

City of Seattle

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of Checklist:

The State Environmental Policy Action (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

Instructions for Applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write “do not know” or “does not apply.” Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about permanent regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered “does not apply.” In addition, complete the Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions (part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words “project”, “applicant,” and “property or site” should be read as “proposal,” “proposer,” and “affected geographic area,” respectively.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

AN ORDINANCE relating to land use and zoning, amending Sections 23.41.012, 23.49.008, 23.49.009, 23.49.011, 23.49.014, 23.49.015, 23.49.019, 23.49.046, 23.49.056, 23.49.058, and Downtown Maps 1A, 1F, 1G, and 1H and Map 1D for 23.66.170 of the Seattle Municipal Code, to promote development adjacent to the downtown waterfront that will support the City's vision for transforming the waterfront into a major public amenity and to clarify other provisions in these Sections of the Code.

2. Name of applicant:

City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:

City of Seattle
Department of Planning and Development (DPD)
700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000, PO Box-34019
Seattle, Washington 98124-4019
Contact: Dennis Meier, 206-684-8270

4. Date checklist prepared:

April 26, 2013

5. Agency requesting checklist:

City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):

City Council consideration is expected to begin its review in the second quarter of 2013.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

The proposal is a non-project action that is not dependent upon any further action except approval by the City Council and Mayor.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

The information provided in this checklist.

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

This is a non-project action and does not relate to specific real property as assumed by the question. The proposal, if adopted, would modify development standards regulating projects and properties in several zones located within Downtown Seattle, particularly the DMC 160 zone. Currently, there is one project in this zone on a lot at the corner of University Street and Alaskan Way known to be in early design development. This project as yet has not filed permit applications. The amendments modify development standards in other downtown zones in which there may be projects with applications pending.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

Approval by Seattle City Council and Mayor of amendments to Seattle's Land Use Code.

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the site of the project. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

The Department of Planning and Development (DPD) is proposing to amend sections of the City's Land Use Code (SMC, Title 23) to encourage development that will complement the anticipated conditions and public facilities along the central waterfront. These facilities include a reconstructed Elliott Bay Seawall and a newly designed Alaskan Way surface street with a waterfront promenade and other complementary improvements in the area.

The chart in Attachment A summarizes the proposed amendments to the Land Use Code by section. In addition to amending sections to respond to anticipated changes related to waterfront redevelopment, limited changes

are also proposed to other downtown standards to generally clarify existing provisions. With the exception of the proposed change to Design Review authority, the amendments are to downtown zoning standards, with some emphasis on the DMC 160 zone along Alaskan Way, an area of less than 10 city blocks. In some cases, when the question asks about systems that are the same city-wide as they are downtown (for example, with respect to sewage systems, under the section titled Water, 3(b)(2)), the response is based on the city-wide system.

Most of the Code sections being amended are in Chapter 23.49 which governs Downtown development. However, one section being amended is 23.41 (Early Project Implementation). This section includes provisions relating to the City's Design Review Program and affects different parts of the City depending on the location of the project. The specific section being amended is 23.41.012 which lists development standards from which a "departure" may be requested by a project applicant.

SMC 23.41.012 authorizes the applicable Design Review Board to consider various departures for projects that participate in the Living Building or Deep Green Pilot programs. The Board is not required to grant any departure. The proposed amendment to this section removes the authority of the downtown Design Review Board to consider a request for a departure from FAR limits and from requirements for view corridor setbacks on designated view corridors.

The ordinance also proposes to remove the respective Design Review Board's authority to grant a FAR departure for lots zoned NC3/P and located within the Pike Place Overlay for projects that participate in the Living Building or Deep Green Pilot programs. (This is the Design Review Board that has review jurisdiction for the geographic area including Capitol Hill.) This Design Review Board has not been requested to grant such a FAR departure for any project participating in the Living Building or Deep Green Pilot programs.

For purposes of the disclosure in this checklist, these proposed amendments to 23.41.012 simply nullify specific aspects of the departure-granting authority of a Design Review Board. Removing this one aspect of a Board's authority is not considered to have any non-speculative impact upon the elements of the environment being assessed for SEPA impacts (SMC 25.05.740, 25.05.444). No project has ever requested such a departure from the Board with Capitol Hill jurisdiction, making a SEPA impact even more speculative. In any case, since a DNS was issued for the Code amendment (adopted as Ordinance 123206) that granted the

Board this authority, no impact is likely from removing that authority.

The remaining amendments propose specific changes to existing Downtown development standards. Most, but not all, of these are applicable to the DMC 160 zone; some of the proposed standards are conditional and some are mandatory. With a few exceptions the effect of adopting and applying the proposal, compared to the existing Code is modest. Only if a project is built under conditions where the proposed standard would apply would there be any non-speculative effect on the built environment and, concomitantly, the natural environment that the built environment affects.

Examples of these amendments with minimal potential impact are changing the list of allowed street-level uses (23.49.009), administrative edits to the TDR chart (23.49.014), correcting Code citations for internal consistency (23.49.015), providing additional authority to the Director of DPD to modify parking location and screening standards (23.49.019), limiting the length of unmodulated upper level street facades (23.49.058), and changes to adopted Downtown maps to reflect these and other proposed new standards on specific streets.

There are a few proposed amendments that have a potentially greater effect on new development and thus the built and natural environment in the DMC 160 zone. Although DPD's analysis shows less than five sites where any development is likely to occur (irrespective of whether the proposal is adopted), new development under the proposal could be at a greater density than allowed under the current Code. Therefore, the proposal, if adopted, has a potentially greater effect on the environment and that effect could happen at a faster rate than would be anticipated under the current Code. A balancing factor, however, is that this smaller group of amendments primarily affects the small geographical area in the DMC 160 zone. The area is less than 10 city blocks -- about 11 acres of developable land at most.

Of this small group of amendments with a potentially greater effect, the most significant proposal is to change the FAR¹ limits for the DMC 160 zone (SMC 23.49.011, FAR). The proposal could, if adopted, act as a relatively greater incentive to develop hotels (compared to other potential new uses). It is an incentive because it limits floor area above the base FAR to hotel use and increases the maximum FAR for hotel use from 7 FAR to 8 FAR. While these changes do not mandate that a hotel or any new structure be developed, adoption

¹ Abbreviated herein as "FAR".

of the proposal makes developing a hotel more likely than under current Code.

Amendments to SMC 23.49.011.B could add to this incentive by removing certain types of floor area from FAR calculations. Specifically, an exemption is proposed in the DMC 160 zone to exempt from FAR several new areas: those within a partially above-grade story on lots abutting Alaskan Way, the area occupied by parking provided at or above grade for hotel use, and the hotel floor area that visually separates parking areas on stories above the ground level. By removing these areas from FAR calculations, a new hotel in DMC 160 could theoretically achieve a FAR of 9, compared to the existing maximum of 7 FAR. However, for purposes of SEPA, this greater maximum FAR still represents only a relatively small potential impact. Within DMC 160, the largest lot of those likely to redevelop is 35,000 square feet. Thus, any new impact because of the incentivizing effect of the amendments, is about 70,000 square feet - based on a 2 FAR increase.

Although hotels may be more likely to develop if the proposal is adopted, they would not be more competitive than a residential use on the same lot. Residential use is not subject to a FAR limit, so the increased FAR potential for hotels would not affect the decision to build a residential project. Recent developments in the DMC 160 zone have been residential because, with no FAR limit, the development potential significantly exceeds any commercial project, including hotels.

Although hotels may be more favored under the proposed amendments, they would not likely displace other commercial uses, such as office or retail. Those uses could still find advantages to locating elsewhere in downtown.

In sum, the amendment may create a slightly greater advantage for hotels in DMC 160 compared to hotels on other downtown lots. This modest shift in market emphasis would be completely consistent with, and help implement, Comprehensive Plan goals for the city center and this zone in that hotels can encourage a lively, vibrant waterfront at the core of downtown. Focusing new growth downtown also helps implement Comprehensive Plan goals for the city as a whole.

Generally speaking, even under current Code, there may be locational advantages to downtown lots, making such lots relatively more attractive and /or more efficient places to develop than other parts of the region. Because of this, downtown lots may be more likely to develop more densely and/or more rapidly relative to lots in other zones. This type and/or pace of development is desirable in that it is consistent with growth management policies and principles in the City's Comprehensive Plan that encourage denser development in urban centers such as Downtown. As discussed in more detail in Part D and in Attachment B,

these amendments will help implement these and other Comprehensive Plan goals.

Another proposed amendment that has a potential effect on the built environment applies throughout downtown and not only DMC 160. That is to exempt from FAR calculations the floor area of a City facility, (except administrative office use floors) up to 50,000 square feet. This proposed change may make a faster pace of development of public sector structures more likely in downtown. However, the City does not expect any significant number of new public sector structures to use this new exemption.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT:

**EVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLY**

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

This is a non-project action. No direct impacts from this proposal are anticipated.

1. Earth

a. General description of the site (circle one):

**Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous,
other: _____**

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. However, as indicated above, the characteristics of earth vary significantly in downtown. For example, the earth in DMC 160 zone is generally flat, but the topography abruptly changes in the northern part of the zone, generally between Western and 1st Avenues.

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

This is a non-project action The question does not apply.

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. Soil conditions vary considerably throughout the urban Seattle area, typically including glacial till. No agricultural soil or prime farmland is present in the City. The DMC 160 zone includes fill soils and other materials above the former tidelands.

d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. Downtown zones include properties with some proximity to sloping bluff and former tideland with fill. Both of these suggest potential for soil instability during seismic events, but there are no significant indicators of actively unstable soils.

e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. No filling or grading is proposed.

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. The potential for erosion is based on the assumption of a site and there is no site for this proposal. Any potential for erosion as part of future development in the downtown zones affected by this proposal would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis.

g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?

This is a non-project action. There is no “site” as assumed by the question. Any potential for increased impervious surface will be evaluated on a project-by-project basis.

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

This is a non-project action. No measures are proposed.

2. Air

a. What type of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

This is a non-project action. No construction activity is contemplated and the question does not apply. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to any required environmental review and other regulatory requirements, including odor and emissions regulations.

b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. There is no “site” as assumed by the question.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. No measures are proposed. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to City codes, ordinances and any required environmental review.

3. Water

a. Surface:

1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. There is no site as assumed in the question. Downtown zones, including the DMC 160 zone, are located east of Elliott Bay. The western edge of the DMC 160 zone is the Alaskan Way right-of-way, which abuts the Urban Harborfront shoreline environment.

2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

This is a non-project action. The proposal will not require any work over water, construction or development activity.

3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. There is no site as assumed in the question and no fill or dredge material.

4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. The proposal does not require surface water withdrawals or diversion

5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. There is no site plan as assumed in the question. Downtown zones are not known to be within a 100-year floodplain, although much of the area within the DMC 160 zone is relatively low and is the site of former tidelands that were filled many decades ago.

6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

This proposal is a non-project action. The question does not apply. The proposal does not involve any discharge of waste materials to surface waters. .

b. Ground:

1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. This proposal does not require any withdrawal or discharge of water.

2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals... agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. There will not be any waste material discharged. The entire city of Seattle is served by a sewage system, generally with sewer mains. The proposed legislation will not change existing regulations applicable to septic tanks or waste material discharge.

c. Water Runoff (including storm water):

1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. The proposal will not generate any runoff or a need for collection and disposal.

2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. The proposal will not generate any waste materials.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, or runoff water impacts, if any:

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. No measures are proposed. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as any required environmental review.

4. Plants

a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. However, a variety of vegetative species can be found throughout Seattle, including parts of downtown, and are identified below.

- X deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other**
- X evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other**
- X shrubs**
- X grass**
- pasture**
- crop or grain**
- wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other**
- water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other**
- other types of vegetation**

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. No vegetation will be removed or altered.

c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. There is no site as assumed in the question. However, downtown does not contain any notable habitat for threatened or endangered plant species.

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. There is no site as assumed in the question and no such measures are proposed. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as any required environmental review.

5. Animals

a. Circle any birds and animals that have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. There is no site as assumed in the question. However, a variety of animal/bird species can be found in Seattle. The downtown area to which these amended regulations would generally apply is developed and is urban in character. Typical animals and birds to be found in the downtown area include rats, mice, seagulls, and other birds.

b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. There is no site as assumed in the question. Referring to the general Seattle area, Chinook salmon in Puget Sound are listed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act. Bald eagles are known to exist within the city limits.

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. There is no site as assumed in the question. No migration route is known, although potentially birds could use portions of the affected area, to the extent it is open and/or unpaved, or with vegetation.

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. No measures are proposed. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as any required environmental review.

6. Energy and Natural Resources

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. Areas generally within Seattle are served by electric and natural gas utilities. Any future development that might occur in the affected areas would be likely to use these sources of energy.

b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. The proposal would not affect the potential use of solar energy

c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. The proposal would not have any energy impacts and would not include any energy conservation features. No measures are necessary. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as any required environmental review.

7. Environmental Health

a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. The proposal will not create any environmental health hazards as described.

1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. No emergency services are required by this amendment. In general, emergency service providers including the Fire and Police Departments will review the effects of future development, including any development that is made possible by the proposed regulatory changes. Those Departments will propose enhanced services as necessary as part of their planning for future service needs, and/or specific protective needs for particular properties.

2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply.

b. Noise

1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment operation, other)?

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply.

2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from site.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply.

3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. No measures are proposed for this non-project action. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as any required environmental review.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?

This is a non-project action. The question, which assumes a "site", does not apply. However, the amendments proposed would generally apply to downtown zones, including DMC 160. Lots in these zones are developed with a wide mix of uses

at urban densities. These zones generally promote commercial development and also include a significant amount of residential development and public uses. The DMC 160 zone is the principal area affected by the proposed amendments and includes both sloping and flat areas near Elliott Bay but east of Alaskan Way. While much of the older development in this area is occupied by commercial uses, including office, hotel, parking, and retail uses, more recent projects have been predominantly for residential uses. Two utilities, Seattle Steam and a City Light Substation, are also located in the area.

b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.

This is a non-project action. The question, which assumes a “site”, does not apply. However, there are no indications of agricultural use of lands in the downtown area within the last one hundred years.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

This is a non-project action. The question, which assumes a “site”, does not apply. However, the DMC 160 zone is occupied by a mix of structures from many development periods, including old waterfront warehouse structures, most of which are now occupied by a variety of commercial uses. Recent developments include high-rise residential structures.

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. No structures are proposed to be demolished. In the DMC 160 zone, additional lots could be redeveloped in the future, although redevelopment opportunities are limited. Sites currently believed to be under consideration for redevelopment are currently used as surface parking lots.

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

This is a non-project action. The question, which assumes a “site”, does not apply. However, the proposal primarily affects parcels within the DMC160 zone. Other parts of the proposal would generally apply to Downtown zones. For example, proposed amendments to street-level use requirements would affect other Downtown zones, including DOC1 and DOC2, and other DMC zones.

f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

This is a non-project action. The question, which assumes a “site”, does not apply. However, the proposed changes to regulations would generally affect parcels located within the Downtown Urban Center. Parcels in the DMC 160 zone are

located within the Commercial Core Urban Center Village.

g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

This is a non-project action. The question, which assumes a “site”, does not apply. No changes are proposed to the shoreline master program. However, the DMC 160 zone is located near the edge of the Urban Harborfront shoreline environment. Should there be any differences or inconsistencies between underlying zoning regulations (including the proposed regulations if adopted) and the shoreline master program, the shoreline regulations would prevail.

h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify.

This is a non-project action. The question, which assumes a “site”, does not apply. However, mapping of the city's critical areas indicates liquefaction prone zones in the DMC 160 zone. Environmentally sensitive areas identified in other affected downtown zones include liquefaction areas, steep slope areas, and potential slide areas.

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply.

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. No measures are proposed.

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and project land uses and plans, if any:

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. No measures are proposed. The proposed Land Use Code amendments have been reviewed and found to be consistent with Comprehensive Plan policies and adopted neighborhood plans. (see Attachment B)

9. Housing

a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. Proposed changes in the DMC 160 zone may further increase the attractiveness of developing housing relative to other permitted uses in the zone.

b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. No units would be eliminated as a result of adopting the proposal.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. No measures are proposed.

10. Aesthetics

a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. There is no structure or material as assumed in the question. See also the response to question 10.b below.

b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. Future potential development of individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the City's codes and ordinances as well as any required environmental review. The proposal, if adopted, would not increase existing maximum heights, except for a five foot increase allowed in the DMC 160 zone if higher ground floor space is provided for street-level uses. Most blocks in the DMC 160 zone are subject to upper level view corridor requirements enacted in 1985 to address view issues, and no changes to these requirements are proposed.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. No measures are proposed. However, some of the proposed changes to development standards in

the DMC 160 zone are intended to promote aesthetics in various ways -- increasing the potential for a more attractive street-level environment, controlling the appearance of bulk and minimizing the visual impacts of parking located on above-grade levels by activating the street-facing facades. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as any required environmental review

11. Light and Glare

a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. The proposal will not produce any type of light or glare.

b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. The proposal will not produce any type of light or glare.

c. What existing offsite sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. There is no site as assumed by the question and thus there will not be any offsite source of light or glare.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. No measures are proposed. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as any required environmental review.

12. Recreation

a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. There is no site or "vicinity" as assumed in the question.

b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. The proposal would not displace any uses.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. No measures are proposed. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as any required environmental review.

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation

a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.

This is a non-project action. The question, which assumes a "site", does not apply. The proposal amends general development standards affecting several Downtown zones which may contain historic landmarks but does not change historic landmark regulations. The DMC 160 zone (located between the Pike Place Market Urban Renewal Area and the Pioneer Square Preservation District) contains several designated Landmark structures and groupings of such structures.

b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.

This is a non-project action. The question, which assumes a "site", does not apply. The proposal amends general development standards affecting several Downtown zones which may contain historic landmarks but the proposal does not change historic landmark regulations. Some structures in the DMC 160 zone have been evaluated for historic or architectural significance in a downtown Historic Resources Inventory. Designated Seattle landmarks in the zone include the Pacific Net and Twine Building, the Olympic Warehouse and Cold Storage Building, the National Building, the 1st Avenue Group/Waterfront Center Hotel Cecil and Globe Building, and the Colman Building. The original Federal Office Building is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. No measures are proposed. Any future development that this proposal makes possible will be required to comply with local, state, and national regulations that require mitigation of impacts on historic and cultural resources.

14. Transportation

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe the proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.**

This is a non-project action. The question, which assumes a “site”, does not apply. In general, the city is well-served by an urban street system.

- b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?**

This is a non-project action. The question, which assumes a “site”, does not apply. Generally, downtown Seattle is currently well-served by King County Metro, transit agencies for Snohomish and Pierce County, Sound Transit bus service and Sound Transit regional commuter rail facilities.

- c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?**

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. The proposal would not eliminate or create parking spaces. Future development proposals cannot be evaluated in terms of parking impacts at this stage, but will be required to meet any applicable parking requirements when City approvals are sought.

- d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).**

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. New development based on this proposal, if adopted, may require such improvements.

- e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.**

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. The proposal does not occur on a site or in the vicinity of transportation as assumed by the question.

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.**

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. The proposal will not generate vehicular trips.

- g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any.**

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. No measures are proposed. Future development projects will be subject to any required environmental review including any applicable transportation concurrency requirements.

15. Public Services

- a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.**

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. No new public services would be required. Projects made possible by these new regulations cannot be evaluated in terms of increased need for public services at this stage.

- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.**

This is a non-project action. The question does not apply. No measures are proposed.

16. Utilities

- a. Utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.**

This is a non-project action. The question, which assumes a “site”, does not apply. The listed utilities (except septic system) are currently available to the downtown zones, including DMC 160, that would be affected by the regulations if adopted. Individual projects developed pursuant to this proposal would be served, as would any project in Seattle, by utilities including electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, and sanitary sewer.

- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in immediate vicinity which might be needed.**

This is a non-project action. The question, which assumes a “site”, does not apply. In general, utility providers, such as Seattle City Light, Seattle Public Utilities, and Washington Natural Gas review probable future development needs, and propose enhanced services as necessary as part of their planning for future service needs.

C. Signature

Signature provided following section D below.

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS

(Do not use this sheet for project actions)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

- 1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?**

As a non-project action, the proposed amendments would not directly affect discharges to water, emissions to air (including greenhouse gas emissions [GHG]), production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances, or production of noise. Over time, individual future development projects that would be regulated by this proposal could occur. At this stage, their details are not known and cannot be precisely evaluated in terms of probable added amounts of the potential impacts identified in this question. Future projects in downtown zones will be subject to any required environmental review during the project review process.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

No proposed measures are proposed beyond existing regulations at this time because the proposal does not involve any construction or development activity. A SEPA GHG Emissions Worksheet is required for all individual projects that may use the provisions of

this proposal. Any potential impacts from GHG emissions will be addressed during review of future development proposals on a project-specific basis.

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

As a non-project action, adoption of the proposed amendments is unlikely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life. The area is developed and urban in character. The proposal does not alter existing protections to plants, animals, fish or marine life.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:

As a non-project action that does not involve any construction or development activity, no measures are proposed beyond existing regulations at this time. Existing regulations promulgated by the City and other regulatory agencies are designed to protect these resources. Standard requirements for directing site runoff on a site and controlling drainage on local streets would provide water quantity and/or quality control measures that would tend to avoid potential adverse impacts upon nearby resources and habitats in Elliott Bay.

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

As a non-project action, the proposed amendments would not affect energy or natural resources. The amended provisions are not expected to result in significantly greater future development density compared to that allowed under existing regulations. Thus there would be no significant increase in the consumption of energy and resources on a per-site basis.

The type of development contemplated by the proposal is consistent with City policies relating to energy and natural resources. Increasing the allowable density in the Downtown Urban Center encourages downtown development and is thus relatively more efficient in controlling energy consumption (e.g., employee and residents' commute trips) compared to development in more far-flung regional locations, which would require greater consumption of fuel resources for similar commute trips. The greater consumption of fuel can have concomitant and detrimental environmental impacts.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

No measures to protect or conserve energy are proposed beyond existing regulations for this non-project action.

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental

protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

As a non-project action, the proposed amendments would not affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated for government protection. Some lots in Downtown zones, including lots in the DMC 160 zone, are near, but not within, marine shoreline areas.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

No measures are proposed beyond existing regulations for this non-project action.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

The question is not applicable to this non-project action. No uses incompatible with existing plans would be allowed or encouraged by these amendments. The effect of the proposed changes to provisions in the DMC 160 zone would be to slightly increase the attractiveness of providing certain preferred uses in that zone, including hotel and residential use, to better complement future conditions anticipated as a result of public investment in waterfront redevelopment.

The proposal is consistent with existing plans and policies including the City's Comprehensive Plan and land use regulations implementing those policies and encouraging development in the Downtown Urban Center. Thus, the proposed amendments are not likely to have the potential for adverse impacts and, indeed, would encourage development that is consistent with well-accepted growth management principles. See also Attachment B to this checklist for a detailed comparison of the consistency of the amendments with the Comprehensive Plan goals for downtown.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and use impacts are:

The question is not applicable to this non-project action and no measures are proposed beyond existing regulations at this time. Future development projects would be subject to applicable required environmental review processes and subject to shoreline regulations. These review processes provide opportunities for analysis and imposition of measures that would mitigate adverse impacts, if any, of future development.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

The proposed non project action would not directly affect transportation or public services. The development capacity that would be allowed if the proposal is adopted would not significantly increase demands for transportation, public services or utilities.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

No measures other than existing regulations are proposed at this time. In general, providers of utilities and public services, including fire protection, police protection, health care, and schools regularly review the effects of increased development and propose enhanced services as necessary as part of their planning for future service needs. Future site-specific development projects will be required to meet any applicable concurrency requirements for transportation, utilities, and public services infrastructure.

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

No conflicts are identified or anticipated.

SIGNATURE:

I, the undersigned, state that to the best of my knowledge the above information is true and complete. It is understood that the lead agency may withdraw any declaration of non-significance that it might issue in reliance upon this checklist should there be any willful misrepresentation or willful lack of full disclosure on my part.

_____, 2013
Dennis Meier Date
Strategic Advisor I, City of Seattle
Department of Planning and Development

This checklist was reviewed by:

_____, 2013
Kristian Kofoed Date
Senior Urban Planner, City of Seattle
Department of Planning and Development

Attachment A:

Ordinance and Code Sections	Description of the proposed change
Chapter 23.41 EARLY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION	
Ord. Sec. 1 Code Sec. 23.41.012.D	<p>Under the current Code, projects that participate in the Living Building or Deep Green pilot programs can request a departure from various Land Use Code requirements through the design review program. DPD’s proposal would remove four different types of departures from the list of allowed departures. The effect of this change would be that applicants can not modify these standards through design review.</p> <p>The four departures that would no longer be allowed are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) downtown view corridor requirements, such as upper-level setbacks. 2) FAR limits on either (a) lots within Downtown zones, if those lots are regulated by floor area incentive provisions or (b) lots zoned NC3P within the Pike/Pine Conservation Overlay District 3) Structure height on lots within the Pike/Pine Conservation Overlay District, and 4) location and access to parking in downtown zones.
Chapter 23.49 DOWNTOWN ZONING	
Ord. Sec. 2 Code Sec. 23.49.008 Structure height	<p>This change would allow an additional 5 feet of height above the current 160 foot height limit in the DMC 160 zone if a minimum floor-to-floor height of 18 feet is provided for street-level uses.</p>
Ord. Sec. 3 Code Sec. 23.49.009 Street-level use req’ts	<p>This change would eliminate certain uses that qualify as street-level use requirements, including animal shelters, kennels, and sales and/service for automobiles or marinas. Other uses, such as arts and religious facilities, colleges, and building lobbies would now qualify as street-level uses. Building lobbies would be added as a qualifying use to address</p>

	<p>constraints on small lots with street-level uses required on multiple frontages.</p> <p>In addition, this section is amended so that the frontage required to be occupied by street-level uses is reduced to 50 percent, while the remaining 50 percent may contain other permitted uses and/or pedestrian or vehicular entrances. This greater flexibility would only apply if the street frontage is 120 feet in length or less. In addition, one of the following conditions has to be present: either the lot has no alley access, or the lot abuts more than one street requiring street-level uses.</p> <p>For required street level uses in DMC 160, an amendment is proposed that is a cross-reference to an amendment proposed for 23.49.056. This is essentially to ensure consistency in Code interpretation between the two sections. If a project takes the option for a greater setback of the street façade from the lot line that the amendment to 23.49.056 allows – up to 16 feet – then the setback allowed for required street level uses can be more than the typical 10 feet, e.g., the setback of those uses can match the choice of setback distance allowed by 23.49.056.</p>
<p>Ord. Sec. 4 Code Sec 23.49.011, FAR</p>	<p>In the DMC 160 zone, 23.49.011.A would specify new maximum FAR limit for different uses. The existing base (or minimum) of 5 FAR for non-residential uses would be retained. The maximum FAR (that is, the amount that could be gained through incentives) for all non-residential uses, except hotels, would be decreased from 7 to 5. The effect of this change is that only hotels could gain FAR above the base FAR. The maximum FAR that hotels could gain would be increased from 7 to 8.</p> <p>Another FAR-related change in DMC 160 is amending 23.49.011.B to include additional exemptions from the calculation of FAR. The new exemptions are:</p> <p>1) floor area within a partially above-grade</p>

	<p>story on lots abutting Alaskan Way, 2) parking accessory to hotel use meeting certain standards, and 3) hotel-related floor area that blocks the sight of parking from the street. This FAR exemption only applies to hotel floor area on stories above ground level.</p> <p>A separate proposal in the same Code section would apply throughout downtown. This proposal would exempt from FAR calculations the floor area of a City of Seattle facility, except office uses within that floor area, up to a maximum of 50,000 square feet.</p> <p>Another proposal that applies throughout downtown is to amend 23.49.011 (C) so that rooftop mechanical equipment is not included in FAR calculations.</p>
<p>Ord. Sec 5 Code Sec. 23.49.014 TDR</p>	<p>An amendment applying specifically to the DMC 160 zone would prohibit the within-block TDR. The required conditions for this kind of transfer do not exist for any lot zoned DMC 160.</p>
<p>Ord. Sec. 6 Code Sec. 23.49.015 Bonus residential floor area in DOC1, DOC2 and all DMC zones</p>	<p>This amendment to 23.49.015 only corrects citations to other sections amended by this ordinance. It has no additional substantive effect.</p>
<p>Ord. Sec. 7 Code Sec. 23.49.019 Parking quantity, curb cut location and access requirements, and screening and landscaping of parking areas</p>	<p>This amendment only applies to the DMC 160 zone. Section 23.49.019.B.2 regulates the location and screening of parking. Generally, parking should either be provided below-grade, or above the street-level if it is separated from the view of pedestrians by other uses to address impacts on the street environment. Current Code allows for some flexibility in the standards for smaller lots. However, even for these smaller lots, there are limits on the number of stories of parking that can be provided above-grade. The Director of DPD has discretion under the current Code to modify these requirements, but only if the lot on which the development is proposed is either 30,000</p>

	<p>square feet <u>or</u> less in area OR less than 150 feet in depth.</p> <p>This amendment responds to the unique conditions along Alaskan Way, where there are key blocks for redevelopment zoned DMC 160 that are exactly 150 feet in depth <u>and</u> greater than 30,000 square feet in area. The Director has no discretion to modify the separation standards for lots with these dimensions. Additional Director discretion would help in encouraging appropriate development and recognizing the unique conditions of these key lots. Because of the area’s high water table conditions, parking for development on these lots will likely need to be above grade. Thus DPD is proposing a change to the dimensional requirements to include blocks that are <u>exactly</u> 150 feet in depth (or less), not only blocks that are <u>less</u> than 150 feet in depth.</p> <p>The proposal makes changes to several other standards in this section. These changes would only apply to certain lots within the DMC 160 zone. In the rest of downtown, the use that “separates” parking from the street has to occupy at least 30 percent of the street frontage for stories above the third story. In the DMC 160 zone, for lots that abut Alaskan Way, the “separating” uses would be required under the proposal for the entire length of the façade facing Alaskan Way. In addition, these separating uses are defined more specifically. The uses on these lots must be residential, lodging, office, retail sales, entertainment, or a restaurant or bar.</p> <p>For other street frontages in the DMC 160 zone (not facing Alaskan Way, that is), the proposal maintains the existing minimum requirement that 30 percent of each street frontage be occupied by a “separating” use. However, instead of only applying above the third story, the separation would be required for <u>all</u> stories</p>
--	---

	<p>above the first story. In addition, for the shallow blocks along Western Avenue, the Code would allow more flexibility by reducing the number of street frontages requiring separating uses.</p> <p>A further amendment in this section, applicable only to DMC 160 lots, is the nature of the screening that is provided -- where separation by another use is <u>not</u> required. In the rest of downtown, the required screening can be an opaque wall at least 3.5 feet high. In the DMC 160 zone, screening would need to be provided by the façade of the building. This more extensive screening would better integrate the parking levels into the design of the structure, blocking the glare of automobile lights that could affect the pedestrian’s view of the building.</p> <p>Finally, additional considerations are proposed to guide Director decisions for locating curb cuts that allow vehicular access to a lot. Generally, in downtown zones, the Directors of DPD and SDOT can allow curb cuts based on a hierarchy of streets with curb-cuts generally discouraged for streets with an intense pedestrian character. the . Current Code also allows the Directors of DPD and SDOT to grant a curb cut that would not follow this hierarchy if factors such as safety and traffic queuing are of sufficient weight. The proposal would add to that list of factors whether the location of the curb cut would improve the safety of hotel guests loading or would increase the visibility of vehicular access for hotel guests.</p>
<p>Ord. Sec. 8 Code Sec. 23.49.046 DOC 1, DOC 2, and DMC conditional uses</p>	<p>Principal use parking garages are only allowed as “administrative conditional uses” in downtown – since these uses can sometimes deaden an otherwise lively street. The Director of DPD has the discretion to conditionally grant these uses based on factors such as pedestrian circulation and transit access. For developments in DMC 160, a new factor is</p>

	<p>added for the Director’s discretionary consideration: whether the visual impacts of parking are adequately addressed through screening or separation by other uses.</p>
<p>Ord. Sec. 9 Code Sec. 23.49.056 DOC 1, DOC 2, DMC street facade, landscaping and street setback requirements</p>	<p>SMC 23.49.056 addresses multiple standards that help shape how a building relates to the street and to the people on the street. These standards include minimum facade heights, facade transparency, blank facade limits, street trees and maximum limits on setbacks.</p> <p>A “limit on setbacks” means that buildings on some downtown streets are required to have their front façade within a certain distance from the lot line. If the façade is set back too far, the vacant space next to the street may suffer from a lack of activity.</p> <p>SMC 23.49.056 provides for different maximum setbacks of street facades based on the pedestrian classification of the street. downtown areas with well established street facades are generally required to provide property line facades. These only allow very limited setbacks from the street. Given the established development pattern, the amendments propose to include Alaskan Way and Western Avenue within the DMC 160 zone as streets that require property line facades (see Map 1H).</p> <p>The amendment proposed to 23.49.056 creates an exception to the standards for property line setbacks to address a unique condition for the buildings along Alaskan Way in the DMC zone. Alaskan Way was originally called “Railroad Avenue” because the main railway lines ran along the waterfront, with sidings provided to serve the loading docks of warehouses along Alaskan Way. These railroad sidings were eventually abandoned, and, as the railroad right-of-way was vacated, it became part of the property owned along</p>

	<p>with the adjacent buildings and loading docks.</p> <p>This is the current condition along Alaskan Way that the urban design vision for the waterfront has taken into account. Like some other Northwest cities -- Portland and Vancouver, B.C. – the historic urban fabric that included loading dock space can be re-purposed to accomplish the urban design vision. The property line façade standards would be modified for lots along Alaskan Way in the DMC 160 zone to allow the street façade of a new structure to set back as much as 16 feet from the Alaskan Way street lot line, to match the setbacks of existing structures. The project must provide specific uses to gain this extra setback area. Examples are outdoor uses – such as street cafés that extend a restaurant in the abutting building – or a widened sidewalk in front of the building, or landscaped open space, or a partially above-grade story with a raised platform, similar to the historic loading docks, that accommodates outdoor uses on the raised setback area.</p> <p>A complementary amendment to 23.49.009 allows the setback of required street level uses from the street façade to match the depth of the setback allowed by this proposed exception. Thus, if (under 23.49.056) a 16 foot setback is chosen by the developer, then 23.49.009 allows a matching setback is allowed for the required street level uses Without this complementary amendment, the two sections could conflict if the developer chooses a 16 foot setback under 23.49.056 but is limited to a 10 foot setback under 23.49.009.</p>
<p>Ord. Sec. 10 Code Sec. 23.49.058 DOC 1, DOC 2, and DMC upper-level development standards</p>	<p>23.49.058.B: amended to require modulation in a DMC 160 zone for facades above 60 feet in height, instead of the current 85 feet, and to reduce the length of unmodulated facades from 155 feet to 125 feet.</p>

	<p>23.49.058.C: amended to include a maximum width provision for upper-level facades in the DMC 160 zone.</p> <p>23.49.058 E: amended to clarify conditions in DMC zones where tower spacing is not required.</p> <p>23.49.058 F: amended to remove requirements for green street setbacks in DMC zones along streets designated as view corridors with view corridor setback requirements.</p>
<p>Ord. Sec .11 Code Sec. Downtown Maps</p>	<p>Map 1A: amended to show the correct eastern boundary of the DMC 160 zone. Maps 1F, 1G, and 1H: amended to apply development standards to some street frontages to enhance the pedestrian environment and support conditions desired for the waterfront area. These standards include a more intensive Pedestrian street classification, expanded street-level use requirements, and property-line facades.</p>
<p>Ord. Sec. 12 Code Sec. 23.66.170 Parking and access</p>	<p>Map D for 23.66.170: amended to make two changes. Map D shows both pedestrian street designations and also SDOT’s street classifications combined for streets within the Pioneer Square Special Review District. The first change is to be consistent with the proposed changes to Map 1F which will show Alaskan Way and Railroad Way as Class 1 Pedestrian Streets, not Class II Pedestrian Streets. The second change corrects the arterial designation of Alaskan Way as a minor arterial, so that Map D would show the correct designation of “principal arterial.”</p>

Attachment B:

Consistency of the Proposed Amendments with Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies

Urban Village Element

UVG13 Promote physical environments of the highest quality, which emphasize the special identity of each of the city’s neighborhoods, particularly within urban centers and villages.

Comment: Many of the proposed amendments are intended to promote a quality urban environment in the DMC 160 zone adjacent to the improved waterfront environment that will exist after the Viaduct is removed.

Land Use Element

LU38 Establish standards for screening and landscaping appropriate to each zone to minimize the impact of new development on the surrounding neighborhood, on the streetscape, on the natural environment and on areas with less intensive zoning.

Comment. Proposed amendments to 23.49.019 call for improved screening and separation of parking located at or above-grade in new structures. These new requirements will minimize visibility and help activate a pedestrian street environment.

LU177 Use a range of downtown land use zones to support the existing character and desired environment of different areas downtown.

Comment: Many of the proposed amendments tailor provisions of the DMC 160 zone to better guide new development to achieve desired conditions in the area along the redeveloping waterfront, where the zone currently applies.

Neighborhood Plan Element: Downtown

DT-G4 Use regulations in the Land Use Code and other measures to encourage public and private development that contributes positively to the downtown physical environment by:

1. enhancing the relationship of downtown to its spectacular setting of water, hills and mountains;
2. preserving important public views;

3. ensuring light and air at street-level and in public parks;
4. establishing a high quality pedestrian oriented street environment;
5. reinforcing the vitality and special character of downtown's many parts;
6. creating new downtown parks and open spaces at strategic locations;
7. preserving downtown's important historic buildings to provide a tangible link to the past;
8. adequately mitigating impacts of more intensive redevelopment on the quality of the physical environment.

Comment. Proposed amendments to standards in Sections 23.49.056 and 23.49.058 will enhance the pedestrian environment by more rigorous street-level and upper level development standards. New development will reinforce the positive changes expected in the area as a result of public investment in the redevelopment of the waterfront as a major downtown amenity. Amendments to the Downtown Maps (Pedestrian Street Classifications (Map 1F), Street-Level Uses Required (Map 1G), and Property Line Facades (Map 1H)) will reflect the higher quality of pedestrian environment desired in the area.

DT-G7 Encourage a mix of housing, employment and related support activities in a crescent bounding the office and retail cores. Within this crescent, foster areas that are predominantly residential in character, including the Chinatown/International District and Belltown. Encourage housing as the primary use in these area and limit the type and scale of non-residential uses allowed to ensure that such development is compatible with a residential neighborhood.

Use the adopted policies of neighborhood plans for the five downtown urban villages for further guidance in defining the appropriate mix of activities to accommodate downtown growth targets for employment and housing, and to meet neighborhood development objectives, including identifying areas which are to be predominantly residential in character.

Comment. Proposed adjustments to permitted FAR in Section 23.49.011 are intended to achieve a compatible mix of residential and non-residential development, with emphasis on housing and hotel use, to promote a mix of activity that will enliven the waterfront and reinforce a unique neighborhood identity, consistent with the goals COM G1 and COM G2 for the Commercial Core neighborhood (see below).

DT-G8 Encourage revitalization of the Harborfront in order to strengthen maritime activities, maintain historic characteristics, and enhance opportunities for public access, consistent with the shorelines goals and policies established in the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element.

Comment. Many of the proposed amendments are specifically directed at enhancing the pedestrian environment in the area and improving connections to the waterfront area west of the DMC 160 zone.

DT-LUP4 Use downtown land use district classifications to specify the intended function of an area and guide future development and change. Recognize certain areas characterized by a specific activity and intensity of development, such as the office and retail cores, and consider the factors critical to the success of that activity, such as access to transportation, topographic conditions, or the presence of a particular amenity....

DOWNTOWN MIXED COMMERCIAL (DMC)

Areas adjacent to the office core, office expansion areas and retail core that provide a transition in the level of activity and scale of development. Areas designated DMC are characterized by a diversity of uses. The DMC land use district is intended to:

- permit office and commercial use, but at lower densities than in the office areas;
- encourage housing and other uses generating activity without substantially contributing to peak hour traffic; and
- promote development diversity and compatibility with adjacent areas through a range of height limits.

Comment. The proposed changes to the DMC 160 zone are consistent with the intended function and conditions specified for DMC zones in general.

Urban Design Policies

DT-UDP6 Employ development standards that guide the form and arrangement of large buildings to reduce shadow and wind impacts at the street-level, promote a human scale, and maintain a strong physical relationship with the pedestrian environment. In areas where consistency of building form is important to maintaining an identifiable character and function, regulate building bulk to integrate new and existing development.

Limit the bulk of tall buildings in residential areas to provide for light, air and views at street-level and reduce the perceived scale of the buildings.

Vary development standards to reduce impacts of large-scale buildings by district consistent with the desired scale and development pattern in the area.

Comment. Changes to the upper level development standards in 23.49.058 are intended to enhance building form in the DMC 160 zone. Specifically, the adjustments to modulation requirements for the upper level facades of structures

will provide more consistency among the various development standards that affect the massing of the upper portions of structures in the area, and also promote conditions that are more compatible with existing development patterns and the desired scale of development.

DT-UDP10 As appropriate for each land use district and type of street environment desired, maintain a strong relationship between buildings and the sidewalk environment through specific street-level development standards. The standards are intended to:

1. make streets enjoyable and pleasant places to be;
2. provide visual interest for pedestrians;
3. provide a comfortable sense of enclosure along the street;
4. integrate individual buildings within the streetscape;
5. bring the activity occurring within buildings into direct contact with the street environment;
6. provide strong edges to clearly define public open spaces; and
7. ensure adequate conditions to support higher density development occurring on abutting properties.

Address through street-level development standards the major components of the streetscape. Consider regulating or requiring features including:

1. street walls,
2. facade transparency,
3. blank wall limitations,
4. overhead weather protection,
5. street landscaping, and
6. screening of parking.

Coordinate street-level development standards with the Pedestrian Street Classification System, established by Policy T 10: Street Classification System. Vary standards according to the classification of the street to reflect the predominant character of the area and the street's relative importance to pedestrian circulation.

Where appropriate, allow flexibility necessary to accommodate desirable public amenities by exempting street frontages occupied by public open space meeting the criteria for bonused open space amenities from street-level development standards that might otherwise be in conflict.

Comment. The proposed amendments would better achieve the above policy by adjusting the street-level development standards in Section 23.49.056, the

street-level uses standards in 23.49.009, and Maps 1F, 1G, 1H to promote the higher quality pedestrian environment desired to support investment in transforming the adjacent waterfront into a major public amenity.

DT-UDP11 Regulate uses at street-level in certain areas in order to generate pedestrian interest and activity in conformance with policies for the pedestrian environment. Promote street-level uses to reinforce existing retail concentrations, enhance main pedestrian links between areas, and generate new pedestrian activity where appropriate to meet area objectives without diluting existing concentrations of retail activity.

Promote active and accessible uses at the street-level of new development where it is important to maintain the continuity of retail activity.

Consider measures to promote street-level space of adequate size and sufficient flexibility to accommodate a variety of retail and service activities. Encourage incorporation, as appropriate, of street-level uses as part of open space public amenity features provided for a floor area bonus to promote activity and increase public use of these spaces.

To encourage active and accessible street-level uses throughout downtown, consider appropriate exemptions of these uses from floor area limits.

Comment. The proposed amendments to Section 23.49.009 are intended to execute this policy consistent with the changed conditions anticipated in this area abutting the redeveloped waterfront and also promote more active street-level uses where these are required throughout downtown.

Transportation

DT-TP10 Classify downtown's streets according to the desired functional relationships of the various uses of the right-of-way. Through this classification system, integrate multiple vehicular and pedestrian needs, minimize modal conflicts, reflect and seek to do the following: reinforce adjacent land use, and provide a basis for physical changes and improvements. Use this system as a guide to identify and prioritize capital improvements and operating changes.

Classify downtown streets under categories addressing three primary functions:

1. traffic function,
2. transit function, and
3. pedestrian function.

Traffic Classification. Classify downtown streets according to the arterial street classifications of the Seattle Comprehensive Transportation Program (SCTP). The primary intent of this system is to promote vehicular use of streets that is consistent with Policy T4: Vehicular Access and Circulation Improvements.

Transit Classification. Classify downtown streets according to the transit street classifications of the SCTP. Use these classifications to coordinate improvements to the street right-of-way and abutting development so that high volumes of buses occur on streets with adequate sidewalk space for waiting riders.

Pedestrian Classification. Establish pedestrian classifications for all downtown streets. The primary intent of this classification system is to coordinate improvements to the street right-of-way and abutting development to comfortably and safely accommodate anticipated pedestrian volumes and reinforce desired conditions for pedestrian circulation consistent with the Urban Design policies. Designate each downtown street according to the following categories and functions:

- **Class I:** High volume pedestrian activity street providing a major link in downtown pedestrian circulation.
- **Class II:** Moderate pedestrian activity street providing a secondary link in the pedestrian circulation system.
- **Green Street:** Link in pedestrian circulation system and element of open space bonus system.

Comment. Proposed amendments to Map 1F, Pedestrian Street Classifications would reclassify portions of Western Avenue and Alaskan Way from Class II to Class I Pedestrian Streets. These designations better reflect the anticipated increase in pedestrian volumes along these streets and the desired improvements to the character of the pedestrian environment.

Neighborhood Plan Element: Commercial Core

COM-G1 Maintain the Commercial Core as a major employment center, tourist and convention attraction, shopping magnet, residential neighborhood, and regional hub of cultural and entertainment activities.

COM-G2 Promote a unique neighborhood identity for the Commercial Core.

Comment. Proposed amendments to adjust the mix of uses encouraged in the DMC 160 zone in Section 23.40.011 will help to promote the mix and diversity of activity desired in this area and the Commercial Core overall. Amendments

related to development standards in the zone are intended to reinforce the unique identify of the neighborhood.

COM-P5 Guide development and capital projects throughout the entire Downtown area through development of a unified urban design strategy that provides a vision for new public facilities, waterfront connections, pedestrian environments, transit linkages and open space.

COM-P9 Seek to improve the pedestrian qualities of streets and public spaces.

COM-P10 Seek to enhance pedestrian connections between the Commercial Core and other neighborhoods.

Comment. Proposed amendments specifically focus on enhancing the pedestrian environment and improving connections between the DMC 160 zone and the waterfront, as well as other adjacent neighborhoods.