parking in the neighborhood and no additional mitigation is warranted.

DECISION – SEPA

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

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

CONDITIONS – DESIGN REVIEW

The owner(s) and/or responsible party(-ies) shall:

Prior to Issuance of Master Use Permit

1. Building elevations shall be modified to reflect the reduced lot coverage agreed upon and details of the street facing side facades shall be enhanced.

Prior to Issuance of Building Permit

2. A final landscaping plan shall be submitted and approved by the Land Use Planner.

Prior to Issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy

3. Compliance with the above conditions must be field-verified and approved by the Land Use Planner assigned to the project (Bob McElhose, at (206)386-9745) or the Senior Land Use Planner for the area where the project is located, at the specified development stage, as required in the Director's decision. You must make an appointment at least three (3) working days in advance of a field inspection. The Land Use Planner will determine whether compliance has been achieved or whether submission of additional information is needed to verify compliance.

CONDITIONS-SEPA

The owner(s) and/or responsible party(s) shall:

During Construction

The following conditions to be enforced during construction shall be posted at the site in a location on the property line that is visible and accessible to the public and to construction personnel from the street right-of-way. The conditions will be affixed to placards prepared by DCLU. The placards will be issued along with the building permit set of plans. The placards shall be laminated with clear plastic or other waterproofing material and shall remain posted on-site for the duration of the construction.

1. The hours of construction activity shall be limited to non-holiday weekdays between the hours of 7:30 a.m. and 6:30 p.m. This condition may be modified by DCLU to allow work of an emergency nature or allow low noise interior work after the exterior of the structure is enclosed. This condition may also be modified to permit low noise exterior work (e.g., installation of landscaping) after approval from DCLU.

2. The applicant shall submit a parking plan for construction workers at varying stages of construction. The plan shall include parking locations for construction worker vehicles, construction-related vehicles and equipment which are parked either on-site or are parked off-site and outside of the business district, or a combination thereof for the term of construction.
3. The applicant shall submit a circulation plan which identifies alternative, safe, unobstructed pedestrian routes to be used during demolition/grading/construction phases. The pedestrian plan shall be reviewed and approved by SEATRAN to ensure pedestrian safety during construction.

Prior to Issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy:

4. Provide a landscape irrigation plan.

Signature: (signature on file) Date: April 30, 2001
Robert McElhose, Supervising Land Use Planner
Department of Design, Construction and Land Use
Land Use Division