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**November 17, 2022** Project: 200 Taylor Ave North

10:30 am – 12:00 am Type: Alley Vacation

Phase: Public Trust

Previous Reviews: Pre-petition review – September 1, 2021

Presenters: Ryan Bussard, Design Director, Principal – Perkins&Will (Architect)

Attendees: Brad Rock, Director of Development – BioMed Realty (Owner)

John Moshy, Vice President of Development – BioMed Realty (Owner)

Kelsey Blommer, Senior Project Manager - OAC Services (CM Consultant)

Drew Graham, Director - OAC Services (CM Consultant)

Christa Wood, Senior Project Architect – Perkins&Will (Architect)

Tony DeEulio, Senior Project Designer – Perkins&Will (Architect)

Jason Henry, Principal - Berger Partnership (Landscape Architect)

Jordan Zlotoff, Associate - Berger Partnership (Landscape Architect)

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary (land use counsel)

Katie Kendall, McCullough Hill Leary (land use counsel)

**Recusals and Disclosures**

Vinita disclosed that BMR is a client of her firm Site Workshop, although she is not working on any of their projects.

**Project Description**

200 Taylor Ave. N is a proposed full block development for new biomedical offices that includes one 9 story and one 8-story building with underground parking for approximately 400 vehicles. The site, bounded by Taylor Ave. N. to the west, Thomas Street to the north, 6th Ave N. to the east, and John Street to the south, comprises five existing tax parcels The site is currently developed with a hotel structure built in 1979; three office buildings built in 1959, 1961, and 1962; and two surface parking lots. The site slopes downward southwest to northeast approximately fourteen feet. All the existing structures will be demolished.

****



The proposal requires the vacation of a north/south alley that runs between John Street and Thomas Street. Automobile and truck access will occur in a single 22-foot wide curb cut on John Street, in a location that is at or near the southern terminus of the current alley. A key feature of the proposed project is a diagonal pedestrian path connecting Thomas and John Streets.

**Meeting Summary**

As required by Council alley and street vacation policies, the Seattle Design Commission reviewed the implications of the vacation of the alley, called Public Trust. The Commission evaluated the loss of the alley and its implications on the remaining rights of way. As a result of this review, the Commission asked for more information about the loss of the alley on the functions of the remaining rights of way. A summary of the requested additional information is below.

**Agency Comments**

SDOT is conceptually supportive of the alley vacation due to the benefit of removing vehicles from Thomas St to support the Thomas Street reimagined project. SDC conditioned this support on the requirement that all vehicle access, including for any service or solid waste vehicles, be provided from a single curb cut on John St accessing a below-grade parking structure with sufficient space for vehicle turnaround.

SDOT does not view the right of way improvements the applicant is proposing as “above and beyond” the standard code requirement for the development, so they would not constitute public benefit.

**Public Comments**

None

**Summary of Commission Discussion and Recommendations**

The Commission focused their review and comments on four issues:

* The diagonal pedestrian connection running through the site
* Open spaces created as part of the project
* A comparison of proposed development that could occur with or without the vacation (no-vacation/vacation)
* The scope of public engagement

1. Diagonal Connection

Overall, the commissioners seem to support the diagonal connection through the site. However, they would like to see more analysis supporting the need to move pedestrians that are not associated with the building function or identity from the public realm to this feature. Their concerns include:

* Is it necessary?
* Is it the right move – should we be moving people off the street and into interior. What are the benefits of this?
* Is it effective?
* Who will use it?
* Why will they use it?

1. Public Spaces

* What is the program of these spaces and how is the design detail supporting the program
* Are these spaces meant for gathering, rest, etc. or are they merely meant as pass through spaces to access opposite side of site, corners of site, etc?
* How will the general public use these spaces or are the spaces designed for building tenants and users?
* Commissioners are concerned that the internal spaces meant as public access through the site will not be used by the public.

1. Alley vs. No Alley Vacation Comparison – Commissioners would like to see a more robust illustration of the no alley vacation option, so a true comparison can be made. The no alley vacation option should show the baseline for the improvements to public spaces and ROW, and the alley vacation option should show improvements to those baselines.
2. Public engagement

* Additional information is needed on outcomes from initial public engagement, including demographics of the communities that will benefit.
* Additional work should occur to expand outreach and engagement to a more diverse population than would be represented by the Uptown Alliance, including in-person engagement with nearby residential properties.