



City of Seattle
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Department of Planning and Development
D. M. Sugimura, Director

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

Application Number: 3014451
Applicant Name: Michael Willis
Address of Proposal: 1301 Western Avenue

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTIONS

Land Use Application to allow a 16-story, mixed-use building containing 168 dwelling units, 3,600 square feet of retail at grade and 130 parking spaces. Review includes 6,000 cubic yards of grading.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review - Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) Section 23.41

SEPA - Environmental Determination pursuant to SMC 25.05

Shoreline Substantial Development Permit – (SMC Chapter 23.60) to allow a mixed use building in an Urban Harborfront (UH) shoreline environment.

SEPA DETERMINATION: Exempt DNS MDNS EIS

DNS with conditions*

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

* Notice of the Early Determination of Non-significance was published on January 30, 2014 and revised on March 27, 2014.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to design and construct a mixed-use building with 168 dwelling units, 3,600 sq. ft. of retail and 130 parking spaces in below and above grade garages. The proposal would eliminate a surface parking lot.

The applicant presented three massing scenarios at the EDG meeting. Common to the alternatives is a podium with a tower set back forty feet from University Ave. to respect the view corridor established above sixty feet. In each scheme parking access occurs on Western Ave. near the north property line to avoid a curb cut on the future redevelopment of Alaskan Way. The proposed building program illustrates a residential lobby at the corner of University St. and Western Ave., retail uses at the corner of University St. and Alaskan Way to extend north along Alaskan Way.

Comprised of a six-story podium with a tower rising from its northern half, Option #1 forms a tripartite façade on the northern elevation with a significant central vertical niche. On the south elevation a smaller vertical reveal establishes an asymmetrical façade at the nine-story tower. Option #2 doubles the vertical niches or light wells at the north wall. The elevation forms an ABABA rhythm facing the steam plant. In this option a narrow vertical reveal visually separates the tower from the lower podium offering the impression of two volumes. A larger reveal extends up the south elevation, perhaps, expressing some change in the residential floor plan. The more detailed third option sculpts the north elevation to ensure that most of the tower steps back from the steam plant. A combination of slight setbacks and reveals in the massing produces the resemblance of three vertical volumes on the Alaskan Way elevation. A shed roof capping the central vertical mass further emphasizes the three volumes. The same motif repeats itself on the Western side without the sloping roof. Facing University St., the six story podium projects forward of the tower. Similar to the other schemes, a shallow vertical reveal on the tower forms an asymmetrical wall. The proportions of the slender reveals derive from the steam plant's smokestacks.

The applicant substantially refined Option #3 by the initial Recommendation meeting: the masonry base forms a "L" shape on the Alaskan Way elevation with six floors wrapping around the corner from University St. and then dropping then dropping to roughly three floors. The west façade tower is no longer staggered and the sloped roof once extending beyond the major vertical plane has been significantly pulled back from the façade due to the requirements of the Shoreline code.

At the Final Recommendation Meeting, the applicant refined the preferred option based on Board direction at the previous meeting. Revisions targeted the masonry base on the west façade, the materiality of the canopies, the composition and spandrels of the curtain walls.

SITE & VICINITY

Located on the north side of University St. between Western Ave. and Alaska Way, the site totals 17,245 square feet with 120 linear feet of frontage on Western, 150' on University and 120' of frontage on Alaskan Way. The site's has an approximate four to nine foot rise from Alaskan Way to Western Ave. A surface parking lot occupies the site.

The site possesses a Downtown Mixed Commercial with a 160' height limit (DMC 160) zoning classification. This zone classification extends from Union St. on the north to Columbia St. on the south. To the west across Alaskan Way, the zoning shifts to Downtown Harbor One with a 45' height limit (DH1/45). On both sides of the 1st Ave. corridor, the zoning is DMC with allowable height limits that range between 240 and 400' feet depending upon the use. The project lies partially within the Urban Harborfront (UH) Shoreline Environment.

The area has an environmental critical area designation of a Liquefaction prone area.

Near the foot of the Harbor Steps, the site sits between the Harbor Steps complex and the Alaskan Way viaduct on the west. Once the Highway 99 viaduct demolition occurs, the site will overlook the new Alaskan Way corridor and promenade. The Seattle Steam plant and a public storage facility lie to the north. Six and seven-story office buildings are located across University St. The site lies at the transition between the downtown office core and the harbor front with its eclectic mix of recreational and tourism oriented uses.

SDOT designates the surrounding streets as follows: University St. is classified as a Green St., Western Ave. represents a minor arterial and Alaskan Way is a major arterial.

ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW

PUBLIC COMMENT

Eleven members of the public affixed their names to the Early Design Review meeting sign-in sheet. Speakers raised the following issues.

- Evaluate how parking access on Western Ave will function. The street is already congested.
- If built, the structure will set a precedent for future waterfront development. Take the time to review it carefully.
- Use solar heating.

A	Site Planning
----------	----------------------

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.

Use the solar array to create an expressive roof top. The architect should recognize that tenants in buildings to the east will view the roof. Design the top as a significant building feature.

Architectural Expression

- 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.**

Recognize the property's prominent location as a well traveled gateway between the downtown core and the waterfront. In the other direction, it represents a link in the Pike Place Market and Pioneer Square corridor.

- B-2 Create a Transition in Bulk & Scale. Compose the massing of the building to create a transition to the height, bulk, and scale of development in neighboring or nearby less intensive zones.**

The size and compositional intention of the six-story volume relates to many of the surrounding historical structures. The relationship of the proposed tower to the smaller volume, however, is less successful. The base of the tower needs to appear firmly rooted in its context.

- B-3 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.**

Both programmatically and spatially, the podium's relationship with the massing on Western and Alaskan streets conveys confusion and lack of resolution. The retail use, based on the schematic elevation, would have two very distinct storefronts---one belonging to the lower volume on the south and one belonging to the tower on the north --for a relatively small space. The predominant pattern of horizontal datum lines in the immediate vicinity offers compelling organizational cues. Rather than planting a tower with a modest reveal to rise from the Alaskan Way grade, consider the tower and lower mass as a series of interlocking volumes that mirror the collage like quality of the surrounding buildings. In short, the building's massing and materials ought to reflect closely the building program.

- 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.**

The schematic of a tripartite facade on Alaskan Way failed to convince the Board of any inherent logic. The Board also questioned the appropriateness of so much glazing. The lower volume fronting University St., with its contemporary updating of traditional loft or warehouse structures, met with enthusiasm. The glass tower, divided vertically by a thin reveal, left a diminished base lacking a strong precedence in the vicinity for its excessiveness of glazing. The Board encourages the formation of a richer more textured base that expresses the retail program facing Alaskan Way and recognizes the series of dominant horizontal datum lines in the district.

The extensive amount of glazing risks the appearance of an office building rather than a residential tower. Consider interlocking the volumes with one another as suggested by the parti studies (the transformations from hand gestures) on p. 23 of the EDG booklet. The design evolution of these concepts ought to produce something more compelling. Neighborhood imagery, so chockfull of design cue, should capably influence the composition of the elevations and the choice of materials. The substantial pier and spandrel frames, the steam plant's pleasing cacophony of exposed pipes and pure geometric volumes, the wood structures on the piers and even the playfulness of the Ferris wheel represent starting points for design exploration.

The Streetscape

- 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.**

The generous amount of space devoted to the residential lobby and lounge disappointed the Board members. Due to the extra sidewalk width along University, ample opportunity exists for increased retail along with a sidewalk café or other means to create a strong connection between retail uses and this important pedestrian corridor along University St./Harbor Steps. Board members preferred corner retail at Western Ave and University St. rather than the lobby.

- C-2 Design Facades of Many Scales. Design architectural features, fenestration patterns, and materials 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.**

See guidance under B-4.

- C-3 Provide Active—Not Blank—Facades. Buildings should not have large blank walls facing the street, especially near sidewalks.**

The presence of a blank wall at the Alaskan Way sidewalk level would diminish the pedestrian experience along what will be a grand boulevard and promenade. Even with the parking ramp at ground level, the design of the street level façade could accommodate an aperture into the building or some other point of visual interest.

- C-4 Reinforce Building Entries. To promote pedestrian comfort, safety, and orientation, reinforce the building's entry.**

Too much emphasis, the Board observed, was placed on a residential entry / lobby at the University and Western Ave corner. A retail presence at this corner will create a stronger connection to the pedestrian realm by enhancing the activity between the office core and the waterfront.

- 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.**

The Board prefers continuous overhead weather protection along the three rights of way.

Public Amenities

- D-1 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.**

The landscaping and the design of the base at the University St. elevation should provide a seamless transition along the grand procession from Third Ave to the waterfront. The right programming, the openness between the interior and exterior along University and the quality of the landscaping will ensure this connection.

- D-2 Enhance the Building with Landscaping. Enhance the building and site with substantial landscaping—which includes special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, and site furniture, as well as living plant material.**

The roof top of the podium level will be viewed from structures above the site. Create a quality design for the green roof.

- 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.**

Along University St. the building and landscape design should reinforce the connection with the Harbor Steps.

- D-4 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.**

The Board will review signage concepts at the Recommendation meeting.

- D-5 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, and on signage.**

Provide a lighting plan at the Recommendation meeting. Renderings of the building at night will assist in the evaluation.

- D-6 Design for Personal Safety & Security. Design the building and site to enhance the real and perceived feeling of personal safety and security in the immediate area.**

Vehicular Access & Parking

- E-1 Minimize Curb Cut Impacts. Minimize adverse impacts of curb cuts on the safety and comfort of pedestrians.**

The Board agreed with the placement of the curb cut on Western Ave.

- E-2 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.**

The second and third floor corners of the building at Western and Alaskan need a more active use than bike storage. Consider double height spaces at the corners for the retail and lobby.

- E-3 Minimize the Presence of Service Areas. Locate service areas for trash dumpsters, loading docks, mechanical equipment, and the like away from the street front where possible. Screen from view those elements which for programmatic reasons cannot be located away from the street front.**

Based on the preliminary floor plan, the service areas appear well integrate into the parking level and have minimal presence on the exterior.

MASTER USE PERMIT APPLICATION

The applicant refined the design and applied for a Master Use Permit with a Design Review and SEPA components on January 8, 2014.

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The Design Review Board conducted Initial and Final Recommendation Meetings on June 17th and August 19th, 2014 respectively to review the applicant's formal project proposal developed in response to the previously identified priorities. At the public meetings, site plans, elevations, floor plans, landscaping plans, and computer renderings of the proposed exterior materials were presented for the Board members' consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT

One member of the public affixed his name to the Initial Recommendation meeting sign-in sheet. The speaker, an expert in commercial leasing in Seattle, spoke about the difficulty of leasing retail space along Western Ave. He advocated for the presence of the exercise room and the residential lobby at the corner until the commercial leasing market improves.

There were no public comments at the Final Recommendation meeting.

A Site Planning

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.**

Meeting #1: The applicant's revisions to the roof top due to the Seattle Shoreline code met with Board approval.

Meeting #2: No changes to the roof top presented.

Architectural Expression

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.

Meeting #1: The brick masonry base with its allusions to nearby turn of the 20th century warehouses received considerable praise, in particular, its detailing and the cleverness in which the two levels of parking disappear behind the loft-like facades. See further Board recommendations for guideline B-4.

Meeting #2: The Board supported the brick base and the minor refinements presented.

B-2 Create a Transition in Bulk & Scale. Compose the massing of the building to create a transition to the height, bulk, and scale of development in neighboring or nearby less intensive zones.

B-3 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.

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.

Meeting #1: The Board recommended a few refinements to the six-story masonry base along Alaskan Way. The masonry portion of the three upper levels should extend northward to the vertical edge of the tower in order to eliminate the gap between the edge and the masonry. Continue the storefront masonry detailing with its wide brick spandrel capping the three lower levels and large storefront windows to include the northern most bays along Alaskan Way.

Conveying its deep reservations in respect to the glass tower, the Board noted the tower's overweening or excessive resemblance to an office building. The predominance of glazing and glass spandrel, the pervasive blue tint, the lack of balconies or noticeable modulation to provide depth and the curtain wall's overall two-dimensionality failing to provide texture all emphasize this visual connotation as an office tower. Using the imagery of rising steam or vapor as well as the Steam Plant's chimneys to inform the design of the building skin generally produced busy elevations. The north and south elevations, in particular, possess awkward proportions emphasized by the composition. On the east and west elevations, the Board recommended that the brick reveals should be narrowed and the masonry replaced with the same metal louvers elsewhere on the facades.

The Board also requested more accurate drawings of the facades with the distinctions in color between the spandrels and the windows more honestly rendered. Produce images of the building during daylight and darkness for the next Recommendation meeting.

Meeting #2: The Board applauded the refinements made where the base and middle tower meet on the east and west facades, and the clarifications to the vertical slots in the middle tower (shown on revised elevations on pages 31, 33, 35 and 37 in the Recommendation #2 booklet). The Board supported the more prevalent transparent vision glass, the less cobalt blue glass tint, and the ‘shadow box’ spandrel panels proposed. The Board also supported the more orderly arrangement of white accent panels, and less prominent louver bands in the tower. The Board supported the two-part approach on the wide south elevation, recognizing the accents on the east portion are more rational, and the west portion a bit more random, but the accents should stay subtle as shown and not become more random or prominent.

The Streetscape

- 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.**

Meeting #1: Noting public comment and the applicant’s reluctance to place commercial use at the corner of University St. and Western Ave., the Board generally accepted the idea of the extension of the residential lobby to the corner but recommends a double height space at the corner. The transparent glazing at the second level will anchor the corner and, when lit in the evening, act as an attractive lantern to individuals approaching from the east and south.

See discussion of the canopies in guidance C-5.

Meeting #2: The Board strongly endorsed the option with a full two-story volume at the southeast corner, and agreed the interior lighting fixture should be selected to provide generous night glow and visual interest to pedestrians, similar to the one shown on Recommendation booklet page 15.

- C-2 Design Facades of Many Scales. Design architectural features, fenestration patterns, and materials 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.**

Meeting #1: See guidance under B-4.

Meeting #2: The Board supported the revised façade compositions presented.

- C-3 Provide Active—Not Blank—Facades. Buildings should not have large blank walls facing the street, especially near sidewalks.**

Meeting #1: The architect’s revisions to the street level Alaskan Way façade alleviated prior concern about blank walls along this important stretch of the future waterfront esplanade.

Meeting #2: The Board supported the revised façade compositions presented, reinforcing the importance of the deeply recessed storefronts, careful brick detailing and projecting brick trim courses (as shown on booklet pages 15 and 23).

C-4 Reinforce Building Entries. To promote pedestrian comfort, safety, and orientation, reinforce the building’s entry.

Meeting #1: In response to earlier guidance, the architect shifted the residential entry toward the mid-point on University St away from the Western Ave corner. With the Board recommending that all of the canopies have glazing (see guidance for C-5), the entry lacks a distinguishing feature seen from afar due to the recessed doorway. The Board noted that signage and the possibility of a raised canopy could signal the entry if needed.

Meeting #2: The Board supported the revised canopies shown on page 23 of the Recommendation #2 booklet with clear glass in all locations except for the wood soffit at the residential lobby bay.

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.

Meeting #1: The two contrasting materials comprising the canopies and their placement provoked considerable discussion among the Board members. The Board recommended eliminating the opaque material in favor of the transparent glazing providing greater homogeneity along the building fronts. The canopies should constitute a nearly continuous covering over the three sidewalks with the possible exception of the corners.

Meeting #2: The Board supported the essentially continuous metal and glass canopies as shown on page 23, including the discrete frame elements expressed at each bay. Also see departure #2.

Public Amenities

D-1 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.

D-2 Enhance the Building with Landscaping. Enhance the building and site with substantial landscaping—which includes special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, and site furniture, as well as living plant material.

Meeting #1: Continue to refine the streetscape along Western Ave. to match the quality of the landscaping in the other rights of way. The uninterrupted portions of the Western sidewalk should be at least eight feet wide. Incorporate a seat wall or bench in the planters to enhance the public realm.

Meeting #2: The Board supported the refined landscape plan presented on page 7, including the four added street trees on Western Avenue, the three added benches, and the planters and paving design shown.

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.

Meeting #1: Prior guidance conveyed the desire that along University St. the building and landscape design should reinforce the connection with the Harbor Steps. The Board did not provide additional comment at the Initial Recommendation meeting.

Meeting #2: The Board was satisfied with the revised building and landscape design.

D-4 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.

Meeting #1: The Board will review signage concepts at the Final Recommendation meeting.

Meeting #2: The Board supported the understated signage shown on page 82, and cut out letters shown for commercial tenants shown on page 78, plus the important address numbers at the residential lobby as shown on page 23.

D-5 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, and on signage.

Meeting #1: The Board recommends the installation of only down lighting for the sconces along the three elevations.

Meeting #2: The Board supported the proposed wall sconces, revised to provide 80% downlight and 20% uplight.

Vehicular Access & Parking

E-1 Minimize Curb Cut Impacts. Minimize adverse impacts of curb cuts on the safety and comfort of pedestrians.

E-2 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.

Meeting #1: At the EDG meeting, the Board conveyed its desire to see a more active use at the second floor corners and suggested, as one solution, doubling the height of the corner spaces at the first floor. The Board members reiterated their expectation and recommended that the University and Western corner have a double height space with transparent glazing. The corner at University and Alaskan Way could either have a double height space with transparent glazing or metal louvers to match the other storefronts along University St. and Alaskan Way.

Meeting #2: As described under C-1, the Board endorsed the two –story volume at the corner of Western and University, to disguise the parking and attract pedestrians to and from the nearby Harbor Steps.

Board Recommendations: The recommendations summarized below were based on the plans submitted at the August 19th, 2012 meeting. Design, siting or architectural details not specifically identified or altered in these recommendations are expected to remain as presented in the plans and other drawings available at the August 19th public meeting. After considering the

site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities, and reviewing the plans and renderings, the three Design Review Board members present unanimously recommended approval of the subject design and the requested development standard departures from the requirements of the Land Use Code (listed below).

STANDARD	REQUIREMENT	REQUEST	JUSTIFICATION	RECOMMENDATION
1. Green St. designation SMC 23.49.058	A continuous upper-level setback of 15' shall be provided on a green street at a height of 45'.	One setback at 75 ft. in compliance with view corridor regulations. The green street setback would create a double tiered base.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A single setback better conforms to the building patterns in the neighborhood. • Consistent with legislation now at City Council. 	Approved
2. Overhead Weather Protection. 23.49.018	Continuous protection shall be required for new development along the entire street frontage.	Provide continuous canopies except for portions at two north corners, and about 4' wide portions at south corners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Canopies reinforce the brick mass corners. 	Approved

The Board did not recommended **CONDITIONS** for the project.

DIRECTOR’S ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW

The Director finds no conflicts with SEPA requirements or state or federal laws, and has reviewed the City-wide Design Guidelines and finds that the Board neither exceeded its authority nor applied the guidelines inconsistently in the approval of this design. The Director agrees with the conditions recommended by the three Board members and the recommendation to approve the design, as stated above.

DECISION - DESIGN REVIEW

The proposed design is **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED**.

ANALYSIS — SHORELINE SUBSTANTIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

Section 23.60.030 of the Seattle Municipal Code provides criteria for review of a shoreline substantial development permit and reads: A substantial development permit shall be issued only when the development proposed is consistent with:

- A. *The policies and procedures of Chapter 90.58 RCW;*
- B. *The regulations of this Chapter; and*
- C. *The provisions of Chapter 173-27 WAC.*

Conditions may be attached to the approval of a permit as necessary to assure consistency of the proposed development with the Seattle Shoreline Master Program and the Shoreline Management Act.

A. The Policies and Procedures of Chapter 90.58 RCW

Chapter 90.58 RCW is known as the Shoreline Management Act of 1971. It is the policy of the State to provide for the management of the shorelines of the state by planning for and fostering all reasonable and appropriate uses. This policy contemplates protecting against effects to public health, the land use and its vegetation and wild life, and the waters of the state and their aquatic life, while protecting public right to navigation and corollary incidental rights. Permitted uses in the shoreline shall be designed and conducted in a manner to minimize, insofar as possible, any resultant damage to the ecology and environment of the shoreline area and any interference with the public's use of the water.

B. The Regulations of this Chapter

The Shoreline Management Act provides definitions and concepts, and gives primary responsibility for initiating and administering the regulatory program of the Act to local governments. The Department of Ecology is to primarily act in a supportive and review capacity, with primary emphasis on insuring compliance with the policy and provisions of the Act. As a result of this Act, the City of Seattle and other jurisdictions with shorelines adopted a local shoreline master program, codified in the Seattle Municipal Code at Chapter 23.60. Development on the shorelines of the state is not to be undertaken unless it is consistent with the policies and provisions of the Act, and with the local master program. The Act sets out procedures, such as public notice and appeal requirements, and penalties for violating its provisions.

In evaluating requests for substantial development permits, the Director must determine that a proposed use and subsequent development meets the relevant criteria set forth in the Land Use Code. The Shoreline Goals and Policies, part of the Seattle Comprehensive Plan, and the purpose and location criteria for each shoreline environment must be considered. A proposal must be consistent with the general development standards of SMC 23.60.152, the specific standards of the shoreline environment (SMC 23.60.600) and underlying zoning designation, any applicable special approval criteria, and the development standards for specific uses.

Seattle Comprehensive Plan - Shoreline Policies

The proposal is subject to the Shoreline Policies of SMC 23.60.004 because the site is located within the shoreline district and the cost of the project exceeds \$6,614. The proposed development has been designed to ensure minimum impact to the public health, land and waters of the state, and their aquatic life. The location of the proposed work on the shoreland will not interfere with the public rights of navigation and corollary rights, thus providing for the management of the shorelines by planning for and fostering all reasonable and appropriate uses. Therefore, the subject application is consistent with the procedures outlined in RCW 90.58.

The proposed project must meet the standards of the underlying Downtown Mixed Commercial 160 (DMC 160) zone, the general development standards for all shoreline environments (SSMP 23.60.152) and the development standards for the UH shoreline environment (SSMP 23.60.660). The Director may attach to the permit or authorize any conditions necessary to carry out the spirit and purpose of, and ensure the compliance with, the Seattle Shoreline Master Program (SSMP 23.60.064).

A. THE REGULATIONS OF CHAPTER 23.60

Chapter 23.60 of the Seattle Municipal Code is known as the “Seattle Shoreline Master Program.” In evaluating requests for substantial development permits, the Director must determine that a proposed use meets the approval criteria set forth in SMC 23.60.030 (cited above). Development standards of the shoreline environment and underlying zone must be considered, and a determination made as to any special requirements (shoreline conditional use, shoreline variance, or shoreline special requirements use permit) or conditioning that is necessary to protect and enhance the shorelines area (SMC 23.60.064).

Pursuant to SMC 23.60.064C, in evaluating whether a development which requires a substantial development permit, conditional use permit, variance permit or special use authorization meets the applicable criteria, the Director shall determine that the proposed use: 1) is not prohibited in the shoreline environment and the underlying zone and; 2) meets all applicable development standards of both the shoreline environment and underlying zone and; 3) satisfies the criteria for a shoreline variance, conditional use, and/or special use permits, if required.

Development Standards

The proposal is permitted outright in SMC 23.60.660 governing the UH (Urban Harborfront) shoreline environment and is therefore subject to:

1. *the general development standards for all shoreline environments (SMC 23.60.152);as well as*
2. *the development standards for uses in the US environment (SMC 23.60.630).*

1. General Development Standards for all Shoreline Environments (SMC 23.60.152)

All uses and developments shall be subject to the following general development standards:

- A. *The location, design, construction and management of all shoreline developments and uses shall protect the quality and quantity of surface and ground water on and adjacent to the lot and shall adhere to the guidelines, policies, standards and regulations of applicable water quality management programs and regulatory agencies. Best Management Practices such as paving and berming of drum storage areas, fugitive dust controls and other good housekeeping measures to prevent contamination of land or water shall be required.*
- B. *Solid and liquid wastes and untreated effluents shall not enter any bodies of water or be discharged onto the land*

- C. *Facilities, equipment and established procedures for the containment, recovery and mitigation of spilled petroleum products shall be provided at recreational marinas, commercial moorage, vessel repair facilities, marine service stations and any use regularly servicing vessels.*
- D. *The release of oil, chemicals or other hazardous materials onto or into the water shall be prohibited. Equipment for the transportation, storage, handling or application of such materials shall be maintained in a safe and leak proof condition. If there is evidence of leakage, the further use of such equipment shall be suspended until the deficiency has been satisfactorily corrected.*
- E. *All shoreline developments and uses shall minimize any increases in surface runoff, and control, treat and release surface water runoff so that receiving water quality and shore properties and features are not adversely affected. Control measures may include, but are not limited to, dikes, catch basins or settling ponds, interceptor drains and planted buffers.*
- F. *All shoreline developments and uses shall utilize permeable surfacing where practicable to minimize surface water accumulation and runoff.*
- G. *All shoreline developments and uses shall control erosion during project construction and operation*
- H. *All shoreline developments and uses shall be located, designed, constructed and managed to avoid disturbance, minimize adverse impacts and protect fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas including, but not limited to, spawning, nesting, rearing and habitat areas, commercial and recreational shellfish areas, kelp and eel grass beds, and migratory routes. Where avoidance of adverse impacts is not practicable, project mitigation measures relating the type, quantity and extent of mitigation to the protection of species and habitat functions may be approved by the Director in consultation with state resource management agencies and federally recognized tribes.*
- I. *All shoreline developments and uses shall be located, designed, constructed and managed to minimize interference with or adverse impacts to beneficial natural shoreline processes such as water circulation, littoral drift, sand movement, erosion and accretion.*
- J. *All shoreline developments and uses shall be located, designed, constructed and managed in a manner that minimizes adverse impacts to surrounding land and water uses and is compatible with the affected area.*
- K. *Land clearing, grading, filling and alteration of natural drainage features and landforms shall be limited to the minimum necessary for development. Surfaces cleared of vegetation and not to be developed shall be replanted. Surface drainage systems or substantial earth modifications shall be professionally designed to prevent maintenance problems or adverse impacts on shoreline features.*
- L. *All shoreline development shall be located, constructed and operated so as not to be a hazard to public health and safety.*

- M. All development activities shall be located and designed to minimize or prevent the need for shoreline defense and stabilization measures and flood protection works such as bulkheads, other bank stabilization, landfills, levees, dikes, groins, jetties or substantial site regrades.*
- N. All debris, overburden and other waste materials from construction shall be disposed of in such a way as to prevent their entry by erosion from drainage, high water or other means into any water body.*
- O. Navigation channels shall be kept free of hazardous or obstructing development or uses.*
- P. No pier shall extend beyond the outer harbor or pierhead line except in Lake Union where piers shall not extend beyond the Construction Limit Line as shown in the Official Land Use Map, Chapter 23.32, or except where authorized by this chapter and by the State Department of Natural Resources and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.*

The proposal meets the applicable general development standards for the shoreline environment.

2. Development Standards for UH Shoreline Environments (SMC 23.60.690)

The development standards set forth in the Urban Harborfront (UH) Shoreline Environment relate to height, lot coverage, view corridors, and public access. The proposal conforms to all applicable development standards for the US environment

SMC 23.60.670 – Uses Permitted Outright in the UH Environment

The proposed upland mixed use building is consistent with allowed uses in the upland Urban Harborfront environment.

B. THE PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER 173-27 WAC

WAC 173-27 establishes basic rules for the permit system to be adopted by local governments, pursuant to the language of RCW 90.58. It provides the framework for permits to be administered by local governments, including time requirements of permits, revisions to permits, notice of application, formats for permits, and provisions for review by the state's Department of Ecology (DOE). As the Seattle Shoreline Master Program has been approved by DOE, consistency with the criteria and procedures of the SMC Chapter 23.60 is also consistency with WAC 173-27 and RCW 90.58.

Summary

Development requiring a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit can only be approved if it conforms to the policies and procedures of the WAC and RCW and with the regulations of Chapter 23.60 of the Seattle Shoreline Master Program.

The project as proposed meets the specific standards for development in the UH environment. It also conforms to the general development standards, as well as the requirements of the underlying zone.

The Director's authority under Seattle's Shoreline Master Program is to ensure that development proposals are consistent those policies and procedures, and conforms to specific development standards of the underlying zones. Thus, as conditioned below, the proposal is consistent with the criteria for a shoreline substantial development permit and may be approved.

DECISION - SHORELINE SUBSTANTIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

The Shoreline Substantial Development Permit is **GRANTED**.

ANALYSIS - SEPA

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated January 8, 2014. The information in the checklist, project plans, and the experience of the lead agency with 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, 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 certain limitations and/or circumstances (SMC 25.05.665 D 1-7) 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 Noise Ordinance, the Stormwater Grading and Drainage Control Code, the Street Use Ordinance, and the Building Code. The following is an analysis of construction-related noise, air quality, earth, grading, construction impacts, traffic and parking impacts as well as its mitigation.

Noise

Noise associated with construction of the mixed use building and future phases could adversely affect surrounding uses in the area, which include residential and commercial uses. The site lies within a high impact area due to extensive construction as defined by the Seattle Department of Transportation. Surrounding uses are likely to be adversely impacted by noise throughout the duration of construction activities. Due to the proximity of the project site to residential 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.

Prior to issuance of demolition, grading and building permits, the applicant will submit a construction noise mitigation plan. This plan will include steps 1) to limit noise decibel levels and duration and 2) procedures for advanced notice to surrounding properties. The plan will be subject to review and approval by DPD. In addition to the Noise Ordinance requirements to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby properties, all construction activities shall be limited to the following:

- 1) Non-holiday weekdays between 7:00 A.M and 6:00 P.M.
- 2) Non-holiday weekdays between 6:00 P.M. and 8:00 P.M limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
- 3) Saturdays between 9:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
- 4) Emergencies or work which must be done to coincide with street closures, utility interruptions or other similar necessary events, limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.

Air Quality

Construction for this project is expected to add temporarily particulates to the air that will result in a slight increase in auto-generated air contaminants from construction activities, equipment and worker vehicles; however, this increase is not anticipated to be significant. Federal auto emission controls are the primary means of mitigating air quality impacts from motor vehicles as stated in the Air Quality Policy (Section 25.05.675 SMC). To mitigate impacts of exhaust fumes on the directly adjacent residential uses, trucks hauling materials to and from the project site will not be allowed to queue on streets under windows of the nearby residential buildings.

Earth

The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code requires preparation of a soils report to evaluate the site conditions and provide recommendations for safe construction on sites where grading will involve cuts or fills of greater than three feet in height or grading greater than 100 cubic yards of material.

The soils report, construction plans, and shoring of excavations as needed, will be reviewed by the DPD Geo-technical Engineer and Building Plans Examiner who will require any additional soils-related information, recommendations, declarations, covenants and bonds as necessary to assure safe grading and excavation. This project constitutes a "large project" under the terms of the SGDCC (SMC 22.802.015 D). As such, there are many additional requirements for erosion control including a provision for implementation of best management practices and a requirement for incorporation of an engineered erosion control plan which will be reviewed jointly by the DPD building plans examiner and geo-technical engineer prior to issuance of the permit.

The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code provides extensive conditioning authority and prescriptive construction methodology to assure safe construction techniques are used; therefore, no additional conditioning is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

Grading

Excavation to construct the mixed use structure will be necessary. The maximum depth of the excavation is approximately 44 feet and will consist of an estimated 6,000 cubic yards of material. The soil removed will not be reused on the site and will need to be disposed off-site by trucks. City code (SMC 11.74) provides that material hauled in trucks not be spilled during transport. The City requires that a minimum of one foot of "freeboard" (area from level of material to the top of the truck container) be provided in loaded uncovered trucks which minimize the amount of spilled material and dust from the truck bed enroute to or from a site. Future phases of construction will be subject to the same regulations. No further conditioning of the grading/excavation element of the project is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

Construction Impacts

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.

Traffic and Parking

Duration of construction of the apartment building may last approximately 18 months. During construction, parking demand will increase due to additional demand created by construction personnel and equipment. It is the City's policy to minimize temporary adverse impacts associated with construction activities and parking (SMC 25.05.675 B and M). Parking utilization along streets in the vicinity is near capacity and the demand for parking by construction workers during construction could reduce the supply of parking in the vicinity. Due to the large scale of the project, this temporary demand on the on-street parking in the vicinity due to construction workers' vehicles may be adverse. In order to minimize adverse impacts, the applicant will need to provide a construction worker parking plan to reduce on-street parking until the new garage is constructed and safe to use. The authority to impose this condition is found in Section 25.05.675B2g of the Seattle SEPA Ordinance.

The construction of the project also will have adverse impacts on both vehicular and pedestrian traffic in the vicinity of the project site. During construction a temporary increase in traffic volumes to the site will occur, due to travel to the site by construction workers and the transport of construction materials. Approximately 6,000 cubic yards of soil are expected to be excavated from the project site. The soil removed for the garage structure will not be reused on the site and will need to be disposed off-site. Excavation and fill activity will require approximately 600 round trips with 10-yard hauling trucks or 300 round trips with 20-yard hauling trucks. Considering the large volumes of truck trips anticipated during construction, it is reasonable that truck traffic avoid the afternoon peak hours. Large (greater than two-axle) trucks will be prohibited from entering or exiting the site after 3:30 PM.

Compliance with Seattle's Street Use Ordinance is expected to mitigate any additional adverse impacts to traffic which would be generated during construction of this proposal.

Long-term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal including: increased surface water runoff due to greater site coverage by impervious surfaces; increased bulk and scale on the site; increased traffic in the area; increased demand for parking; demolition of older structures, and increased light and glare.

Several adopted City codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. Specifically these are: The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code which requires on site collection of stormwater with provisions for controlled tightline release to an approved outlet and may require additional design elements to prevent isolated flooding; the City Energy Code which will require insulation for outside walls and energy efficient windows; and the Land Use Code which controls site coverage, setbacks, building height and use and contains other development and use regulations to assure compatible development. 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. However, due to the size and location of this proposal, greenhouse gas emissions, historic preservation, traffic, and parking impacts warrant further analysis.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

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

Historic Preservation

The proposal site is directly across University St. from the Pacific Net and Twine building, a Seattle landmark. Based on an adjacency review by the Department of Neighborhoods, it is determined that DON would not require mitigation.

The proximity of the site to the historic Elliott Bay shoreline indicates the need for onsite construction supervisor(s) to relay to all workers the importance of paying close attention during excavation work, with the need to suspend work immediately in an area if evidence of cultural remains is encountered, until the remains can be assessed by a professional archaeologist.

An archaeologist should review the raw data from any geotechnical studies done in areas where underground structures would be placed.

Should evidence of cultural remains, either historic or prehistoric, be encountered during excavation, work in the immediate area would be suspended, and the find would be examined and documented by a professional archaeologist. Decisions regarding appropriate mitigation and further action would be made at that time.

As a result of this information, conditioning is warranted per City of Seattle [Director's Rule 2-98](#) to require any city or contracted employee should be made aware of what cultural resources might be encountered pursuant to [Director's Rule 2-98](#) as well as if resources of potential archaeological significance are encountered during construction or excavation of non-fill areas.

Traffic and Transportation

The proposed mixed use development would produce approximately 400 new daily vehicular trips, with 36 week day, PM peak hour trips. The addition of the proposed building would not likely cause nearby intersections to degrade to an unsatisfactory level of service. No SEPA mitigation of traffic impacts to the nearby intersections is warranted.

During demolition of the Alaskan Way Viaduct and subsequent construction of Elliott Way, there could be times when through traffic on Western Ave. increases substantially due to construction detours or diversions. During these times, it may be difficult to turn left onto Western Ave. due to higher traffic volumes and/or long queues. If the project is occupied during this construction phase, there may be times when egress movements from the driveway should be restricted to right-out-only movements to prevent excessive delays exiting the site. Building management could impose these restrictions when and if long delays occur.

Parking

Per SMC 23.54.015 Tables A and B, urban centers have no minimum parking requirements. Located in the Commercial Core Urban Center Village, this project would not have to supply parking. The applicant proposes 130 parking spaces in below and above-grade garages with access from Western Ave. A total of 168 residential units would reflect a parking ratio of .77 spaces per unit. Data from the 2000 Census shows that renter-occupied residences in this downtown neighborhood had an average of 0.3 vehicles per unit. Based on this information, the proposed parking ratio would accommodate the expected parking demand, which is likely to include parking by residents who use vehicles every day for commuting to and from work, as well as parking for residents who do not commute regularly to work, but own vehicles that are used much less frequently. The retail component would not likely generate any significant amount of parking impacts due to its size and urban location. No SEPA mitigation of parking impacts is warranted.

Summary

In conclusion, several adverse effects on the environment are anticipated resulting from the proposal, which are anticipated to be non-significant. The conditions imposed below are intended to mitigate construction impacts identified in the foregoing analysis, or to control impacts not regulated by codes or ordinances, per adopted City policies.

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 – DESIGN REVIEW

Prior to Building Application

1. Include the departure matrix in the zoning summary section 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.

Prior to Commencement of Construction

2. Arrange a pre-construction meeting with the building contractor, building inspector, and land use planner to discuss expectations and details of the Design Review component of the project.

Prior to Issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy

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 planner assigned to this project (Bruce P. Rips, 206.615-1392). An appointment with the assigned Land Use Planner must be made at least one work week 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.

For the Life of the Project

4. 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 (Bruce Rips, 206.615-1392). 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.

CONDITIONS – SEPA

Prior to Issuance of Master Use Permits

5. The owner and/or responsible parties shall provide DPD with a statement that the contract documents for their general, excavation, and other subcontractors will include reference to regulations regarding archaeological resources and that construction crews will be required to comply with those regulations.

Prior to Issuance of a Demolition, Grading, or Building Permit

6. A transportation route plan shall be provided to DPD and SDOT; this plan shall document proposed truck access to and from the site, and shall indicate how pedestrian connections around the site will be maintained during the construction period.
7. Prior to construction, a construction supervisor(s) will relay to all workers the importance of paying close attention during excavation work, with the need to suspend work

immediately in an area if evidence of cultural remains is encountered, until the remains can be assessed by a professional archaeologist.

During Construction

8. Grading, delivery and pouring of concrete and similar noisy activities will be prohibited on Saturdays and Sundays. In addition to the Noise Ordinance requirements, to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby residences, only the low noise impact work such as that listed below, will be permitted on Saturdays from 9:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M:
 - A. Surveying and layout.
 - B. Testing and tensioning P. T. (post tensioned) cables, requiring only hydraulic equipment (no cable cutting allowed).
 - C. Other ancillary tasks to construction activities will include site security, surveillance, monitoring, and maintenance of weather protecting, water dams and heating equipment.
9. In addition to the Noise Ordinance, requirements to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby properties, all construction activities shall be limited to the following:
 - A. Non-holiday weekdays between 7:00 A.M and 6:00 P.M.
 - B. Non-holiday weekdays between 6:00 P.M. and 8:00 P.M limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
 - C. Saturdays between 9:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
 - D. Emergencies or work which must be done to coincide with street closures, utility interruptions or other similar necessary events, limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
10. Large (greater than two-axle) trucks will be prohibited from entering or exiting the site after 3:30 PM.
11. Non-noisy activities, such as site security, monitoring, weather protection shall not be limited by this condition.
12. If resources of potential archaeological significance are encountered during demolition, excavation, or construction, the owner and/or responsible parties shall:

Stop work immediately and notify DPD (Bruce P. Rips, 206/615-1392) and the Washington State Archaeologist at the State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (OAHP). The procedures outlined in Appendix A of Director's Rule 2-98 for assessment and/or protection of potentially significant archeological resources shall be followed.

Abide by all regulations pertaining to discovery and excavation of archaeological resources, including but not limited to Chapters 27.34, 27.53, 27.44, 79.01 and 79.90 RCW and Chapter 25.48 WAC, as applicable, or their successors.

Compliance with all applicable conditions must be verified and approved by the Land Use Planner, Bruce Rips, (206-615-1392) 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.

Signature: _____ (signature on file) Date: November 17, 2014
Bruce P. Rips, Assoc. AIA, AICP
Department of Planning and Development

BPR:bg

H:\RIPS\DOC\DESIGN REVIEW\DEC 304451 1301 Western Ave.docx