



City of Seattle

Department of Planning and Development
D. Sugimura, Director

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

Application Number: 3014830
Applicant: Jodi Patterson O’Hare
Address of Proposals: 1315 E Jefferson Street

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow a 4-story structure with 32 residential units above 3,590 sq. ft. of retail. Project includes 3,000 cu. yds. of grading. Parking for 16 vehicles to be provided below grade and three at grade (19 total). Existing structures to be demolished.

The following approvals are required:

The following Master Use Permit components are required:

Design Review (SMC 23.41)

Development Standard Departure to allow less than the required rear setback.
(SMC 23.47A.014 B3b)

Development Standard Departure to allow less than the required parking screening. (SMC 23.47A.016 D1c)

SEPA-Environmental Determination (SMC 25.05)

SEPA Determination: [] Exempt [X] DNS [] MDNS [] EIS

[] MDNS with conditions

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

Site Description:

The subject site is located mid-block on the south side of E Jefferson Street between 13th and 14th Avenue. The site consists of two parcels containing an existing one story commercial building and an accessory parking lot. From the low point of the site in the southwest corner along the alley the grade gently rises approximately 3 feet to the high point in the northeast corner.

The site is zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC2-40), as are the properties to the east and west. To the south the zoning changes to Lowrise Three (LR3) multifamily. To the north is the Seattle University sports fields zoned as a Major Institution Overlay (MIO-65)



ECAs:

No Environmentally Critical Areas have been identified on site.

Access:

The site is bordered by E Jefferson Street on the north and an existing unimproved alley on the south.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:

The site lies across East Jefferson Street from two major institutions, Seattle University and Swedish Hospital at Cherry Hill (aka Providence). Directly north of the site is a Seattle University sports field. To the west of the site is a one story office building. To the east, a new live work structure is proposed under DPD Project 3015025. Directly south of the subject lot across the alley is a combination of newer townhouse structures and older single family homes.

East Jefferson Street serves as a commercial corridor although institutions occupy much of the north side of the street. Small scale retail and commercial businesses line parts of the south side of East Jefferson Street intermixed with larger four story office buildings

Most of the buildings have parking access from the street and the alley along the south property line.

The area includes sidewalk, curb, and gutter, and appears to have moderate levels of pedestrian activity in spite of the narrow sidewalks.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: June 5, 2013.

DESIGN PRESENTATION

The EDG packet includes materials presented at the EDG meeting, and is available online by entering the project number(s) (3014830) at this website:

http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp.

The EDG packet is also available to view in the 3014830 file, by contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

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

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

PUBLIC COMMENT

Approximately six members of the public attended this Early Design Review meeting. The following comments, issues and concerns were raised:

- Supportive of the preferred design option which includes ground level setback on the street and alley.
- Noted that ground level commercial space along E Jefferson would benefit from the building overhang. The cantilevered building would provide rain protection which is more important than the loss of natural light.
- Expressed support for the increased ground level setback on E Jefferson which encourages uses to spill out onto the sidewalk area.
- Noted that retail signage location would be important as the design develops.
- Stated existing residential units have an intimate relationship to the alley. Felt alley should be developed as continuous space which encourages active living and walking rather than just a place for a parking entrance and vehicle thoroughfare.
- Expressed concern that the adjacent parcel proposed for development is not required to participate in the Design Review process.
- Felt that special attention should be placed on privacy between the existing residences and the proposed building. Noted that window relationships were important for successful living in close quarters.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

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

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE (JUNE 5, 2013):

1. **E Jefferson Street Retail Spaces:** The Board felt the preferred Massing Option 3 should move forward to MUP submittal with the following guidance:
 - a. The Board was concerned about the viability of the ground level retail spaces setback from the E Jefferson Street sidewalk. The Board noted the street level setback should be designed to support active retail spaces that engage with the sidewalk. The Board requested street level vignettes demonstrating treatment of the ground level at the Recommendation Meeting (D-1, D-9, D-10, D-11).
 - b. The Board encouraged the applicant to further study treatment of the building cantilever, soffit, ground level transparency and lighting. The Board noted the retail signage should be located in a visually accessible location. Each element of the ground plane should work in concert to achieve a successful active retail space (D-1, D-9, D-10, D-11).
 - c. The Board encouraged interior lighting along the ground level that would light the building from the inside-out, achieving a ‘glow’ at all times (D-10).
 - d. At Recommendation, the Board would like to see an interior and exterior lighting plan for the commercial spaces. More information about the location and signage details for retail spaces will also be required (D-9, D-10 and D-11).

2. **Alley Treatment:** The alley along the south property line separates the subject lot from the lower density residential zone to the south. The Board felt the first floor level should be treated to maintain and enhance the existing residential character of the alley.
 - a. The Board was supportive of the landscaping proposed along the alley which contributes to the alley’s residential character. At Recommendation, the Board requested a landscape plan demonstrating the viability of the proposed plants under the shaded building cantilever (D-8, E-1 and E-2).
 - b. The Board encouraged the applicant to maintain lush landscaping in an uninterrupted, continuous space along the alley as represented in the EDG packet (D-8, E-1 and E-2).
 - c. The Board expressed concern about the dispersed utility functions (i.e. surface parking, solid waste and recycling access and utility room access) along the alley façade. The Board noted that the dispersed utility functions detract from the integrity of the shared space. The Board would like to see a reorganization of the space to concentrate the utility functions of the development into the area of surface parking (D-8).
 - d. The Board requested more information about the location of trash and recycling space entrance at the Recommendation meeting (D-6 and D-8).

3. **Privacy and Respect for Adjacent Sites:** The Board noted the south façade treatment should consider and mitigate privacy impacts for the existing residential units directly south.
 - a. The Board noted that the inspirational photographs for the architectural concept presented at EDG include a significant amount of residential glazing. The Board requested the applicant to develop the architectural concept so it is informed by the site's relationship and sensitivity to adjacent residential structures (A-5, C-2).
 - b. The Board requested the applicant provide a privacy study including the location of windows and outdoor space for adjacent residential structures across the alley. The applicant will need to demonstrate how the architectural concept, window glazing and deck location mitigate privacy concerns for adjacent residential structures (A-5 and C-2).
 - c. The Board encouraged the applicant to concentrate active roof deck area toward the street façade to mitigate privacy impacts to residential units across the alley (A-5 and A-7).

4. **Materials:** The Board noted building exterior should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials.
 - a. The Board noted that the proposed material application concept presented by the applicant in the EDG presentation includes wrapping high quality materials used on the front of the building onto each side and rear façades. The Board noted that quality material application, fenestration, texture and/ or color may be used to mitigate large blank walls on the visually prominent east and west facades (C-2 and C-4).

RECOMMENDATION MEETING: DECEMBER 4, 2013

The packet includes materials presented at the Recommendation meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3014830) at this website:

http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp

or contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

Address: Public Resource Center
700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98124

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following comments, issues and concerns were raised:

- Expressed support for the proposed development. Felt the revised building design responded to neighbor's concerns for treatment of the alley and privacy.
- Expressed support for the parking screening departure along the alley. Noted the design's substantial landscaping is a better screening alternative than the code required fence.

- Felt building would be a good addition to the neighborhood and expressed excitement for the new commercial spaces.
- Expressed appreciation for the treatment along the alley, specifically the incorporation of privacy screens to obscure lines-of-site and between existing and new windows.
- Expressed appreciation for the attention to detail and consideration of future signage location and design.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

At the Recommendation meeting, the Board discussed the response to EDG and offered the following recommendations for the proposal to meet the applicable Design Review Guidelines identified at the EDG meeting.

- 1. E Jefferson Street Retail Spaces. The design provides 5' ground level setback to accommodate restaurant or retail space adjacent to the sidewalk.**
 - a. The Board felt the applicant clearly demonstrated how the setback space would be activated by its relationship to the sidewalk with the inclusion of transparent roll-up doors, man door, lighting and signage. The Board felt the space could accommodate a variety of future uses and still provide an active commercial frontage that engages users and passersby (D-1, D-9, D-10, D-11).
 - b. The Board noted the two-foot landscape strip within the right-of-way may be awkward if the railing was removed surrounding the setback area. It was noted that the landscaping could be removed through a future Tenant Improvement Permit to provide a direct connection from the sidewalk to the man door provided between the two roll up doors. The Board felt the man door was important and should be maintained within the building permit plans (D-1).
- 2. Alley Treatment. The design relocates residential trash and recycling storage space to the lower parking level. The commercial trash and recycling was relocated into the building to provide an alley façade within limited utility functions and maximized commercial transparency and landscaping.**
 - a. The Board felt the revised alley design responded directly to EDG guidance. The Board appreciated the revised utility spaces and felt the increased landscaping treatment and commercial transparency along the alley provided a more successful alley design (D-8, E1 and E-2).
- 3. Privacy and Respect for Adjacent Sites. The submitted design provides an analysis of window location for adjacent residential structures across the alley. To mitigate the direct line of site concerns colored corrugated perforated metal panels supported by a welded steel frame strategically located.**
 - a. The Board was pleased with the direction of the privacy screen and felt they were a thoughtful response to the sensitive relationship between the new building and the existing residential structures. The screens will active the façade, allow filtered light into the units while also obscuring direct line-of-site between residential units (A-5, C-2, C-4).
 - b. The Board supported the roof deck location along the north façade which minimizes impacts to existing residential units on the south façade (A-5).

- 4. Materials. The design includes a combination of standing seam metal wall panels for the second to fourth floor residential wrap. The building also utilizes clear cedar plank, exposed concrete, corrugated metal panel, metal fascia, CMU and colored corrugated perforated metal panels.**
- a. The Board was supportive of the architectural concept and material application which translates through the front façade onto the sides and rear facade (C-2, C-4).
 - b. The Board was supportive of the materials used which include: standing seam metal wall panels at varying widths for the Floor 2-4 residential wrap, corrugated metal panel for the main body of floor 2-4, exposed concrete, CMU and metal wall panel at the first floor base, clear cedar plank at primary residential and commercial entries and along the alley commercial space, metal wall panel at floor and roof line, and colored corrugated perforated metal panels as accents and privacy screens (C-2, C-4).
 - c. The Board supported the design intent and felt the material application was thoughtful, well-explored and sophisticated. The Board felt of the metal screens add liveliness to the otherwise restrained material application (C-4).
 - d. The Board discussed the colored, corrugated, perforated wall panels at length. The Board appreciated a color application which adds visual interest, and creates eye movement across the building. The Board felt the color choices should ‘dance’ in relation to one another. The Board felt the colors should be distinct but part of the same family. The Board requested the applicant to refine colors through the sampling process to make an informed decision. The applicant should also investigate using a tighter group of colors with subtle variation to provide create the dancing relationship but also restraint in color application. The Board felt the new NW School on Pike Street provided a good example of a successful use of colored material (C-4).
 - e. The Board also felt the alley façade could benefit from a few well-placed colored panels to add a little movement to the back of the building but also felt the application should not be overwhelming the adjacent residential uses (C-4).
 - f. The Board felt colored area in proportion to the other more neutral material was Important for the success of the façade. The Board felt the applicant had achieved the correct proportion of color on the building façade (C-4).

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The Board identified the following Citywide Design Guidelines of highest priority for this project. The specific guidelines are summarized below. The full text of the guidelines is available on the City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development website.

- A-2 Streetscape Compatibility. The siting of buildings should acknowledge and reinforce the existing desirable spatial characteristics of the right-of-way.**
- A-4 Human Activity. New development should be sited and designed to encourage human activity on the street.**
- A-5 Respect for Adjacent Sites. Buildings should respect adjacent properties by being located on their sites to minimize disruption of the privacy and outdoor activities of residents in adjacent buildings.**
- A-8 Parking and Vehicle Access. Siting should minimize the impact of automobile parking and driveways on the pedestrian environment, adjacent properties, and pedestrian safety.**

- C-2 Architectural Concept and Consistency.** Building design elements, details and massing should create a well-proportioned and unified building form and exhibit an overall architectural concept. Buildings should exhibit form and features identifying the functions within the building. In general, the roofline or top of the structure should be clearly distinguished from its facade walls.
- C-3 Human Scale.** The design of new buildings should incorporate architectural features, elements, and details to achieve a good human scale.
- C-4 Exterior Finish Materials.** Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.
- D-1 Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances.** Convenient and attractive access to the building's entry should be provided. To ensure comfort and security, paths and entry areas should be sufficiently lighted and entry areas should be protected from the weather. Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.
- D-6 Screening of Dumpsters, Utilities, and Service Areas.** Building sites should locate service elements like trash dumpsters, loading docks and mechanical equipment away from the street front where possible. When elements such as dumpsters, utility meters, mechanical units and service areas cannot be located away from the street front, they should be situated and screened from view and should not be located in the pedestrian right-of-way.
- D-8 Treatment of Alleys.** The design of alley entrances should enhance the pedestrian street front.
- D-9 Commercial Signage.** Signs should add interest to the street front environment and should be appropriate for the scale and character desired in the area.
- D-10 Commercial Lighting.** Appropriate levels of lighting should be provided in order to promote visual interest and a sense of security for people in commercial districts during evening hours. Lighting may be provided by incorporation into the building façade, the underside of overhead weather protection, on and around street furniture, in merchandising display windows, in landscaped areas, and/or on signage.
- D-11 Commercial Transparency.** Commercial storefronts should be transparent, allowing for a direct visual connection between pedestrians on the sidewalk and the activities occurring on the interior of a building. Blank walls should be avoided.
- D-12 Residential Entries and Transitions.** For residential projects in commercial zones, the space between the residential entry and the sidewalk should provide security and privacy for residents and a visually interesting street front for pedestrians. Residential buildings should enhance the character of the streetscape with small gardens, stoops and other elements that work to create a transition between the public sidewalk and private entry.
- E-1 Landscaping to Reinforce Design Continuity with Adjacent Sites.** Where possible, and where there is not another overriding concern, landscaping should reinforce the character of neighboring properties and abutting streetscape.

- E-2 Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site. Landscaping, including living plant material, special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, site furniture, and similar features should be appropriately incorporated into the design to enhance the project.**

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board's recommendation on the requested departures is based upon the departure's potential to help the project better meet these design guideline priorities and achieve a better overall design than could be achieved without the departures.

- 1. Rear Setback (SMC 23.47A.014 B3b):** The Code requires a 17' setback from the centerline of alley above a height of 40 feet. The applicant proposes to maintain a 15' foot setback from the centerline of alley above a height of 40 feet.

The Board unanimously voted in favor of requested departure. The departure request to maintain a continuous 15 foot setback from floor 2-4 supports a uniform façade and the architectural concept as described by the applicant, according to Design Review Guideline C-2. The Board also felt the façade treatment and incorporation of privacy screens along the alley better met the intent of Design Review Guideline A-5, Respect for Adjacent Sites and that the development would benefit more from the material treatment more than the increased setback requirement above a height of 40 feet.

- 2. Parking Screening (SMC 23.47A.016 D1c):** The Code requires surface parking abutting or across an alley from a lot in a residential zone must have a 6-foot high screen along the abutting lot line and a 5-foot landscape area inside the screening. The applicant proposes to not provide the required 6-foot screen and 5-foot landscape area.

The Board unanimously voted in favor of the requested departure. The Board felt the revised location for the utility spaces, treatment of alley paving and location and breadth of landscaping provided a more successful, open and quality alley treatment than the code required fencing better meeting the intent of Design Review Guideline D-8.

BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation summarized below was based on the design review packet dated December 4, 2013, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the December 4, 2013, Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the five Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design. The Board recommends approval without conditions.

DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

The proposed design is **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED**.

SEPA ANALYSIS

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 August 27, 2013. The Department of Planning and Development has analyzed and annotated the environmental checklist submitted by the project applicant, reviewed the project plans and any additional information in the file, and pertinent comments which may have been received regarding this proposed action have been considered.

As indicated in the checklist, this action may 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 an environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation” subject to some limitations.

Codes and development regulations applicable to this proposed project will provide sufficient mitigation for many short and/or long term impacts. Applicable codes may include the Stormwater Code (SMC 22.800-808), the Grading Code (SMC 22.170), the Street Use Ordinance (SMC Title 15), the Seattle Building Code, and the Noise Control Ordinance (SMC 25.08). Puget Sound Clean Air Agency regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. Additional discussion of short and long term impacts is found below.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

DPD did not receive any public comment letters during the public comment period ending on September 25, 2013.

Short Term Impacts

The following temporary or construction-related impacts are expected: temporary soil erosion; decreased air quality due to increased dust and other suspended air particulates during excavation, filling and transport of materials to and from the site; increased noise and vibration from construction operations and equipment; increased traffic and parking demand from construction personnel traveling to and from the work site; consumption of renewable and non-renewable resources; disruption of utilities serving the area; and conflict with normal pedestrian movement adjacent to the site. Compliance with applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most adverse short-term impacts to the environment.

Noise - The project is expected to generate loud noise during demolition, grading and construction. These impacts would be especially adverse in the early morning, in the evening, and on weekends.

The Seattle Noise Ordinance permits increases in permissible sound levels associated with construction and equipment between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekdays and 9:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekends. If extended construction hours are desired, the applicant may seek approval from DPD through a Noise Variance request. The applicant's environmental checklist states that extended hours are not anticipated. The limitations stipulated in the Noise Ordinance are sufficient to mitigate noise impacts; therefore no additional SEPA conditioning is necessary to mitigation noise impacts.

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 due to the relatively minor contribution of greenhouse gas emissions from this project.

No further conditioning or mitigation is warranted pursuant to specific environmental policies or the SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665).

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; increased bulk and scale on the site; increased traffic in the area and increased demand for parking; increased demand for public services and utilities; and increased light and glare.

Several adopted City codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. Specifically these are: the Drainage Code which requires on site detention of Stormwater with provisions for controlled tight line 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 and Design Review process 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, although some impacts warrant further discussion.

Greenhouse gas emissions - 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 due to the relatively minor contribution of greenhouse gas emissions from this project.

No further conditioning or mitigation is warranted pursuant to specific environmental policies or the SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665).

Parking and Traffic - The applicant submitted a Transportation Assessment (Memorandum by Transpo Group, dated September 9, 2013).

The 1315 E Jefferson development is anticipated to generate 220 new daily trips, 12 new AM peak-hour trips and 36 new PM peak-hour trips per ITE data.

DPD's Transportation Planner has reviewed the transportation assessment and determined additional SEPA mitigation is not necessary.

The transportation assessment noted that the residential peak parking demand for this development is 29 vehicles. The proposal includes 16 parking spaces. The overflow peak parking demand is therefore 13 spaces.

SMC 25.05.675.M notes that there is no SEPA authority provided for mitigation of residential parking impacts in the Capitol Hill/First Hill Urban Center. This site is located in that Urban Center, and the project is mostly residential with some commercial. Regardless of the parking demand impacts, no SEPA authority is provided to mitigate impacts of parking demand from the residential components of this project, even if impacts were identified.

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 requirement of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21.C), including the requirement to inform the public of agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

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

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

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

CONDITIONS - DESIGN REVIEW

Prior to Certificate of Occupancy

1. The Land Use Planner shall inspect materials, colors, and design of the constructed project. All items shall be constructed and finished as shown at the design recommendation meeting and the subsequently updated Master Use Plan set. Any change to the proposed design, materials, or colors shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Lindsay King 206-684-9218 or lindsay.king@seattle.gov).
2. The applicant shall provide a landscape certificate from Director's Rule 10-2011, indicating that all vegetation has been installed per approved landscape plans. Any change to the landscape plans approved with this Master Use Permit shall be approved by the Land Use Planner (Lindsay King 206-684-9218 or lindsay.king@seattle.gov).

For the Life of the Project

3. The building and landscape design shall be substantially consistent with the materials represented at the Recommendation meeting and in the materials submitted after the Recommendation meeting, before the MUP issuance. Any change to the proposed design, including materials or colors, shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Lindsay King 206-684-9218 or lindsay.king@seattle.gov).

CONDITIONS - SEPA

None required.

Signature: (signature on file) Date: January 30, 2014
Lindsay King, Senior Planner
Department of Planning and Development