

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

BEFORE THE HEARING EXAMINER  
CITY OF SEATTLE

In the Matter of the Appeal of the:

Hearing Examiner File W-18-009

**QUEEN ANNE COMMUNITY  
COUNCIL**

**DECLARATION OF NICOLAS WELCH  
IN SUPPORT OF SEATTLE CITY  
COUNCIL’S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION FOR PARTIAL DISMISSAL**

of the Final Environmental Impact  
Statement for the Citywide Implementation  
of ADU-FEIS.

I, Nicolas Welch, declare and state as follows:

1. I am over eighteen years of age, have personal knowledge of the matters herein, and am competent to testify regarding all matters set forth herein.

2. I am a Strategic Advisor at the Office of Planning and Community Development and have worked with the City since 2013. I am familiar with the proposal that is the subject of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (“FEIS”) at issue in this appeal. I am also familiar with the City’s earlier Determination of Nonsignificance (“DNS”) that Appellant Queen Anne Community Council appealed in Hearing Examiner File No. W-16-004, and I testified as a witness in the appeal hearing.

3. The proposal analyzed in the FEIS and that which was the subject of the earlier DNS consist of the same primary elements. The FEIS developed and analyzed three action alternatives that feasibly attain the proposal's objectives. The three action alternatives include more detail in some respects than the proposal that was the subject of the DNS. Moreover, all three action alternatives differ in the scale and focus of the proposed code changes. However, all three action alternatives in the FEIS, including the

1 preferred alternative, include the same primary elements as the Proposal that was the  
2 subject of the DNS.

3 4. The proposal that was the subject of the DNS allowed accessory dwelling  
4 units (“ADUs”) to exceed 1,000 square feet in floor area in certain circumstances.  
5 Similarly, all three action alternatives in the FEIS also allow ADUs to exceed 1,000  
6 square feet in floor area under certain circumstances.

7 5. The DNS proposal also allowed up to two ADUs: one attached ADU  
8 (“AADU”) and one detached ADU (“DADU”). Similarly, the preferred alternative and  
9 alternative 3 allow one AADU and one DADU, but also allow the option of having two  
10 AADUs. This additional feature in alternative 3 and the preferred alternative does not  
11 contribute to any greater significant impacts. Moreover, neither the presence of two  
12 AADUs nor the combination of an AADU with a DADU constitutes a duplex or triplex.  
13 Among other differences, the City’s land use regulations categorize duplexes and triplexes  
14 as multifamily residential uses. ADUs, which are considered to be part of a single-family  
15 dwelling unit, are subject to different regulations and limitations.

16 6. Both the preferred alternative and alternative 3 include a maximum floor  
17 area ratio limit of 0.5 (meaning the total square footage of structures on the lot cannot  
18 exceed 50 percent of the lot area) or 2,500 square feet, whichever is greater. This feature  
19 of those alternatives was not part of the more general proposal that was the subject of the  
20 DNS. However, the floor area ratio limit was added to alternative 3 and the preferred  
21 alternative as a mitigating element of those alternatives, because the purpose of the feature  
22 is to limit development in single-family zones. Under existing regulations, and in the  
23 proposal analyzed in the DNS, there are no limits imposed on floor area ratio. Thus the  
24 floor area ratio limitation reduces impacts of those specific alternatives as compared to the  
25 more general proposal that was the subject of the DNS.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

7. The preferred alternative also allows up to twelve unrelated people to live in a lot in a single-family zone. Existing regulations and the proposal analyzed in the DNS allow an unlimited number of related people, and up to eight unrelated people, to live on a lot in a single-family zone. Thus that specific feature of the preferred alternative does not create new or more significant impacts of the alternative as compared to the more general proposal that was the subject of the DNS.

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

EXECUTED in Seattle, Washington, this 21st day of December, 2018.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Nicolas Welch, Declarant