

# SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

## UPDATED 2014

### ***Purpose of checklist:***

Governmental agencies use this checklist to help determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant. This information is also helpful to determine if available avoidance, minimization or compensatory mitigation measures will address the probable significant impacts or if an environmental impact statement will be prepared to further analyze the proposal.

## **A. Background**

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Rainier Beach Area Rezones for Affordable Housing Development

2. Name of applicant:

City of Seattle

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:

Office of Planning and Community Development  
700 5th Avenue, Suite 2000  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
Contact: Geoff Wentlandt, (206) 684-3586

4. Date checklist prepared:

May 11, 2020

5. Agency requesting checklist:

City of Seattle Office of Planning and Community Development

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):

Approval by City Council and Mayor in the summer of 2020.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

No

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

A Mandatory Housing Affordability FEIS was issued in November of 2017. The FEIS does not include analysis of the zone changes in this proposal. However, the exhibits in the Land Use Section (3.2), the Aesthetics section, (3.3), the Open Space and Recreation Section (3.7) were consulted. The sections were consulted for baseline and reference data and existing conditions information. The sections were also consulted for understanding the degree of impact that could be expected where applicable information about zone changes was available including for the aesthetics analysis.

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

Applications for Master Use Permit (MUP) and design review, are pending for development of affordable housing buildings, a Muslim Housing Services referral office, the Rainier Valley Community Food Center on property contained in this proposal. (Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections project numbers 3027659, and 3035046). The proposed rezones evaluated in this proposal are analyzed independent of the pending proposed projects.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

Approval of an ordinance by Seattle City Council.

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

This is a non-project proposal. This proposal would implement a suite of zoning changes on land in the Rainier Beach neighborhood on a collection of currently vacant or little-used parcels fronting Rainier Avenue South. Due to their location and proximity to neighboring uses and institutions, the parcels are identified as having a high potential for infill development with affordable multi-family housing and social service uses. OPCD proposes incremental zoning changes to increase zoning capacity to moderately higher-intensity zones with the intention for these lands to potentially support greater densities or quantities of affordable housing and social services. The proposal supports development that would be in efficient configurations for cost-effective construction due to the topographical factors and parcel size features. In total the proposal would affect 3.16 acres of land in two clusters with multiple parcels each. The parcel clusters are located approximately 1,300 feet or roughly a quarter mile from one another along Rainier Ave. S. at S. Cloverdale St. and S. Rose St. Throughout this checklist the areas will be referred to as the S. Cloverdale cluster of parcels and the S. Rose St. cluster of parcels.

The following zone name acronyms are used in the description below:

Acronym	Name / Description
SF 5000	Single Family 5000 zone
LR3	Lowrise 3 multifamily zone
NC2-55	Neighborhood Commercial 2 zone with a 55' height limit
NC2-65	Neighborhood Commercial 2 zone with a 65' height limit
(M)	MHA base level affordable housing requirement
(M1)	MHA second tier (higher) affordable housing requirement
(M2)	MHA third tier (higher) affordable housing requirement

### ***S. Cloverdale St. Cluster***

This cluster consists of three parcels, totaling 1.15 acres to the northwest of the Rainier Beach High School sports fields. The existing zoning on these parcels is NC2-55 (M). The proposal would rezone these parcels to NC2-65 (M1). See also attached map. The cluster of parcels is within the Rainier Beach urban village and no change to the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designation would be required.

### ***S. Rose. St. Cluster***

This cluster consists of two large parcels north of the existing Rose Street Apartment building that total 2.01 acres. One parcel fronts onto Rainier Ave. South, is 68,567 sq. ft., and extends east to approximately the middle of the block. This parcel is split-zoned at the approximate midpoint of the parcel, with the front half facing Rainier Ave. S. and is currently zoned LR3 (M). The rear half of this parcel is currently zoned SF 5000. The large parcel is used as a religious facility. A second smaller parcel is directly to the south of the first parcel. It is 18,659 sq. ft. and is currently vacant and zoned NC2-55 (M).

Under this proposal, the three portions of the cluster would be rezoned as follows:

- Front (Rainier Ave. facing) portion of the large parcel: from LR3 (M) to NC2-55 (M1)
- Rear portion of the large parcel: from SF 5000 to LR3 (M1)
- Smaller parcel: from NC2-55(M) to NC2-55(M1)

The proposed zoning would improve upon the prior zoning error that split-zoned the large parcel. In general City policy seeks to avoid split-zoning any parcel. We believe the split zoning of the parcel was unintentional. OPCD proposes to improve upon the erroneous split-zone condition by applying the NC2-55 (M1) zone to the front-half of the large parcel, which would create consistency with the existing zoning to the south on the smaller parcel in the cluster. For the rear half of the parcel, OPCD proposes a rezone to the LR3 (M1) zone, which would provide a stepped transition from higher intensity commercial zoning on the arterial road, to a multi-family residential zone, before the edge of the Single Family context. Under the proposal, height limits would be stepped, from 55' (NC zone), to 40' (LR3 zone), to 35' (Single Family zone).

With the zoning change, OPCD proposes to make a corresponding correction to the Comprehensive Plan FLUM. Similar to zone boundaries it is unintended for a single parcel to be split with multiple Comprehensive Plan designations. This proposal would amend the FLUM mapping error that applies a split comprehensive plan designation to the large Rose St. parcel. The mapping correction would apply a single Commercial/Mixed Use designation to the entire parcel. This correction would be made as an administrative correction that is provided for by the Seattle Municipal Code and the Comprehensive Plan.

See also attached maps.

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.

The proposal would address the two clusters of parcels along Rainier Ave. S. in the Rainier Beach neighborhood as described above. One cluster is at S. Rose St. (7930 Rainier Ave. S), and the other cluster is at S. Cloverdale St. (8600 Rainier Ave. S.) See also attached maps.



## B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

### 1. Earth

- a. General description of the site  
(circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous,  
other \_\_\_\_\_
- b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?
- c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils.
- d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.
- e. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities and total affected area of any filling, excavation, and grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.
- f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.
- g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?
- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

This is a non-project action. No construction, grading or filling are proposed as a part of this action.

The affected area of the S. Rose St. cluster is relatively flat, with a gentle slope to the east. Total elevation gain across the entire site is approximately 6 feet. The affected area of the S. Cloverdale St. cluster is slightly sloping downward to the northeast. There are no steep slopes on the site.

Both sites are in the Rainier Valley in areas underlaid by glacial drift deposits including till and outwash deposits from the Pleistocene era. There are no surface indications of unstable soils.

Compliance with existing city ordinances to reduce or control erosion is required.

### 2. Air

- a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.
- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed. Rainier Ave. S. is an arterial road with high traffic volume that causes emissions from vehicles. Otherwise there are no known sources of off-site emissions and odors in close proximity to the affected areas.

The proposal could encourage future development that is slightly greater in scale than would be allowed under existing zoning. Development might result in emissions generally consistent with construction, operation, and maintenance in urban areas.

Compliance with existing city ordinances to reduce or control emissions and other impacts to air is required.

### 3. Water

a. Surface Water:

- 1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.
- 2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.
- 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.
- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.
- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.
- 6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

This is a non-project action. No construction or site alteration is proposed. Both clusters of parcels in the affected area are within 2,000 feet of the Lake Washington shoreline. There are no streams or surface water on any of the sites in the affected area. No portion of the affected area is in the shoreline environment. No discharge is proposed.

b. Ground Water:

- 1) Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well. Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.
- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals. . . ; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the

number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

This is a non-project action. No construction or site alteration is proposed. The proposal could encourage future development which might result in one-time or ongoing ground water withdrawals generally consistent with construction, operation, and maintenance in urban areas.

c. Water runoff (including stormwater):

1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.

This is a non-project action. No construction or site alteration is proposed. The proposal could encourage future residential development which might result in water runoff generally consistent with construction, operation, and maintenance in urban areas.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water, and drainage pattern impacts, if any:

Compliance with existing city ordinances to reduce or control surface, ground, or runoff water impacts is required.

**4. Plants**

a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site:

- X deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
- X evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
- shrubs
- X grass
- pasture
- crop or grain
- Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.
- wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
- water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
- other types of vegetation

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

c. List threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.

This is a non-project action. No construction or site alteration is proposed. The S. Rose St. cluster includes several mature trees including a known exceptional sitka willow tree. The cluster of parcels at S. Cloverdale St. includes a variety of unmaintained grasses and shrubs including blackberries in the gently sloping area at the edge of the Rainier Beach High School sports fields. There are no large trees on the Cloverdale St. parcels.

## 5. Animals

- a. List any birds and other animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site. Examples include:

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:  
mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:  
fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other \_\_\_\_\_

- b. List any threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.
- c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.
- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:
- e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.

Not applicable. No specific animals have been observed on the sites. However, vegetation and trees on the sites are likely to be used by songbirds and potentially other birds and rodents and small mammals in the area.

## 6. Energy and natural resources

- a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.
- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.
- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

This is a non-project action. No construction or site alteration are proposed. The proposal could encourage future development that is incrementally larger than what would be allowed under existing zoning, which might result in additional energy and natural resource use generally consistent with construction, operation, and maintenance in urban areas.

## 7. Environmental health

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.



- 1) Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.
- 2) Describe existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project development and design. This includes underground hazardous liquid and gas transmission pipelines located within the project area and in the vicinity.
- 3) Describe any toxic or hazardous chemicals that might be stored, used, or produced during the project's development or construction, or at any time during the operating life of the project.
- 4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.
- 5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

The cluster of parcels at S. Cloverdale St. currently contains the New Star Mini Mart. In the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the site was occupied by an automobile service station, and later a portion of the site is thought to have been occupied by a car wash operation. There may be possible contamination from petrochemicals or cleaning chemicals on some of this affected area due to the past uses. At the time of a project proposal a detailed environmental site assessment would be required, and remediation could be required before ground-disturbing new construction. The Rose St. cluster of parcels are currently occupied by residential uses and a religious facility and are not known to have housed contaminating uses in the past.

#### b. Noise

- 1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?
- 2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.
- 3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

This is a non-project action. No construction or site alternative is proposed. The proposal could encourage future development which might result in additional health hazards or noise generally consistent with construction, operation, and maintenance in urban areas. Both sites are on Rainier Ave. S. a high-volume roadway that causes noise from passenger vehicles, busses and trucks. The S. Cloverdale Street cluster is also adjacent to the Rainier Beach High School softball and baseball fields. Sporting events at the fields could cause noise that would affect future development at the sites.

#### 8. Land and shoreline use

- a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe.
- b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses as a result of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax

status will be converted to nonfarm or nonforest use? Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how:

- c. Describe any structures on the site.
- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?
- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?
- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?
- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?
- h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify.
- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?
- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?
- k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:
- l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:
- m. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with nearby agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:

This is a non-project action. No construction or site alteration is proposed.

The S. Cloverdale St. cluster is within the Rainier Beach Residential Urban Village comprehensive plan Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designation. The designation provides broad flexibility for types and intensities of zoning. The proposed zoning change from a 55' height limit to a 65' limit is consistent with the comprehensive plan FLUM designation.

The S. Rose St. cluster is not within a designated urban village, and has a combination of Multifamily Residential, Commercial/Mixed Use, and Single Family FLUM designations. This proposal improves an anomaly on the large parcel that splits that parcel with the Lowrise Multifamily and the Single Family 5000 FLUM designations. The SMC calls for corrections to zoning anomalies (cite), and general zoning principles include guidance against split-zoning. This proposal would make a FLUM mapping correction to apply one consistent FLUM designation to the large parcel and the second parcel in the cluster: Commercial / Mixed Use. The proposal improves on an unintended zoning map condition, and achieves a planned land use pattern more in line with Comprehensive Plan and SMC zoning principles.

None of the affected area is within a shoreline environment. Zoning classifications are as noted in the proposal description above. The proposal could encourage future residential development which might result in the demolition of existing structures. The Rose St. cluster contains vacant land, and a religious facility. The Coverdale St. cluster contains vacant land and the New Star mini mart. There are no residential units on any of

the affected land, so there is no possibility for direct residential displacement from any development in the affected area.

Nearby and adjacent uses to the Cloverdale St. cluster are as follows. The portion of property that fronts S. Cloverdale sits adjacent to an 18,732 square foot parcel which is located to the east and is currently occupied by a single-story wood frame building built in 2007 which is currently used as an office building. Located directly east of the proposal are the Rainier Beach High School sports fields owned by the Seattle Public School District. Located to the south is a four story, wood frame apartment building built in 1960. Other development in the area consists of the Rainier Beach Community Center located on the west side of Rainier Ave S and the South Lake Service School to the north dominating the southwest corner of Rainier Ave S and S. Cloverdale St.

Adjacent uses to the Rose St. cluster are the Rose Street Apartments to the south, and a three-story mid-century garden apartment complex to the north along Rainier Avenue. The rear portion of the site abuts single family residential buildings that back up to the parcel from Wolcott Ave. S., and Duncan Ave. S.

## 9. Housing

- a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.
- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed. No housing units will be eliminated since there is no existing housing on site. Although this proposal does not include construction, the proposed zoning envelopes could facilitate an estimated 425 new housing units using general assumptions.

The Seattle Office of Housing in 2019 awarded resources to non-profit housing providers for potential future affordable housing development at both clusters. Therefore, it is a high likelihood that all or the vast majority of future housing constructed on these sites would be rent- and income-restricted affordable housing.

## 10. Aesthetics

- a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?
- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed. The proposal would modify height limits. In the S. Cloverdale St. cluster of parcels, the height limit would increase from 55' to 65'. This increase equates to about one additional story of building height. There would be minimal effects of an additional story of allowed height on adjacent areas because of the nature of the surrounding uses. Most of the site is

bordered to the southeast by sports fields and the uses to the north and the south are a multi-story apartment building and a small office building separated from the parcels by a parking lot. The height limit on the Rose St. cluster of parcels would change from 40' to 55' for the front half of the site, and from 35' to 40' for the rear half of the site currently in the single family designation. The height limit on the south portion of the site facing Rainier Ave. would remain 55' as it is currently. The increase in the height limit could affect the aesthetic condition for single family homes that are adjacent to the area, if new development is proposed. Greater height limits and appearance of mass and scale would be experienced by single family home owners in the area. The Lowrise 3 zone that would abut single family areas includes setback requirements of 15' from the rear lot line, and an average of 7' from side lot lines. In addition, an upper-level setback of 12 feet is required where abutting a lot zoned single-family for all portions of the structure above 34 feet in height. The LR3 zone setbacks would mitigate the effect of mass and scale on adjacent areas.

Compliance with design review guidelines, and a design review process would be required for future development on both clusters of parcels. Design review is expected to have a moderating effect on aesthetic impacts from new development, particularly in the case of the Rose St. parcels. Design guidelines contain extensive guidance for stepped transitions where a higher intensity zone abuts a lower intensity zone. Design review, and the zoning allow for arrangement of building mass in configurations that mitigate the aesthetic and height/bulk/scale impacts on adjacent homes.

## 11. Light and glare

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?
- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?
- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?
- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed. The proposal could encourage future development which might result in the light and glare generally consistent with the construction, operation, and maintenance of buildings in urban areas. The amount and nature of light from potential future development of the sites would be similar to existing light and glare emitted from adjacent development and the context of light from vehicles on Rainier Ave. S. Compliance with existing city ordinances on construction and design review is required.

The S. Cloverdale St. cluster is abutted by the Rainier Beach High School ball fields, including softball and baseball fields with lights. Light and glare from the ball fields could affect future development on this cluster of parcels.

## 12. Recreation

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?
- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed. The proposal could encourage future residential development which might result in the removal or creation of recreational opportunities generally consistent with the construction, operation, and maintenance of buildings in urban areas.

The affected area is close to extensive existing recreational opportunities within walking distance. These include the Rainier Beach High School fields and facilities; the Rainier Beach Community Center and Pool; and Pritchard Island Beach Park within a quarter mile to the east on the shore of Lake Washington.

Compliance with existing city ordinances on amenity areas is required.

### 13. Historic and cultural preservation

- a. Are there any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers located on or near the site? If so, specifically describe.
- b. Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation? This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources.
- c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.
- d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required.

This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed. The affected area does not contain any Seattle Landmarks or structures eligible for designation in historic registers. No structures or sites in the immediate vicinity of the site are known to have historic significance or eligibility for designation.

Compliance with existing city ordinances on historic resources is required.

### 14. Transportation

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site or affected geographic area and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.
- b. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?
- c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?
- d. Will the proposal require any new or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

- e. Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.
- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and nonpassenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates?
- g. Will the proposal interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, generally describe.
- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed. The affected area is adjacent to Rainier Ave. S., which is classified by SDOT as a principal arterial roadway part of the Frequent Transit Network. Bus stops for the Route 7 and 9 busses on Rainier Ave. S. are within one block for each cluster of parcels.

The proposal could affect the size, location, and amount of bike and motor vehicle parking provided in new development. On street parking is available on the east side of Rainier Ave. in the vicinity of the Rose St. cluster and on blocks north of there. Abundant on street parking is available on S. Cloverdale St. in the vicinity of that cluster. The proposal could allow future development with an increment of more housing or commercial space which could cause further constraints on-street parking in the area. The proposal could encourage future residential development which might result in additional vehicular trips, the removal or creation of additional parking spaces, and impacts to existing infrastructure as generally consistent with the construction, operation, and maintenance of buildings in urban areas.

Compliance with existing city ordinances on parking and transportation infrastructure is required.

**15. Public services**

- a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, public transit, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.
- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed. The proposal could encourage future residential development which might result in additional need for public services. The proposal could incrementally increase the number of housing units and commercial spaces with the Rainier Beach neighborhood requiring public services. The Rainier Beach Urban Village is an area of the city that is prioritized for delivery of public services and planned for expected residential and commercial growth.

**16. Utilities**

- a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:  
 electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system,  
 other \_\_\_\_\_

All of the above utilities are available in the Rainier Ave. S. corridor.

b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed. The affected area has access to a variety of utility services.

### C. Signature

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature:	on file
Name of signee:	Geoff Wentlandt
Position and Agency/Organization:	Land Use Policy Manager City of Seattle Office of Planning & Community Development
Date Submitted:	May 11, 2020

## D. Supplemental sheet for nonproject actions

### 1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

Overall, this non-project proposal would not result in any direct impacts to water, air, toxic or hazardous substances, or noise because it does not directly propose development. In terms of its effects upon future possible development, the proposed zoning changes would increase allowable amount and density of new development. The increment of additional future development that could occur could generate minor adverse impacts commonly associated with development in urban areas, such as emissions from automobile trips and heating in new buildings, and incidental contributions to environmental noise and stormwater runoff.

The proposed changes could result in incremental increases in the amount and duration of construction activity, but these would make only a minor difference in the total potential for emissions to air, noise and release of toxic or hazardous substances. Any development or redevelopment will have to comply with City regulations for management of stormwater runoff and other construction practices and requirements.

Any incremental increase in greenhouse gas emissions resulting from additional development could be offset at least partially by reductions in commuting over future buildings' lifetimes as more residents and employees would be able to live and work in Seattle.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are: None proposed.

### 2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

There are vegetated portions of properties present within the affected areas and some existing large trees and one exceptional tree as described in part B above. There is likely to be some use of these vegetated areas by birds and some small mammals. The vegetation and habitat that could be affected to an incrementally greater degree are isolated patches within a highly urbanized areas of Seattle. Any habitat loss from future development on the affected areas would not be linked to any significant broader habitat corridors, and therefore would be of relatively small impact.

This non-project proposal would result in no direct impacts to plants, animals, fish, or marine life because it does not directly propose development. The proposal could indirectly affect the potential for impacts to plants and animals because redevelopment of the sites may be incrementally more likely, and/or may cover more of the parcel area compared to development under existing conditions.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life. The existing regulations in the SMC are likely to minimize impacts on plants and animals, and may even serve to improve habitat if new development occurs. All of the proposed zones include Green Factor landscaping requirements. Existing zoning in the Single Family 5000 area does not include a Green Factor Landscaping requirement. New development under the proposal would provides ecologically functioning vegetation because of Green Factor. It is also expected that the City's tree ordinance will provide incentive for the exceptional tree located on site to be retained at the time of a future redevelopment.

### 3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?



The proposed changes would result in no direct negative impacts to energy or natural resources because it does not directly propose development. Changes in the amount or density of future development could result in an incremental increase in the number or density of new housing units and/or commercial spaces that, in some cases, could result in incrementally higher energy use for a particular project. The differential levels of impacts given potential increments in future development are not likely to be significant. New buildings will continue to be required to comply with the Seattle Energy Code and other standards for energy efficiency. Additionally, to the extent that additional development capacity results in an increase in the number of housing units in Seattle, the proposal may in certain cases reduce demand for energy and natural resources by increasing residential and commercial density in an area with frequent transit service and a mix of land uses, increasing the likelihood that people will walk and use transit for work and other daily trips.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are: None proposed.

**4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection, such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?**

The proposed changes would result in no direct negative impacts to environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated for government protection because it does not directly propose development. The affected area does not contain any of the environmentally sensitive areas listed in this question 4.

Future possible development projects in these areas would continue to be subject to the requirements of project level State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review and other state laws for potential archaeologically significant sites, as applicable.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are: None proposed.

**5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?**

The proposal would result in no direct impacts to land and shoreline use as it is a non-project action. No construction is proposed. The proposal would change the zoning designation for two clusters of parcels, which in some of the affected areas would change the type and intensity of allowed land uses and could cause indirect impacts on the compatibility of potential future uses with plans. This proposal will increase the conformance of the planned land use pattern with that envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan and the SMC.

For the affected area in the S. Cloverdale St. cluster of parcels, the proposal would have no adverse effect on the compatibility of potential future land uses with existing plans. The S. Cloverdale St. parcels are within the Rainier Beach Residential Urban Village comprehensive plan designation. In general, urban villages are planned as priority areas for growth in the city with dense concentrations of housing and jobs. The proposed zoning change from NC2-55 to NC2-65 for this area would not change the allowed land uses (both are NC2 zones), but could result in an extra story of residential development at the upper floors of future buildings, causing a slightly denser use of land. Additional density in the urban village is supported by multiple Comprehensive Plan policies including the following:

*GS 1.2 Encourage investments and activities in urban centers and urban villages that will enable those areas to flourish as compact mixed-use neighborhoods designed to accommodate the majority of the city's new jobs and housing.*

*GS 1.5 Encourage infill development in underused sites, particularly in urban centers and villages.*

*GS 1.13 Provide opportunities for marginalized populations to live and work in urban centers and urban villages throughout the city by allowing a variety of housing types and affordable rent levels in these places.*

The proposed height limit of 65' is appropriate for the urban village location as per SMC general rezone criterion 23.34.008 E.4 (emphasis added)

*"In general the **height limits greater than 55 feet should be limited to urban villages.** Height limits greater than 55 feet may be considered outside of urban villages where higher height limits would be consistent with an adopted neighborhood plan, a major institution's adopted master plan, or where the designation would be consistent with the existing built character of the area."*

The proposed zoning changes to the Rose St. cluster of parcels would affect potential future land use. Development under the proposed zoning would be consistent with the overall planned land uses and functions in the Rainier Ave. S. corridor, and the proposal will improve overall compatibility of land use with principles set out in the SMC and the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed changes could result in adverse impact to the compatibility of potential new development and existing single family areas near the rear portion of the Rose St. parcels as discussed below.

The Rose St. cluster of parcels is roughly one block north of the Rainier Beach Residential Urban Village. The Comprehensive Plan does not focus as much growth outside of urban villages compared to urban village locations. But the plan does call for infill development in appropriate locations and circumstances outside of urban villages. The Comprehensive Plan's Growth strategy element provides the following policy guidance specifically for areas outside of urban villages:

*GS 1.22 Support healthy neighborhoods throughout the city so that all residents have access to a range of housing choices, as well as access to parks, open space, and services.*

*GS 1.23 Allow limited multifamily, commercial, and industrial uses outside of urban villages to support the surrounding area or to maintain the existing character.*

The Comprehensive Plan Land Use element provides the following additional guidance for planned land use in areas outside of urban villages:

*LU G1 Achieve a development pattern consistent with the urban village strategy, concentrating most new housing and employment in urban centers and villages, while also allowing some infill development compatible with the established context in areas outside centers and villages.*

*LU 1.2 Promote this plan's overall desired land use pattern through appropriate zoning that regulates the mix of uses as well as the size and density of development to focus new residential and commercial development in urban centers and urban villages, and integrate new projects outside of centers and villages into the established development context.*

The “established land use / development context” for the nearby Rainier Ave. S. corridor is a varied mix of single and multi-story commercial developments, multi-story multifamily residential development of various sizes, and mixed-use commercial / residential development. More recent construction is mixed use / commercial such as the Rose Street apartments immediately to the south, and Emerald City Commons in the block to the north. There is a collection of multi-story apartment buildings that are 20 or more years old on both sides of Rainier in the vicinity, such as the 7827 Rainier Ave. S. and the building immediately to the north. Typical development in the NC2-55 zone of multi-story residential development over ground floor commercial, would be compatible with this existing, somewhat eclectic context. There are numerous commercial businesses on Rainier Ave. S. in this stretch. The proposed change to NC2 zoning would allow commercial development on the front portion of the Rose St. cluster that is consistent with the established context of many commercial uses in the area. For these reasons, the proposal to change the Rainier Ave. S. frontage to NC2-55 zoning (from LR3 zoning in one portion) would create compatibility with existing land use pattern and plans. It would not alter the “existing character”.

The rear portion of the large Rose St parcel is split-zoned, and has a split Comprehensive Plan designation. This proposal would change the zoning for the back portion from SF-5000 to LR3. The application of the LR3 zone to the rear portion of the parcel would provide a stepped transition from the commercial Rainier Ave. frontage, to multifamily residential use, to the single family area to the east. Other deep parcels in the vicinity along Rainier Ave. S. have commercial uses at the front of the lot, and dense multifamily uses that extend to a similar depth in the block to that proposed, including areas in the block north of Kenyon St. and the block north of Frontenac St. (i.e. The Emerald City Commons building). This proposal would be consistent with the precedent of other nearby areas, and it would provide a more gradual stepped transition of uses and scale – as envisioned in Comprehensive Plan policies including GS 3.11 below (emphasis added.)

*GS 3.11 Use zoning tools and natural features to **ease the transitions from the building intensities of urban villages and commercial arterials to lower-density developments of surrounding areas.***

The SMC provides additional guidance to create height transition from higher areas to lower areas at SMC 23.34.009.D.2:

*“A gradual transition in height and scale and level of activity between zones shall be provided unless major physical buffers, as described in subsection 23.34.008.D.2, are present.”*

Splitting single parcels with multiple zones and Comprehensive Plan FLUM designation is generally discouraged, and It is believed that the splitting of the large parcel in the Rose St. cluster was unintentional. Unification of the lot with a single FLUM designation is a boundary correction under this proposal.

The Comprehensive Plan addresses these types of corrections at page 40 (emphasis added):

*“As the city’s needs and priorities shift, the **Future Land Use Map may be changed or formally amended. Some changes, such as adjusting boundaries or moving around specific zones within the same general land use area or urban village, can be made without a formal amendment or change to the map.** (Page 40 introduction to the Land Use Element.)”*

Land Use Policy LU 1.5 provides further guidance for when such changes to the map are appropriate:

*LU 1.5 Require Future Land Use Map amendments only when needed to achieve a significant change to the intended function of a large area.*

The SMC also addresses the correction of mapping errors in rezone criteria:

*23.34.007. F Mapping errors due to cartographic or clerical mistakes may be corrected through process required for Type V Council land use decisions in SMC Chapter 23.76 and do not require the evaluation contemplated by the provisions of this chapter.*

Given the above provisions for correction changes of the FLUM mapping, the proposal to unify the Comprehensive Plan designation of the large parcel is consistent with the type of change provided for by both the Comprehensive Plan, and the Municipal Code.

Regardless of the discussion above, the change from the Single Family zone to the LR3 zone at the rear of the Rose St. parcel could introduce land use incompatibility with abutting residential uses. The change could introduce greater height bulk and scale, and aesthetic impacts, as discussed in part B of the checklist above. The change could also cause some use incompatibilities between potential future multifamily residential uses and existing low scale single family residential uses. Incompatibilities could come in the form of increased noise from talking, laughing or music, cooking smells, and more congestion on sidewalks and roads in the immediate vicinity.

It is expected that as part of this proposal, the City Council will approve the simultaneously A.) the FLUM correction changing the entire Rose St. cluster of parcels to Commercial / Mixed Use; and B.) the above-described zoning changes to NC2-55 and LR3.

### **Housing**

This proposal is intended to implement new regulations that encourage the production of more housing units in a portion of the City that is planned and well-positioned for residential growth. As seen in the discussion in Part C of the checklist, it is anticipated that there is a high likelihood for some or all of the housing that could result from future construction in the affected areas to be rent- and income- restricted housing. There is no existing housing on the affected areas, so no direct residential displacement will result from this proposal or future development proposals in the affected area.

### **Height, Bulk, and Scale**

The proposal would modify zoning designations that would result in the potential for greater height, bulk, and scale.

As described in Section B of the checklist above, in the Cloverdale St. cluster of parcels the amount of increased allowable height is 10'. This equates to roughly one story of additional allowed height compared to existing zoning. Given the configuration and type of adjacent uses the impact of this increment would be minimally perceived from adjacent areas. There would be no scale incompatibility because of the nature of the adjacent uses (offices, ball fields, and an apartment complex).

Allowed height, bulk and scale changes on the front portion of the Rose St. cluster would not cause incompatibility. Height limits here would not change for the south parcel, and would change by 15' of allowed height for the portion that would be rezoned from LR3 to NC2-55. This part of the site is flanked by existing multi-story apartment buildings to both the north and south. Rainier Ave. S. is a busy and wide arterial road with numerous existing multi-story structures in the general vicinity.

There is the potential for height bulk and scale impact on the rear portions of the Rose St. cluster of parcels, which would be rezoned from SF 5000 to LR3 under the proposal. Some height, bulk and scale impacts as perceived from nearby and adjacent properties could result from future development on this portion of the

site due to the proposal. The impacts would be in the form of higher nearby buildings, which could cast some shadow, decrease privacy, and create the visual presence of newly constructed facades. One to two additional stories of building height compared to existing zoning could result on these portions of the affected area. The visual impact could be minor to moderate depending on the vantage point and specific location of a viewer on a nearby single-family lot. However, mitigating factors are required ground level and upper level setbacks in the LR3 zone, and design review guidelines which place a strong preference for stepping down of massing between higher intensity and lower intensity zones. The condition that could result at this zone edge is one that exists in numerous locations within highly urbanized Seattle, including along nearby stretches of Rainier Ave. S. within one half mile of the site.

**Public View Protection, Shadows on Open Space, Light and Glare**

The proposal would modify height limits as described in the Part B of the checklist and increase the potential for incrementally greater scale of development compared to that which could occur under existing regulations. Some impacts could occur if the proposal encourages additional development, which could block some existing views, create new views, and create shadows, light, and glare consistent with infill development. The affected area is generally flat, and there are no protected views or notable views of mountains or waterbodies or landscapes that would be affected by development.

The proposal could cause minor additional shadows to be cast on the fringes of adjacent ball fields at the Rainier Beach High school because development on the Cloverdale St. cluster of sites could be one story higher than under existing regulations. Additional shadows could be cast into the yards of homeowners adjacent to the east portions of the Rose St. cluster of parcels, because development would be allowed to be 5' higher, and closer to property lines - compared to the development that could occur under existing conditions.

**6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?**

Overall, this proposal is not likely to substantially increased demands on transportation or public services and utilities. The proposal could lead to an incremental increase in the quantity and density of housing units and/or commercial spaces compared to the amount that would be allowed under existing zoning. However, as described in Part B of the checklist, the affected area is immediately adjacent to sufficient transportation infrastructure due to its location on Rainier Ave. S. It is expected that Rainier Ave. S. would be the primary access point to and from the site. The location of the affected area is in a portion of the city planned for growth and increased demand on services.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are: None proposed.

**7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.**

The proposal is believed to avoid conflicts with local, state, and federal laws and requirements for protection of the environment. See also discussion at part D.5 above.