



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: 3017644
Applicant Name: Wright Runstad and Company
Address of Proposal: 1301 Fifth Avenue

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow a residential and commercial development with a 12-story, 160 room hotel building, and a 59-story structure with 214 residential units and 780,000 square feet of office. Project includes 91,000 sq. ft. of retail space at the ground level. Parking for 871 vehicles to be provided below grade. The existing Rainier Tower building and a small retail out building (Louis Vuitton) to remain; all other structures on the block to be demolished (140,000 sq. ft.). Addendum to *Downtown Height and Density Changes Environmental Impact Statement* has been prepared.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review pursuant to Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 23.41

SEPA - Environmental Determination – Chapter 25.05 Seattle Municipal Code.

SEPA DETERMINATION: Exempt DNS MDNS EIS¹
 DNS with conditions
 DNS involving grading, non-exempt or demolition
or involving another agency with jurisdiction

¹ This project includes an Addendum to the Downtown Height and Density Changes Final EIS dated January 2005, which is adopted with this Decision. This Addendum was noticed on November 20, 2014.

BACKGROUND DATA

Site and Vicinity Description

The project site lies within the Metropolitan Tract, an eleven acre area primarily located in a rectangle formed by Seneca St, Third Ave, Union St. and Sixth Ave owned by the University of Washington. Development within the Tract includes the Skinner Building (Fifth Ave Theater), the IBM Building, the Fairmont Olympic Hotel and the Olympic Garage, the Cobb Building, Puget Sound Plaza Building and 1411 Fourth Ave Building. Other significant buildings and uses in the area include the Great Northern Building (housing the Men's Warehouse) and Chase Bank to the north of the site; the Hilton Hotel and the Plymouth Congregational Church to the east; and Benaroya Hall to the west.

The Metropolitan Tract upon which the site partially occupies, totals 208,574 square feet. The site's 24 foot declension begins at a high point at the corner of 5th Ave and University St to a nadir at the opposite corner on 4th Ave and Union St.

The site possesses the zoning classification of Downtown Office Commercial One with Unlimited and 450' heights (DOC1 U/450/U) depending upon use. The DOC1 zone extends southward to Jefferson St., east to I-5 and west to the alley between 1st and 2nd Avenues. North of Union St. the zoning shifts to Downtown Residential Commercial (DRC) with 85 to 150' height limits depending upon use

Project Description

The applicant proposes the redevelopment of approximately three-quarters of the Rainier Square block bordered by Fourth Avenue on the west, Fifth Avenue on the east, Union Street on the north and University Street on the south. The 31-story Rainier Tower, designed by Minoru Yamasaki, anchors the block on its southeast corner. Its graceful tapered walls begin at street level and rise outward to form a distinctive plinth for the office space that emerges above it. The tower and a small one-story pavilion housing a Louis Vuitton store would remain. The rest of the block, a series of one to three story structures surrounding an atrium would be demolished. Notable elements of the mostly commercial complex are its sizeable above grade plaza at the southwest corner overlooking the Cobb Building, the storefronts, and the various setbacks from the rights of way that accommodate wide sidewalks.

The development parti includes a 59-story tower of a height of approximately 845 feet with first floor retail at its base beneath 750,000 square feet of office use on 38 floors and then 214 residential units on 19 floors at the top of the structure. A stepped east façade beginning at the fourth floor and rising in a sloping accordion to define the office portion represents the design's most salient feature---an inverse form of the Rainier Tower's plinth. The tower's shaft occupies the site's northwest corner. A smaller subtraction from the tower's mass, curved in shape, delineates the Fourth and Union corner and rises from grade to the 23rd floor. The residential entrance lobby occurs on Fourth Ave and the office lobby fronts Union St. A new 12-story hotel (160 rooms) occupies the block's southwest corner. Its entrance faces University Ave. The rectangular structure sits nestled between the Rainier Tower and the

proposed skyscraper. A two-story edifice, a visual gasket, visually separates the hotel from the new tower. It serves as an entry into the complex. A third floor plaza, a kind of interstitial space, wraps around the hotel and then extends to Fifth Ave. between the new tower and the existing Rainier Tower. This serves to set the new development back from Rainier Tower's base giving it visual breathing room. The developer intends to establish commercial storefronts along Fourth Ave., the corner of Fifth Ave and Union and wrapping to Fifth Ave toward the hotel. These would encircle a sky lit atrium reminiscent of the existing one.

Vehicular ingress and egress to an 871 vehicle parking garage set below grade would occur on Union St. Egress would also connect to University Ave as well. Truck loading berths would share the same access. An underground tunnel extends from Rainier Square across Fifth and Sixth Avenues to One Union Square.

Design Evolution

At the first Early Design Guidance meeting, the applicant provided three design concepts with roughly similar building programs. Alternative #1 illustrates a low retail plinth along the edges of the site not occupied by Rainier Tower. Flanking Union St., a narrow tower rising 680 feet above the base, houses offices in the lower two-thirds of the structure and a hotel in the upper floors. The tower's narrow sides border 4th and 5th Avenues. A smaller residential tower containing residential units extends along 4th Avenue beginning at the site's southwest corner. In plan, the two towers form an "L" wrapped around the existing Rainier Tower. The taller of the towers, which exceeds the height of the 31-story Rainier Tower, would have a stepped profile at the upper levels of the north and south elevations.

The second alternative, a considerably less conventional tower, again wraps around two sides of the Rainier Tower leaving one continuous building above a glazed winter garden containing amenity and retail spaces. Each programmatic element has a distinct volumetric treatment within the composition, as if the structure resembled a three dimensional puzzle. The office portion in plan wraps the site in an "L" shape. Its greatest height occupies the 5th Ave and Union St. corner then drops in height as it wraps the 4th Ave and Union corner and extends along 4th. At this same corner, the residential element, which appears embedded into the office tower, forms a volumetric cube that projects out away from the two major office facades. Rising above the residential portion, the hotel caps the 4th and Union corner. The major uses are expressed individually as separate components by interstitial spaces comprising amenity areas. The lower heights proposed for the west edge of the block preserve Puget Sound views for much of the Rainier Tower.

Similar to the first option, the third scheme has two separate towers of disparate heights. The larger tower reaches 800 feet, second in height to the Columbia Tower. An eleven story base extends from Fourth to Fifth Avenue along Union St. Above the base, the structure tapers or stair steps upward, inversely echoing the curves forming the Rainier Tower podium. At mid-height, the tapering ceases and gives way to a rectangular shaft, square in plan, which ends in a flat roof. This tower contains offices in the lower two-thirds and residences above the office use. A separate structure, a hotel, sits due west of the Rainier Tower and rises no higher than the 11-story opaque plinth of its neighbor. In all of the scenarios a new, below-grade garage burrows beneath a one to two-story retail plinth. Ingress into the garage occurs from Union St. with egress on University St.

At the second EDG meeting, the development team presented its response to the Board's earlier guidance. Much of this included a more elaborate rationale for the arrangement of the massing. The shift of the hotel away from University St. represented the major change from the original applicant preferred scheme. Another change included a new care out at the southeast corner of the proposed tower.

By the Initial Recommendation meeting, the applicant had refined much of the concepts put forward at the 2nd EDG meeting. The meeting booklet illustrated an analysis of setbacks on Fifth Ave to explore view opportunities to Rainier Tower. The booklet also presented several design studies for the large curvature (or scoop) forming the mid-portion of the east elevation. The booklet outlined the series of departure requests.

The applicant re-submitted modifications to the project design based on previous Board guidance as well as additional departure requests for the June 23rd Recommendation meeting. Most notably the applicant eliminated the one-story storefront projection at the northwest corner, removed the southeast concave corner and lowered the line of transition on the east elevation from the tenth floor to the seventh floor that defines the tower base from the pleated shaft.

Public Comments

At the first EDG meeting, eleven members of the public affixed their names to the EDG Meeting sign-in sheet. Speakers raised the following issues:

- The taller, thinner tower makes the skyline more balanced.
- The relationship of the towers on the site is commendable.
- This area of downtown needs residential. This is a true mixed-use building.
- The EDG packet possesses very little information about the hotel. Provide more information at the next meeting.
- The sculpted base of the proposal breaks out of the typical downtown box.
- The program ought to provide enough space for a major retailer. It would be shame to lose the potential for this opportunity. The proposal needs flexibility to provide larger retail spaces.

At the second EDG meeting, nine members of the public added their names to the sign-in sheet. One person spoke during the public comment period who mentioned that mostly office workers use the open space on the plinth of the Rainier Square complex.

DPD received several written comments during the MUP review period. Comments ranged from concerns about demolition/construction impacts, blockage of natural light, obstruction of private views, inadequacy of the Addendum to the Downtown FEIS and the need for a project specific EIS. Another letter challenged the vesting dates for the Master Use Permit application.

ANALYSIS-DESIGN REVIEW

Design Guidelines Priorities

The project proponents presented their initial ideas at two Early Design Guidance meetings on June 17, 2014 and August 5, 2015 respectively. After visiting the site, considering the

analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Downtown Design Review Board members identified the following Downtown Design Guidelines as high priorities. Board comments for each EDG meeting are labeled.

SITE PLANNING AND MASSING

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

EDG Meeting #1: The composition of the three major massing elements (the Rainier Tower and the proposed structures) ought to appear as if communicating with one another. The additions to the block should be designed in a manner that would possess a strong relationship or “attitude” toward the tower’s base. Consider a design of the new insertions into the block that would 1) express a clear spatial organization shaped by the base and the two new buildings and 2) provide sightlines to the tower’s base from the north on Fifth Ave and from the west along University St. The Board noted the third scheme’s reliance upon the horizontal datum line at 139 feet established by the top of the curved base in determining the beginning of the upward curve of the tower and the height of the hotel. The Board questioned the need for strictly adhering to it. The tiers of the proposed residential / office tower could commence just above the retail plinth allowing pedestrians to experience the tower’s dramatic shape and opening views to Rainier Tower’s curved podium.

EDG Meeting #2: The landscape concept plan provided, on one hand, a clearer spatial organization that began to address the Board’s desire to provide the Rainier Tower base with breathing room and to respect its distinct, object-like presence. On the other hand, the position of the tower in relationship to Fifth Ave. did not increase the sight lines to the Rainier Tower base from the north as the Board had requested at the earlier meeting. The bulk of the office and retail portions of the proposed tower remained pressed to the Fifth Avenue property line. In response the Board asked the applicant to cut into or set back the Fifth Ave base to open views for the pedestrian from the north. The Board continued to assert that the applicant’s reliance on the combination of the approximate 139 foot datum line (the top of the Rainier Tower base) and the lack of a setback at Fifth Ave. acts to close off views.

The Board was pleased with the shift of the hotel mass away from University Ave.

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

EDG Meeting #1: In order to achieve the guidance provided in A1 above, the Board suggested that the applicant consider building higher and consider other departures, similar to the façade modulation (request # 1 in the booklet), which may enable the lower realms of the complex to have a clearer spatial organization.

The upper reaches of the proposed tower have proportions roughly similar to Rainier Tower, square in plan, with a blunt or flat roof. While the architect conveyed the intention of relating the two towers by this similarity of form, the Board members indicated an interest in a more dramatic shape or expression on the skyline. Seattle towers over 40 floors all possess sculpted shafts and/or interestingly shaped tops.

EDG Meeting #2: The applicant proposed use of curtain wall articulations and other architectural elements instead of choosing to develop an alternative scheme with a higher more slender tower or with a different roof top shape.

Individualized articulations of the curtain wall for the lower office and the higher residential program components with an outdoor residential amenity space separating them will, according to the architect, endow the building with a distinct upper skyline presence. The suggestion of a faceted wall (p. 12 of the EDG #2 booklet) which shimmers at the upper levels intrigued the Board.

ARCHITECTURAL EXPRESSION

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

EDG Meeting #1: The desire for a coherent spatial arrangement of the masses at the lower levels or pedestrian realm of the complex corresponds to a second Board interest---that open space, whether private, public or a mix, has an outward presence at or near the streetscape. The applicant could consider the placement of open space at street level as an entry plaza(s) or above the plinth to exert itself in more compelling ways upon the pedestrian experience than the green swaths illustrated (p. 45) in the EDG booklet. Interstitial or negative space introduced by Rainier Tower's idiosyncratic base ought to be complemented by the massing of the new structures. The insertion of new volumes can serve to expand and shape this space into a definable open area. By giving the podium of the Rainier Tower breathing room, the development can celebrate a significant Seattle structure, supplements its visual dynamism and creates a meaningful space that defines the lower realm where the three major buildings meet.

EDG Meeting #2: The sculptural presence of the Rainier Tower base forms significant voids or negative spaces achieved by its distinct tapering walls. The applicant's design has responded to this unusual form and its suggestion of hollowed spaces by fashioning the proposed tower's large curved or concave wall which represents the proposal's identifying character. The Board referred to this architectural idea as the "major scoop". A series of "minor scoops", forms carved into the structure or curtain wall, adorn the office building in several places---at the northeast corner, at the northwest corner and at the southeast corner facing Rainier Tower.

The major scoop with its accordion-like pleats received a mixed response with the Board members' opinions ranging from opposition to support. At the next meeting, several separate designs and details of the major scoop will need to be developed and presented to the Board. The focus of the efforts must consider the proportionality of the scoop in relationship to the base and tower and its materiality. Development of the scoop should transform the massing from diagrammatic form to a substantive architectural element.

The Board members agreed that the “minor scoops” looked applied and unconvincing. The applicant will need to rethink this idea and present alternatives at the next meeting.

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

EDG Meeting #1: The concavity of Rainier Tower’s base provides the design motif for the proposed tower’s form. The architect’s inversion of the form, a broad base tapering upward to the shaft, creates a visual reference. At the next meeting, the Board would benefit from a clearer understanding of the compelling reasons for the tiered or stepped building mass. Consider beginning the steps or tiers closer to the pedestrian level. The Board noted that this mid-section of the building has little or no engagement with the form that influenced it.

EDG Meeting #2: As mentioned above (B-1), the success of the major scoop is contingent on the elegance of the materials and its proportionality.

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

EDG Meeting #1: The Board observed that the hotel’s massing and placement appears separate or detached from the rest of the complex. Further consideration should occur about 1) its location and its effect on view blockage of the base from the west and 2) the lack of visual synergy with Rainier Tower. The Board raised the prospects of a taller, narrower hotel structure or one embedded in the proposed tower similar in intention to the manner in which the residential volume expresses itself in Alternative # 2 as a singular form but within the larger building mass.

EDG Meeting #2: In response to earlier guidance, the architect shifted the hotel mass away from University St. to open up views to Rainier Tower from the west. This move received the Board’s endorsement. The hotel height remained the same---no higher than the top of the Rainier Tower’s base, which measures 139’ at one point.

THE STREETScape

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

EDG Meeting #1: In following meetings, the architect should provide perspectives of the streetscapes that include the massing of Rainier Tower and the proposed towers. As the design for the commercial plinth evolves more information should inform the reader of the retail components.

EDG Meeting #2: The streetscape perspectives helped inform the Board of the architect’s intent on sculpting the proposed tower at lower levels. See Board guidance in B-1 on the “minor scoops”.

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

EDG Meeting #1: During the EDG review process, the focus of the applicant’s and the Board’s effort is the arrangement of the complex’s massing components. The evolution of the facades will be informed by both the parti and urban / building attributes to be revealed in later reviews.

EDG Meeting #2: Given the Board’s divided response toward the major scoop (see guidance B-1), articulation of this critical element will continue to receive careful scrutiny. The applicant will need to provide a series of façade studies illuminating alternatives or variations in the steps or accordion-like folds of the tower, focused on its shape, on the fenestration’s detailing and on the relationship of opaqueness and transparency. The Board recommended that this evolution of the tower and its analysis be presented as soon as possible.

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

EDG Meeting #1: See the guidance for C2.

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

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

EDG Meeting #1: Continuous canopies are a requirement in the Seattle downtown code. The Board looks forward to the development of this element within the city’s urban fabric.

EDG Meeting #2: Deliberation amongst the Board members did not focus on the canopies. Refinements of the street level concept should include continuous canopies on each of the streets.

PUBLIC AMENITIES

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

EDG Meeting #1: The Board strongly encourages the addition of open space that helps provide visual definition to the complex at street or plinth levels. See the guidance above for B-1.

EDG Meeting #2: The applicant provided a landscape concept for open space above the plinth (See D-3 guidance) including an outdoor plaza on level two at Fourth Ave. and Union St. The applicant also proposed a continuous street edge devoted to entrances and retail instead of a public plaza at-grade. Illustrations of the streetscape show the possibility of outdoor cafes at the southwest (near the hotel) and southeast corners.

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

EDG Meeting #1: The treatment of the sidewalks will be an important future consideration.

EDG Meeting #2: The applicant team provided streetscape perspectives illustrating storefronts possessing generous amounts of glazing and overhead canopies. A landscape concept for the wide sidewalks that ring the block will need to be provided at the next meeting. The dialogue between building and streetscape concept will be an important element of the review at the next meeting.

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

EDG Meeting #1: Rainier Tower, particularly its base, provides this distinct and memorable “sense of place” described by the guideline. The design of the complex should support and enhance the base as a distinct object by providing good sightlines to it and by allowing the massing of the tower and hotel, particularly at the lower levels, to be informed by the sculptural attributes of the podium. As stated in an earlier guidance by the Board, the three major masses and the retail podium should visually communicate with one another. The negative space or interstitial areas ought to be as definable as the surrounding masses.

EDG Meeting #2: The landscape architect’s articulate vision for an upper level open space above the plinth wrapping around the three sides of the hotel and separating the proposed tower from Rainier Tower began to address earlier Board issues regarding the depth and spatial quality of the interstitial space between the three significant masses. These concepts should continue to evolve with greater detail. The open space concept brought forward to the Board and the public would be limited to use by office workers and hotel guests.

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

EDG Meeting #1: In later stages of the review process, the Board will evaluate the applicant’s signage concept.

EDG Meeting #2: In later stages of the review process, the Board will evaluate the applicant's signage concept.

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

EDG Meeting #1: Development and review of a lighting concept plan will occur during later stages of the review process.

EDG Meeting #2: Development and review of a lighting concept plan will occur during later stages of the review process.

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

VEHICULAR ACCESS AND PARKING

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

EDG Meeting #1: The development proposal, limiting the number of vehicular access points to two, received the Board's endorsement. Due to the lack of an alley, Union and University streets would serve as ingress and egress respectively. See guidance for E3.

EDG Meeting #2: The idea of vehicular ingress on Union and egress on University has not changed since the earlier meeting. (Staff note: the development team has since noted that Union St may likely have ingress and egress.)

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

E3 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.

EDG Meeting #1: Since service access and loading as well as tenant vehicular access and parking occur in the same area, minimize or eliminate potential conflicts that may arise among users. As the programming of the building evolves provide additional information in the MUP plans.

EDG Meeting #2: No further guidance was provided at this time.

MASTER USE PERMIT APPLICATION

The applicant revised the design and applied for a Master Use Permit with a design review component on October 31, 2014.

The SEPA comment period for this proposal ended on December 3, 2014.

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The Design Review Board conducted two Recommendation Meetings on May 5, 2015 and June 23, 2015 to review the applicant's formal project proposal developed in response to the previously identified priorities. At the two public meetings, site plans, elevations, floor plans, landscaping plans, a model and computer renderings of the proposed exterior materials were presented for the Board members' consideration.

Public Comments

The following summarizes the public comment during the Recommendation phase.

At the initial Recommendation meeting, seven members of the public affixed their names to the meeting sign-in sheet. Speakers raised the following issues:

- The applicant fails to consider the project's impact on traffic and the pedestrian experience.
- The departure requests mostly fall short. Reject the following requests: to provide steeper parking garage ramps, to reduce the size of the loading berths, to reduce the percentage of an active street front on three of the four streets.
- The proposed parking layout fails to show code compliance with the correct number of large parking stalls.
- The floor area ratio (FAR) as shown on p. 169 of the Recommendation booklet is misleading.
- This FAR calculation would avoid paying the correct amount of funds to the city's incentive zoning program. The application short changes the potential monetary contribution to help house the city's low-income population.
- The project distorts the massing and reduces the amount of landscaping available to the public.
- Several process questions were posed to the Board by one of the speakers. Did the Board members conduct site visits; is there a record of the visit? The same speaker asked the Board to review the discrepancy between the MUP drawings and the Recommendation packet; look at the FAR problems, and give careful consideration of the proposed hotel design.

DPD received several letters. The author of one letter suggested a taller building with a spire on top to accentuate the building's profile on the skyline. Other letters commented on DPD's technique of evaluating the floor area ration (FAR) and transportation impacts. Another letter encouraged the Design Review Board to better evaluate the departure requests in the EIS addendum.

Two members of the public affixed their names to the Second Recommendation meeting sign-in sheet. Speakers voiced the following:

- The project does little to engage with street life. It has an inaccessible streetscape.
- The project further exacerbates the lack of affordable housing in Seattle. The development should assist those in need of housing.
- The applicant has ignored the Board's guidance and its earlier direction related to the departures including the lack of canopies in specific locations.
- Loading berth sizes should be 25' in length.
- The revised design illustrates little improvement to street activity.
- The new departure request for expanding the upper level width should be denied. The departure brings the proposed tower shaft closer to the Rainier Tower.

SITE PLANNING AND MASSING

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The Board reiterated its dissatisfaction with the use of the top edge of the Rainier Tower plinth as a datum line to determine where the proposed tower's dominant curve begins its upsweep. The curved portion of the proposed building mass disassociates itself from Rainier Tower because its height above the datum line fails to engage with the base of the existing tower. Beginning the swoop much lower allows the opposing concave curves to form an interesting visual dialogue as they intersect one another from a perspective north or south of the two structures. The Board sees this change in the scoop as beneficial to the tower's proportions and will preserve much of the existing view to Rainier Tower. A setback along Fifth may not be needed if the geometry of the curve opens up the views to the tower.

Second Recommendation Meeting: In response to direction received at the initial Recommendation meeting, the applicant lowered the spring point from the tenth to the seventh level from which the east vertical wall of the Fifth Ave base transitions to folds or accordion-like pleats. The lowering of this spring point proved insufficient, according to the Board, as the base of Rainier Tower viewed from the north remained mostly concealed by the proposal's bulk. As the Board reviewed page eight of the packet with its diagrams of the relationship of the proposal with the existing tower, it determined after careful deliberation that the point of transition on the façade should occur at the Fourth level.

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The Board noted its general satisfaction with two significant elements of the building's upper reaches or shaft---the articulation of the three-story mechanical and amenity spaces separating the office and residential components and the building's upper cornice or parapet. The screen surrounding the roof top mechanical penthouses is composed of a series of glass and perforated metal panels echoing the vertical prismatic folds that adorn the

building's elevations. Backlit in the evenings, the screen would emit a variegated or harlequin like pattern nearly 850 feet above the surrounding streets.

Second Recommendation Meeting: The Board did not offer comments on the upper reaches of the proposed tower.

ARCHITECTURAL EXPRESSION

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The Board, after reviewing four alternative studies of the terraced east wall, agreed that the applicant's preferred accordion like pleats or folds forming the outer skin of the prevailing scoop met its expectation. The angled metal panels, scattered along the other facades, would fold along with the angled glazing. The pleats and the projecting metal panels would provide a texture beyond that of a smooth slope as illustrated in Study #4.

While commending the revised corner elevations at Fifth and Union, the Board found the applicant's attempt to carve into the tower's southeast corner unsatisfactory as it breaks the predominant datum line above the two-story retail base. The presence of the southeast scoop pales in contrast to the dramatic lift expressed by the Rainier Tower base.

Second Recommendation Meeting: In response to the advice offered at the Initial Recommendation meeting, the applicant removed the vertical scoop at the southeast corner closest to Rainier Tower. Volume lost from this change was then added by the applicant to both the mid-portion of the south façade, creating a new departure request, and to the curved wall at the southwest corner. The elimination of the southeast corner scoop, according to the Board, improved the quality of the building's appearance along Fifth Ave., ensuring a more unified façade. The changes to the dimensions of the southwest corner scoop were acceptable as well as the departure request for the south elevation. The Board stated that increasing any of the building area beyond these changes would require a third Recommendation meeting.

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: See Board guidance for B-1.

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The two-story base, composed of storefront glazing, stone at the entries and a grey metal band at its cornice, loses its presence along the Fourth Ave. elevation due to its lower height. The Board directed the applicant to revise the lower façade to achieve a two-story base similar to the Union St. and Fifth Ave. elevations.

The hotel design received considerable praise. With detailing of its facades responding to subtle elements of Rainier Tower, the hotel is both fully resolved as a stand-alone structure while visually engaged with the larger complex. The proposed hotel complements the existing tower but avoids actively flattering it.

Second Recommendation Meeting: The revisions to the Fourth Ave base met the Board's expectations. The act of raising the height of the wide horizontal channel defining the base creates a much stronger presence along the street.

The prominent base along Union St. with its dominant office lobby entrance loses definition or clarity as it transitions into the concave corner at Fourth Ave. The Board recommends revealing, or expressing more fully, the metal channel as it turns downward at the corners where the arc meets the orthogonal planes along Union and Fourth streets. Provide greater exposure by wrapping the vertical channel to frame the curve or by recessing the curtain wall at the curvature to reveal more of the channel. A horizontal continuation of the channel along the curve's arc is unnecessary. In addition, the area within the curve should have more texture. These techniques will endow the northwest corner with more visual substance.

Add open interior stairs connecting the office lobby on Union St. with the two floors of the market hall to enable ease of passage from the plaza at Rainier Tower to Union St.

THE STREETScape

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: With the elimination of the applique curve, the corner design of Fifth and Union received the Board's praise.

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The long vertical scoop forming the proposed tower's northwest corner needs to extend to grade. This will heighten its visual drama and create a modest open space or entry plaza at a significant corner. The Board added that this scoop could be eliminated if the revised geometry of the major swoop facing Fifth Ave was found to be satisfactory.

Second Recommendation Meeting: Changes in the dimensions of the curve, the elimination of the protruding, one-story storefront and landscape options to give greater definition to the northwest corner did little to convince the Board of the curved corner's sine qua non to the tower's design. The Board, however, did not request revisions to the corner other than to recommend placement of an entry at the corner, refinement to the channel (see B4 guidance) and alterations to the canopy (see C5 guidance).

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The Board indicated its preliminary approval of a partial blank wall along the Fourth Ave hotel street front.

Second Recommendation Meeting: The Board did not discuss the blank walls along the Fourth Ave hotel street front. However the members recommended granting departure # 10.

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: Discussion among the Board members focused on the size of the office lobby facing Union St. and whether the reduction in its size would add more retail commercial space along the street frontage. The Board decided to not request reduction in the amount of office lobby fronting Union in part due to the strength of the portal or entry with its stone surround.

Second Recommendation Meeting: The Board recommended entries at the northwest corner and on the south façade facing the Rainier Tower plaza.

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The applicant requested a series of departures from land use code requirements governing overhead weather protection. These requests addressed the location of canopies close to street trees and vehicle entries and altered the height maximums of canopies in other locations. In response, the Board conveyed a strong desire for continuous canopies along the four rights of way. When overhead weather protection extends toward a tree, the Board prefers a shallower canopy in order to establish continuity along the streets and provide pedestrian comfort.

When a canopy's placement needs to exceed the 15 foot height maximum as indicated in the Code, the Board requested that the canopy's depth project further than the maximum amount.

The Board recommended placement of a marquee at the northwest corner's concave wall. The canopy, however, does not need a structural connection to the flanking canopies along Union St. and Fourth Avenue. It may float free of the adjacent canopies, however, the canopy's design should provide a suitable visual transition.

PUBLIC AMENITIES

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The design of the rooftop above the second floor, which wraps the Rainier Tower's perimeter on the north and west, feels piecemeal according to the

Board. It does little to engage the landscaping surrounding the tower and at street level. The size and shape of the skylight above the atrium nearly cuts off the users' ability to circulate within the outdoor area. The landscape gestures forming this outdoor plaza need refinement to produce a sense of place. The Board noted that the space could be extended along Fifth Ave if the curve of the proposed tower reached down to the third floor and formed a balcony (now at Level 10) overlooking the street.

The Board questioned the applicant on how the current landscaping surrounding the Rainier Tower base would connect with the new development. Stairs and other features would need to be redesigned. The south wall of the retail space facing Rainier Sq. would also have to be well detailed and presented to the Board.

Second Recommendation Meeting: The modifications to the second floor rooftop open space with its smaller skylight and greater definition to the outdoor rooms proved acceptable. The Board did not recommend additional changes.

The applicant's notion of a small sitting plaza at the northwest corner did not generate enthusiasm among the Board members. Placement of an entry at the corner underneath a canopy will best generate pedestrian activity.

Modifications to the proposed building base facing Rainier Tower along the east perimeter of the hotel and the tower's south side with a linear set of windows on one side and vertical vegetative wall on the other received Board enthusiasm and endorsement. Two conditions will ensure the meaningful interchange between the proposed and existing towers. Ensure the presence of a door with accompanying signage along the glazed south wall to provide entry into the building. Where necessary alterations occur at this plaza, such as the demolition of the existing outdoor steps to the terrace, the plaza should be refinished with the same exposed concrete aggregate at the floor plane to ensure continuity.

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: More effort should be applied to creating a common and interesting landscape language at the entries and the tree pits. Street furniture should be added that complements the landscape design. The Fourth and Union corner plaza provides an opportunity for interesting landscaping and the introduction of street furniture.

Second Recommendation Meeting: Revisions to the tree pits and landscaping at the entries received tacit support.

For the Fourth and Union corner see guidance provided in D1.

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: See Board guidance for D-1.

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The Board requested a signage concept plan along with elevations showing the location of signs at the office and retail base.

The Board added that signage should not cover the piers that form the hotel.

Second Recommendation Meeting: Install a sign at the south façade facing the base of Rainier Tower to announce access to the market hall at the base of the future tower.

The hotel signage as represented on p. 31 of the Recommendation booklet appeared satisfactory to the Board. Place the signs in the locations and at the size generally shown in the illustrations.

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: Provide special lighting at the hotel entry to enhance the sense of entry.

Second Recommendation Meeting: The Board did not address how the applicant's proposed hotel entry lighting responded to their earlier direction.

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

VEHICULAR ACCESS AND PARKING

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

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The proposed design would now allow ingress and egress on Union St and egress only on University.

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

E3 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.

Initial Recommendation Meeting: The Board discussed the departure request for seven smaller loading berths and indicated its inclination to approve it.

Second Recommendation Meeting: The Board recommended granting a departure for dimensional changes for seven of the 14 loading berths.

Board Recommendations: The recommendations summarized below were based on the plans submitted at the June 23, 2015 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 June 23rd public meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities, and reviewing the plans and renderings, the Design Review Board members present recommended approval of the subject design and the requested development standard departures from the requirements of the Land Use Code (listed below).

DEPARTURES

STANDARD	REQUIREMENT	REQUEST	JUSTIFICATION	RECOMMENDATION
1. Façade Modulation SMC 23.49.058B	According to Table 23.49.058A, maximum length varies from 155' to 80' depending upon building height.	11,539 cubic yards along 4 th Ave.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximizes building bulk at the northwest corner away from Rainier Tower. 	Approved
2. Façade Modulation SMC 23.49.058B	According to Table 23.49.058A, maximum length varies from 155' to 80' depending upon building height.	16,634 cubic yards along Union St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximizes building bulk along Union St. away from Rainier Tower. 	Approved based on lowering the point of transition along the east façade from Level 7 to Level 4.
3. Loading Berth Standards SMC 23.54.035C	Loading berths shall be not less than 10' wide and 35' in length unless reduced to 25' by Director (subsection C2c).	4 berths: 9 by 20' 3 berths: 10 by 20'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loading dock manager will be on-site during business hours to direct loading/unloading activities. 	Approved based on the on-site presence of a loading dock manager.
4. Overhead Weather Protection SMC 23.49.018	Continuous canopies with a minimum 8' horizontal plane, and placed 10' to 15' above the sidewalk.	Union St. Discontinuous canopies, reduction in width to 5' along a portion of façade, and exceeds height by 1'4".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserves existing trees. Emphasizes office lobby entry. Emphasizes concave northwest corner. 	Approved. If street trees perish during construction, the canopies will need to be continuous.
5. Overhead Weather Protection SMC 23.49.018	Continuous canopies with a minimum 8' horizontal plane, and 10' to 15' above the sidewalk.	5th Ave. Reduction in width to 6'6" along a portion of façade, and exceeds height by 1'4".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Canopy adjusts to slope and provides continuity with its extension along Union St. 	Approved
6. Overhead Weather Protection SMC 23.49.018	Continuous canopies with a minimum 8' horizontal plane, and placed 10' to 15' above the sidewalk.	University St. Discontinuous canopies flanking garage exit and reduction in height of 1' to 1'6" between hotel entry and garage entry.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserves existing street tree. Provides continuity with hotel entry canopy. 	Approved. If street trees perish during construction, the canopies will need to be continuous.
7. Overhead Weather Protection SMC 23.49.018	Continuous canopies with a minimum 8' horizontal plane, and placed 10' to 15' above the sidewalk.	4th Ave. Discontinuous canopy at concave corner and a portion exceeds height by 1' 1 ½".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emphasizes special corner design. Provides design continuity with extension along Union St. 	Approved
8. Street façade, landscaping & street setbacks. SMC 23.49.056.B.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General setback limits apply on streets not requiring property line facades. 	<p>Union St. 46.1% of façade between 15 and 35' above sidewalk is setback more than 2'. Length of setback exceeds 20'.</p> <p>A separate portion of the setback area (concave corner) is deeper than 10' from the sidewalk line</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emphasizes office lobby entry. Allows for small entry plaza at northwest corner. 	Approved

STANDARD	REQUIREMENT	REQUEST	JUSTIFICATION	RECOMMENDATION
9. Street façade, landscaping & street setbacks. SMC 23.49.056.B.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum façade height is 35’. General setback limits apply on streets not requiring property line facades. 	<p>5th Ave. 58’11” of the façade is less than 35’ above sidewalk grade.</p> <p>58’11” of the façade is set back more than 10’ from the sidewalk line.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower height provides a transition to Rainier Tower. 	Approved
10. Street façade, landscaping & street setbacks. SMC 23.49.056.B.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum façade height is 35’. General setback limits apply on streets not requiring property line facades. Blank façade limit is 15’ wide; total width less than 40% of street frontage. 	<p>4th Ave. A portion of concave corner at Union St. is set back more than 10’ from the sidewalk.</p> <p>Two areas of hotel façade each exceed the 20’ width limit for blank facades by over 3’.</p> <p>Hotel plinth at lobby entry is less than 35’ above adjacent sidewalk grade due to the setback of the hotel façade.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concave facade provides an identity to the northwest corner. Hotel has high quality stone at base. Board had directed applicant to shift bulk of hotel away from University to provide sight lines to Rainier Tower. 	Approved
11. Street façade, landscaping & street setbacks. SMC 23.49.056.B.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General setback limits apply on streets not requiring property line facades per 23.49.056.B.1 	<p>University St. At base of hotel, 1,563 sf are setback more than 10’ or a total of 106.16 linear feet.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board directed applicant to shift bulk of hotel away from University to provide sight lines to Rainier Tower. 	Approved
12. Street Use SMC 23.49.009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum of 75% of street frontage at street-level requires retail use. 	<p>Union St. 50.2% proposed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office tower lobby occupies approx. 33% of Union St. street frontage. Board rejected expanding area of retail. 	Approved based on the inclusion of accessible, open interior stairs linking Union St lobby with the two floors of the market hall.
13. Street Use SMC 23.49.009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum of 75% of street frontage at street-level requires retail use. 	<p>5th Ave. 70% proposed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing Rainier Tower is included in calculation. The entire proposed street frontage is 100% retail. 	Approved
14. Street Use SMC 23.49.009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum of 75% of street frontage at street-level requires retail use. 	<p>University St. 61.7% proposed. This equals the existing retail at the base of Rainier Tower.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hotel will have a bar at the corner of 4th and University. 	Approved
15. Upper Level Width Limits SMC 23.49.058D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On lots where the width and depth of the lot each exceed 200’, the maximum façade width of any portion of the structure above 240’ shall be 145’ along the north/south axis 	<p>5th Ave façade. Encroachment varies up to 13’5”</p>		Approved

The Board recommended the following **CONDITIONS** for the project. (Authority referenced in the letter and number in parenthesis):

- 1) Revise the east façade’s transition from a vertical wall to a series of folds or pleats to begin at level four. (A1)

- 2) Any added building area beyond the specific revisions shown or requested at the Second Recommendation meeting requires a third Recommendation meeting. (B1)
- 3) Reveal or express more fully the metal channel at the corners where the curvature meets the orthogonal planes along Union and Fourth streets. Provide greater exposure by wrapping the vertical channel to frame the curve or by recessing the curtain wall at the curvature to reveal more of the channel. These techniques will endow the concave corner with more visual substance. (B4).
- 4) Provide more texture within the curtain-wall's concave northwest corner. (B4)
- 5) Add entries at the northwest corner facing Fourth Ave and Union St and on the south façade facing the Rainier Tower plaza. (C4)
- 6) Place overhead weather protection at the northwest corner's concave wall. The canopy may float or sit detached from the adjacent canopies along Union St. and Fourth Avenue. However, the canopy design should appear as a suitable transition from one street to the other. (C5)
- 7) Add signage next to the door at the glazed south wall facing the plaza surrounding Rainier Tower to signal entry into the building. (D1, D4)
- 8) Hotel signage must replicate the size and location shown on p. 31 of the 2nd Recommendation meeting booklet. (D4)
- 9) Add open interior stairs connecting the office lobby on Union St. with the two floors of the market hall to enable ease of passage from the plaza at Rainier Tower to Union St. (B-4)

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. In addition, the Director is bound by any condition where there was consensus by the combined Downtown Design Review Board and Design Commission and agrees with the conditions recommended by the five Board members and the recommendation to approve the design, as stated above.

DECISION - DESIGN REVIEW

The proposed design is **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED**.

ANALYSIS - SEPA

Environmental review is required pursuant to the Washington Administrative Code 197-11, and the Seattle SEPA Ordinance (Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 25.05). 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, certain neighborhood plans, and other policies explicitly referenced may serve as the basis for exercising substantive SEPA

authority. The Overview Policy states, in part, “Where City regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation” subject to some limitations. Under such limitations/circumstances (SMC 25.05.665) mitigation can be considered.

A Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) was published for the Downtown Height and Density Changes in 2005. The FEIS evaluated the probable significant environmental impacts that could result from the redevelopment following a change in zoning to allow additional height and density in the Downtown zones. That analysis evaluated the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of the Preferred Alternative and other alternatives.

The subject site lies within the geographic area analyzed in the FEIS. The proposed development is within the range of actions and impacts that were evaluated in the various alternatives. DPD determined that it is appropriate to adopt the FEIS and prepare an EIS Addendum to add more detailed, project-specific information related to the proposed development.

DPD relies on SMC 25.05.600, allowing the use of existing environmental documents as part of its SEPA responsibilities with this project. DPD has determined that the proposed impacts for this Master Use Permit are identified and analyzed in the referenced FEIS; however additional analysis is warranted as permitted pursuant to SMC 25.05.625-630, through an Addendum to the FEIS. After review of the Downtown Height and Density Changes EIS (DHDC), DPD has concluded that any significant impacts associated with the action were adequately analyzed in the DHDC EIS.

The Addendum adds analysis or information about the proposal and does not substantively change the analysis of significant impacts and alternatives in the DHDC EIS. The action produces no probable, significant, adverse environmental impacts that were not already studied in the EIS.

DPD determined that the EIS Addendum should address the following areas of environmental impact:

- Land Use
- Housing
- Urban Design---Height, Bulk and Scale
- Urban Design---Pedestrian Amenities and Open Space
- Views and Aesthetics
- Shadows
- Light and Glare
- Wind
- Traffic and Transportation
- Energy / Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Construction

An Addendum analyzing these areas of environmental impact was prepared and the Notice of Adoption and Availability of Addendum (“Addendum to the Final EIS for the Downtown Height and Density Changes”) was published in the City’s Land Use Information Bulletin on April 30, 2015. A copy of the Addendum was sent to parties of record that commented on the EIS. In addition, a copy of the notice was sent to parties of record for this project.

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), and the Seattle Building Code. Puget Sound Clean Air Agency regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. Additional discussion of short and long term impacts, and conditions to sufficiently mitigate impacts where necessary, is found below.

The initial public comment period following the Notice of Application ended on November 20, 2014. Comments were received in response to the design review aspects of the proposal.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The following is a discussion of the impacts identified in each element of the environment, along with indication of any required mitigation for the impacts disclosed. The impacts detailed below were identified and analyzed in the EIS and EIS Addendum.

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; 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.

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.

Environmental Health / Air Quality

Construction for this project is expected to temporarily add 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).

Should asbestos be identified on the site, it must be removed in accordance with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) and City requirements. PSCAA regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality and require permits for removal of asbestos during demolition. The City acknowledges PSCAA's jurisdiction and requirements for remediation will mitigate impacts associated with any contamination.

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

These strategies are expected to adequately mitigate the adverse environmental impacts from the proposed development. Therefore, no further mitigation is warranted for impacts to environmental health.

Construction 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. Properties located to the west of the site include residential units and will be impacted by construction noise. Several construction sites are located near the site with additional developments proposed nearby. The combined impacts, duration of construction noise in this area, and amount of noise-generating grading and construction activity warrant additional mitigation to reduce the impacts of construction noise on nearby residents.

To mitigate construction noise impacts pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.B (Construction Impacts Policy), the applicant will submit a Construction Management Plan with a noise mitigation element, which has been reviewed and approved by DPD and SDOT. No further mitigation is warranted for construction noise impacts.

Light and Glare

Construction may result in light and glare-related impacts both from stationary sources and mobile sources---particularly at night and at times of the day with low light levels. Stationary sources of light include area lighting of the job site during days/times of low light levels. Such is necessary to meet safety requirements. While noticeable, such lighting is not expected to cause significant impacts.

No significant light and/or glare related impacts are anticipated in conjunction with mobile sources---construction vehicles entering or exiting the site. Headlights of construction related vehicles accessing the site would be noticeable; however, no significant off-site disruption is anticipated.

Construction related lighting would be shielded and directed away from adjacent land uses.

While some construction related light and glare impacts would be unavoidable, with mitigation and given the anticipated short-term duration, none are considered to be significant.

Construction

The duration of the project's construction is estimated at 32 months. Due to the project's location in the Downtown Core Construction hub, the Seattle Department of Transportation requires a Construction Management Plan. The department proactively addresses and responds to the cumulative mobility impacts in hubs through active management of construction-related issues such as pedestrian mobility, truck haul routes and the timing of construction truck traffic, truck staging areas, construction employee parking and lane and sidewalk closures.

While some construction related transportation and parking impacts would be unavoidable, with the mitigation required and given the anticipated short-term duration, none of the impacts would be considered significant.

Long Term Impacts Identified in the EIS and EIS Addendum

The following is a discussion of the impacts identified in each element of the environment, along with indication of any required mitigation for the impacts disclosed. The impacts detailed below were identified and analyzed in the FEIS.

Land Use

SMC 25.05.675J establishes policies to ensure that proposed uses in development projects are reasonably compatible with surrounding uses and are consistent with applicable City land use regulations and the goals and policies set forth in the Land Use element of the Seattle Comprehensive Plan. Subject to the overview policy set forth in SMC Section 25.05.665, the decision maker may condition or deny any project to mitigate adverse land use impacts resulting from a proposed project. Density-related impacts of development are addressed under the policies set forth in SMC 25.05.675 G (height, bulk and scale), M (parking), R (traffic) and O (public services and facilities) and are not addressed under this policy.

In the Downtown EIS, land use would be significantly transformed over time by the increased density of residential and commercial development. It was determined that such an increase in density was consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and neighborhood plans and was not interpreted to be a significant unavoidable impact.

The proposal would be consistent with development trends that are occurring throughout the Downtown Urban Center area and, more specifically, in the general vicinity of the project site. Given the size and mixed-use nature of the proposed project, it is anticipated that this development would continue the trend for redevelopment within this portion of Downtown.

No significant land use impacts are anticipated from development of the Rainier Square project and, therefore, no mitigation is necessary.

Housing

According to the DHDC EIS under all downtown area development alternatives some existing housing might be demolished. Some households with employees in new downtown Seattle office buildings and hotels would have difficulty finding affordable housing to meet their needs in King County. “Those demolitions and the difficulties that some households with Downtown employees would face finding appropriate housing would be as likely to occur under the previously existing conditions as under any of the alternatives considered, and were not significant adverse impacts of the alternatives.”

Presently, there is no housing on the project site, and thus no housing opportunities will be lost. No person would be displaced by the redevelopment proposal. The proposal for 214 new market rate housing units would be over 71 percent of the Comprehensive Plan growth target of 300 units, which has already been exceeded. Accommodating a greater number of residential developments in the downtown core is likely to result in less environmental impacts on both the built and natural environments than constructing a similar number of lower intensity housing units in other portions of the city and region.

The project is consistent with the goals and policies set forth in SMC 25.05.675.I.2. The project does not reduce the existing supply of affordable housing and contributes to the increase in affordable housing through participation in the housing bonus program (SMC 23.49.012.C), which will provide funds for more housing units downtown. No further mitigation is warranted

Aesthetics--- (Height, Bulk and Scale)

The Downtown EIS addresses the impacts of increasing the height and density in specific sections of Downtown Seattle. The EIS notes that the increase in height limits will allow more variations in the skyline with less bulky buildings even as the density increases.

The proposal has been designed to maintain the scale of the vicinity’s large high-rise structures including Two Union Square. The structure’s four-story base relates to its context of mid-rise structures such as the Skinner Building, the Great Northern Building and 1411 Fourth Ave. Building. It’s key feature, the stepped or terraced east elevation, acts to reduce the structure’s bulk and scale as it rises in height. It also echoes the tapered base of the Rainier Tower. At 845 feet in height, the structure would be the second tallest in the city. Its proximity with other tall structures, Two Union Square, 1201 Third Ave., Russell Investments Center as well as Columbia Tower and the Seattle Municipal Tower create a common scale

appreciated from distances. The 12-story hotel would closely replicate the height of many of the surrounding structures in the vicinity.

The proposal would be required to adhere to all current, applicable City Land use code requirements and the project was subject to the City's Design Review processes. The proposal would be similar in height, bulk and scale to nearby structures. No significant unavoidable adverse impacts are anticipated relative to aesthetics.

Aesthetics--Urban Design (Pedestrian Amenities and Open Space)

The Downtown Height and Density EIS describes several positive impacts including 1) improved pedestrian facilities, 2) the presence of existing setbacks requirements to help maintain a pedestrian scale and offset the bulky presence of towers and 3) new public open space in developments to benefit pedestrians. The proposal serves to reduce the width of the Union St. sidewalk and places the tower closer to the street, albeit complying with zoning requirements, than the current structure. The 59-story tower and the 12-story hotel will contribute to the greater bulk of the commercial core. The amount of residents, lodgers and employees in the office building component would likely contribute to pedestrian activity. Those inhabiting the two buildings would seek out pedestrian amenities and open space.

The project would contribute 15,000 sq. ft. of open space pursuant to SMC 23.49.016 which requires 20 sq. ft. of open space for each 1,000 sq. ft. of office floor area. Open space for residential use is not required pursuant to SMC 23.49.020 due to the project providing a voluntary agreement to provide funds for low income housing. Most of this open space would occur on the third level along two sides of the hotel and on the south side of the office/residential tower. The open space would be above the sidewalk and for the use of office workers, residents and hotel guests. The linear space would replace the sizeable existing plaza also located above sidewalk grade.

The redevelopment of Rainier Square will comply with zoning regulations and has met the guidance established by the Downtown Design Review Board. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated from the proposal and no additional mitigation is necessary.

Views and Aesthetics

SMC 25.05.675.P requires that the Director assess the extent of adverse impacts on public views and the need for mitigation. The Addendum provides an analysis of view impacts to designated parks, landmarks, public places, and scenic routes as a result of the proposed development.

The Downtown Height and Density Changes EIS analyzed possible impacts to the Harborview Viewpoint, Plymouth Pillars Park, views toward various landmarks, public places skyline views and scenic routes as a result of the proposed increase in building height and density in Downtown. Views would be altered in the sense that the number of buildings and arrangement of structures that compose the skyline would be different as development occurs

under the Preferred Alternative. The document concludes that this type of change is not considered a significant impact.

The proposed 1301 Fifth Ave. project would result in impacts similar to those described in the Downtown EIS. The Proposed Action would blend into the Downtown skyline and would be consistent with other high-rise buildings. The proposed complex would not result in any significant impacts to designated view corridors, scenic views, City Landmarks, or scenic routes. Views of the Downtown skyline, the Space Needle, the Olympic Mountains, Elliott Bay and Lake Union would still be possible from designated public viewsheds.

Of the City's 87 officially-designated public viewpoints, only two could be affected the Proposed Action---Four Columns Park and Harborview Viewpoint. The applicant analyzed the view from the observation level of the Volunteer Park Water Tower on Capitol Hill because the proposed site is generally out of the view from Four Columns Park. While the proposed complex would be visible from both locations, the proposed structure would blend into the existing Downtown building massing that occurs adjacent to the project site. Views from other public viewpoints would either be blocked by structures between the viewpoint and the subject development or dominated by the taller Columbia Tower.

City policy aims to "protect public views of historic landmarks designated by the City's Landmarks Preservation Board. Proximate to the project site are several designated City landmarks including the nearby Great Northern Building, 1411 Fourth Ave. Building, Mann Building, Seattle Tower and the YWCA Building. The proposal would not affect public views of any of these landmark structures; views would remain possible from all streets that border each building. Public views in the site vicinity consist mostly of views from adjacent streets. The proposal also would not have any effect on views of the Space Needle.

Fifth Avenue and I-5 are designated scenic routes. Fifth Ave. through the commercial core of downtown offers occasional views of Elliott Bay at street intersections where views are available to the west. These views would not be changed by the proposal. One-way south bound, Fifth Ave. is bounded by significant sized structures. The view down the street includes the distinguished features of the Rainier Tower base. There are no scenic views of any natural and human-made features designated for protection in views to the south down Fifth Ave. because the up-grade of the street between Pike St. and Seneca S. results in no near or distant views at the ground horizon of the view. Mt. Rainier and other prominent natural features are not within the field of the view. The view to the north from Fifth Ave. is of the Westin Hotel tower at the terminus of the view at Stewart St. Views on this corridor are limited to the right-of-way since many building front to the edge of the street. Since the proposed buildings do not encroach into the right of way corridor, no views are blocked.

Views from I-5 northbound would include the top of the proposed building as an element of the downtown skyline which would enhance the variety of the view. No natural features would be within the views from I-5 to the south. Views from I-5 to the north also would include the tower as an element of the downtown skyline. Although Elliott Bay is potentially visible from the line of sight from I-5 southbound, any views of the water are already blocked by downtown buildings at a higher elevation than the highway.

The proposal would blend into the Downtown skyline and would be consistent with other high-rise buildings in this portion of downtown. No scenic route-related impacts are anticipated.

No significant adverse impacts are anticipated from the proposed Rainier Square project and no mitigation is necessary. In addition, no significant unavoidable adverse viewshed related impacts are anticipated.

Shadows

The Downtown Height and Density Changes EIS states that taller buildings increase the length of a shadow and increased building bulk widen the shadow that is cast. Buildings that are taller and narrower with spacing between structures may cause fewer shadow impacts. Shading of Downtown parks identified in Seattle's SEPA policies is not expected to change significantly.

SMC 25.05.675.Q requires that the Director assess the extent of adverse impacts of shadows on designated downtown open spaces and the need for mitigation. Seattle's SEPA policies aim to "minimize or prevent light blockage and the creation of shadows on open spaces most used by the public. Policy background, however indicates that due to the scale of development that is permitted Downtown, it is not practical prevent shadow impacts at all public open spaces in Downtown. The policies identify specific Downtown parks (Freeway, Westlake, Market (Steinbrueck), Convention Center and Kobe Terrace parks) where mitigation of shadow impacts may be considered. Of the five identified in the code, Westlake and Convention Center Park would incur shadow impacts from the structure. The Addendum demonstrates that nearby public spaces are already surrounded by dense urban development and the project produces only minor additional shading.

Anticipated shadow impacts are typical of tall structures in the Downtown environment. The orientation of the tower on the site and the shape of the tower tend to lessen shadow-related impacts. Minimal shadow-related public open space impacts have been identified and no mitigation is necessary.

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts are anticipated.

Light and Glare

The Addendum analyzed light and glare impacts. In general, highly glazed buildings, such as the proposal, reflect light, both sunlight and artificial illumination. Drivers, pedestrians and building occupants in nearby buildings are most affected by glare. Multiple factors, such as building orientation for one, influence the quality and quantity of solar reflection. Glare impacts in Downtown Seattle area particular concern for drivers who can be blinded by disability glare, causing potentially hazardous conditions. Unlike pedestrians, drivers may avert their sight at some peril.

The proposed 59-story building has a reflective glass façade above the fourth floor with an array of vertical metal prisms scattered on the face of the building with increased density toward the upper third of the structure. Both the glazing for the tower and the hotel facades would reflect about 30 percent of solar glare. The glare analysis describes several factors mitigating the quality and quantity of glare upon those at risk. These include the presence of surrounding lower height buildings to deflect or block oncoming light and outgoing glare, the orientation of the downtown street grid and the brief duration of the sun on a single pane of the buildings. The consultant writes, “The duration of effect would be very brief at larger angles of view and limited to one to a few seconds at lower angles.” The most serious impact, according to the study, “would occur on east-west streets in downtown that angle upward to the east. In those cases, the impact could be over a distance of a block or more. The eastbound one-way streets where this is possible, however, don’t experience glare because intervening buildings block low angle glare.”

The project would produce interior and exterior lighting as well as light generated by vehicles entering and exiting the site. The latter would produce localized increase in light and glare from headlights.

Glare impacts of the proposal are not considered significant as they do not create hazards to drivers and pedestrian impacts are moderate.

Wind

The Downtown Height and Density Changes EIS notes the impacts that the proposed height and density changes could have on pedestrians in Downtown. The EIS observes that taller building affect the wind environment for pedestrians by causing downwash on flat sides perpendicular to prevailing winds. The use of design and architectural techniques may prevent adverse wind effects.

Consulting firm Rowan, Williams, Davies & Irwin, Inc. (RWDI) prepared a report, dated February 5, 2015, that analyzed effects of wind around the project site. The firm’s conclusion is that wind conditions around the Rainier Tower and surrounding sidewalk are generally appropriate for sitting or standing throughout the year. With the addition of the proposed development, the report states “wind conditions are anticipated to remain generally unchanged.” Wind conditions would be comfortable for sitting in summer and winter seasons at the entrances and sidewalks around the proposed tower and hotel. The predicted wind conditions, according to the consulting firm, are considered appropriate for the intended use the respective spaces. Impacts are consistent with the range of potential impacts discussed in the DHDC EIS.

No significant unavoidable adverse wind related impacts are anticipated.

Transportation

SMC 25.05.675R requires that the Director assess the extent of adverse impacts of traffic and transportation and the need for mitigation. The Downtown Height and Density Changes EIS

analysis considered the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of the EIS alternatives as they relate to the overall transportation system. The subject site lies within the area analyzed in the EIS and the proposed development is within the range of actions and impacts evaluated in the EIS.

Traffic analyses associated with the proposed development were reviewed by DPD, as described in the Addendum as well as various transportation and parking technical memos and reports by Parametrix). These forecasts assume that 45 percent of the trips associated with the office component of the project access the site by car. The Addendum found that the proposed development would result in approximately 4,216 net new daily trips, including 657 AM peak hour trips and 554 PM peak hour trips. This is within the range of potential trips analyzed in the FEIS.

The study also examined impacts to 18 nearby intersections in the project vicinity and found that the vehicle trip impacts were consistent with the analysis in the EIS. In the 2020 Build evaluation, the project would generate enough traffic to degrade the Levels of Service (LOS) at two intersections (Sixth Ave/Union St and Sixth Ave/Spring St.) beyond what would occur in 2020 without the site's redevelopment in the AM peak hour. The Sixth Ave/Seneca St. intersection would remain at a LOS F. In the PM peak hour, five intersections would degrade to LOS beyond what would occur in 2020 without redevelopment. These include the following: Sixth Ave/University, Sixth Ave / Seneca, Fifth Ave/University St., Fifth Ave/Spring St. and Fourth Ave/Union St. The LOS at Fifth Ave and University St. intersection would deteriorate from a C to F in contrast to a LOS of C without the project. At Sixth Ave/Spring St. the LOS would continue to receive a grade of F.

The Addendum describes potential mitigation options which would improve operations at Fifth Ave/University St and Sixth Ave/Seneca St to LOS D. SDOT would decide whether these improvements should be implemented as part of signal optimization in the downtown core.

The proposed accommodation of 871 vehicles in a below grade garage is forecasted to be fully utilized during the peak office hours (8 AM to 5 PM weekdays). For eight hours, the demand could exceed capacity by over 100 vehicles. The excess demand, according to the Addendum, could be accommodated in other nearby parking facilities.

DPD will require a Transportation Management Plan to mitigate adverse traffic and parking impacts. The goal for the TMP is based on the most recent mode split survey results of Center City commuters (2014 Center City Commuter Mode Split Survey, Commute Seattle). Commute trips by employees of office tenants who lease space in the building will need to achieve a single occupancy vehicle (SOV) goal of not more than 31% of all commute trips to be measured as the percentage of trips that occur between 6:00 AM and 9:00 AM, consistent with the State of Washington's Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) act.

The project will not generate significant unavoidable transportation impacts beyond the scope of the impacts identified in the Downtown EIS.

Energy / Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The EIS growth model associated with the Downtown Height and Density Changes EIS projected that commercial development trends over a 20-year timeframe could fluctuate between zero percent and 2.1 percent. The EIS noted that a new electrical substation would need to be energized by 2012. The Downtown EIS identified several strategies aimed at reduction in energy use.

The scale of global climate change is so large that the impacts of a project can only be considered on a “cumulative” basis. It is not anticipated that a single development project, even one of the scale of the Proposed Action, would have an individually discernable impact on global climate change. The project’s GHG emissions would likely combine with emissions across the City, County, and State and planet to cumulatively contribute to global climate change. The applicant has provided a table with estimated greenhouse gas emissions from the proposed action.

The design of the complex complies with provisions of the City’s Energy Code. In addition, the project is consistent with the City Climate Action Plan Implementation Strategy TLU 17 by location near existing and planned high capacity transit. The following measures have been proposed to reduce energy use, increase sustainable building design and reduce GHG emissions. Key measures include the following:

- Construction waste management to include salvaging demolished material and construction waste for recycling
- Recycled content of construction materials.
- High performance glazing reducing heat gain.
- Drought resistant and tolerant planting in landscaped area to minimize irrigation requirements.
- Use of outside air for heating, ventilating and air conditioning.
- Efficient light fixtures and controls based on occupancy and time of day.
- Low flow plumbing fixtures.
- Reduction in transportation related energy use related to the downtown location where a majority of office workers commute by transit, carpooling, bicycles and walking. The project is anticipated to encourage bicycling by including facility for bicycle storage, showers and locker rooms.

No significant impacts are anticipated and no additional mitigation is necessary.

DECISION - STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

The proposed action is **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

CONDITIONS – DESIGN REVIEW

Prior to MUP Issuance

- 1) Revise the east façade's transition from a vertical wall to a series of folds or pleats to begin at level four.
- 2) Any added building area beyond the specific revisions shown or requested at the Second Recommendation meeting requires a third Recommendation meeting.
- 3) Reveal or express more fully the metal channel at the corners where the curvature meets the orthogonal planes along Union and Fourth streets. Provide greater exposure by wrapping the vertical channel to frame the curve or by recessing the curtain wall at the curvature to reveal more of the channel. These techniques will endow the concave corner with more visual substance.
- 4) Provide more texture within the curtain-wall's concave northwest corner.
- 5) Add entries at the northwest corner facing Fourth Ave and Union St and on the south façade facing the Rainier Tower plaza.
- 6) Place overhead weather protection at the northwest corner's concave wall. The canopy may float or sit detached from the adjacent canopies along Union St. and Fourth Avenue. However, the canopy design should appear as a suitable transition from one street to the other.
- 7) Add signage next to the door at the glazed south wall facing the plaza surrounding Rainier Tower to signal entry into the building.
- 8) Hotel signage must replicate the size and location shown on p. 31 of the 2nd Recommendation meeting booklet.
- 9) Add open interior stairs connecting the office lobby on Union St. with the two floors of the market hall to enable ease of passage from the plaza at Rainier Tower to Union St.

Prior to Construction

- 10) The assigned Land Use Planner will attend all pre-construction conferences with DPD building staff and applicant representatives to monitor building plan consistency with approved MUP drawings.

During Construction

- 11) The assigned Land Use Planner will attend all relevant construction meetings affecting building design with city staff and applicant representatives. Proposed changes to the building design that vary from the approved Master Use Permit will be reviewed by the Land Use Planner.

Prior to Issuance of Occupancy

- 12) 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 assigned Land Use Planner to this project. An appointment with the assigned Land Use Planner must be made at

least five working days in advance of field inspection. The Land Use Planner will determine whether submission of revised plans is required to ensure that compliance has been achieved.

For the Life of the Project

- 13) As proposed, the architectural features and details presented at the Final Design Review meeting shall remain.
- 14) Any proposed changes to the exterior of the building or the site must be submitted to DPD for review and approval by the Land Use Planner. 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 MUP Issuance

- 15) The property owner shall record an acknowledgement of the permit conditions in the manner prescribed by the City of Seattle in Attachment of DPD's Director's Rule 27-2015 (SDOT's Director's Rule 09-2015).

Prior to the Issuance of the Demolition and/or Shoring Permit

- 16) The applicant shall submit for review and approval by DPD and SDOT a Construction Management Plan using the template provide on the SDOT website at <http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/cmp.htm>. The CMP shall also include all mitigating measures for construction related impacts identified in the Addendum. The Plan shall include a discussion on management of construction related noise, efforts to mitigate noise impacts and community outreach efforts to allow people within the immediate area of the project to have opportunities to contact the site to express concern about noise. The project shall also include all mitigating measures for construction related impacts identified in the Addendum (pages 2-111 to 2-112). The Plan may also be incorporated into any Construction Management Plans required to mitigate any short term transportation impacts that result from the project.

Prior to Building Permit Issuance

- 17) The applicant shall prepare a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) stating the goal and detailing the elements that will be implemented to achieve the goal. Physical elements required by the Director's Decision should be both listed in the TMP and included on plans for the project's building permit. The applicant submits this draft to both DPD and SDOT.

Prior to Building Occupancy

- 18) Implement a Transportation Management Plan (TMP). The goal of this TMP is to reduce the single-occupant vehicle trips to a maximum of 31% of all office employee trips.

For the Life of the Project

- 19) The applicant/responsible party shall provide office tenants, agents, and representative with a copy of the TMP as part of leasing documents and building management procedures, and require tenants to comply with its conditions.
- 20) The applicant/responsible party shall conduct TMP required surveys and produce regular reports at the applicant's expense in a manner and form prescribed by the City.

Bruce P. Rips, AICP
Department of Planning and Development
Land Use Division

Date: December 3, 2015

BPR:rgc
H:\DOC\Design Review\DEC.3017644 1301 5th Ave.docx

IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR ISSUANCE OF YOUR MASTER USE PERMIT

Master Use Permit Expiration and Issuance

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

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

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

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