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B.0 SITE ANALYSIS

Vicinity Map

Aerial Photo
Zoning Map
B.2 SITE ANALYSIS: SURROUNDING CONTEXT

A. Water Tower

B. Maple Leaf Playfield

C. Reservoir Building

D. Office Building

E. House

F. Houses

G. House

H. House
SITE ANALYSIS: STREETSCAPES B.3

West Elevation: 15th Avenue NE

East Elevation: 15th Avenue NE

PROJECT SITE

NE 85th Street

NE 86th Street

ACROSS FROM PROJECT SITE

NE 86th Street

NE 85th Street
SITE PLANNING GUIDELINES

A-1 RESPONDING TO SITE CHARACTERISTICS
The siting of buildings should respond to specific site conditions and opportunities such as non-rectangular lots, location on prominent intersections, unusual topography, significant vegetation and views or other natural features.

DRB: Preserve a continuous parcel of existing trees along 15th Avenue NE. In particular, continue the wooded appearance all the way to the corner of 15th and NE 85th.

Applicant’s Response: The site design designates approximately 11,300 square feet to a tree preservation area on the eastern portion of the site. This area preserves a cohesive, continuous wooded area that runs the full length of the property line along 15th Avenue. Landscaping at the corner of 15th and 85th will complement the existing trees.

A-2 STREETScape COMPATIBILITY
The siting of buildings should acknowledge and reinforce the existing desirable spatial characteristics of the right-of-way.

DRB: Provide variety of setbacks and rooflines at the perimeter of the site.

Applicant’s Response: Some units facing the future reservoir park to the west are rotated to vary both the setback and the rooflines along that property line. In addition, five different units with distinct rooflines and varied heights are arranged for along 85th and 86th Streets.

A-3 ENTRANCES VISIBLE FROM THE STREET
Entries should be clearly identifiable and visible from the street.

DRB: Orient new homes to the street in order to foster interaction with the surrounding neighborhood.

Applicant’s Response: No homes are located along 15th Avenue in order to preserve existing trees. As a result, the site is strongly oriented toward 85th and 86th Streets. Homes facing these streets have stoops and front doors directed toward the sidewalk.

A-7 RESIDENTIAL OPEN SPACE
Residential projects should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive, well-integrated open space.

DRB: Identified as a design priority.

Applicant’s Response: The shape of the site lends itself to three shared open spaces, including the large tree preservation area on the eastern portion of the site. The open spaces are located adjacent to and integrated with circulation in order to maximize opportunities for informal social interaction.

A-8 PARKING AND VEHICLE ACCESS
Siting should minimize the impact of automobile parking and driveways on the pedestrian environment, adjacent properties, and pedestrian safety.

DRB: Limit curbcuts and parking access points, particularly at the southeast corner of the site.

Applicant’s Response: Access to the underground garage is limited to one driveway at the south end of the site. Early plans for a second access point from the north were scrapped in the interest of automobile and pedestrian safety on that dead-end street. Curbcuts are kept away from the corner of 85th Street and NE 15th

A-10 CORNER LOTS
Buildings on corner lots should be oriented to the corner and public street fronts. Parking and automobile access should be located away from corners.

DRB: Create a landscaped area at corner of 85th and 15th in order to preserve the existing trees and enhance them with compatible plantings.

Applicant’s Response: The unique qualities of the site are highlighted by reserving the most visible corner for existing trees and landscaping that complements the existing qualities.
B-1 HEIGHT, BULK, AND SCALE COMPATIBILITY
Projects should be compatible with the scale of development anticipated by the applicable Land Use Policies for the surrounding area and should be sited and designed to provide a sensitive transition to nearby, less intensive zones. Projects on zone edges should be developed in a manner that creates a step in perceived height, bulk, and scale between the anticipated development potential on the adjacent zones.

DRB: The requested 6-foot interior setbacks will require mitigation to limit tall, narrow spaces. Explore different massing, lowered rooflines, and human scale elements.

Applicant’s Response: The design includes 5 different units, each with distinct roof forms, heights, and massing. In many units, the roofs brought lower to the ground by building the upper level into the slope of the roof and adding dormers as needed. Additional efforts include continuing the roof line down to the lower levels, echoing roof forms with smaller awnings at the lower levels, and integrating human-scale awnings and trellises at ground level.

C-1 ARCHITECTURAL CONTEXT
New buildings proposed for existing neighborhoods with a well-defined and desirable character should be compatible with or complement the architectural character and siting pattern of neighboring buildings.

DRB: The project should resemble the existing neighborhood. Provide variety in the building styles to reflect the diversity of housing in the area.

Applicant’s Response: The project’s 5 unit types each have distinct massing and rooflines based on traditional forms found in the surrounding neighborhood.

C-2 ARCHITECTURAL CONCEPT AND CONSISTENCY
Building design elements, details and massing should create a well-proportioned and unified building form and exhibit an overall architectural concept.

DRB: The Board looks forward to reviewing a project with a character that balances consistency with variety. The design should utilize a well-defined palette of materials.

Applicant’s Response: The different unit types provide variety within the project but are unified by a limited palette of materials that includes cedar shingles, lapped fibercement siding, asphalt shingle roofs, and metal-roofed awnings. Color will also provide both continuity across the project and variety from one unit to the next.

D-1 PEDESTRIAN OPEN SPACES AND ENTRANCES
Convenient and attractive access to the building’s entry should be provided. To ensure comfort and security, paths and entry areas should be sufficiently lighted and entry areas should be protected from the weather. Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.

DRB: Interior pedestrian paths should be well integrated with the surrounding neighborhood.

Applicant’s Response: Pedestrian paths follow clear north/south and east/west routes. Paths connect to the sidewalk on three sides and to the future reservoir park to the west.

E-2 LANDSCAPING TO ENHANCE THE BUILDING AND/OR SITE
Landscaping, including living plant material, special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, site furniture, and similar features should be appropriately incorporated into the design to enhance the project.

DRB: Identified as a design priority.

Applicant’s Response: Specific landscaping approaches will characterize the two new open spaces. The southwest open space will be organized around a fire pit that evokes the Campfire history of the site. The northwest open space will make a feature out of the stormwater retention process.

E-3 LANDSCAPING DESIGN TO ADDRESS SPECIAL SITE CONDITIONS
The landscape design should take advantage of special on-site conditions such as high-bank front yards, steep slopes, view corridors, or existing significant trees and off-site conditions such as greenbelts, ravines, natural areas, and boulevards.

DRB: Identified as a design priority.

Applicant’s Response: The landscape design will work with and enhance the existing mature trees on the site. In addition, plantings in the understory of those trees will diversify the foliage and make it more appropriate for wildlife habitat.
Site Plan

NE 86th Street

NE 85th Street

15th Avenue NE

Unit Types Key
- Unit A
- Unit A.1
- Unit A.3
- Unit C
- Unit D
- Unit D.1
- Unit D.3
D.1 PLANS

Parking Garage
Basement
Circulation & Service
Garage
Mechanical & Trash

Living Room
Circulation & Service
Porches
Kitchen

Level 1
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E.0 LANDSCAPE

- eco turf
- [native grass blend]
- woodland garden
- rain garden
- xeriscape garden
- native plant garden
- stone fire pit
- permeable concrete path, typ.
- concrete pedestal boardwalk
- recycled glass arbor, refuse enclosure
- stair & drive to below grade garage
- existing bus stop to remain
- existing trees to remain, typ.
- stone & reclaimed wood arbor
- stairs to below grade garage
- stormwater feature, rain garden plants
- [recycled glass arbor]
- [Pseudotsuga menziesii (douglas fir), typ.]
- [Acer truncatum (painted maple), typ.]
- [Cercidiphyllum japonica (katsura), typ.]
- [Cornus nutalli (pacific dogwood), typ.]
- [Pseudotsuga menziesii (douglas fir), typ.]
E.2 LANDSCAPE
F.0 ELEVATIONS - NE 85TH AVENUE and 15TH AVENUE NE

NE 85th Avenue

15th Avenue NE
ELEVATIONS - 86TH AVENUE NE and RESERVOIR

86th Avenue NE

Reservoir
This unit is designed with a low upper plate height—5' above the level 2 floor—and the gabled roof brings the eaves lower to the ground between adjacent units. Unit A is placed in a number of key locations on the site where the side façade is exposed to the street or to the pedestrian path. In those instances, a bump-out at the stairwell breaks up the façade. Orienting the stair to the outside wall creates a buffer between the public exterior and the private interior areas. The location of the back porch complements that of the A.3 unit in the center of the site so that one unit’s kitchen does not directly face the other’s. When combined as a duplex, the roofs are joined by a cricket that sheds water and provides ceiling height in the spaces below it.
This unit is designed with a low upper plate height—5' above the level 2 floor—and the gabled roof brings the eaves lower to the ground between adjacent units. Unit A is placed in a number of key locations on the site where the side façade is exposed to the street or to the pedestrian path. In those instances, a bump-out at the stairwell breaks up the façade. Orienting the stair to the outside wall creates a buffer between the public exterior and the private interior areas. The location of the back porch complements that of the A.3 unit in the center of the site so that one unit’s kitchen does not directly face the other’s. When combined as a duplex, the roofs are joined by a cricket that sheds water and provides ceiling height in the spaces below it.
This is one of two unit types with a private, lower-level garage. The garage elevates the main living level farther above grade than other units. In order to bring a better scale to the entry, the front porch is located mid-way between the garage level and the main living areas. Where the unit is adjacent to public pathways, a bay at the stair provides interest and scale while also maintaining the privacy of the interior. When combined as a duplex, the roof gables and modulation break up the façade.
This is one of two unit types with a private, lower-level garage. The garage elevates the main living level farther above grade than other units. In order to bring a better scale to the entry, the front porch is located mid-way between the garage level and the main living areas. Where the unit is adjacent to public pathways, a bay at the stair provides interest and scale while also maintaining the privacy of the interior. When combined as a duplex, the roof gables and modulation break up the façade.
This unit is designed specifically for sensitive locations adjacent to the existing stand of Douglas firs. The ground level in this area slopes from the west to the east, so Level 1 is at grade on the west and the basement level daylights to the east. Because of these unique conditions, the entry is located on the kitchen side of the unit in order to orient the living room and master bedroom to face the trees rather than an adjacent unit. These three units are situated so that the kitchen facades alternate with those of the units facing to them.
This unit has a low roof that overhangs a porch along one side of the building. This roof and porch establish a lower scale and are intended to contrast with and complement the rooflines of other unit types. Ceiling height on level 2 is created with dormers on the front and back of the site. The level 1 floor plan is designed so that either the front or the back could be used as the main entrance. In its free-standing form, Unit C’s living room faces the more expansive view—the future reservoir park—with the kitchen and main entry facing the common area. As a duplex, the porch and living room face the common space to preserve the privacy of the office building next to it. This flexibility creates a dynamic relationship between the C units on either side of the north common space. The facing facades are similar but differentiated—one is the flip side of the other—creating continuity and diversity.
This unit has a low roof that overhangs a porch along one side of the building. This roof and porch establish a lower scale and are intended to contrast with and complement the rooflines of other unit types. Ceiling height on level 2 is created with dormers on the front and back of the site. The level 1 floor plan is designed so that either the front or the back could be used as the main entrance. In its free-standing form, Unit C’s living room faces the more expansive view—the future reservoir park—with the kitchen and main entry facing the common area. As a duplex, the porch and living room face the common space to preserve the privacy of the office building next to it. This flexibility creates a dynamic relationship between the C units on either side of the north common space. The facing facades are similar but differentiated—one is the flip side of the other—creating continuity and diversity.
This unit is designed to be used in a variety of locations both as a free-standing structure and as a duplex. The front and back facades reflect the public and private sides of the building. The front has large windows for the living room and master bedroom and is intended to face the less restricted of the two sides. The back windows are smaller and higher to provide light and views without sacrificing privacy. The covered porches at the front and back provide lower scale and a transitional zone from public to private.
This unit is designed to be used in a variety of locations both as a free-standing structure and as a duplex. The front and back facades reflect the public and private sides of the building. The front has large windows for the living room and master bedroom and is intended to face the less restricted of the two sides. The back windows are smaller and higher to provide light and views without sacrificing privacy. The covered porches at the front and back provide lower scale and a transitional zone from public to private.
This is the second unit type with a lower-level private garage. The floor plan is nearly identical to unit A.1, however, the roof lines and the modulation of the façade are specific to this unit.
This floor plan is very similar to that of the D unit, with variety in the roofline and the architectural details. Like Unit D, this unit has distinct public and private facades that are arranged in two duplex options in a total of eight units in the middle of the site. The two duplex arrangements are alternated to avoid having the living room windows face each other directly. For the two units next to the reservoir property, large windows are added to orient those areas to the west. Each unit is also oriented so that the living room and entry face the less restricted view, so some enter from the main east/west pathway and others enter from a common area. As a result, the eight units combine in a dynamic but ordered pattern along the pathway.
This floor plan is very similar to that of the D unit, with variety in the roofline and the architectural details. Like Unit D, this unit has distinct public and private facades that are arranged in two duplex options in a total of eight units in the middle of the site. The two duplex arrangements are alternated to avoid having the living room windows face each other directly. For the two units next to the reservoir property, large windows are added to orient those areas to the west. Each unit is also oriented so that the living room and entry face the less restricted view, so some enter from the main east/west pathway and others enter from a common area. As a result, the eight units combine in a dynamic but ordered pattern along the pathway.
UNIT D.3 DUPLEX OPTION B TYPICAL H.23

Level 1

Level 2

Roof

Right Elevation

Back Elevation

Left Elevation
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1.0 MATERIALS

- Natural Wood Shake
- Trim
- 'Prodema' - Fiber Resin Board
- Blue
- Taupe
- Burgundy
- Green
- Brown
Contemporary Railings

Composite Wood Porches

Dark Aluminum or Fiberglass Windows

Composition Shingles

Standing Seam Metal

MATERIALS I.1
**INTERIOR SETBACKS**

SMC 23.45.014.D.2 / Table Cv

**DEVELOPMENT STANDARD REQUIREMENT:**

Where two or more principal structures are located on a lot, the required setback between those portions of interior facades which face each other shall be as follows:

For facing facades up to 40 feet in length, the average interior setback shall be 10' and the minimum interior setback shall be 10'.

**REQUEST / PROPOSAL:**

The applicant is requesting that the minimum interior setback be 6 feet.

**JUSTIFICATION:**

Reducing the minimum interior setback allows open space to be consolidated into generous common areas while maintaining a mix of detached homes and duplexes. The average interior setback is 17.7 feet, greatly exceeding the code requirement.

In response to the Design Review Board’s concerns, the site design includes a variety of building types with care taken to bring rooflines down and to create human-scale elements such as porches and window bays at the ground level. The 6-foot setbacks are limited to facades that do not contain primary entrances. In addition, many of these setbacks will be incorporated into the landscape and stormwater drainage plans as swales and bio-retention planters.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETBACKS DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRONT SETBACKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 FEET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**J.0 DEPARTURE DIAGRAMS**
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INTERIOR SETBACKS: Section studies of 6'-0" setback conditions

Section 1

Section 2

Section 3

Section 4

Section 5

Key Plan
DEVELOPMENT STANDARD REQUIREMENT:
External architectural details with no living space including cornices, eaves, sunshades, gutters, and vertical architectural features which are less than 8 feet in width, may project a maximum of 18 inches into any required setback.

REQUEST / PROPOSAL:
The applicant is requesting that eaves be permitted to project 24 inches into the required setback where that setback is 10’ or greater.

JUSTIFICATION:
Increasing the projection of the eaves to 24 inches will allow the design to reflect more closely the variation in the roof forms that are found in the surrounding neighborhood.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD REQUIREMENT:
An unenclosed porch or steps may extend a maximum of 6 feet into the required front setback at ground level, provided that it is set back the same distance from the front lot line as that required for unenclosed decks and balconies [8’ per SMC 23.45.014.F.2.a].

REQUEST / PROPOSAL:
The applicant is requesting that steps be permitted to extend into the required front setback.

JUSTIFICATION:
Because the ground naturally slopes down from the back of units on 85th to the sidewalk, these units are designed with basement living space. In addition, 7 of the proposed homes facing 85th and 86th have lower-level garages accessed from the street. SDOT’s driveway standards limit how low the floor of that garage can be set, so these units are design with entrances mid-way between the garage level and the main living areas. As a result, the porches for the units on 85th and 86th are from 42” to 60” above grade.

Extending steps into the setback will connect these homes to the sidewalk level with traditional, human scale elements. The steps can also provide informal areas to sit and interact with neighbors and create a transitional zone between public and private areas.
DEPARTURE DIAGRAMS J.3

CURBCUTS AND DRIVeways
SMC 23.54.030.D.1.e

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD REQUIREMENT:
Driveways serving more than thirty 30 parking spaces shall provide a minimum 10 foot wide driveway for one (1) way traffic or a minimum 20 foot wide driveway for two-way traffic.

REQUEST / PROPOSAL:
The applicant is requesting that the two-way drive that serves the underground parking be 16 feet wide.

JUSTIFICATION:
The placement of the underground parking garage and the homes adjacent to it is restricted by the location of existing trees and by the dedicated open space at the corner of 15th Ave. NE and NE 85th. A 16-foot driveway will allow more space to be given to the primary pedestrian entrance to the project and allow for a buffer between the public path or drive and the homes next to them.

The Design Review Board responded favorably to this request at Early Design Guidance.

SMC 23.54.030.F.1.b

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD REQUIREMENT:
Curb cuts must not exceed a maximum width of 10 feet.

REQUEST / PROPOSAL:
The applicant is requesting that 2 curb cuts on 85th and 1 curb cut on 86th be allowed to be 16 feet wide.

JUSTIFICATION:
In order to limit disruptions in public pedestrian walkways while meeting the parking needs of the site, curb cuts are shared between two separate units. Allowing an increased width in the curb cut will allow safer backing for two units without increasing the overall number of cuts.
**J.4 DEPARTURE DIAGRAMS**

**SMC 23.45.016.A.3.a.(1)**

**DEVELOPMENT STANDARD REQUIREMENT:**
In Lowrise 2 and Lowrise 3 zones an average of 300 square feet per unit of private, usable open space, at ground level and directly accessible to each unit, shall be required. No unit shall have less than 200 square feet of private, usable open space.

**REQUEST / PROPOSAL:**
The applicant is requesting that the minimum private open space be reduced to zero for the two units that make up building 23 and reduced to 185 sf for building 22. In addition, the applicant requests that the average private open space be reduced to 280 sf.

**JUSTIFICATION:**
The proposed design is modeled after cottage housing where a group of smaller homes are grouped together and oriented around shared open spaces. This project consolidates open space into three generous, shared green spaces. Instead of opening into a tiny backyard, units may open onto a broad common green or into a mature stand of Douglas firs. While the average private open space per unit is less than the required 300 square feet, the average of all open space on the site is 497 sf, far exceeding the requirement.

**SMC 23.45.016.B.1.3**

**DEVELOPMENT STANDARD REQUIREMENT:**
To ensure privacy of open space, openings such as windows and doors on the ground floor of walls of a dwelling unit, or common areas which directly face the open space of a different unit, are prohibited, unless such openings are screened by view-obscuring fences, freestanding walls or wingwalls.

**REQUEST / PROPOSAL:**
The applicant is requesting that openings which directly face the open space of another unit or the shared open space be allowed without screening.

**JUSTIFICATION:**
The emphasis for this project is on generous common open space rather than individual fenced yards. The function of these open spaces will rely on informal transitions from public to private areas that facilitate social interaction among residents.