1072 **ALKI BOARDWALK LLC** 19-2/1250 WA 4532 49TH AVE SW 08125 SEATTLE WA 98116 DATE 4-17-25 \$ 1,253.00 DAY TO THE OF CITY OF SEATTLE One thousand two hundred fifty eight BANK OF AMERICA DOLLARS à liss ACH B/T 125000024 FOR CITATION # 80301 3P #001072# #125000024#

SEATTLE WA 980 17 APR 2025 PM 3 L



OFFICE OF HEARING EXAMINER PO Box 94729 SEATTLE, WA 98/24-4729

98124-472929

المرابع المراجع البينا المتعام المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع

ALKI BOARDWALK LLC 4532 49TH AVE SW SEATTLE, WA 98116



BEFORE THE HEARING EXAMINER CITY OF SEATTLE

In the Matter of the Citation Issued to

Citation: 80801 Holtz

STEPHEN HOCHHALTER

by the Director, Seattle Department of Transportation for violation of the Street Use Code MITIGATION HEARING DECISION

On January 16, 2025, the Director, Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), as authorized by SMC 15.91.004, served a Notice of Citation, assessing a **\$1258.00** penalty to **Stephen Hochhalter** for violation of the provisions of the Seattle Municipal Code pertaining to:

- No permit obtained (SMC 15.04.010)
- Failure to comply with conditions of permit (SMC 15.04.010)

Stephen Hochhalter requested a hearing to mitigate the violation. That hearing was held on February 13, 2025. At the time of the hearing, SDOT records indicated that the conditions giving rise to the issuance of the citation had not been corrected.

DECISION

As provided by SMC 15.91.010, **Stephen Hochhalter** is found to have committed the violation alleged in the citation.

____The evidence presented at hearing supports the request that the penalty be reduced because:

_____ The violation was caused by the act, neglect, or abuse of another.

or

Correction was commenced promptly prior to citation, but full compliance was not achieved due to challenges by the appellant with the City permitting system.

OR

x The evidence presented at hearing does not support the request that the penalty be reduced. Mitigation is only possible when a matter is in compliance and compliance had not yet been achieved at the time of hearing. Further, the record indicates a significant delay on Appellant's behalf to come into compliance. The Appellant indicated concern with usability of the City