

Design Review Board (DRB) Process Preliminary Plat and PUD Application File No. Z18-598PPUD

The following is a summary of the DRB review process for the referenced file:

1. The design review process is required for PUD applications under the provisions of SMC 17.G.060.170 (Land Use Application Procedures- Decision Criteria). Subsection D.4.b provides as follows:

“Architectural and Site Design.

The proposed development has completed the design review process and the design review committee/staff has found that the project demonstrates the use of innovative, aesthetic, and energy efficient, architectural and site design.”

2. The review of PUD applications by the DRB has been a rare occurrence. City staff told the applicant during the process that since the most recent PUD ordinance (adopted in 2006) this is the first time in 12 years that the DRB reviewed a PUD application. This led to some confusion in the DRB review process, as the DRB is normally reviewing building architectural plans. **In this instance the review was of the PUD site plan.**
3. **The DRB review is a two-stage process. Stage 1 is a “collaborative workshop” format** where the applicant presents the design concept and both the public and the DRB provide input to the applicant on important issues that should be considered. **This stage occurs before the application can be filed. This allows both public and DRB concerns to be addressed in the permit application.** During this workshop meeting, held on April 25, 2018, the applicant presented two alternate design concepts for consideration. One included an extension of Crestline thru the project and one did not extend Crestline beyond the current termination at 32nd Avenue. **The vast majority of public comment and the comments by DRB members favored the site plan option that did not extend Crestline.** As part of the summary report filed by the DRB after the workshop meeting they requested a site plan that would protect trees and “urban forest” resources on the site.
4. The second DRB meeting was held on June 13, 2018. **This is the “recommendation meeting” where the DRB formally adopts recommendation on the design to be forwarded to the review authority,** in this case the Hearing Examiner. The applicant submitted to the DRB for final review a detailed site plan that did not extend Crestline. **The site plan submitted was based upon public comment, DRB members’ advice during the workshop session, and the applicant’s judgment that this plan best advances the vision of the City Comprehensive Plan and the Lincoln Height Neighborhood Plan.** Further public comments were received at this meeting. The vast majority of the public comment at the DRB meeting supported the submitted site plan. **After considerable discussion, which considered the staff testimony that Crestline was necessary automobile “connectivity” in the area, the DRB recommended approval of the site**

plan. This recommendation was based upon the DRB desire to place a priority on pedestrian infrastructure and connectivity, preserving open space and protecting significant urban forest resources on the site. This is evidenced in the DRB's deliberations, which have been submitted to the record, and the recommendations dated June 13, 2018, as referenced in the Staff Report under Condition No. 43.

5. The recommendations of the DRB were by a unanimous vote. As such these recommendations are binding of the Hearing Examiner, subject to the provisions of 17G.040.080 D. The staff, as is their right, openly advocated for the extension of Crestline throughout the design review process. **The DRB has the authority to review a PUD site plan and provide flexibility in "site development standards" (see SMC 17G.070.010 A.1 and A.3). In doing so they approved the site development plan with no Crestline connection. See DRB recommendation (a). Recommendations c, d, and e are impossible to meet if Crestline is extended through the project site.** Had the DRB chose to recommend that Crestline be extended and was necessary for automobile connectivity it was have been included as a recommendation. It was not.