

Amendment 1 Version 1 to CB 121048 Interim Design Review

Sponsor: Councilmember Solomon

Allowing all applicants to utilize administrative design review

Effect: This amendment would allow applicants who choose to be reviewed pursuant to design review to elect to go through the administrative design review (ADR) process rather than the full design review (FDR) process, even if the project meets applicability thresholds for FDR.

Most mixed use projects in urban centers would be reviewed under FDR, whereas smaller multifamily projects would typically go through ADR.

The primary differences between FDR and ADR are as follows:

- In the FDR process, the Early Design Guidance (EDG) meeting is a public meeting incorporating Design Review Board participation; in the ADR process, the EDG meeting is only with staff, and is not a public meeting.
- FDR includes a second public meeting called the Recommendation Meeting, which occurs after MUP application and reviews but before a MUP decision. Public comment is accepted in person at this meeting (and written comment is accepted throughout the design review process). ADR does not include a Recommendation Meeting, nor any in-person public comment opportunity (although written public comments are accepted throughout the process as in FDR).

Through this amendment, larger projects that would be reviewed under FDR should they elect to go through design review would have the option to instead utilize ADR. This would provide a more streamlined design review process for those projects. Since HB 1293 requires that design review processes have no more than one public meeting, the ADR process may better fit that intention in the interim given that it includes no public meetings, whereas FDR includes two public meetings.

While all design review is made optional through the transmitted legislation, the design review process is the only way for development project applicants to be granted departures from development standards such as floor area or setbacks. Therefore, it is generally expected that applicants, particularly applicants for the larger projects that would be subject to FDR, may choose to go through the design review process for the purpose of seeking and being granted a departure.

Departures are ultimately decided by the SDCI Director. For those projects choosing to utilize ADR instead of FDR, SDCI would be making departure decisions utilizing professional expertise and written public comment without input from design review boards.

Amend Section 1 of CB 121048 as follows:

Section 1. Section 23.41.004 of the Seattle Municipal Code, last amended by Ordinance 127100, is amended as follows:

23.41.004 Applicability

* * *

F. Interim suspension of required design review for all proposed development

1. Notwithstanding any contrary provision of this Title 23 and Title 25, including but not limited to Chapters 23.40, 23.41, 23.42, 23.45, 23.47A, 23.48, 23.49, 23.57, 23.58B, 23.58C, 23.60A, 23.61, 23.73, 23.76, 25.05, 25.11, 25.16, 25.20, and 25.22, required design review is temporarily suspended for all proposed development.

2. Applicants of proposed development that is being reviewed pursuant to the full, administrative, or streamlined design review process as of the effective date of this ordinance may elect to continue review under the design review process or withdraw the proposed development from the design review process. Applicants of all other proposed development may elect, at any time during the effective period of this ordinance, their proposed development be reviewed pursuant to the full, administrative, or streamlined design review process. Applicants with projects meeting the thresholds for full design review pursuant to Section 23.41.004.A that elect to continue review, or elect review, under the design review process may choose administrative design review.

3. The provisions of this subsection 23.41.004.F shall be in effect for six months from the effective date of this ordinance.