



City of Seattle

Gregory J. Nickels, Mayor
Department of Planning & Development
D.M. Sugimura, Director

**CITY OF SEATTLE
ANALYSIS AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT**

Application Number: 3007687
Applicant Name: Christina Bollo of SMR Architects for Plymouth Housing Group
Address of Proposal: 2630 1st Avenue

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow a 7-story building containing 2,039 sq. ft. of ground-level retail and 84 units residential above. Parking not required.

The following Master Use Permit components are required:

Design Review - Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) Section 23.41 with Development Standard Departures:

1. To allow shorter and narrower overhead weather protection - (SMC 23.49.018)

SEPA Environmental Review - Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) Section 25.05

SEPA DETERMINATION: Exempt DNS MDNS EIS

DNS with conditions

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

SITE AND VICINITY

The 6,660 square foot subject site is located at the southeasterly corner of 1st Avenue and Cedar Street in the Belltown neighborhood. The site is developed with a surface parking lot and is zoned Downtown Mixed Residential/Residential with a height limit of 65 feet for non-residential uses and a height limit of 125 feet for residential uses.

Surrounding zoning is the same, DMR/R 125/65 to the north, northeast, south and west (assuming Cedar Street is to the north). The zone designation does not change east of the site but the height limit for residential uses increases to 240 feet.

Surrounding development consists of another surface parking lot south of the site, an 18-story residential tower (Harbour Heights) across the alley to the east, the 2-3 story City Church and International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers building surrounded by surface parking to the north, and a 6-story apartment (The Cedars) across 1st Avenue to the west. Other development in the immediate area consists of 2- 8 story office, warehouse, apartment buildings and surface parking lots. Unlike other parts of Belltown this 1 to 2 block area has not seen development since the early 1980's.



First Avenue is designated as a class 1 pedestrian street-minor arterial. Cedar Street is designated as a green street and contains 3 street trees. A cedar tree is located on 1st Avenue surrounded by art benches. Initial discussions with SDOT and the artist indicate that the cedar tree should be replaced and planted in the same general area but 4 feet more towards the middle of the sidewalk.

A METRO bus stop is located on 1st Avenue near the corner which will remain.

PROPOSAL

The proposed project consists of 84 affordable studio apartments (about 250 square foot per unit) for Plymouth Housing Group and approximately 2000 square foot restaurant and/or retail on the first floor. The first floor also would include a manager's office, tenant activity room, offices and other on-site social services for the residents. No parking is required and none is proposed.

The preferred concept consists of a 7 story, 75 foot high structure with five wood frame floors over 2 floors of concrete. Finish materials studied are concrete, metal siding and stucco. The non-residential space would have an entry on 1st Avenue and on Cedar Street near the corner. The residential would have an entry on Cedar Street at the center of the building. Open space would be provided on the 7th floor roof deck facing north. A notch in the massing on the south side would create a light well and provide opportunity for windows on the south side.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

DPD received several written public comments prior to the each Early Design Guidance meeting; the Design Review Board was provided copies of these comments at the meetings. Nineteen members of the public attended the first EDG meeting and eighteen members of the public attended the second EDG meeting. To summarize, the issues raised were at the EDG meetings;

- Concerns about pedestrian safety at the intersection of Cedar and the alley.
- Request a setback on Cedar to allow gathering space, in response to existing conditions and to help with the visibility at the alley/Cedar intersection.

- Concerns about privacy and window adjacency and alignment in the alley
- Request that the alley window bays be setback and at a 45 degree angle
- Wants Harbour Heights residents to be held harmless if they strike pedestrians with their vehicles.
- Concerns about lighting in the alley
- Concerns about the rooftop design. Wants “attractive” rooftop not “interesting” rooftop. Use plant material on roof. Why are laundry room vented to roof? Why is there a need for another vent hood for kitchen?
- Concerns about the choice of building materials and whether corrugated metal siding is appropriate. Associates metal with industrial which is not appropriate.
- Request to soften the alley façade with landscape
- Concern about the triangular bays in the alley
- Concerns about the mass of the building- too boxy and not modulated.
- Concerns about air quality and odor and sound from rooftop equipment
- Bike storage should not be on roof terrace
- Where is bus shelter going to be placed? It should not interfere with parking access.
- Lack of consultation and collaboration by design team and owner.
- Concerned about creating a canyon effect- design not friendly
- Bench along sidewalk by entry is not a good solution because it is in the right of way.
- Glazing at the alley/street corner is not a good solution
- Make parapet more interesting
- Screen the mechanical equipment
- Don't block off roof terrace views for tenants with planters.
- Acknowledged that building could be 50 feet taller
- Retail space designed well
- Maximize landscaping on 1st Avenue
- It is common for Belltown to have 400 foot tall buildings with windows across from each other on alley

DPD received three comments letters following the 2nd EDG meeting and one comment letter in during the SEPA comment period which ended June 4, 2008. The comment letters addressed concerns about pedestrian safety and privacy at the alley façade. One member of the public attended the Recommendation Meeting and the comments are summarized below:

- Objects to the use of metal siding; brick and concrete are better for the historical context
- There should be a cornice atop the building
- The departure request are reasonable
- The rooftop artwork does nothing for the neighborhood
- The rooftop should be darker, less reflective

ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW

Design Guidance

At the Early Design Guidance meeting on January 22, 2008, three alternative design schemes were presented. The preferred concept consists of a 7 story, 75 foot high structure with five wood frame

floors over 2 floors of concrete. Finish materials studied to date are concrete, metal siding and stucco. The non-residential space would have an entry on 1st Avenue and on Cedar Street near the corner. The residential would have an entry on Cedar Street on the eastern portion of the site. Open space would be provided on the 7th floor roof deck facing north. A notch in the massing on the south side would create a light well and provide opportunity for windows on the south side.

At the second Early Design Guidance meeting on April 8, 2008, materials and color palette were presented and a Green Street landscape plan shown. Three alley façade options were also presented in response to neighborhood comments.

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 siting and design guidance and identified by letter and number those siting and design guidelines found in City of Seattle's "*Design Review: Guidelines for Multifamily and Commercial Buildings*" of highest priority to this project. Identification and discussion of the Guidelines have been incorporated into the priorities addressed below.

The Design Review Board reviewed the final project design on July 8, 2008 at which time site, landscaping and floor plans, as well as elevation sketches and renderings, were presented for the members' consideration. The design presented at the Recommendation meeting showed an enhance south façade, a preferred alley façade, and rooftop artwork. The guidance by the Board appears after the bold guidelines text and the recommendations from the final meeting follow in bold text.

A

Site Planning & Massing

Responding to the Larger Context

A-1 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 beyond the immediate context of the building site.

A-2 Enhance the skyline.

Design the upper portion of the building to promote visual interest and variety in the downtown skyline.

The Board is interested in how the project would relate to future development on adjacent sites and whether the design team is aware of future development on adjacent sites. This could be particularly important with respect to the surface parking lot abutting to the south.

The Board wants to understand how the building responds to the green street at the ground level and with respect to urban form/scale.

The building may not be visible in the broader skyline, but the roof top and roof deck will be highly visible to taller buildings surrounding it. The Board feels that the roof top design should be organized and attractive because it will be visible from taller buildings. The roof deck should be both functional and aesthetically pleasing from above. Refer to guideline D-2, enhance the building with landscaping.

2nd EDG

The Board wants the rooftop design to be studied further in an effort to ideally find a more appealing solution. One Board member felt the small size of the rooftop area minimized the impact of it on views from taller buildings. Perspectives of the rooftop and 7th floor terrace need to be presented at the next meeting. In relation to the rooftop and 7th floor terrace, the Board asked that the building top be given design attention in that how the building terminates and reaches the sky is important.

Further information on the surrounding (across the Cedar street in particular) green street improvements needs to be provided and how they relate to the project frontage along Cedar.

At the Recommendation Meeting, the Board was pleased with new design of the 7th floor terrace. Though there may be some bike racks on the terrace, they will located in setback areas behind the exit doors.

The rooftop of the building has been enhanced with a compass rose design by Seattle artist Joe Burmeister, entitled *There, From, Here*. In general the Board felt this was an interesting and pleasing way to enhance the rooftop and provide some distraction from views of the typical rooftop mechanical structures. However, some of the mechanical structures are still quite evident especially one in the middle of the design and the Board urged the artist to make an attempt to address this. The applicant has agreed to address these concerns.

A fully developed green street landscape plan was presented featuring two additional street trees and planting areas along Cedar. There will also be 24" planting strip adjacent to the building along this façade. Additional benches have been added near the residential entrance on Cedar. Two street trees will added to 1st Avenue and the existing Cedar tree will be replaced with one closer to the southwest corner of the building along with the existing sitting stones.

B

Architectural Expression

Relating to the Neighborhood Context

B-1 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.

B-3 Reinforce the positive urban form & architectural attributes of the immediate

are *consider the predominant attributes of the immediate neighborhood and reinforce desirable siting patters, massing arrangements and streetscape characteristics of nearby development.*

B-4 Design a well proportioned & unified building

Compose the massing and organize the publicly accessible 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

At the next meeting an analysis of how this project relates to the Harbor Heights and adjacent buildings must be provided. The Board noted that Harbor Heights is setback from Cedar Street and

wants to know how this streetscape relates to the project as well as how it relates to the built form on 1st Avenue. The Board did not get a sense how the project would respond to the neighborhood character with respect to scale and materials.

The Board thought there is opportunity for a refined, elegant design because of the size of the project. The Board wants the east and west facades to express the hierarchy between the street and the alley. The Board noted that the two facades face different environments and should appropriately respond.

2nd EDG

The Board wants attention given towards how the building materials are integrated and unified in the building design. The Board indicated that how the elements and finish details fit together is important. For instance, detailing the metal so that it does not represent an industrial design is important considering the context. The Board preferred color options 1 and 3 as compared to option 2 which seemed the least contextual. The Board suggested bringing down more color to the base concrete to add interest. Material and color samples need to be provided at the next meeting.

The Board did not have concerns about the finish materials (concrete, stucco and metal) studied and presented; The Board felt they were appropriate at this location.

At the Recommendation meeting, the Board was pleased with color palette and the use of materials that convey a well-integrated design on all facades.

C

The Streetscape:

Creating the Pedestrian Environment

C-1 Promote pedestrian interaction.

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

C-3 Provide active-not blank- facades.

Buildings should not have large blank walls facing the street, especially near sidewalks.

C-4 Reinforce building Entries

To promote pedestrian comfort, safety and orientation, reinforce the building's entry.

C-5 Encourage overhead weather protection.

Encourage project applicants to provide continuous, well-lit, overhead weather protection to improve pedestrian comfort and safety along major pedestrian routes.

C-6 Develop the alley façade.

To increase pedestrian safety, comfort and interest, develop portions of the alley façade in response to the unique conditions of the site or project.

The Board wants distinct well marked entries for the residential and commercial. The Board believes that gathering space around the residential entry is needed for this type of building and wants the design to provide this feature. The Board asked the team to consider shifting the residential entry more towards 1st Avenue.

The Board sees opportunity to develop the corner of 1st Avenue and Cedar at the ground level so that it strongly engages the pedestrian. The Board indicated that all the corners will be visible and should be designed well. The Board referenced how the Harbour Heights ground level transitions away from the alley which allows views into the alley from Cedar Street, and they felt the project needs to respond to that condition.

The Board wants the design to address any potential blank façade on the south side where there is currently a surface parking lot. The Board needs to understand how the proposed light well relates to the unit layout and where windows will be located.

The Board wants the project to provide continuous overhead weather protection on both street frontages and at the corner of 1st and Cedar.

2nd EDG

The Board appreciated the design of the south façade including the light well. They want the south façade to be further studied with potential refinements that result in more texture particularly on the western edge of the concrete wall. They voiced concerns about dark colors in the light well because it could create darker space if and when the abutting lot is developed.

The Board appreciated the design options for the alley façade and asked that refinements be studied. The Board recognized that buildings having windows facing each other across an alley is prevalent in downtown. However, the Board made a suggestion about the angled bays stating that an asymmetrical design like Plymouth Place (sheet C10) could be utilized in this location. The Board stated that this would further decrease direct views towards Harbour House and vice versa, and provide north-south views.

At the Recommendation meeting, the applicant presented the update design for the south façade. The south façade, which is likely to remain exposed for the foreseeable future, has been enhanced with scoring and reveals presenting a more pleasing aspect to the neighbors. The wall colors in the light well are now the lightest in the palette. The Board was pleased with these new detailings.

The Board appreciated the extensive view studies for the three alley façade options. While the Board did prefer the symmetrical bay option as being the most attractive, they did appreciate the concerns that the applicant has for the neighbors objections. The Board agreed that, while all options were acceptable, the applicant should decide which option would be most satisfactory. The applicant has, thus, decided to pursue the alley façade option that has no bays.

D

Public Amenities

Enhancing the Streetscape & Open Space

D-2 Enhance the Building with Landscaping

Enhance the building and site with substantial landscaping

D-3 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.

D-6 Design for Personal Safety and Security

Design the building and site to enhance the real and perceived feeling of personal safety and security in the immediate area

The Board wants the rooftop deck landscaped to enhance the building especially with respect to how it is viewed from above.

The Board acknowledged the concerns raised by the public comments regarding pedestrian safety; however, they did not believe this project was responsible or could change the behavior of drivers. The Board noted that many structures downtown are built to the property lines along alleys. Although, the Board indicated that the alley corner could be designed with both aesthetics and safety in mind.

The Board wants the applicant to continue to work towards a good solution for siting the art benches and cedar tree.

2nd EDG

The Board wants to see more detailed landscape plans at the next meeting. Usability and the outside/inside link of the 7th floor terrace needs to be addressed. See earlier comments about the green street.

The Board supported the design and location of the residential entry and the concept of having benches adjacent to the entry. Some members had a concern that use of the benches would block the sidewalk. The Board was pleased that the cedar tree and art benches will be part of the project.

The Board acknowledged that this project is not providing on-site parking, and that the building might contribute towards slowing traffic in the alley. The Board feels this project will not contribute towards the pedestrian/vehicle safety issue raised by neighbors. The presentation showed that the built environment downtown typically includes zero setback conditions at the alley intersections and the Board agreed.

Details of proposed lighting and signage need to be presented at the next meeting. Particular concern about alley lighting was raised and must be addressed.

As noted above, the Board was pleased with the re-designed 7th floor terrace offering a greater degree of usability. The Board was also pleased with green street design and the retention of the cedar tree and stone benches on 1st Avenue.

The Board unanimously agreed that the applicant addressed pedestrian safety issues very well at the alley entrance through the use of a change in scoring of the pavement. The change in texture acting as a “reminder” to both vehicles and pedestrian to use caution. The Board did suggest, however, that the scoring could be extended into the alley somewhat to give “early warning” to vehicles and to tie in the stairway to the Harbor Heights building.

Departure from Development Standards

The applicant requested potential departures from the following Land Use Code development standards:

<i>Requirement</i>	<i>Proposed</i>	<i>Board Comments</i>
SMC 23.49.018 Overhead Weather Protection. (OWP) Continuous overhead weather protection shall be required for new development along the entire street frontage of a lot, a minimum of 8’ from the façade of the building and nor more than 15 ‘ in height .	The design shows continuous overhead weather protection along the entire street frontage except where a new cedar tree is proposed on 1 st Avenue. Width of the canopies varies from 5’ to the required 8’ at the residential entrance and over the commercial entrance. Because of the change in grade on Cedar the canopies are 15’ 10’’ at the corner.	The four members of the Board unanimously approved these departures because it enabled the replacement of a new cedar tree and art benches near its original location and to provide clearance for new street trees along Cedar Street.

The Board unanimously recommended approval of this project with no conditions.

ANALYSIS & DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

Director’s Analysis

Four members of the Downtown Design Review Board were in attendance and recommended approval of the design without conditions to the Director and identified elements of the Design Guidelines which are critical to the project’s overall success. The Director must provide additional analysis of the Board’s recommendations and then accept, deny or revise the Board’s recommendations (SMC 23.41.014.F3). The Director agrees with and accepts the recommendation by the Board.

The Director of DPD has reviewed the decision and recommendations of the Design Review Board made by the four members present at the decision meeting and finds that they are consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines for Multifamily and Commercial Buildings. The Director agrees with the Design Review Board’s conclusion that the proposed project and conditions imposed result in a design that best meets the intent of the Design Review Guidelines and accepts the recommendations noted by the Board. The Director is satisfied that all of the conditions imposed by the Design Review Board have been met.

Director’s Decision

The design review process is prescribed in Section 23.41.014 of the Seattle Municipal Code. Subject to the above-proposed conditions, the design of the proposed project was found by the Design Review Board to adequately conform to the applicable Design Guidelines. The Director of DPD has reviewed the decision and recommendations of the Design Review Board made by the four members present at the decision meeting, provided additional review and finds that they are

consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines for Multifamily and Commercial Buildings. The Design Review Board agreed that the proposed design, along with the conditions listed, meets each of the Design Guideline Priorities as previously identified. Therefore, the Director accepts the Design Review Board's recommendations and **CONDITIONALLY APPROVES** the proposed design and the requested departures with the conditions summarized at the end of this Decision.

ANALYSIS - SEPA

The proposal site is located in an environmentally critical area, thus the application is not exempt from SEPA review. However, SMC 25.05.908 provides that the scope of environmental review of projects within critical areas shall be limited to: 1) documenting whether the proposal is consistent with the City's Environmentally Critical Areas (ECA) regulations in SMC 25.09; and 2) Evaluating potentially significant impacts on the critical area resources not adequately addressed in the ECA regulations. This review includes identifying additional mitigation measures needed to protect the ECA in order to achieve consistency with SEPA and other applicable environmental laws.

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

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated April 17, 2008 and annotated by the Land Use Planner. The information in the checklist, pertinent public comment, and the experience of the lead agency with review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision.

The Department of Planning and Development has analyzed the environmental checklist and geotechnical report submitted by the project applicant; and reviewed the project plans and any additional information in the file. As indicated in this analysis, this action will result in adverse impacts to the environment. However, due to their temporary nature and limited effects, the impacts are not expected to be significant.

The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665) 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 and environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation*” subject to some limitations. Short-term adverse impacts are anticipated from the proposal. No adverse long-term impacts on the environmentally critical area are anticipated.

Short-term Impacts

The following temporary or construction-related impacts on the identified critical area are expected: 1) temporary soil erosion; and 2) increased vibration from construction operations and equipment. These impacts are not considered significant because they are temporary and/or minor in scope (SMC 25.05.794).

Several adopted codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code regulates site excavation for foundation purposes and requires that soil erosion control techniques be initiated for the duration of construction. The ECA ordinance and DR 33-2006 and 3-2007 regulate development and construction techniques in designated ECA areas with identified geologic hazards. The Building code provides for construction measures and life safety issues. Compliance with these applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most short-term impacts to the environment and no further conditioning pursuant to SEPA policies is warranted.

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, they are not expected to be significant.

Noise

There will be excavation required to prepare the building site and foundation for the new building. Additionally, as development proceeds, noise associated with construction of the building could adversely affect the surrounding residential uses. Due to the proximity of these uses, the limitations of the Noise Ordinance are found to be inadequate to mitigate the potential noise impacts. Pursuant to the SEPA Overview Policy (SMC.25.05.665) and the SEPA Construction Impacts Policy (SMC 25.05.675 B), mitigation is warranted.

2. The hours of construction activity shall be limited to non-holiday weekdays between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. and between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays (except that grading, delivery and pouring of cement and similar noisy activities shall be prohibited on Saturdays). This condition may be modified by DPD to allow work of an emergency nature. This condition may also be modified to permit low noise exterior work (e.g., installation of landscaping) after approval from DPD.

Long-term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of this proposal including: increased surface water runoff due to greater site coverage by impervious surfaces, and loss of plant and animal habitat.

Several adopted City codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. Specifically these are: the ECA Ordinance, the Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code which requires provisions for controlled tightline release to an approved outlet and may require additional design elements to prevent isolated flooding. Compliance with these applicable codes and ordinances is adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation of most long-term impacts and no further conditioning is warranted by SEPA policies.

Operational activities, primarily vehicular trips associated with the project and the projects' 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, they are not expected to be significant.

DECISION - SEPA

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

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

CONDITIONS – SEPA

The owner applicant/responsible party shall:

During Construction

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

1. The hours of construction activity shall be limited to non-holiday weekdays between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. and between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays (except that grading, delivery and pouring of cement and similar noisy activities shall be prohibited on Saturdays). This condition may be modified by DPD to allow work of an emergency nature. This condition may also be modified to permit low noise exterior work (e.g., installation of landscaping) after approval from DPD.

CONDITIONS – DESIGN REVIEW

2. Any proposed changes to the exterior of the building or the site or must be submitted to DPD for review and approval by the Land Use Planner (Marti Stave, 684-0239), or by the Design Review Manager (Vince Lyons, 233-3823). Any proposed changes to the improvements in the public right-of-way must be submitted to DPD and SDOT for review and for final approval by SDOT.
3. Compliance with all images and text on the MUP drawings, design review meeting guidelines and approved design features and elements (including exterior materials, landscaping and ROW improvements) shall be verified by the DPD Land Use Planner assigned to this project or by the Design Review Manager. An appointment with the assigned Land Use Planner must be made at least (3) working days in advance of field inspection. The Land Use Planner will determine whether submission of revised plans is required to ensure that compliance has been achieved.
4. Embed all of the conditions listed at the end of this decision in the cover sheet for the MUP permit and for all subsequent permits including updated MUP plans, and all building permit drawings.
5. Embed the 11 x 17 colored elevation drawings from the DR Recommendation meeting and as updated, into the MUP plans prior to issuance, and also embed these colored elevation drawings into the Building Permit Plan set in order to facilitate subsequent review of compliance with Design Review.
6. Include the Departure Matrix in the Zoning Summary section of the MUP Plans and on all subsequent Building Permit Plans. Add call-out notes on appropriate plan and elevation drawings in the updated MUP plans and on all subsequent Building Permit plans.

Compliance with all applicable conditions must be verified and approved by the Land Use Planner, Marti Stave, (206 684-0239) at the specified development stage, as required by the Director's decision. The Land Use Planner shall determine whether the condition requires submission of additional documentation or field verification to assure that compliance has been achieved. **Prior to any alteration of the approved plan set on file at DPD, the specific revisions shall be subject to review and approval by the Land Use Planner.**

Signature: _____ (signature on file) Date: August 21, 2008
Marti Stave, Land Use Planner
Department of Planning and Development

MS:lc

Stavem/DOCS/Desgin Review/3007687 1st & Cedar/3007687dec.doc