



Department of Construction and Inspections
Nathan Torgelson, Director

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

Application Number: 3020645
Applicant Name: Bradley Khouri for B9 Architects
Address of Proposal: 1427 NW 65th Street

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow a 4-story apartment building containing 22 units. No parking is proposed. Existing structure to be demolished.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review – Board Review - (SMC 23.41). Departures requested.

1. SMC 23.45.518– Rear Setback.
2. SMC 23. 45.5527B1 – Façade Length.
3. SMC 23. 45.522A4 – Amenity Area.

SEPA - Environmental Determination - (SMC 25.05)

SEPA DETERMINATION: Exempt DNS MDNS EIS

 DNS with conditions

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

BACKGROUND DATA

Site Description

The project is located on a rectangular site on NW 65th Street. The site slopes slightly downhill to the south.

The subject property is zoned Lowrise 3 (LR3). The LR3 zone extends to the south from this site for several blocks. Property to the north is zoned LR1, the location of Ballard High School. The site, approximately 5,000 square feet, is



currently occupied by a multifamily building. Vehicle and pedestrian access to the site is available from NW 65th Street. There is no alley in this block. No Environmentally Critical Areas (ECA) are mapped at the site.

Vicinity Description

The surrounding development is a mix of lowrise, multifamily residential structures and Ballard High School. Single family homes dominate the area to the east.

Project Description

The project proposal is to construct a 4 story structure containing 22 residential units. No parking is proposed. The existing structure is slated to be removed.

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3020645) at this website:

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

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

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

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

The applicant applied for early design guidance and met with the Design Review Board on September 21, 2015 and again on March 21, 2016 for the Recommendation meeting. The applicant applied for the Master Use Permit November 5, 2015.

Public Comment

Public comment letters were received during the official comment period. Comments focused on traffic and parking impacts to the neighborhood, screening and privacy issues for neighbors.

ANALYSIS AND DECISION –DESIGN REVIEW

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE

The design review packet which includes materials presented at the design review meeting is available online as noted above.

PUBLIC COMMENT

One member of the public was present at the meeting and offered no comments.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

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

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The priority Citywide and Neighborhood guidelines identified by the Board as Priority Guidelines are summarized below, while all guidelines remain applicable. For the full text please visit the [Design Review website](#).

CONTEXT & SITE

CS1 Natural Systems and Site Features: Use natural systems/features of the site and its surroundings as a starting point for project design.

CS1-B Sunlight and Natural Ventilation

CS1-B-1. Sun and Wind: Take advantage of solar exposure and natural ventilation. Use local wind patterns and solar gain to reduce the need for mechanical ventilation and heating where possible.

CS1-B-2. Daylight and Shading: Maximize daylight for interior and exterior spaces and minimize shading on adjacent sites through the placement and/or design of structures on site.

CS2 Urban Pattern and Form: Strengthen the most desirable forms, characteristics, and patterns of the streets, block faces, and open spaces in the surrounding area.

CS2-C Relationship to the Block

CS2-C-2. Mid-Block Sites: Look to the uses and scales of adjacent buildings for clues about how to design a mid-block building. Continue a strong street-edge and respond to datum lines of adjacent buildings at the first three floors.

CS2-D Height, Bulk, and Scale

CS2-D-1. Existing Development and Zoning: Review the height, bulk, and scale of neighboring buildings as well as the scale of development anticipated by zoning for the area to determine an appropriate complement and/or transition.

CS2-D-2. Existing Site Features: Use changes in topography, site shape, and vegetation or structures to help make a successful fit with adjacent properties.

CS2-D-5. Respect for Adjacent Sites: Respect adjacent properties with design and site planning to minimize disrupting the privacy of residents in adjacent buildings.

At the Early Design Guidance meeting the Board gave direction to the applicant to continue to study and develop the proposed concept of eroding the front building façade to lessen the built mass on the street and emphasized that an eroded building form would be a good fit at this midblock site. The Board thought that the idea had merit in order to create a better streetscape, fit better within the multifamily context, and to capture light and air at the site entryway. The Board

liked the idea that each unit would have at least two facades for operable windows to increase light and air in the units.

At the Recommendation meeting the Board approved of the broken block building form to create a more interesting building at this mid-block site. The Board thought that the “floating box” was an interesting feature which supplied energy, façade relief, and a unique shape to the project. The Board discussed the departure associated with the floating box. The proposal is for a one foot departure request at the west side setback over 18.5 linear feet. After discussion, the Board denied the departure request stating that it was not respectful to the adjacent site to have the box form closer to the property line. The Board approved the other varying facades.

PUBLIC LIFE

PL3 Street-Level Interaction: Encourage human interaction and activity at the street-level with clear connections to building entries and edges.

PL3-A Entries

PL3-A-1. Design Objectives: Design primary entries to be obvious, identifiable, and distinctive with clear lines of sight and lobbies visually connected to the street.

PL3-A-2. Common Entries: Multi-story residential buildings need to provide privacy and security for residents but also be welcoming and identifiable to visitors.

PL3-A-3. Individual Entries: Ground-related housing should be scaled and detailed appropriately to provide for a more intimate type of entry.

PL3-A-4. Ensemble of Elements: Design the entry as a collection of coordinated elements including the door(s), overhead features, ground surface, landscaping, lighting, and other features.

PL3-B Residential Edges

PL3-B-1. Security and Privacy: Provide security and privacy for residential buildings through the use of a buffer or semi-private space between the development and the street or neighboring buildings.

PL3-B-2. Ground-level Residential: Privacy and security issues are particularly important in buildings with ground-level housing, both at entries and where windows are located overlooking the street.

PL3-B-4. Interaction: Provide opportunities for interaction among residents and neighbors.

At the Early Design Guidance meeting the Board gave guidance to continue to develop the common entry and courtyard entries with attention to the pedestrian experience upon entering the site and balance with individual entries. Create privacy for individual entries and architectural wayfinding for the site entry. The ensemble of entry elements should be clear, unimposing, and create a natural flow from the right of way to individual units. Foster a sense of community via the entry experience and at the interior courtyard. The Board directed the applicant to design security gate(s) to be functional and transparent. Fences should blend with the project landscape context and serve their purpose inconspicuously.

At the Recommendation meeting the Board approved of the varying unit entries, courtyard design, and circulation. They pointed out the possible troublesome nature of the floating box unit windows and the open circulation walks and stairs, stating that there would be a constant visual intrusion into the floating box units. There was considerable discussion on how this might negatively affect the units as well as the project as a whole. The Board also discussed the

basement unit with a patio light well as its only source of natural light citing the unit as too dark and better suited for a storage unit. The Board encouraged the applicant to consider design solutions to ameliorate or correct these concerns, but did not condition the project on these issues. The Board felt the overall ensemble of architectural elements was pleasing and appropriate for the location.

DESIGN CONCEPT

DC2 Architectural Concept: Develop an architectural concept that will result in a unified and functional design that fits well on the site and within its surroundings.

DC2-A Massing

DC2-A-1. Site Characteristics and Uses: Arrange the mass of the building taking into consideration the characteristics of the site and the proposed uses of the building and its open space.

DC2-A-2. Reducing Perceived Mass: Use secondary architectural elements to reduce the perceived mass of larger projects.

DC2-B Architectural and Facade Composition

DC2-B-1. Façade Composition: Design all building facades—including alleys and visible roofs—considering the composition and architectural expression of the building as a whole. Ensure that all facades are attractive and well-proportioned.

DC2-B-2. Blank Walls: Avoid large blank walls along visible façades wherever possible. Where expanses of blank walls, retaining walls, or garage facades are unavoidable, include uses or design treatments at the street level that have human scale and are designed for pedestrians.

DC3 Open Space Concept: Integrate open space design with the building design so that they complement each other.

DC3-A Building-Open Space Relationship

DC3-A-1. Interior/Exterior Fit: Develop an open space concept in conjunction with the architectural concept to ensure that interior and exterior spaces relate well to each other and support the functions of the development.

DC3-B Open Space Uses and Activities

DC3-B-1. Meeting User Needs: Plan the size, uses, activities, and features of each open space to meet the needs of expected users, ensuring each space has a purpose and function.

DC3-B-2. Matching Uses to Conditions: Respond to changing environmental conditions such as seasonal and daily light and weather shifts through open space design and/or programming of open space activities.

DC3-B-3. Connections to Other Open Space: Site and design project-related open spaces to connect with, or enhance, the uses and activities of other nearby public open space where appropriate.

DC3-B-4. Multifamily Open Space: Design common and private open spaces in multifamily projects for use by all residents to encourage physical activity and social interaction.

DC3-C Design

DC3-C-1. Reinforce Existing Open Space: Where a strong open space concept exists in the neighborhood, reinforce existing character and patterns of street tree planting, buffers

or treatment of topographic changes. Where no strong patterns exist, initiate a strong open space concept that other projects can build upon in the future.

DC3-C-2. Amenities/Features: Create attractive outdoor spaces suited to the uses envisioned for the project.

DC4 Exterior Elements and Finishes: Use appropriate and high quality elements and finishes for the building and its open spaces.

DC4-A Exterior Elements and Finishes

DC4-A-1. Exterior Finish Materials: Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.

DC4-A-2. Climate Appropriateness: Select durable and attractive materials that will age well in Seattle's climate, taking special care to detail corners, edges, and transitions.

DC4-B Signage

DC4-B-1. Scale and Character: Add interest to the streetscape with exterior signs and attachments that are appropriate in scale and character to the project and its environs.

DC4-B-2. Coordination with Project Design: Develop a signage plan within the context of architectural and open space concepts, and coordinate the details with façade design, lighting, and other project features to complement the project as a whole, in addition to the surrounding context.

DC4-C Lighting

DC4-C-1. Functions: Use lighting both to increase site safety in all locations used by pedestrians and to highlight architectural or landscape details and features such as entries, signs, canopies, plantings, and art.

DC4-C-2. Avoiding Glare: Design project lighting based upon the uses on and off site, taking care to provide illumination to serve building needs while avoiding off-site night glare and light pollution.

DC4-D Trees, Landscape, and Hardscape Materials

DC4-D-1. Choice of Plant Materials: Reinforce the overall architectural and open space design concepts through the selection of landscape materials.

DC4-D-2. Hardscape Materials: Use exterior courtyards, plazas, and other hard surfaced areas as an opportunity to add color, texture, and/or pattern and enliven public areas through the use of distinctive and durable paving materials. Use permeable materials wherever possible.

During its initial review, the Board considered the project building forms and uses and directed the applicant to design the rear yard to serve as private open space for the basement units. They directed the applicant to create opportunity for the units to exit onto the open space as patio and garden features. This may cause a change in the amenity area calculations. The Board directed the applicant to review the amenity space requirements and if an additional departure is needed to articulate the departure request in the MUP and at the next design review meeting. The Board thought the interior courtyard was an interesting concept to further develop and to fully detail with the full palette of architectural and landscape elements. The courtyard should capture and reflect as much light as possible, be carefully lit to avoid light spillage and provide places to gather, include feature plantings and opportunities for a courtyard community to develop. Include balconies and small roof top balconies wherever possible. The rooftop amenity spaces should have railing or glass instead of solid walls for parapet enclosure to reduce the sense of

height and bulk. The Board directed the applicant to retain high quality materials as shown in the preliminary concepts.

At the Recommendation meeting the Board approved of the project massing with exception to the side setback departure needed for the floating box. They approved the façade designs and architectural composition as shown. They approved the open space courtyard and building entries and unit relationships to the open space. The Board felt the materials proposed will be appropriate as well as the signage and lighting plans. The Board approved the landscape plan.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board’s recommendation on the requested departure(s) will be based on the departure’s potential to help the project better meet these design guidelines priorities and achieve a better overall project design than could be achieved without the departure(s). The Board’s recommendation will be reserved until the final Board meeting.

SUMMARY OF REQUESTED DEPARTURES

At the time of the Recommendation four departures were requested.

	Standard Requirement	Required	Request	Rationale for Departure	Board Direction
1	SMC 23.45.518 Rear Setback	The Code requires 15 foot rear building setback.	12.5 inches building setback.	Shifting the building to the rear allows for the open courtyard in the middle of the site, variable bulk and scale. CS2B, D, PL1A.	Recommend Approval
2	SMC 23.45.518 Side setback	The Code requires 7 foot average and 5 foot minimum setback from the street lot line.	4 foot minimum for 18.5 linear feet and 8.5 feet average. Minimum variable setback from 4 feet to 1.5 feet.	The Floating Block is a design feature that breaks the façade line for better bulk and scale, legibility, façade composition and connection to the street. CS2B, D, PL1A, CS2C, CS2D, DC2C1	Recommend Denial based on the impacts to adjacent sites. CS2D5
3	SMC 23.45.527.B.1 Façade Length	The Code allow 65% of the property line or 69 feet 10 inches.	Additional 4 feet 10 inches for 74’ 8”.	The increase allows an open courtyard in the center of the site for better height bulk and scale, network of open spaces, interesting massing and architectural façade composition. CS2C, D PL1, A, 3A, DC2A, DC2B	Recommend Approval
4	SMC 23.45.522A.4. Amenity Area	Amenity at ground level shall be common space.	To allow amenity space to be over 4’ above grade.	To make better use of the rear setback area for residents with ground level units at the rear and shift the common amenity to the center courtyard. DC1, A2, DC3, B4, PL1 B3, PL1 C3.	Recommend Approval

Board Recommendation:

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design recommendation packet dated March 21, 2016 and the materials shown and described by the applicant at the Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design. In addition, the four (4) member Board supported three of the departure requests, rejected one departure request, and **recommended approval** of the design to the Director without conditions.

ANALYSIS AND DECISION –DESIGN REVIEW

The Director of Seattle DCI has reviewed the design and finds that it is consistent with the *Seattle design review guidelines*.

The project applicant is striving to create an infill residential building in the Ballard Hub Urban Village. The project makes use of the site topography as a starting point for the building massing by stepping the building down the site. (CS1-B). The proposed design strengthens the street pattern by presenting a strong façade along NW 65th Street which includes a side entry and modulated building forms all around. The main residential entry and building massing respond to the urban site context with defensible space and a large articulated entry courtyard (CS2-C, D).

The front façade has substantial glazing to create a strong connection to the street and public realm (PL3-A). Building fenestration has been designed and detailed to capture light and to help create a strong connection to the overall building community concept (DC3). In the building's courtyard the building is varied with open walkways and courtyard "box" units. The design uses secondary architectural elements to visually reduce the building scale (CS2-D).

Residential units are designed to be identifiable with large transparent glazing (PL3-C). Building uses are well sited for and light and air for residents (DC-2).

Departures were requested for rear setback, facade length, and amenity area, The Board recommended approval for the rear setback, façade length and amenity area departures. The Board recommended denial of the side setback request. The rear setback departure allows for the open courtyard in the middle of the site, helping to vary the bulk and scale. (CS2B, D, PL1A). The Floating Block in the courtyard is a design feature that breaks the façade line for better bulk and scale, legibility, façade composition and connection to the street and helps the project better meet guidance. (CS2B, D, PL1A, CS2C, CS2D, DC2C1)

The façade length departure request allows an open courtyard in the center of the site for better height bulk and scale, network of open spaces, interesting massing and architectural façade composition. (CS2C, D PL1, A, 3A, DC2A, DC2B). The amenity departure helps make better use of the rear setback area for residents with ground level units and shifts the common amenity to the center courtyard where it can be better used by all. (DC1, A2, DC3, B4, PL1 B3, PL1 C3). The Director will take the Board's recommendation and the departure for the side setback is denied, the other three are approved.

The Director determines that the project has satisfactorily responded to the early design guidance given by the Review Board. The Director approves the proposed project and grants three of four requested departures.

DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

The application is **GRANTED**.

ANALYSIS - SEPA

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

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated November 3, 2015 and annotated by the Land Use Planner. The information in the checklist, the supplemental information submitted by the applicant and the experience of the lead agency with the review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision.

The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665) 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 (SMC25.05.665) mitigation can be considered. Thus a more detailed discussion of some of the impacts is appropriate.

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 policies 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. Thus, a more detailed discussion of some of the impacts is appropriate. Short-term and long-term adverse impacts are anticipated from the proposal.

Short-term Impacts

Temporary or construction-related impacts are expected: 1) demolition and construction activities could result in the following adverse impacts; 2) construction dust and storm water runoff, temporary soil erosion, emissions from construction machinery and vehicles, increased particulate levels during excavation and construction, increased noise level, occasional disruption of adjacent

vehicular and pedestrian traffic, and a small increase in traffic and parking impacts due to construction workers' vehicles. These impacts are not considered significant because they are temporary and/or minor in scope (SMC 25.05.794).

City codes and/or ordinances applicable to the project such as: The Noise Ordinance, the Stormwater Code and Grading Code, the Street Use Ordinance, and the Building Code. The Street Use Ordinance includes regulations which mitigate dust, mud, and circulation. Temporary closure of sidewalks and/or traffic lane(s) is adequately controlled with a street use permit through the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT). Compliance with these applicable codes and ordinances will be adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation and further mitigation by imposing specific conditions is not necessary for these impacts.

The other short-term impacts not noted here as mitigated by codes, ordinances or conditions (e.g., increased traffic during construction, additional parking demand generated by construction personnel and equipment, increased use of energy and natural resources, increased greenhouse gas emissions) are not sufficiently adverse to warrant further mitigation or discussion.

Greenhouse gas emissions

Construction activities including construction worker commutes, truck trips, the operation of construction equipment and machinery, and the manufacture of the construction materials themselves result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant due to the relatively minor contribution of greenhouse gas emissions from this project.

Grading

Excavation to construct the residential structure will be necessary. The project will generate approximately 1,000 cubic yards of grading. The soil removed may be reused on the site and if not will be disposed of off-site. City code (SMC 11.74) provides that material hauled in trucks not be spilled during transport. The City requires that a minimum of one foot of "freeboard" (area from level of material to the top of the truck container) be provided in loaded uncovered trucks which minimize the amount of spilled material and dust from the truck bed enroute to or from a site. Future phases of construction will be subject to the same regulations. No further conditioning of the grading/excavation element of the project is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

Noise

Construction activities including construction workers arrival and departure, construction equipment and machinery, and general construction noise will occur. These impacts are not considered significant because they are temporary and/or minor in scope and are subject to the Seattle Noise Code. No conditioning of the noise during construction element of the project is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

Traffic and Parking

The construction of the project also will have adverse impacts on both vehicular and pedestrian traffic in the vicinity of the project site. During construction a temporary increase in traffic

volumes to the site will occur, due to travel to the site by construction workers and construction materials transport. Excavation and fill activity will require approximately 100 round trips with 10-yard hauling trucks or 50 round trips with 20-yard hauling trucks. No conditioning of the traffic and parking construction element of the project is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

Earth

The applicant will submit a geotechnical engineering study to address soil foundation support considerations, site preparation, grading erosion control and drainage recommendations as part of the building permit. Erosion control measures and BMP's as required by the City of Seattle will be incorporated into the project's erosion control and development plans to protect off-site properties and to manage stormwater during construction.

Review of the submitted report and approval of the resultant plans and construction methods will be subject to the standards of the Stormwater, Grading, and Drainage Control Code. No further mitigation for the purposes of SEPA compliance is warranted.

Long-term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are anticipated from the proposal: increased surface water runoff from greater site coverage by impervious surfaces; increased bulk and scale on the site; increased demand on public services and utilities; increased light and glare; loss of vegetation; and increased energy consumption. These long-term impacts are not considered significant because the impacts are minor in scope.

Transportation and Parking

No parking is required or proposed at this site in the Ballard Hub Urban Village. Additional traffic will impact the surrounding street network, but is not determined to be significant enough to require mitigation. The project is not expected to adversely affect intersection operations. No mitigation pursuant to SMC 25.05.675 R is warranted.

Greenhouse gas emissions

Operational activities, primarily vehicular trips associated with the project and the projects' energy consumption, are expected to result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant due to the relatively minor contribution of greenhouse gas emissions from this project.

Historic Preservation

In accordance with SEPA Historic Preservation Policy (SMC 25.05.675 H.2.c) the Department of Neighborhoods staff for the Landmarks Preservation Board reviewed buildings slated for removal on the project site. Based on the review, staff has determined that it is unlikely that the current buildings would meet the standards for designation as an individual landmark, due in large part to loss of historic materials and integrity. Staff determines no mitigation is required.

Other long-term impacts are typical of development and will be mitigated by the City's adopted codes and/or ordinances. Specifically these are: Stormwater and Grading Codes (stormwater runoff from additional site coverage by impervious surface); Design Review Program (height; setbacks; access to parking); and the Seattle Energy Code (long-term energy consumption); and the Environmentally Critical Area Regulations.

DECISION - SEPA

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

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

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

This DNS is issued after using the optional DNS process in WAC [197-11-355](#) and early review DNS process in SMC 25.05.355. There is no further comment period on the DNS.

CONDITIONS – DESIGN REVIEW

None.

CONDITIONS – SEPA

None.

Holly J. Godard, Senior Land Use Planner
Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

Date: June 16, 2016

HG:drm

K:\Decisions-Signed\3020645.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 Seattle DCI 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.