



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

Project Number: 3033991-LU
Applicant Name: Jodi Patterson-O’Hare
Address of Proposal: 2224 2nd Ave

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

Land Use Application to allow an 8-story, 175-unit apartment building with retail. Parking for 92 vehicles proposed. Existing buildings to be demolished. Early Design Guidance conducted under 3033958-EG.

The following approvals are required:

- Design Review with Departures (Seattle Municipal Code 23.41)***
**Departures are listed near the end of the Design Review Analysis in this document*
- SEPA - Environmental Determination (Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 25.05)**

SEPA DETERMINATION:

Determination of Non-Significance

- No mitigating conditions of approval are imposed.
- Pursuant to SEPA substantive authority provided in SMC 25.05.660, the proposal has been conditioned to mitigate environmental impacts

SITE AND VICINITY

Site Zone: DMR/R-95/65

Zoning Pattern: (North) DMR/R-145/65
(South) DMR/R-95/65
(East) DMR/R-145/65
(West) DMR/R-95/65



Environmentally Critical Areas:

There are no known Environmentally Critical Areas (ECAs) onsite.

Current and Surrounding Development; Neighborhood Character; Access:

This site is in the Belltown Neighborhood and the immediate vicinity is largely comprised of mixed-use buildings (commercial on the ground floor with apartments above) dating from the early 20th century until the present. The iconic (and designated Historic Landmark) Mama's Mexican Kitchen building abuts the site to the northwest and the Landmarked Wayne Apartments occupy the western portion of the site. 2nd Avenue is a Class I Pedestrian Street and designated Arterial. Regrade Park is directly across the alley and abuts the portion of Bell Street which has been redeveloped as a curb less street park where pedestrians and vehicles share the width of the right of way.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

The public comment period ended on 6/17/2020. In addition to the comment(s) received through the Design Review process, other comments were received and carefully considered, to the extent that they raised issues within the scope of this review. These areas of public comment related to concerns with impacts from construction and impacts to air quality, historic preservation, housing, parking, traffic, and utilities, as well as support for the proposal. Comments were also received that are beyond the scope of this review and analysis per SMC 23.41 and 25.05.

Public comments were also received that are beyond the scope of this review and analysis. These include support for retail businesses returning to the new project and concern about displacement of existing businesses, concern about the financial viability of the project, coordination with King County sewer facilities, requests for information and concern about sidewalk closures, impacts of the new building and rooftop mechanical equipment on private residential views, concern about the adequacy of the City's SEPA procedures, sufficient sidewalk space for pedestrians and food vendors, questions about project status, requests to combine the permits for this project with other projects, and support for and opposition to the project generally.

I. ANALYSIS – DESIGN REVIEW

The design packets include information presented through design review, and are available online by entering the record numbers at this website:

<http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/aboutus/news/events/DesignReview/SearchPastReviews/default.aspx>

Any recording of the Board meeting is available in the record.

The packet is also available to view in the file, by contacting the Public Resource Center at SDCI:

Mailing Address:	Public Resource Center 700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000 P.O. Box 34019 Seattle, WA 98124-4019
Email:	PRC@seattle.gov

FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE July 16, 2019

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Concerned about vehicle access and pedestrian safety; requested to reduce the number of proposed parking spots.
- Concerned that this project will be like the one just completed at 2nd and Bell which is monotonous and does not contribute vitality to the street or neighborhood. (seconded in three other comments).
- Noted the regular use of the alley by pedestrians, supported the café that will front the alley, with concern about its below-grade location.
- Called on the design to preserve the eclectic nature of Belltown and doubt that the proposed ‘funky’ signage is sufficient to do that.
- Requested careful consideration of exterior lighting, noting that too dim and too bright were both to be avoided.
- Requested that the MHA component be performed on-site as a means of preserving neighborhood character.
- Supported the activation of the alley and for the intent to create small retail spaces similar to those that currently exist.
- Requested that parking be completely eliminated from the project due to the negative effect it would have on the pedestrian character of the alley (seconded in two other comments); noted that no parking is required by code on this site.
- Requested that no cement-panel siding be used on this project.
- Concerned that the project was not adequately responding to context; “a vital and interesting patchwork” of structures and uses.
- A representative of Friends of Historic Belltown shared:
 - A suggestion that parking areas be design for future re-purposing
 - A request that existing context be a principal consideration in the design of this new project.
 - A suggestion that the design team see this project as creating urban wildlife habitat that will support and welcome the existing workforce community.
 - A request that overhead weather protection be uniquely created by the businesses that will occupy the retail spaces.
 - A request that the alley be developed as a “woonerf”, similar to Bell Street Park.
 - A request to increase the number of commercial spaces along the alley, noting that music venues work very well in below-grade space.
- Concerned that the upper levels of the proposal were monotonous and undistinguished, a suggestion that they be developed with depth and texture.
- Supported the historically-appropriate long and narrow retail spaces
- Requested notching, setbacks, modulation of the upper levels; “not just a big square box”.
- Noted that Regrade Park, particularly the off-leash area, is heavily used by neighbors; concerned about the effect of increased traffic in the alley associated with parking.
- A representative of Rise Up Belltown shared:
 - A request that homage be made in the design of the new project to the Landmarked Wayne Apartments that will be demolished.
 - A request that additional retail spaces be contiguous from street to alley.
 - A note that the jazz club Tulas does not ever have its window blinds open, suggesting that similar uses could thrive in non-standard or below-grade spaces.

- Concern about the ‘protective screening’ of the proposed open space along the alley and its potential to separate and disconnect its users from the right of way.
- A request that public access be provided to the proposed roof decks and that blank wall areas be designated for murals created by members of the Belltown community.
- Encouraged setting the upper levels of the project back from the street, similar to the Wayne Apartment Building, as shown on page 23.
- Supported the design of the project and the positive effect it will have on local business owners.
- Doubted that the proposed design will actually connect to the character of the existing block, noting that the ‘patchwork’ character of Belltown is an essential component of its character and that the renderings of the streetscape have none of this eclectic variety. Encouraged the design team to revisit the character of the existing landmarks on the block (Mama’s, the Wayne Apartments) and bring the worthy aspects of those buildings to this new design.

SDCI staff also summarized design related comments received in writing prior to the meeting:

- Concern about vehicle access and pedestrian safety;
- Concern about the loss of neighborhood character when historic structures are replaced with new projects.

Other comments not related to design were received regarding construction impacts, gentrification, and the loss of existing affordable housing.

One purpose of the design review process is for the Board and City to receive comments from the public that help to identify feedback and concerns about the site and design concept, identify applicable Seattle Design Guidelines and Neighborhood Design Guidelines of highest priority to the site and explore conceptual design, siting alternatives and eventual architectural design. Concerns with off-street parking, traffic and construction impacts are reviewed as part of the environmental review conducted by SDCI and are not part of this review.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the record number: <http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/>

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the following siting and design guidance.

1. Three Schemes

- a. The Board supported the applicant’s preferred scheme, agreeing that the “Funky Base” street edge was a context-appropriate response to the eclectic character of the Belltown neighborhood, but had concerns about the massing of the upper levels and the development of the alley frontage. (B-1, B-1.IV, B-3, C-1, D-3)
- b. Due to these concerns the Board agreed unanimously that the project should return for a second EDG Meeting and provided the following guidance.

2. **Alley:** The Board supported the applicants stated intent to activate the alley edge of the project but expressed concern about how successful the program elements and proposed configuration would be.
 - a. The Board noted this unique condition of an alley fronting public open space (Regrade Park) and in agreement with public comments regarding its high level of use, the Board directed the applicant to prioritize the development of this edge as a carefully crafted urban environment of well-designed architectural forms and details. (C-6, C-6.II, C6.III, B-3, B-3.I, B-1)
 - b. Echoing public comment, The Board did not support the heavy screening element separating the outdoor space from the alley as it would diminish the connection. (D-1.I, C-1)
 - c. The Board encouraged the applicant to activate this edge of the project by creating a secondary residential entry point. (C6.II, D-6)
 - d. For the next meeting, the Board directed the design team to provide sufficient information to explain their design response to this guidance and demonstrate how it will be successful, including precedents with similar conditions. (C-6.II, D-3, C-6)

3. **Massing:** The Board expressed concern about the bulk and massing of the upper levels, finding it difficult to reconcile with the promising approach of the Funky Base design concept.
 - a. The Board appreciated the gesture towards a massing setback above the base but found the proposed configuration unsuccessful and gave guidance to explore further setback options. (B-1.I, B-1.IV, B-2, B-3, B-4)
 - b. The Board noted that the separation and distinction between the base and upper massing needs to be more than two dimensional and agreed that it was unlikely that this could be achieved with only color and material changes, an approach they agreed had been unsuccessful on recent nearby projects. (B-3.I, B-1.I)
 - c. The Board declined to provide a specific dimension but agreed that a few feet could be enough to create volumetric relief and scale mitigation. (B-2.3, D-4, B-1)
 - d. In developing a composition of base, middle and top, The Board directed the applicant to explore a range of solutions and present this information at the next meeting. (B-1, B-1.IV)
 - e. The Board agreed that the design concept connecting the base elements and the upper levels would be a critical element and that it could be successfully resolved in a number of ways, including;
 - i. A ‘quieter’ expression of the upper levels as a simple and well-ordered composition of high-quality materials and details. (B-1.IV, B-3, B-4)
 - ii. Bringing aspects of the funky base into the upper levels, possibly in the form of modulation shifts, recessed balconies and projecting elements. (B-3, B-4, D-4, B-1.III)

4. **Base and Streetscape:**
 - a. The Board supported the development of multiple retail storefronts, both as an homage to the existing block and as an appropriated response to context in the Belltown neighborhood. (B-1, B-3, B-1.III)
 - b. The Board acknowledged public comment about the eclectic character of this block and the applicant’s intent to recreate that spirit but noted that the existing condition is one that developed over time. The Board encouraged the design team to look for

- opportunities to allow future tenants to customize their storefronts. (B-1.d, B-2.a, B-3.I)
- c. The Board supported the minimization of the residential lobby along 3rd Avenue and encouraged the design team to program the street edge of this area with active uses. (C-1 B-1, B-3, C-1, D-3)
 - d. The Board agreed that exterior lighting will be critical on both the street and the alley and encouraged the design team to look beyond standard lighting solutions. Incorporate uniquely lit façades that spill light on to the pedestrian areas. (D-1, D-5)

5. Exterior materials:

- a. The Board agreed that the upper level exterior materials could respond to either to the proposed base or to existing context but that in both cases high quality materials would be critical to successfully integrating this new project. (A-2, B-1, B-3.I, B-4, C-2, B-1.I)
- b. For the next meeting, the Board requested demonstration of a number of possible material and detailing choices and fenestration patterns, including privacy studies. (B-3, B-4, B-1.I)

SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE October 22, 2019

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Concerned with impacts to territorial views from the roof deck of neighboring buildings.
- Recommended the design reflect the simple architectural expression of Belltown.
- Recommended the use of red brick color with cream accent.
- Supported the entry off alley and paintable areas on 2nd Avenue.
- Recommended the elimination of overhead weather protection.
- Critical of the design of 206 Bell and concerned that this project would be similarly disconnected from the spirit of Belltown.
- Discouraged metal siding, balconies and alley retail.

SDCI staff also summarized design related comments received in writing prior to the meeting:

- Concerned that the response to EDG was insufficient overall.
- Concerned that the Art areas do not appear to effectively respond to neighborhood context (B-1).
- Concerned that the programming and articulation of the alley edge could contribute to the growing economic stratification of Belltown residents.
- Concerned that alley screening elements would create a de-activated 'dead zone' in the alley at the center of the project. (C-6.11)
- Supported the development of a residential entry at the alley.
- Concerned that the 2nd Avenue facade does not effectively create a transition in bulk and scale (B-2).
- Encouraged a wider range of customizable elements at the street edge.
- Supported the use of brick on 2nd Avenue and the departure from overhead weather protection requirements.
- Encouraged the applicant to significantly reduce the number of parking stalls provided.

Other comments not related to design were received regarding gentrification and the loss of existing affordable housing.

One purpose of the design review process is for the Board and City to receive comments from the public that help to identify feedback and concerns about the site and design concept, identify applicable Seattle Design Guidelines and Neighborhood Design Guidelines of highest priority to the site and explore conceptual design, siting alternatives and eventual architectural design. Concerns with off-street parking, traffic and construction impacts are reviewed as part of the environmental review conducted by SDCI and are not part of this review.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the record number: <http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/>

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the following siting and design guidance.

1. Massing:

- a. The Board supported the revised Option 3 scheme, agreeing that the layered elements could result in a dynamic composition that mitigated building scale and was connected to neighborhood context. (A-1, B-1, B-2)
- b. The Board expressed concern about the potential prominence of the mechanical screening elements and provided guidance to minimize their visibility. (B-3.I, B-1.I)
- c. The Board agreed that the parapet height at the south need not match the adjacent building and that a non-homogenous approach could be successful. (B-3, B-4, D-3, C-6)
- d. The Board agreed that a legible design concept (a “story”) should emerge from the choice of materials and colors and their articulation. (B-1, B-4, A-1)

2. Alley:

- a. The Board continued to support the applicant’s intent to activate the alley edge of the project but agreed that further work would be required to achieve this result. (C-6, D-3)
- b. The Board supported the pushing and pulling of the building edges at the alley but questioned whether the screening elements were diminishing this effect and provided direction to explore creating additional recesses at entrances. (C-6, C-6, B-3, B-3.I, B-1)
- c. The Board agreed that the studies showing alternate screening elements had promise and directed the design team to continue studying this condition using successful precedents from other cities to support their proposed choices. (D-1.I, C-6.II, C-1)
- d. For the next meeting, the Board directed the design team to provide complete details of the alley condition and the proposed design response. (C-6.II, D-3, C-6)

3. Base and Streetscape:

- a. The Board continued to support the development of multiple retail storefronts, and the proposal to use paintable surfaces and canopies that are easily customizable for future tenants. The Board requested that complete details be provided for the next meeting. (B-1, B-3, B-1.III)
- b. The Board agreed that exterior lighting will be critical on both the street and the alley and asked that complete details be provided at the next meeting. (D-1, D-5)

- c. The Board tentatively supported a variation in the depth of code-required overhead weather protection as part of the eclectic design concept and to minimize negative impacts on existing street trees. (D-3)

4. Exterior materials:

- a. The Board agreed that detail, color and texture will be critically important in the development of the layered 2nd Avenue facade and noted that the eclectic and funky base expression could be supported by a simpler composition of the upper levels. (B-1.I, B-1.IV, B-2, B-3, B-4)
- b. The Board supported the more neutral dark-grey brick shown in the renderings but recognizing public comment, agreed that exploration of a range of colors as part of the larger composition would be merited. (B-3)

ADMINISTRATIVE RECOMMENDATION July 9, 2020

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following design-related comments were received:

- Supported the proposed design.
- Suggested replacing the structures while preserving the street-facing uses would benefit the neighborhood.
- Recommended including historic motifs such as mullioned windows, recessed window patterns at the street level, and light colored window frames to retain, reflect, and reinterpret the historic design elements of Belltown (B1.I, B1.IV, B3.I, D3.I).
- Supported activating the alley but felt the proposed design is too modern and should include more historic character.
- Encouraged using brick in the alley (B4.3).
- Discouraged overhead weather protection in favor of unique custom awnings.
- Requested the proposal respond to the context of the 2nd Ave bike lane (A1.I).
- Asked to consider how the project would respond to Mama's landmark building to make a coherent block and complement historic elements of Mama's, Crocodile, and historic apartments such as the Castle (B1.I, B1.II, B3.I)
- Suggested designing the alley to integrate with Bell Street Park and the dog park (B1.I).
- Noted that the area is a night life district and should be designed with an active night life and associated noise in mind (B1.2).
- Discouraged too much creativity and modulation in favor of simple artistic elements to the façade (B1.III, C2.1).
- Suggested the following pedestrian amenities at the ground-level: public art designed by Belltown artist Buster Simpson, murals designed by local artists, street seating, and no overhead weather protection (B3.3, D3.1).
- Suggested eliminating or minimizing signage. Opposed to bright lighting (B4.3, D4.4, D5.1).
- Offered the following ideas regarding street-level uses: reinforce existing commercial concentrations, consider trees and narrow sidewalks, streetscape designs that support active pedestrian and seating use, and adding concrete blocks from existing buildings to use as seating (C1.1, C1.2, C1.3, D1.1, D3.III).

- Stated that desirable façade elements discourage floor to ceiling windows and encourage recessed doorways with vestibules, individual canopies, and designated smoking areas (C3.1).
- Suggested entry treatments should include interesting doorways, decorative lighting, canopies, and recessed entry bays (C4.1).
- Suggested minimizing the 2nd Ave entry and locating the main entrance on the alley to promote activation (C4.2).
- Encouraged planters, native plants, and cedar trees (D2.1).
- Requested increasing setbacks on 2nd Ave to allow for an open-air café and retail space.
- Advocated increasing the alley width to a minimum of 20' to promote safety.
- Requested a safe loading zone that doesn't obstruct pedestrian flow.
- Requested making the rear of the building visually appealing with the addition of green space, possibly by moving the penthouse terrace to the southeast side, installing a green wall, or a setback with trees.
- Requested a restaurant or bar with sidewalk seating and overhead weather protection.
- Opposed to a cupola or top stack.
- Recommended eliminating the ground-level residential units and extending the retail spaces all the way through the building.

SDCI also received non design-related comments concerning demolition of existing building, historic landmark impacts, population growth, housing availability, environmental impacts, SEPA, parking, social distancing practices, public notice, construction impacts, housing affordability, and permit status.

One purpose of the design review process is for the City to receive comments from the public that help to identify feedback and concerns about the site and design concept, identify applicable Seattle Design Guidelines and Neighborhood Design Guidelines of highest priority to the site and explore conceptual design, siting alternatives and eventual architectural design.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the record number: <http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/>

SDCI PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS

SDCI visited the site, considered the analysis of the site and context by the proponents, and considered public comment. SDCI design recommendations are summarized below.

1. Design Concept:

- a. Staff notes and concurs with the Board's previous support for the revised Option 3 scheme, and acknowledges public comments concerned with a sufficient response to context. The layered elements which have been strengthened and clarified per the Board's previous guidance, resulting in a dynamic composition that mitigates building scale and responds effectively to neighborhood context. Staff recommends approval of the design. (A-1, B-1, B-2)
- b. At EDG, the Board agreed that a legible design concept (a "story") should emerge from the choice of materials and colors and their articulation. Staff agrees that this legibility has been achieved and recommends approval of the design (B-1, B-4, A-1)

2. Base and Streetscape:

- a. Staff notes public comments related to lighting, signage, the design of the street level uses and pedestrian amenities. Staff has reviewed and recommends approval of the following aspects of the design:
 - a. Seating: although there are no purely public seating areas, a covered seating area associated with the retail space has been provided at the alley and similar capability exists for the street-front retail spaces. (D-1.I, C-6.II)
 - b. Lighting and Signage: The signage fits the Belltown context and the lighting plan is sufficient for safety without over-lighting and screened to eliminate glare. (D-5, D-5.1)
 - c. Greenspace: Landscape areas have been provided at the upper level amenity area that will be perceptible from Regrade Park and Staff has worked with the applicant to develop an urban edge at the alley that provides significant space for public art. (D-2, D2.I)
 - d. Bike Lane: Staff has reviewed SDOT bicycle planning documents for 2nd Ave and find this design meets that criteria. (E-1, C-1)
- b. Staff concurs with the Board's support for the multiple retail storefronts and inclusion of customizable elements for future tenants and recommends approval of this aspect of the design. (B-1, B-3, B-1.III)
- c. At EDG the Board tentatively supported a departure for variation in the depth of code-required overhead weather protection as part of the eclectic design concept and to minimize negative impacts on existing street trees. The departure is now requested for minimum height above sidewalk grade and non-continuous canopy. Public comments were varied in response to overhead weather protection design. Staff recommends approval of the departure related to overhead weather protection as outlined in the Departures section of this document, provided the unique commercial character of Belltown is honored through the inclusion of typologically consistent transom-lite glazing in the storefronts where they do not already exist. Staff therefore recommends a condition to revise the fenestration pattern of the commercial storefronts on 2nd Avenue to include transom-lite glazing. (D-3, C-5, D-2, C-2, B-3)
- d. As noted in previous meetings and email, Staff is concerned by the homogeneity of the "funky base" expression south of the entry, noting that it lacks the variation and dynamism of the sketches supported by the Board previously (EDG; page 70 and 72, EDG-2; page 48). Public comments also listed concerns with the design of the street frontage and retail spaces. Staff appreciates the studies provided on page 32 and notes that the "Multiple Colors at B Podium" sketch begins to address this issue but still lacks the vibrancy of the earlier sketches and the Belltown context. (B-1.I, A-1.1, B-1, B-1.II, B-1.IV, B-3, B-3.I)
- e. Staff notes that Belltown was originally platted with a wide assortment of smaller lot sizes and developed over time with a variety of building types, scales and styles. To connect the storefront expression of this new project with existing context, Staff recommends a condition to revise the composition of the southern portion of the commercial street front to create a dynamic and contextually responsive assembly of storefronts that reinforce the unique qualities of Belltown. (A-1.1, B-1, B-1.II, B-1.IV, B-3, B-3.I)
 - i. This can be achieved in a number of ways, among those staff suggests a composition of elements distinguished by changes in brick type, bond pattern and color in combination with horizontal (face of brick) and/or vertical (height of parapet) offsets, similar to the EDG packet page 72.

3. Entry:

- a. Staff recognizes the Board's previous concern regarding the location of the leasing office at the street edge and appreciates the revision to move this necessary but inactive use away from street in favor of a shared amenity space. (C-1.1, C-1.3, C-3)
- b. As noted in previous conversations, Staff remains concerned by the obscurity of the principal residential entrance and recommends a condition to reinforce and strengthen the principal residential entry with an expression that is prominent, clearly identifiable and visible from the street, and inviting to pedestrians. This can be achieved in any number of ways, and Staff recommends the exploration of two options in particular. (C-4.2, B1.III, B-4, C-1)
 - i. Employ the full residential program width in the development of a unique masonry expression using a change in brick type, bond and color in combination with horizontal and/or vertical offsets.
 - ii. The development of an expression distinct from the masonry storefronts that comprise the rest of the street edge.

4. Alley:

- a. Staff recognizes public comment and the Boards previous support for the development of the alley as an active and engaging street edge, noting in particular its connection to the lively and popular Regrade Park. (C-6, D-3)
- b. Staff acknowledges public comment related to the alley design and recommends approval of the additional commercial space with at-grade seating, elimination of below-grade exterior spaces and proposed art installation are successful responses to the Board's guidance on these issues. (D-1.I, C-6.II, C-1,C-6.II, D-3, C-6)

5. Exterior materials:

- a. At EDG the Board agreed that detail, color and texture would be critically important in the development of the layered 2nd Avenue facade. Staff supports the manner in which this has been achieved and recommends a condition that all exterior materials shall be maintained as drawn and specified in the Recommendation packet. (B-1. I, B-1.IV, B-2, B-3, B-4)

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

SDCI Staff's preliminary recommendation on the requested departure(s) is based on the departure's potential to help the project better meet these design guidelines priorities and achieve a better overall project design than could be achieved without the departure(s).

At the Recommendation stage of review, the following departures were requested:

1. **Overhead Weather Protection (SMC 23.49.018.B):** The Code requires continuous overhead weather protection for new development along the entire street frontage with a minimum dimension of eight (8) feet measured horizontally from the building wall and a minimum height of 10 feet above sidewalk elevation. The applicant proposes:
 - a. Non-continuous canopy cover (177'5" required; 136' proposed);
 - b. A reduced canopy depth of 6'-6"; and
 - c. Minimum canopy height of 7'-9".

The proposed departure is to allow for retractable canopies and to accommodate street trees.

Staff recommends conditional approval of the proposed departure as the unique quality of this overhead weather protection can help the project better meet the criteria in B1 Respond to the Neighborhood Context and C5 Encourage Overhead Weather Protection (OHWP). This recommendation is conditioned on the provision of transom-lite glazing per Condition #1.

2. **Street Setbacks (SMC 23.49.162.B.2.a):** The Code allows a maximum area of the facade between 15 and 25 feet above the street frontage to be setback a total amount of 5 times the length of the building, which for this project is 889 square feet. The applicant proposes an increase of this area to 1500 square feet.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed departure as it is in response to the Board's specific request to set back the level above the street to create a scale mitigating gasket that will help the project better meet criteria in B2.3. Reduction of Bulk and B1.I. Compatible Design.

3. **Side Setback (SMC 23.49.166):** The Code requires setbacks from side lot lines that are not street lot lines to all portions of the structure above a height of 65 feet. The amount of setback is determined by the length of street frontage and for this project would be 20 feet. The applicant proposes a reduction of this setback to 1'-6" at the north and south property lines, as shown in the Recommendation packet.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed departure as the attendant continuation of the street wall will can help the project better fit in the existing context meet and the criteria in B1 Respond to the Neighborhood Context. This departure will also help the project respond to the urban form goals of current planning efforts as detailed in A1.2. Response to Planning Efforts.

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The Downtown Design Guidelines recognized by the Board and Staff as Priority Guidelines are identified above. All guidelines remain applicable and are summarized below. For the full text please visit the [Design Review website](#).

SITE PLANNING AND MASSING

A1 Respond to the Physical Environment: Develop an architectural concept and compose the building's massing in response to geographic conditions and patterns of urban form found nearby or beyond the immediate context of the building site.

A1.1. Response to Context: Each building site lies within a larger physical context having various and distinct features and characteristics to which the building design should respond. Develop an architectural concept and arrange the building mass in response to one or more of the following, if present:

- a. a change in street grid alignment that yields a site having nonstandard shape;
- b. a site having dramatic topography or contrasting edge conditions;

- c. patterns of urban form, such as nearby buildings that have employed distinctive and effective massing compositions;
- d. access to direct sunlight—seasonally or at particular times of day;
- e. views from the site of noteworthy structures or natural features, (i.e.: the Space Needle, Smith Tower, port facilities, Puget Sound, Mount Rainier, the Olympic Mountains);
- f. views of the site from other parts of the city or region; and
- g. proximity to a regional transportation corridor (the monorail, light rail, freight rail, major arterial, state highway, ferry routes, bicycle trail, etc.).

A1.2. Response to Planning Efforts: Some areas downtown are transitional environments, where existing development patterns are likely to change. In these areas, respond to the urban form goals of current planning efforts, being cognizant that new development will establish the context to which future development will respond.

Belltown Supplemental Guidance:

A1.I. Views: Develop the architectural concept and arrange the building mass to enhance views. This includes views of the water and mountains, and noteworthy structures such as the Space Needle.

A1.II. Street Grid: The architecture and building mass should respond to sites having nonstandard shapes. There are several changes in the street grid alignment in Belltown, resulting in triangular sites and chamfered corners. Examples of this include 1st, Western and Elliott between Battery and Lenora, and along Denny;

A1.III. Topography: The topography of the neighborhood lends to its unique character. Design buildings to take advantage of this condition as an opportunity, rather than a constraint. Along the streets, single entry, blank facades are discouraged. Consider providing multiple entries and windows at street level on sloping streets.

A2 Enhance the Skyline: Design the upper portion of the building to promote visual interest and variety in the downtown skyline. Respect existing landmarks while responding to the skyline’s present and planned profile.

A2.1. Desired Architectural Treatments: Use one or more of the following architectural treatments to accomplish this goal:

- a. sculpt or profile the facades;
- b. specify and compose a palette of materials with distinctive texture, pattern, or color;
- c. provide or enhance a specific architectural rooftop element.

A2.2. Rooftop Mechanical Equipment: In doing so, enclose and integrate any rooftop mechanical equipment into the design of the building as a whole.

ARCHITECTURAL EXPRESSION

B1 Respond to the neighborhood context: Develop an architectural concept and compose the major building elements to reinforce desirable urban features existing in the surrounding neighborhood.

B1.1. Adjacent Features and Networks: Each building site lies within an urban neighborhood context having distinct features and characteristics to which the building design should respond. Arrange the building mass in response to one or more of the following, if present:

- a. a surrounding district of distinct and noteworthy character;
- b. an adjacent landmark or noteworthy building;
- c. a major public amenity or institution nearby;
- d. neighboring buildings that have employed distinctive and effective massing compositions;
- e. elements of the pedestrian network nearby, (i.e.: green street, hill climb, mid-block crossing, through-block passageway); and

f. direct access to one or more components of the regional transportation system.

B1.2. Land Uses: Also, consider the design implications of the predominant land uses in the area surrounding the site.

Belltown Supplemental Guidance:

B1.I. Compatible Design: Establish a harmonious transition between newer and older buildings. Compatible design should respect the scale, massing and materials of adjacent buildings and landscape.

B1.II. Historic Style: Complement the architectural character of an adjacent historic building or area; however, imitation of historical styles is discouraged. References to period architecture should be interpreted in a contemporary manner.

B1.III. Visual Interest: Design visually attractive buildings that add richness and variety to Belltown, including creative contemporary architectural solutions.

B1.IV. Reinforce Neighborhood Qualities: Employ design strategies and incorporate architectural elements that reinforce Belltown's unique qualities. In particular, the neighborhood's best buildings tend to support an active street life.

B2 Create a Transition in Bulk and Scale: Compose the massing of the building to create a transition to the height, bulk, and scale of development in nearby less-intensive zones.

B2.1. Analyzing Height, Bulk, and Scale: Factors to consider in analyzing potential height, bulk, and scale impacts include:

- a. topographic relationships;
- b. distance from a less intensive zone edge;
- c. differences in development standards between abutting zones (allowable building height, width, lot coverage, etc.);
- d. effect of site size and shape;
- e. height, bulk, and scale relationships resulting from lot orientation (e.g., back lot line to back lot line vs back lot line to side lot line); and
- f. type and amount of separation between lots in the different zones (e.g., separation by only a property line, by an alley or street, or by other physical features such as grade changes); g. street grid or platting orientations.

B2.2. Compatibility with Nearby Buildings: In some cases, careful siting and design treatment may be sufficient to achieve reasonable transition and mitigation of height, bulk, and scale impacts. Some techniques for achieving compatibility are as follows:

- h. use of architectural style, details (such as roof lines, belt courses, cornices, or fenestration), color, or materials that derive from the less intensive zone.
- i. architectural massing of building components; and
- j. responding to topographic conditions in ways that minimize impacts on neighboring development, such as by stepping a project down the hillside.

B2.3. Reduction of Bulk: In some cases, reductions in the actual bulk and scale of the proposed structure may be necessary in order to mitigate adverse impacts and achieve an acceptable level of compatibility. Some techniques which can be used in these cases include:

- k. articulating the building's facades vertically or horizontally in intervals that reflect to existing structures or platting pattern;
- l. increasing building setbacks from the zone edge at ground level;
- m. reducing the bulk of the building's upper floors; and
- n. limiting the length of, or otherwise modifying, facades.

B3 Reinforce the Positive Urban Form & Architectural Attributes of the Immediate Area.: Consider the predominant attributes of the immediate neighborhood and reinforce desirable siting patterns, massing arrangements, and streetscape characteristics of nearby development.

B3.1. Building Orientation: In general, orient the building entries and open space toward street intersections and toward street fronts with the highest pedestrian activity. Locate parking and vehicle access away from entries, open space, and street intersections considerations.

B3.2. Features to Complement: Reinforce the desirable patterns of massing and facade composition found in the surrounding area. Pay particular attention to designated landmarks and other noteworthy buildings. Consider complementing the existing:

- a. massing and setbacks,
- b. scale and proportions,
- c. expressed structural bays and modulations,
- d. fenestration patterns and detailing,
- e. exterior finish materials and detailing,
- f. architectural styles, and
- g. roof forms.

B3.3. Pedestrian Amenities at the Ground Level: Consider setting the building back slightly to create space adjacent to the sidewalk conducive to pedestrian-oriented activities such as vending, sitting, or dining. Reinforce the desirable streetscape elements found on adjacent blocks.

Consider complementing existing:

- h. public art installations,
- i. street furniture and signage systems,
- j. lighting and landscaping, and
- k. overhead weather protection.

Belltown Supplemental Guidance:

B3.I. Respond to Nearby Design Features: The principal objective of this guideline is to promote scale and character compatibility through reinforcement of the desirable patterns of massing and facade composition found in the surrounding area. Pay particular attention to designated landmarks and other noteworthy buildings.

- a. Respond to the regulating lines and rhythms of adjacent buildings that also support a street-level environment; regulating lines and rhythms include vertical and horizontal patterns as expressed by cornice lines, belt lines, doors, windows, structural bays and modulation.
- b. Use regulating lines to promote contextual harmony, solidify the relationship between new and old buildings, and lead the eye down the street.
- c. Pay attention to excellent fenestration patterns and detailing in the vicinity. The use of recessed windows that create shadow lines, and suggest solidity, is encouraged.

B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building: Compose the massing and organize the interior and exterior spaces to create a well-proportioned building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept. Design the architectural elements and finish details to create a unified building, so that all components appear integral to the whole.

B4.1. Massing: When composing the massing, consider how the following can contribute to create a building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept:

- a. setbacks, projections, and open space;
- b. relative sizes and shapes of distinct building volumes; and
- c. roof heights and forms.

B4.2. Coherent Interior/Exterior Design: When organizing the interior and exterior spaces and developing the architectural elements, consider how the following can contribute to create a building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept:

- d. facade modulation and articulation;
- e. windows and fenestration patterns;
- f. corner features;

- g. streetscape and open space fixtures;
- h. building and garage entries; and
- i. building base and top.

B4.3. Architectural Details: When designing the architectural details, consider how the following can contribute to create a building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept:

- j. exterior finish materials;
- k. architectural lighting and signage;
- l. grilles, railings, and downspouts;
- m. window and entry trim and moldings;
- n. shadow patterns; and
- o. exterior lighting.

THE STREETScape

C1 Promote Pedestrian Interaction: Spaces for street level uses should be designed to engage pedestrians with the activities occurring within them. Sidewalk-related spaces should appear safe, welcoming, and open to the general public.

C1.1. Street Level Uses: Provide spaces for street level uses that:

- a. reinforce existing retail concentrations;
- b. vary in size, width, and depth;
- c. enhance main pedestrian links between areas; and
- d. establish new pedestrian activity where appropriate to meet area objectives. Design for uses that are accessible to the general public, open during established shopping hours, generate walk-in pedestrian clientele, and contribute to a high level of pedestrian activity.

C1.2. Retail Orientation: Where appropriate, consider configuring retail space to attract tenants with products or services that will “spill-out” onto the sidewalk (up to six feet where sidewalk is sufficiently wide).

C1.3. Street-Level Articulation for Pedestrian Activity: Consider setting portions of the building back slightly to create spaces conducive to pedestrian-oriented activities such as vending, resting, sitting, or dining. Further articulate the street level facade to provide an engaging pedestrian experience via:

- e. open facades (i.e., arcades and shop fronts);
- f. multiple building entries;
- g. windows that encourage pedestrians to look into the building interior;
- h. merchandising display windows;
- i. street front open space that features art work, street furniture, and landscaping;
- j. exterior finish materials having texture, pattern, lending themselves to high quality detailing.

Belltown Supplemental Guidance:

C1.I. Retail Concentration: Reinforce existing retail concentrations;

C1.II. Commercial Space Size: Vary in size, width, and depth of commercial spaces, accommodating for smaller businesses, where feasible;

C1.III. Desired Public Realm Elements: Incorporate the following elements in the adjacent public realm and in open spaces around the building:

- a. unique hardscape treatments
- b. pedestrian-scale sidewalk lighting
- c. accent paving (especially at corners, entries and passageways)
- d. creative landscape treatments (planting, planters, trellises, arbors)
- e. seating, gathering spaces
- f. water features, inclusion of art elements

C1.IV. Building/Site Corners: Building corners are places of convergence. The following considerations help reinforce site and building corners:

- a. provide meaningful setbacks/open space, if feasible
- b. provide seating as gathering spaces
- c. incorporate street/pedestrian amenities in these spaces
- d. make these spaces safe (good visibility)
- e. iconic corner identifiers to create way finders that draw people to the site.

C1.V. Pedestrian Attraction: Design for uses that are accessible to the general public, open during established shopping hours, generate walk-in pedestrian clientele, and contribute to a high level of pedestrian activity. Where appropriate, consider configuring retail space to attract tenants with products or services that will “spill-out” onto the sidewalk (up to six feet where sidewalk is sufficiently wide).

C2 Design Facades of Many Scales: Design architectural features, fenestration patterns, and material compositions that refer to the scale of human activities contained within. Building facades should be composed of elements scaled to promote pedestrian comfort, safety, and orientation.

C2.1. Modulation of Facades: Consider modulating the building facades and reinforcing this modulation with the composition of:

- a. the fenestration pattern;
- b. exterior finish materials;
- c. other architectural elements;
- d. light fixtures and landscaping elements; and
- e. the roofline.

C3 Provide Active — Not Blank — Facades: Buildings should not have large blank walls facing the street, especially near sidewalks.

C3.1. Desirable Facade Elements: Facades which for unavoidable programmatic reasons may have few entries or windows should receive special design treatment to increase pedestrian safety, comfort, and interest. Enliven these facades by providing:

- a. small retail spaces (as small as 50 square feet) for food bars, newsstands, and other specialized retail tenants;
- b. visibility into building interiors;
- c. limited lengths of blank walls;
- d. a landscaped or raised bed planted with vegetation that will grow up a vertical trellis or frame installed to obscure or screen the wall’s blank surface;
- e. high quality public art in the form of a mosaic, mural, decorative masonry pattern, sculpture, relief, etc., installed over a substantial portion of the blank wall surface;
- f. small setbacks, indentations, or other architectural means of breaking up the wall surface;
- g. different textures, colors, or materials that break up the wall’s surface.
- h. special lighting, a canopy, awning, horizontal trellis, or other pedestrian-oriented feature to reduce the expanse of the blank surface and add visual interest;
- i. seating ledges or perches (especially on sunny facades and near bus stops);
- j. merchandising display windows or regularly changing public information display cases.

C4 Reinforce Building Entries: To promote pedestrian comfort, safety, and orientation, reinforce building entries.

C4.1. Entry Treatments: Reinforce the building’s entry with one or more of the following architectural treatments:

- a. extra-height lobby space;
- b. distinctive doorways;

- c. decorative lighting;
- d. distinctive entry canopy;
- e. projected or recessed entry bay;
- f. building name and address integrated into the facade or sidewalk;
- g. artwork integrated into the facade or sidewalk;
- h. a change in paving material, texture, or color;
- i. distinctive landscaping, including plants, water features and seating
- j. ornamental glazing, railings, and balustrades.

C4.2. Residential Entries: To make a residential building more approachable and to create a sense of association among neighbors, entries should be clearly identifiable and visible from the street and easily accessible and inviting to pedestrians. The space between the building and the sidewalk should provide security and privacy for residents and encourage social interaction among residents and neighbors. Provide convenient and attractive access to the building's entry. To ensure comfort and security, entry areas and adjacent open space should be sufficiently lighted and protected from the weather. Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.

C5 Encourage Overhead Weather Protection: Project applicants are encouraged to provide continuous, well-lit, overhead weather protection to improve pedestrian comfort and safety along major pedestrian routes.

C5.1. Overhead Weather Protection Design Elements: Overhead weather protection should be designed with consideration given to:

- a. the overall architectural concept of the building
- b. uses occurring within the building (such as entries and retail spaces) or in the adjacent streetscape environment (such as bus stops and intersections);
- c. minimizing gaps in coverage;
- d. a drainage strategy that keeps rain water off the street-level facade and sidewalk;
- e. continuity with weather protection provided on nearby buildings;
- f. relationship to architectural features and elements on adjacent development, especially if abutting a building of historic or noteworthy character;
- g. the scale of the space defined by the height and depth of the weather protection;
- h. use of translucent or transparent covering material to maintain a pleasant sidewalk environment with plenty of natural light; and
- i. when opaque material is used, the illumination of light-colored undersides to increase security after dark.

C6 Develop the Alley Façade: To increase pedestrian safety, comfort, and interest, develop portions of the alley facade in response to the unique conditions of the site or project.

C6.1. Alley Activation: Consider enlivening and enhancing the alley entrance by:

- a. extending retail space fenestration into the alley one bay;
- b. providing a niche for recycling and waste receptacles to be shared with nearby, older buildings lacking such facilities; and
- c. adding effective lighting to enhance visibility and safety.

C6.2. Alley Parking Access: Enhance the facades and surfaces in and adjacent to the alley to create parking access that is visible, safe, and welcoming for drivers and pedestrians. Consider

- d. locating the alley parking garage entry and/ or exit near the entrance to the alley;
- e. installing highly visible signage indicating parking rates and availability on the building facade adjacent to the alley; and
- f. chamfering the building corners to enhance pedestrian visibility and safety where alley is regularly used by vehicles accessing parking and loading.

Belltown Supplemental Guidance:

C6.I. Address Alley Functions:

- a. Services and utilities, while essential to urban development, should be screened or otherwise hidden from the view of the pedestrian.
- b. Exterior trash receptacles should be screened on three sides, with a gate on the fourth side that also screens the receptacles from view. Provide a niche to recess the receptacle.
- c. Screen loading docks and truck parking from public view using building massing, architectural elements and/or landscaping.
- d. Ensure that all utility equipment is located, sized, and designed to be as inconspicuous as possible. Consider ways to reduce the noise impacts of HVAC equipment on the alley environment.

C6.II. Pedestrian Environment:

- e. Pedestrian circulation is an integral part of the site layout. Where possible and feasible, provide elements, such as landscaping and special paving, that help define a pedestrian-friendly environment in the alley.
- f. Create a comfortably scaled and thoughtfully detailed urban environment in the alley through the use of well-designed architectural forms and details, particularly at street level.

C6.III. Architectural Concept:

- f. In designing a well-proportioned and unified building, the alley facade should not be ignored. An alley facade should be treated with form, scale and materials similar to rest of the building to create a coherent architectural concept.

PUBLIC AMENITIES

D1 Provide Inviting & Usable Open Space: Design public open spaces to promote a visually pleasing, safe, and active environment for workers, residents, and visitors. Views and solar access from the principal area of the open space should be especially emphasized.

D1.1. Pedestrian Enhancements: Where a commercial or mixed-use building is set back from the sidewalk, pedestrian enhancements should be considered in the resulting street frontage. Downtown the primary function of any open space between commercial buildings and the sidewalk is to provide access into the building and opportunities for outdoor activities such as vending, resting, sitting, or dining.

- a. All open space elements should enhance a pedestrian oriented, urban environment that has the appearance of stability, quality, and safety.
- b. Preferable open space locations are to the south and west of tower development, or where the siting of the open space would improve solar access to the sidewalk.
- c. Orient public open space to receive the maximum direct sunlight possible, using trees, overhangs, and umbrellas to provide shade in the warmest months. Design such spaces to take advantage of views and solar access when available from the site.
- d. The design of planters, landscaping, walls, and other street elements should allow visibility into and out of the open space.

D1.2. Open Space Features: Open spaces can feature art work, street furniture, and landscaping that invite customers or enhance the building's setting. Examples of desirable features to include are:

- a. visual and pedestrian access (including barrier-free access) into the site from the public sidewalk;
- b. walking surfaces of attractive pavers;
- c. pedestrian-scaled site lighting;
- d. retail spaces designed for uses that will comfortably "spill out" and enliven the open space;

- e. areas for vendors in commercial areas;
- f. landscaping that enhances the space and architecture;
- g. pedestrian-scaled signage that identifies uses and shops; and
- h. site furniture, art work, or amenities such as fountains, seating, and kiosks. residential open space

D1.3. Residential Open Space: Residential buildings should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive, well-integrated open space. In addition, the following should be considered:

- i. courtyards that organize architectural elements while providing a common garden;
- j. entry enhancements such as landscaping along a common pathway;
- k. decks, balconies and upper level terraces;
- l. play areas for children;
- m. individual gardens; and
- n. location of outdoor spaces to take advantage of sunlight.

Belltown Supplemental Guidance:

D1.I. Active Open Space: As a dense, urban neighborhood, Belltown views its streets as its front porches, and its parks and private plazas and spaces as its yards and gardens. The design and location of urban open spaces on a site or adjoining sidewalk is an important determinant in a successful environment, and the type and character of the open space should be influenced by the building's uses.

- a. Mixed-use developments are encouraged to provide usable open space adjacent to retail space, such as an outdoor cafe or restaurant seating, or a plaza with seating.
- b. Locate plazas intended for public use at/or near street grade to promote physical and visual connection to the street; on-site plazas may serve as a well-defined transition from the street. Take views and sun exposure into account as well.
- c. Define and contain outdoor spaces through a combination of building and landscape and discourage oversized spaces that lack containment.
- d. The space should be well-buffered from moving cars so that users can best enjoy the space.

D2 Enhance the Building with Landscaping: Enhance the building and site with generous landscaping— which includes special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, and site furniture, as well as living plant material.

D2.1. Landscape Enhancements: Landscape enhancement of the site may include some of the approaches or features listed below:

- a. emphasize entries with special planting in conjunction with decorative paving and/or lighting;
- b. include a special feature such as a courtyard, fountain, or pool;
- c. incorporate a planter guard or low planter wall as part of the architecture;
- d. distinctively landscape open areas created by building modulation;
- e. soften the building by screening blank walls, terracing retaining walls, etc;
- f. increase privacy and security through screening and/or shading;
- g. provide a framework such as a trellis or arbor for plants to grow on;
- h. incorporate upper story planter boxes or roof planters;
- i. provide identity and reinforce a desired feeling of intimacy and quiet;
- j. provide brackets for hanging planters;
- k. consider how the space will be viewed from the upper floors of nearby buildings as well as from the sidewalk; and
- l. if on a designated Green Street, coordinate improvements with the local Green Street plan.

D2.2. Consider Nearby Landscaping: Reinforce the desirable pattern of landscaping found on adjacent block faces.

- m. plant street trees that match the existing planting pattern or species;
- n. use similar landscape materials; and
- o. extend a low wall, use paving similar to that found nearby, or employ similar stairway construction methods.

Belltown Supplemental Guidance:

D2.I. Belltown-Specific Landscape Character: Landscape enhancement of the site may include some of the approaches or features listed below, where appropriate:

- a. emphasize entries with special planting in conjunction with decorative paving and/or lighting;
- b. use landscaping to make plazas and courtyards comfortable for human activity and social interaction;
- c. distinctively landscape open areas created by building modulation, such as entry courtyards;
- d. provide year-round greenery — drought tolerant species are encouraged to promote water conservation and reduce maintenance concerns; and
- e. provide opportunities for installation of civic art in the landscape; designer/ artist collaborations are encouraged (e.g., Growing Vine Street).

D3 Provide Elements That Define the Place: Provide special elements on the facades, within public open spaces, or on the sidewalk to create a distinct, attractive, and memorable “sense of place” associated with the building.

D3.1. Public Space Features and Amenities: Incorporate one or more of the following a appropriate:

- a. public art;
- b. street furniture, such as seating, newspaper boxes, and information kiosks;
- c. distinctive landscaping, such as specimen trees and water features;
- d. retail kiosks;
- e. public restroom facilities with directional signs in a location easily accessible to all; and
- f. public seating areas in the form of ledges, broad stairs, planters and the like, especially near public open spaces, bus stops, vending areas, on sunny facades, and other places where people are likely to want to pause or wait.

D3.2. Intersection Focus: Enliven intersections by treating the corner of the building or sidewalk with public art and other elements that promote interaction (entry, tree, seating, etc.) and reinforce the distinctive character of the surrounding area.

Belltown Supplemental Guidance:

D3.I. Art and Heritage: Art and History are vital to reinforcing a sense of place. Consider incorporating the following into the siting and design:

- a. vestiges of Belltown Heritage, such as preserving existing stone sidewalks, curbs
- b. art that relates to the established or emerging theme of that area (e.g., Western, 1st, 2nd, 3rd Avenue street specific character.
- c. install plaques or other features on the building that pay tribute to Belltown history.

D3.II. Green Streets: Green Streets are street rights-of-way that are enhanced for pedestrian circulation and activity with a variety of pedestrian-oriented features, such as sidewalk widening, landscaping, artwork, and traffic calming. Interesting street level uses and pedestrian amenities enliven the Green Street and lend special identity to the surrounding area.

D3.III: Street Furniture/Furnishings along Specific Streets: The function and character of Belltown’s streetscapes are defined street by street. In defining the streetscape for various streets,

the hierarchy of streets is determined by street function, adjacent land uses, and the nature of existing streetscape improvements.

- a. 1st Avenue: Any new installations between Denny Way and Virginia Street should continue the established character of the street by using unique pieces of inexpensive and salvaged materials such as the Wilkenson sandstone pieces that are currently in place. South of Virginia, new installations should reflect the character of the Pike Place Market.
- b. 3rd Avenue: New installations on 3rd Avenue should continue to be “civic” and substantial and be reflective of the role the street plays as a major bus route.
- c. 2nd Avenue: New installations on 2nd Avenue should continue the style of “limited edition” street art that currently exists between Cedar Street and Virginia Street.
- d. 4th Avenue: Street furnishings on 4th Avenue should be “off-the-shelf”/ catalogue modern to reflect the high-rise land uses existing or permitted along that corridor.
- e. 1st, 2nd and 3rd Avenues: Sidewalks should be wide and pedestrian amenities like benches, kiosks and pedestrian-scale lighting are especially important on promenade streets.
- f. 5th Avenue: Installations on 5th Avenue are encouraged to have a futuristic or “googie” architectural theme to reflect the presence of the monorail as part of the streetscape.
- g. Elliott Avenue: These streets offer good connections between Pike Place Market and the new sculpture garden. The area is experiencing a fair amount of residential growth. Like 1st Avenue, these streets are receiving eclectic public art and varied facades, and ultimately both will become promenade-type streets.

D3.IV. Street Edge/Furnishings: Concentrate pedestrian improvements at intersections with Green Streets (Bell, Blanchard, Vine, Cedar between 1st and Elliott, Clay, Eagle, and Bay Streets). Pedestrian crossings should be “exaggerated,” that is they should be marked and illuminated in a manner where they will be quickly and clearly seen by motorists.

D4 Provide Appropriate Signage: Design signage appropriate for the scale and character of the project and immediate neighborhood. All signs should be oriented to pedestrians and/or persons in vehicles on streets within the immediate neighborhood.

D4.1. Desired Signage Elements: Signage should be designed to:

- a. facilitate rapid orientation
- b. add interest to the street level environment
- c. reduce visual clutter
- d. unify the project as a whole
- e. enhance the appearance and safety of the downtown area.

D4.2. Unified Signage System: If the project is large, consider designing a comprehensive building and tenant signage system using one of the following or similar methods:

- a. signs clustered on kiosks near other street furniture or within sidewalk zone closest to building face;
- b. signs on blades attached to building facade;
- c. signs hanging underneath overhead weather protection.

D4.3. Signage Types: Also consider providing:

- d. building identification signage at two scales: small scale at the sidewalk level for pedestrians, and large scale at the street sign level for drivers;
- e. sculptural features or unique street furniture to complement (or in lieu of) building and tenant signage;
- f. interpretive information about building and construction activities on the fence surrounding the construction site.

D4.4. Discourage Upper-Level Signage: Signs on roofs and the upper floors of buildings intended primarily to be seen by motorists and others from a distance are generally discouraged.

D5 Provide Adequate Lighting: To promote a sense of security for people downtown during nighttime hours, provide appropriate levels of lighting on the building facade, on the underside of overhead weather protection, on and around street furniture, in merchandising display windows, in landscaped areas, and on signage.

D5.1. Lighting Strategies: Consider employing one or more of the following lighting strategies as appropriate.

- a. Illuminate distinctive features of the building, including entries, signage, canopies, and areas of architectural detail and interest.
- b. Install lighting in display windows that spills onto and illuminates the sidewalk.
- c. Orient outside lighting to minimize glare within the public right-of-way.

D6 Design for Personal Safety & Security: Design the building and site to promote the feeling of personal safety and security in the immediate area.

D6.1. Safety in Design Features: To help promote safety for the residents, workers, shoppers, and visitors who enter the area:

- a. provide adequate lighting;
- b. retain clear lines of sight into and out of entries and open spaces;
- c. use semi-transparent security screening, rather than opaque walls, where appropriate;
- d. avoid blank and windowless walls that attract graffiti and that do not permit residents or workers to observe the street;
- e. use landscaping that maintains visibility, such as short shrubs and/or trees pruned so that all branches are above head height;
- f. use ornamental grille as fencing or over ground-floor windows in some locations;
- g. avoid architectural features that provide hiding places for criminal activity;
- h. design parking areas to allow natural surveillance by maintaining clear lines of sight for those who park there, for pedestrians passing by, and for occupants of nearby buildings;
- i. install clear directional signage;
- j. encourage “eyes on the street” through the placement of windows, balconies, and street-level uses; and
- k. ensure natural surveillance of children’s play areas.

VEHICULAR ACCESS AND PARKING

E1 Minimize Curb Cut Impacts: Minimize adverse impacts of curb cuts on the safety and comfort of pedestrians.

E1.1. Vehicle Access Considerations: Where street access is deemed appropriate, one or more of the following design approaches should be considered for the safety and comfort of pedestrians.

- a. minimize the number of curb cuts and locate them away from street intersections;
- b. minimize the width of the curb cut, driveway, and garage opening;
- c. provide specialty paving where the driveway crosses the sidewalk;
- d. share the driveway with an adjacent property owner;
- e. locate the driveway to be visually less dominant;
- f. enhance the garage opening with specialty lighting, artwork, or materials having distinctive texture, pattern, or color
- g. provide sufficient queuing space on site.

E1.2. Vehicle Access Location: Where possible, consider locating the driveway and garage entrance to take advantage of topography in a manner that does not reduce pedestrian safety nor place the pedestrian entrance in a subordinate role.

E2 Integrate Parking Facilities: Minimize the visual impact of parking by integrating parking facilities with surrounding development. Incorporate architectural treatments or suitable landscaping to provide for the safety and comfort of people using the facility as well as those walking by.

E2.1. Parking Structures: Minimize the visibility of at-grade parking structures or accessory parking garages. The parking portion of a structure should be architecturally compatible with the rest of the building and streetscape. Where appropriate consider incorporating one or more of the following treatments:

- a. Incorporate pedestrian-oriented uses at street level to reduce the visual impact of parking structures. A depth of only 10 feet along the front of the building is sufficient to provide space for newsstands, ticket booths, flower shops, and other viable uses.
- b. Use the site topography to help reduce the visibility of the parking facility.
- c. Set the parking facility back from the sidewalk and install dense landscaping.
- d. Incorporate any of the blank wall treatments listed in Guideline C-3.
- e. Visually integrate the parking structure with building volumes above, below, and adjacent.
- f. Incorporate artwork into the facades.
- g. Provide a frieze, cornice, canopy, overhang, trellis or other device at the top of the parking level.
- h. Use a portion of the top of the parking level as an outdoor deck, patio, or garden with a rail, bench, or other guard device around the perimeter.

E2.2. Parking Structure Entrances: Design vehicular entries to parking structure so that they do not dominate the street frontage of a building. Subordinate the garage entrance to the pedestrian entrance in terms of size, prominence on the street-scape, location, and design emphasis. Consider one or more of the following design strategies:

- i. Enhance the pedestrian entry to reduce the relative importance of the garage entry.
- j. Recess the garage entry portion of the facade or extend portions of the structure over the garage entry to help conceal it.
- k. Emphasize other facade elements to reduce the visual prominence of the garage entry.
- l. Use landscaping or artwork to soften the appearance of the garage entry from the street.
- m. Locate the garage entry where the topography of the site can help conceal it.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The analysis summarized above was based on the design review packet dated Tuesday, June 16, 2020. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the Recommendation phase of the subject design and departures are APPROVED with the following conditions:

1. **Context and Typology:** Revise the fenestration pattern of the commercial storefronts on 2nd Avenue to include transom-lite glazing. (D-3, C-5, D-2, C-2, B-3)
2. **Context Response:** Revise the composition of the southern portion of the commercial street front to create a dynamic and contextually responsive assembly of storefronts that reinforce the unique qualities of Belltown. (A-1.1, B-1, B-1.II, B-1.IV, B-3, B-3.I)

3. **Building Entry:** Reinforce and strengthen the principal residential entry with an expression that is prominent, clearly identifiable and visible from the street, and inviting to pedestrians. Specifically explore at least two options: (C-4.2, B1.III, B-4, C-1)
 - i. Employ the full residential program width in the development of a unique masonry expression using a change in brick type, bond and color in combination with horizontal and/or vertical offsets.
 - ii. The development of an expression distinct from the masonry storefronts that comprise the rest of the street edge.
4. **Exterior Materials:** All exterior materials shall be maintained as drawn and specified in the Recommendation packet unless specifically approved by SDCI. (B-1. I, B-1.IV, B-2, B-3, B-4)

ANALYSIS & DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

Director’s Analysis

The design review process prescribed in Section 23.41.016.G of the Seattle Municipal Code describing the content of the SDCI Director’s administrative design review decision reads as follows:

1. A decision on an application for a permit subject to administrative design review shall be made by the Director.
2. The Director's design review decision shall be made as part of the overall Master Use Permit decision for the project. The Director's decision shall be based on the extent to which the proposed project meets the guideline priorities and in consideration of public comments on the proposed project

Subject to the preliminary conditions identified during the recommendation phase of review, the design of the proposed project was found by the SDCI Staff to adequately conform to the applicable Design Guidelines.

Staff identified elements of the Design Guidelines which are critical to the project’s overall success.

SDCI staff worked with the applicant to update the submitted plans to address the preliminary design review conditions identified during the recommendation phase of review.

Applicant response to the preliminary Design Review Condition(s):

1. The applicant has revised the fenestration pattern of the commercial storefronts on 2nd Avenue to include transom-lite glazing.
2. The applicant has revised the composition of the southern portion of the commercial street front to create a dynamic and contextually responsive assembly of storefronts that reinforce the unique qualities of Belltown.
3. The applicant has reinforced and strengthen the principal residential entry with an expression that is prominent, clearly identifiable and visible from the street, and inviting to pedestrians.
4. The exterior materials have been maintained as drawn and specified in the Recommendation packet.

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

The Director of SDCI finds that the proposal is consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines.

DIRECTOR'S DECISION

The Director **CONDITIONALLY APPROVES** the proposed design with conditions listed at the end of this document.

II. ANALYSIS – SEPA

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

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated 12/4/2019. The Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) has annotated the environmental checklist submitted by the project applicant; reviewed the project plans and any additional information in the project file submitted by the applicant or agents; and any pertinent comments which may have been received regarding this proposed action have been considered. The information in the checklist, the supplemental information, and the experience of the lead agency with the review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision.

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

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

Short Term Impacts

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

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Construction activities including construction worker commutes, truck trips, the operation of construction equipment and machinery, and the manufacture of the construction materials themselves result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, no further mitigation is warranted pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.A.

Construction Impacts - Parking and Traffic

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

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

Pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.B (Construction Impacts Policy), additional mitigation is warranted and a Construction Management Plan is required, which will be reviewed by Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT). The requirements for a Construction Management Plan include a Haul Route and a Construction Parking Plan. The submittal information and review process for Construction Management Plans are described on the SDOT website at: [Construction Use in the Right of Way](#).

Construction Impacts - Noise

The project is expected to generate loud noise during demolition, grading and construction. The Seattle Noise Ordinance (SMC 25.08.425) permits increases in permissible sound levels associated with private development construction and equipment between the hours of 7:00 AM and 10:00 PM on weekdays and 9:00 AM and 10:00 PM on weekends and legal holidays in this zone.

If extended construction hours are necessary due to emergency reasons or construction in the right of way, the applicant may seek approval from SDCI through a Noise Variance request. The applicant's environmental checklist does not indicate that extended hours are anticipated at this time.

A Construction Management Plan will be required prior to issuance of the first building permit, including contact information in the event of complaints about construction noise, and measures to reduce or prevent noise impacts. The submittal information and review process for Construction Management Plans are described on the SDOT website at: [Construction Use in the Right of Way](#). The limitations stipulated in the Noise Ordinance and the CMP are sufficient to mitigate noise impacts; therefore, no additional SEPA conditioning is necessary to mitigation noise impacts per SMC 25.05.675.B.

Construction Impacts – Mud and Dust

Approximately 7,500 cubic yards of material will be excavated and removed from the site. Transported soil is susceptible to being dropped, spilled or leaked onto City streets. The City's Traffic Code (SMC 11.74.150 and .160) provides that material hauled in trucks not be spilled during transport. The City requires that loads be either 1) secured/covered; or 2) a minimum of six inches of "freeboard" (area from level of material to the top of the truck container). The regulation is intended to minimize the amount of spilled material and dust from the truck bed en route to or from a site.

No further conditioning of the impacts associated with these construction impacts of the project is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies (SMC 25.05.675.B).

Environmental Health

The applicant submitted studies regarding existing contaminations on site (Phase I Environmental Site Assessment by Aspect Consulting dated 10/25/2018 and Phase II Environmental Site Assessment by Aspect Consulting dated 11/28/2018).

The Phase II ESA concluded, "In summary, no potential contaminants of concern were reported at concentrations exceeding their MTCA Method A cleanup levels for unrestricted land use. However, there is petroleum-impacted soil beneath the alleyway adjacent to and north of parcels A and B (Figure 2). These petroleum impacted soils fall within Class II disposal criteria and would require special handling and disposal at a permitted facility if encountered during future redevelopment activities. Given the heterogeneous nature of soil and the petroleum impacts identified, Aspect recommends having a plan in place to handle potentially contaminated soil at the Subject Property if it is redeveloped."

As indicated in the SEPA checklist, Phase I ESA, and Phase II ESA, the applicant will comply with all provisions of MTCA in addressing these issues in the development of the project.

If the recommendations described in the reports are followed, then it is not anticipated that the characterization, removal, treatment, transportation or disposal of any such materials will result in a significant adverse impact to the environment. This conclusion is supported by the expert environmental consultants for the project, whose conclusions are also set forth in the materials in the MUP file for this project.

Adherence to MTCA provisions and federal and state laws are anticipated to adequately mitigate significant adverse impacts from existing contamination on site. Phase II report briefly describes strategies to ensure adherence with MTCA provisions and indicates compliance with Washington State Department of Ecology regulatory authority.

Mitigation of contamination and remediation is in the jurisdiction of Washington State Department of Ecology ("Ecology"), consistent with the City's SEPA relationship to Federal, State and Regional regulations described in SMC 25.05.665.E. This State agency program functions to mitigate risks associated with removal and transport of hazardous and toxic materials, and the agency's regulations provide sufficient impact mitigation for these materials. The City acknowledges that Ecology's jurisdiction and requirements for remediation will mitigate impacts associated with any contamination.

The proposed strategies and compliance with Ecology's requirements are expected to adequately mitigate the adverse environmental impacts from the proposed development and no further mitigation is warranted for contaminated soil or groundwater impacts to environmental health per SMC 25.05.675.F.

Should asbestos be identified on the site, it must be removed in accordance with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) and City requirements. PSCAA regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality and require permits for removal of asbestos during demolition. The City acknowledges PSCAA's jurisdiction and requirements for remediation will mitigate impacts associated with any contamination. No further mitigation under SEPA Policies 25.05.675.F is warranted for asbestos impacts.

Should lead be identified on the site, there is a potential for impacts to environmental health. Lead is a pollutant regulated by laws administered by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), including the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992 (Title X), Clean Air Act (CAA), Clean Water Act (CWA), Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), and Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) among others. The EPA further authorized the Washington State Department of Commerce to administer two regulatory programs in Washington State: the Renovation, Repair and Painting Program (RRP), and the Lead-Based Paint Activities Program (Abatement). These regulations protect the public from hazards of improperly conducted lead-based paint activities and renovations. No further mitigation under SEPA Policies 25.05.675.F is warranted for lead impacts.

Long Term Impacts

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

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Operational activities, primarily vehicular trips associated with the project's energy consumption, are expected to result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, no further mitigation is warranted pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.A.

Historic Resources

The site is adjacent to a designated historic landmark (Mama's Mexican Kitchen Building). The Department of Neighborhoods (DON) reviewed the proposal for compliance with the Landmarks Preservation requirements of SMC 25.12 and did not recommend changes to the proposed design (Landmarks Preservation Board letters, reference number LPB 280/20). Per the Overview policies in SMC 25.05.665.D, the existing City Codes and regulations to mitigate impacts to historic resources are presumed to be sufficient, and no further conditioning is warranted per SMC 25.05.675.H.

The site includes a designated City of Seattle historic landmark, The Wayne Apartments; however, it was given “no controls” by the Landmarks Preservation Board, which means that no Certificate of Approval is required in association with the MUP or building demolition. The applicant will comply with the other requirements of SMC 25.12.835.B prior to demolition permit approval, as required by that code section. DON has determined that modification or demolition of this landmark does not require a Certificate of Approval from the Landmarks Preservation Board, prior to MUP issuance.

Per the Overview policies in SMC 25.05.665.D, the existing City Codes and regulations to mitigate impacts to historic resources are presumed to be sufficient, and no conditioning is warranted per SMC 25.05.675.H.

Height, Bulk, and Scale

The proposal completed the design review process described in SMC 23.41. Design review considers mitigation for height, bulk and scale through modulation, articulation, landscaping, and façade treatment.

Section 25.05.675.G.2.c of the Seattle SEPA Ordinance provides the following: “The Citywide Design Guidelines (and any Council-approved, neighborhood design guidelines) are intended to mitigate the same adverse height, bulk, and scale impacts addressed in these policies. A project that is approved pursuant to the Design Review Process shall be presumed to comply with these Height, Bulk, and Scale policies. This presumption may be rebutted only by clear and convincing evidence that height, bulk and scale impacts documented through environmental review have not been adequately mitigated. Any additional mitigation imposed by the decision maker pursuant to these height, bulk, and scale policies on projects that have undergone Design Review shall comply with design guidelines applicable to the project.”

The height, bulk and scale of the proposed development and relationship to nearby context have been addressed during the Design Review process. Pursuant to the Overview policies in SMC 25.05.665.D, the existing City Codes and regulations to mitigate height, bulk and scale impacts are adequate and additional mitigation is not warranted under SMC 25.05.675.G.

Parking

The proposed development includes 175 residential units with 90 off-street vehicular parking spaces. The traffic and parking analysis (Heffron, 2nd & Bell Mixed-Use Project, May 2020) indicates a peak demand for approximately 53 vehicles from the proposed development. Peak residential demand typically occurs overnight.

The traffic and parking analysis noted that the peak parking demand for this development is 53 vehicles. The number of proposed parking spaces accommodates all of the anticipated parking demand, and no additional mitigation is warranted per SMC 25.05.675.M.

Transportation

The Traffic Impact Analysis (Heffron, 2nd & Bell Mixed-Use Project, May 2020 and updated September 9, 2020) indicated that the project is expected to generate a net total of 110 new daily vehicle trips, with 7 net new PM peak hour trips and 2 net new AM peak hour trips.

The additional trips are expected to distribute on various roadways near the project site, including Blanchard Street, Bell Street, and 2nd Avenue would have minimal impact on levels of service at nearby intersections and on the overall transportation system. The SDCI Transportation Planner reviewed the information and determined that no mitigation is warranted per SMC 25.05.675.R.

DECISION – SEPA

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

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

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

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

CONDITIONS – DESIGN REVIEW

For the Life of the Project

1. The building and landscape design shall be substantially consistent with the materials represented at the Recommendation meeting and in the materials submitted after the Recommendation meeting, before the MUP issuance. Any change to the proposed design, including materials or colors, shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Joe Hurley email is joseph.hurley@seattle.gov).

CONDITIONS – SEPA

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

2. Provide a Construction Management Plan that has been approved by SDOT. The submittal information and review process for Construction Management Plans are described on the SDOT website at: [Construction Use in the Right of Way](#)

Joe Hurley, Senior Planner
Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

Date: February 11, 2021

JH:drm

K:\Decisions-Signed\3033991-LU.docx

IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR ISSUANCE OF YOUR MASTER USE PERMIT

Master Use Permit Expiration and Issuance

The appealable land use decision on your Master Use Permit (MUP) application has now been published. At the conclusion of the appeal period, your permit will be considered “approved for issuance”. (If your decision is appealed, your permit will be considered “approved for issuance” on the fourth day following the City Hearing Examiner’s decision.) Projects requiring a Council land use action shall be considered “approved for issuance” following the Council’s decision.

The “approved for issuance” date marks the beginning of the three-year life of the MUP approval, whether or not there are outstanding corrections to be made or pre-issuance conditions to be met. The permit must be issued by SDCI within that three years or it will expire and be cancelled (SMC 23-76-028). (Projects with a shoreline component have a two-year life. Additional information regarding the effective date of shoreline permits may be found at 23.60.074.)

All outstanding corrections must be made, any pre-issuance conditions met, and all outstanding fees paid before the permit is issued. You will be notified when your permit has issued.

Questions regarding the issuance and expiration of your permit may be addressed to the Public Resource Center at prc@seattle.gov or to our message line at 206-684-8467.