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CURRENT DESIGN
Overall Concept Diagrams

- Describing concept development
- How single entry affects site layout
- Urban garden location
- Vehicular circulation are proposed to best serve the development and community (impervious surfaces, character & variety, end units, open space, unit count)
- Total paved area as it relates to vehicular circulation schemes & site layout

Approx 4-5 pages to be added to final DRB packet
Urban Garden Diagram, information
CURRENT DESIGN: COLORED ELEVATIONS

15TH AVE NE - WEST SITE ELEVATION - BUILDINGS 9, 5, 10

EAST SITE ELEVATION - BUILDINGS: 2, 4, 6, 8.
CURRENT DESIGN: COLORED ELEVATIONS

WEST ELEVATION- BUILDINGS: 7, 5, 3, 1

SITE ELEVATION - ELEVATED COURTYARD- SOUTH ELEVATION- BUILDINGS: 9, 5, 6
CURRENT DESIGN: COLORED ELEVATIONS

NORTH SITE ELEVATION- BUILDINGS 8, 7, 9

NORTH DRIVE AISLE- NORTH ELEVATION BUILDINGS: 9, 7, 8
SITE ELEVATION - EAST ELEVATIONS OF BUILDINGS 1, 3, 5, 7

SITE ELEVATION - ELEVATED COURTYARD - NORTH ELEVATION - BUILDINGS: 4, 3, 10

CURRENT DESIGN: COLORED ELEVATIONS
VINYL WINDOWS

FIBER CEMENT LAP SIDING

FIBER CEMENT PANEL SIDING

WOOD LAP SIDING

DECORATIVE STONE

CAST-IN-PLACE CONCRETE
CURRENT DESIGN: MATERIALS - BUILDING 5 & 6

FIBER CEMENT PANEL SIDING

WOOD LAP SIDING

FIBER CEMENT LAP SIDING

VINYL WINDOWS

ADD PHOTOS
DEPARTURES PAGE - SUMMARY
CURRENT DESIGN: LANDSCAPE PLANS

A. ARBOR | ENTRY FEATURE
B. COURTYARD | BOARDWALK
C. OPEN SPACE CHARACTER

COURTYARD ENTRY STAIR
STAIRS | PLANTERS
COURTYARD ‘GROVE’
GOLDSPIRE GINKGO
COURTYARD & OPEN SPACE

- Ribes sanguineum 'Brocklebank'
- Cornus 'Strobiheq' Kahoys Red Twig Dogwood
- Pennisetum setaceum 'Shenandoah' Switchgrass
- Carex morrowii 'Ice Dance'
- Polystichum munitum
- Polystichum setaceum 'Divisidium' Soft Shield Fern
- Polyphyllium prophyllium Tassel Fern
- Arbutus kinnikinnick Island Pink
- Sarcococca ruscifolia Sweet Box
- Hebe buxifolia 'Nana' Barwood Hebe
- Sange marcum 'Royal Purple' Lilac

RESIDENTIAL PLANTING (Shade)

- Vincaria libanotis
- Eleocharis annual 'Royal Purple'
- Ribes sanguineum 'Brocklebank' Flowering Current
- Polystichum munitum
- Polystichum setaceum 'Divisidium' Soft Shield Fern
- Lanct moldspore 'Ice Dance'

RESIDENTIAL PLANTING (Sun)

- Deschampsia cespitosa 'Shasta Grass'
- Deschampsia cespitosa 'Stocker's Kentucky Bluegrass'
- Deschampsia cespitosa 'Stokes Field Grass'
- Deschampsia cespitosa 'Shasta Grass'

SHADE TREES

- Acer platanoides 'Vire' Maple
- Betula pendula 'Jacquemontii' Pendulous Birch
- Smilax glabra 'Goldspire'

CURRENT DESIGN: LANDSCAPE PLANTING & MATERIALS
1. Massing Options and Design Concept.

a. After considerable discussion, the Board generally preferred Scheme 1 due to the advantages of larger setbacks that the exterior drive provided. The Board especially appreciated the large setbacks at the north and south property lines, as this lessens the visual and privacy impacts to the existing residential structure to the north, and allows for mitigation of impacts of potential new development on the site to the south. The Board was less concerned about the setback to the east, as the existing structures are currently set back from the property line. (CS1-B, CS2-B, DC1-B, DC1-C, DC2-A)

b. The Board also noted the potential for a hybrid of Scheme 1 and 2, which would use an L shaped drive, accessed at the north end of the site, to retain the larger setback on the north and allow the applicant more flexibility to arranging the units in response to site characteristics. (CS1-B, CS2-B, DC1-B, DC1-C, DC2-A)

c. The Board appreciated the variation in height of the structures as presented in Schemes 2 and 3 that locate lower heights near the site boundaries, to lessen visual and privacy impacts on adjacencies (CS1-B, CS2-B, CS2-D)

d. The Board requested more information demonstrating how the massing and unit design works with the topography and proposed grading. (DC2-A)

e. The Board appreciated the consolidated trash collection areas. (DC1-C)

2. Circulation and Unit Orientation.

a. The Board preferred a circulation pattern that utilizes one curb cut, to minimize the impact on the pedestrian environment along 15th Ave NE. (PL4-A, DC1-B, DC1-C)

b. The pedestrian corridor, as presented in the preferred alternative, was supported in concept by the Board. The Board was concerned that as proposed, the width of the walkway in relation to the height of the adjacent buildings was not adequate to create a welcoming and functional space. (PL1-A, PL1-B, PL1-C, CD3-B)

c. The Board was supportive of Scheme 1, and encouraged the applicant to design the drives as “woonerven” or shared streets, to accommodate pedestrians and vehicles, and to function as a shared open space instead of voids within the site. The design should integrate landscaping and green features into the design of the space. (CD3-A, PL1-B, PL1-C, PL2-B, DC1-C)

d. The Board indicated preliminary support for departures that would decrease the width of the drive to provide more space for creating usable open spaces. (PL1-C, DC1-C, DC2-A, DC3-A, DC3-B, DC3-C)

e. The Board requested sections and elevations that demonstrate the relationship of unit entries (both vehicular and pedestrian) with the drives and open spaces.
f. The Board requested more detail about the design and character of the woonerf, including landscaping, hardscaping, and the how the units establish a relationship with the space. (PL3-A, DC3-B, DC4-D)

3. **Urban Garden & Open Space Concept**

   a. Overall, the Board was concerned that a successful open space concept, with spaces large enough to be functional as intended, was constrained by the number of units proposed. Units should be eliminated or rearranged to provide an opportunity for strengthening the overall building-open space relationship, and providing quality open spaces. (PL1-B, PL1-C, DC2-A, DC3-A, DC3-B)

   b. Design and locate the urban garden to be the focal point of the overall open space concept and to make a gesture towards the public realm. The Board discussed the location of the urban garden at length. Schemes 1 and 2 have the garden located to the north of the drive, allowing for maximum sun access. However, in both of these Schemes, the urban garden appears disconnected with the overall concept. In addition, the Board was concerned that if located at the south end of the site, the garden could be shaded by potential future development. (CS2-B, PL1-A, PL1-B, PL1-C, DC3-A, DC3-B, DC3-C)

   c. The Board encouraged activating the urban garden through design and integration with the surrounding uses. The Board supported the location of the urban garden in Scheme 3, as it functions as a semi-public space by providing an entry to the pedestrian corridor, and has the potential to tie into the programming of the adjacent structures. (PL1-A, PL2-B, DC3-A, DC3-B, DC3-C)

   d. The Board supported the idea of multi-use spaces, especially safe and defensible places for kids to play. The Board noted that removing or relocating the central units in Scheme 1 would provide an opportunity for a shared courtyard. (PL1-C, PL2-B, DC3-B)

4. **Streetscape and Live-work Units**

   a. The Board supported consolidating the live-work units, as opposed to breaking up the units into small groupings. The Board noted that the continuous edge as presented in Scheme 1 and Scheme 2 holds a strong street edge, and expresses a commercial/retail character. (CS2-C, CS3-A, PL3-B, DC2-A, DC2-E)

   b. The location of the live-work units should be pushed towards the south of the site to tie into and continue the commercial activity the intersection of 15th and 125th and help to establish the emerging commercial streetwall. (CS2-C, CS3-A, PL3-B, DC2-A, DC2-E)

   c. The Board was concerned about the 30' depth of the live-work units. The design and layout of the live-work units should demonstrate the ability to be viable as retail spaces. The Board suggested deeper units, and designing the interior so all living spaces are located in the upper floors. (PL3-B)
### PROJECT DATA FOR PROPOSED SCHEMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE AREA (GSF):</th>
<th>36,400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDG OPTION 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVE-WORK: 4,050</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWNHOUSE: 12,600</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDSCAPE: 5,305</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERVIOUS: 14,085</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC/TRASH: 360</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDG OPTION 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA (SF): 3,564</td>
<td>PERCENTAGE: 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,950</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,264</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,382</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDG OPTION 1-2 HYBRID</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA (SF): 0</td>
<td>PERCENTAGE: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,114</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,729</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,184</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDG OPTION 3-PREFERRED</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA (SF): 3,456</td>
<td>PERCENTAGE: 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,114</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,963</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,211</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT OPTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA (SF): 0</td>
<td>PERCENTAGE: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,285</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,328</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,412</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| PROPOSED FAR | 67,530 | 1.86 (57%) |
| LIVING (GSF): 36,400 |
| **EDG OPT 1** |  |
| Pros | • Single curb cut with simple circulation route  |
| • Urban Garden ample sunlight exposure. |
| • Compliant for required setbacks |
| Cons | • Less area for landscaping |
| • Close proximity between units and adjacent units, less “buffer” |
| • Continuous row of live-work units, monolithic |
| • No parking for live-work units |
| • Minimal connection to urban garden |
| **EDG OPT 2** |  |
| Pros | • Additional landscaped areas for communal gathering |
| • Efficient Layout with limited corner units and windows |
| Cons | • Public urban garden is cut-off from majority of site. Residents will be less inclined to use this space if located here. |
| • Limited area for “backyard” landscape |
| • Garbage/Recycling located at entry |
| • Continuous “canyon” run of residential units along single family lots to the east |
| **EDG OPT 1-2 HYBRID** |  |
| Pros | • Large setback along North South property lines |
| Cons | • Minimal Landscaping along North and South Property Lines |
| • “Auto-Court” configuration |
| • Continuous “canyon” run of residential units along single family lots to the east |
| • Minimal “woonerf” type protected streetscape |
| **EDG OPT 3-PREFERRED** |  |
| Pros | • Increased connection between the urban garden and resident entrances |
| • Provides variety of unit types (including end units with surface parking) |
| • Massing is reduced into more clusters for a more pedestrian friendly scale |
| • Landscaped buffers to north and south |
| • Garbage/Recycling at edge of site |
| Cons | • Urban garden is not located at SW corner of site |
| • Dual curb cuts |
| **CURRENT OPTION** |  |
| Pros | • Enhanced setback areas for northern and southern units, reduced drive-aisle width. |
| • Reduction of LW unit to provide additional space to urban garden as a gathering area & better connection to residents |
| • Parking provided for each unit (as well as some guest parking stalls), including L-W units. |
| • Dead end streets provide protected and less traveled drives for better “woonerf” design |
| Cons | • None |
Description: 1-2 Hybrid Study

The main purpose of this scheme is to illustrate the comments provided by the Design Review board regarding their preference to schemes 1 and 2 and combining them into this “hybrid” scheme. This scheme illustrates the next step in design, however it does not solve all issues and generates additional ones as well. The hybrid scheme takes this project in the wrong direction and will not provide Board’s assumed benefits to create a more successful project.

Priorities & Board Recommendations:

• (1b) The drive-aisle/setback along the north, although may provide additional space between adjoining properties it has a negative impact of placing the highest possible volume of traffic to pass by this building with all units requiring access to this area in order to exit the site. There is no space for a landscape buffer as requested by neighbors. There is no available parking for the live-work units which will only tax the public streets and surrounding area with already limited parking. Units on the southern portion of site will be further from car wash, allowing for maximum solar exposure, but no landscape buffer/ separation can be provided.

• (2a) Reduced automobile access to a single curb cut and located it along the northern property line.

• (2c) Consolidating the automobile circulation to the outer parts of the, this will increase the number of automobiles passing by each unit, with higher speeds, and reduces the opportunity to treat the areas as more “woonerven” and less defensible as the two-way access will discourage that opportunity.

• (3a) With the required number of units on this scheme there is a reduction in open space area and increase in impervious surfaces due to requested circulation on outer portion of site. There is minimal connection between open spaces and the quality of the open spaces do not improve.

Minimal code alternates/departures are requested or required:

Departures:
Reduction of eastern property line setback from 20'-0" to 10'-0" for multi-family structures. For mixed-use structures reduction of setback to 10'-0" only above 20'-0" (SMC 23.71.030.D.1 & 2).
Relocation of required usable open space to northwestern portion of lot in lieu of south- west corner (SMC 23.71.014.C.8.a-e); in this location it is not as well connected to the other landscaped and pedestrian portions of the site.

Project Data:
Total Units: 39 (39 Townhouse Units)
Proposed FAR Building Area = 67,950 sf (57.4% of allowable FAR)
Allowable FAR Building Area (3.25) = 116,300 sf
On Grade parking: 15 Parking stalls, 28 garage stalls
Landscaping & Usable Open Space: 4,729 gsf (13% of site);
(including Urban Garden of 565 gsf)
Priorities & Board Recommendations:

- (1c) Board appreciated variance in height that located lower heights near site boundaries.
- (2a) Board preferred schemes with one curb cut
- (2b) Board supported the pedestrian corridor and the location of the urban garden as a way for users to activate it more regularly and connect it to the rest of the development. There was concern with the width in relation to the height was not adequate to create a welcoming space.
- (2c) Encouraged applicant to design drives a “woonerven” or shared streets to accommodate pedestrians and vehicles... The design should integrate landscaping and green features into the design of the space.
- (2d) Board indicated preliminary support for a decreased drive width in order to maximizes usable open spaces and reduce impervious surfaces.
- (3a) Board had concern that the number of units constrained the size and function of open spaces.
- (3b) Design and locate Urban Garden to be the focal point of the overall open space and to make a gesture to the public realm.
- (3c) The Board encouraged activating the urban garden through design and integration with surrounding uses.
- (3d) The Board supports the ideas of multi-use spaces
- (4a) The Board supported consolidating the live-works
- (4b) Locate the live-works to the south end of the site

Public Comments:

- Lush landscape buffers to all adjacent properties, especially north.
- Appreciated shorter units towards the edges of the site.
- Limit access to one curb cut to minimize impacts on the pedestrian environment and streetscape.
- Did not want bus stop moved further north.
- Preferred consolidation of structures on 15th.

Project Data:
Total Units: 40 (8 Live/Work Units & 32 Townhouse Units )
Proposed FAR Building Area = 61,200 sf (51.7% of allowable FAR)
 allowable FAR Building Area = 118,300 sf
On Grade parking: 10 Parking stalls, 28 garage stalls
Landscaping & Usable Open Space = 7,271 gsf (19.98% of site)
(including Urban Garden of 1,400 gsf)
Priorities & Board Recommendations Responses:

- (1c) Reduced buildings 7 & 8 from 4 to 3-stories
- (2a) Created a single access point towards the north of the site to allow for a better pedestrian experience on 15th Ave.
- (2b) Used the drive width departure requested (2d) to widen the pedestrian corridor. The raised corridor will also minimize the height of the adjacent buildings.
- (2c) Drives are designed as woonerven with patterned paving, landscaping and height variation to designate pedestrian and vehicle spaces. The dead ends allow for protected areas for shared uses with minimal traffic.
- (2d) The reduced drive area was used to increase the open space landscaping buffers on the north and south side and to increase the width of the pedestrian corridor.
- (3a) One unit was removed to provide a larger and more functional Urban Garden. 39 units are the minimum for a successful development and this scheme provides the most open and space and landscape area.
- (3b) Maintaining a centralized location for the Urban Garden and placing it adjacent to the main pedestrian and vehicular access makes it the focal point of the project. It also connects to the raised pedestrian corridor to further emphasize the connection between public and private.
- (3c) A strong pedestrian connection ties the urban garden to the elevated courtyard between the paving and planting areas. It will be a community meeting point with mail delivery boxes and seating areas included in the design.
- (3d) The raised pedestrian corridors and drives with dead ends allow for protected areas for shared uses.
- (4a, 4b) Units were combined on the south end to create a better pedestrian experience closer to the main intersection and bus stop.
- This concept provides the most landscaping buffer to the north and south with sufficient area for lush landscaping per the public’s request.
- Rear setback is reduced to 10’, however this allows for pedestrian break through middle of site and enhances a smaller scale to the various building clusters.

Project Data:
Total Units: 39 (39 Townhouse Units )
Proposed FAR Building Area = 61,063 sf (51.6% of allowable FAR)
Allowable FAR Building Area = 118,300 sf
On Grade parking: 21Surface parking stalls, 24 garage stalls
Landscaping & Usable Open Space = 8,328 gsf (22.9% of site) (including Urban Garden of 1,080 gsf)
Comparison Conclusion:
The Current Scheme has more than six times the area of landscaping against the north property line. The wider and contiguous nature of the Current Scheme’s Landscape Buffer will allow for more dense plantings and more privacy.

Comparison Conclusion:
The Current Scheme has 16% more Semi-Public Open Space and more than double the Private Open Space (215%). The Current Scheme allows for more units to have private yards, which is an amenity to those units.
Comparison Conclusion:
The Current Scheme has 76% more landscaped area and a larger Urban Garden than the Hybrid Option. Due to the continuous drive, there is more impervious area in the Hybrid Option.

Comparison Conclusion:
The Current Scheme has 31% more end units which allow for more natural light to the units, smaller scale of the structures and a more desirable layouts. Through lot views can also be achieved to break up the canyon effect of the townhomes.

Continuous Row of Units along eastern property line
Central Axis breaks up buildings into smaller clusters and increase exterior wall area and opportunity for windows
Continuous pavement for automobile access forces vehicles to drive by all units.

Elevated crosswalk to reduce speed.

"Dead End" minimal traffic area creates defensible space.

Planter buffer between entrance and drive-aisle.

Volume and speed of traffic reduced by layout.

Elevated crosswalk to reduce speed.

Comparison Conclusion:
The Current Scheme drive layout allows for dead ends and minimizes through-traffic which will keep speed down and allow for "defensible" and protected drive areas that can be used for play or social gatherings.

Comparison Conclusion:
The Current Scheme allows for easier pedestrian connections throughout the site and more open views through the property.
PEDESTRIAN LEVEL VIEWS
PEDESTRIAN LEVEL VIEWS

IN PROCESS
SITE SECTIONS

SITE SECTION - LOOKING WEST
EXTERIOR SIGNAGE PLAN

To be provided at DRB Meeting, as part of final packet
EXTERIOR LIGHTING PLAN

To be provided at DRB Meeting, as part of final packet
The existing 36,400 SF site drops approximately eight feet total from the SW corner to the NE corner. Dual curb cuts and drive aisles from the west side of the site will provide the best location for car access both ingress and egress onto site and replace the three curb cuts that are existing.

Two commercial structures (including garage outbuilding) & asphalt paving will be removed for the construction.

Existing asphalt paving to be removed

Existing adjacent buildings

Project affected trees

Structures to be removed

Exist. pavement or retaining walls to be removed
Best solar access is currently from the south, west and east due to the single and two story neighboring structures. The 3 story structure to the north will have little affect on sunlight. All townhome and live/work units should benefit from direct sunlight most of the year during mid-day hours.

Views will be blocked by the same buildings on the lower floors. There is a potential for good territorial views south, east and west on the upper floors. North views will be blocked by the 3 story structure.

Most pedestrian and bicycle access will occur along the west of the site on 15th AVE NE. To the south 125th Street is more bicycle friendly and has a dedicated bicycle lane in both the east and west directions.

Vehicles will travel mostly south bound on 15th Ave NE. It is a main route for residents from the north to access NE 125th ST towards I-5 south and north, as well as towards the Northgate shopping district. Since there is no alley adjacent to the site, NE 15th ST is the best option for entry to the site. A bus stop is conveniently located right in front of the property on 15th Ave NE, but may need to shift further north to avoid drive aisle access and minimize vehicle conflicts. Bus routes connect residents to various other neighborhoods including the University, Lake City, Richmond Beach, Mountlake Terrace, Northgate Mall and Transit Center and regular routes to Downtown.
Land Use Code Summary

23.47A.002 Scope of Provisions
NC3-40 Neighborhood Commercial 3 (NC3) Zone

23.47A.004 Permitted and prohibited uses.
Table A Residential use is permitted outright subject to provisions of this title.
G.1. Live-work units are a permitted use, (4.) Deemed a non-residential use

The proposal complies with this section of the Land Use Code.

C.1. no more than 20% can be residential use

23.47.005 C.1. no more than 20% can be residential use

23.47.008 Street-level development standards

23.47.012 Structure height.
Designated zone allows for height of forty (40) feet.
-1.a.1.a. Floor-to-floor height for live/work shall be a minimum 13’ at the main floor.
J.2. Roof top features. Add 4'-0" for parapets, open railings, planters, etc.
J.4. Roof top features. Add 10'-0" for stair towers, elevators, etc.

The proposal complies with this section of the Land Use Code.

23.47.013D Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Limits.
A. All gross floor area not exempt is counted against the maximum gross floor area.
B. Maximum FAR allowed in NC3 zone = 3.25

The proposal complies with this section of the Land Use Code.

23.47A.014 Setbacks and separations.
Front 0'-0" if non-residential use is located at property line.
Rear 10'-0" minimum above 13’.
Side 0'-0" minimum

The proposal complies with this section of the Land Use Code.

23.47A.016 Landscaping standards.
A.2 Green Factor of 0.3 or greater required if more than 4 new dwelling units
B.1. Street trees required.
D.1. Screening of surface parking areas.
Table D - d. garbage dumpsters 6-foot high screening.

The proposal complies with this section of the Land Use Code.

23.47A.024 Amenity area.
A.1. Parking Access provided from street with one two-way curb cut.
B.1.a. Parking shall not be located between a structure and a street lot line.

The proposal complies with this section of the Land Use Code.

23.54.015 - Required parking.
Table B 23.54.015 1 per dwelling unit.

K.1. Table E - Bicycle parking = 1 per 4 dwelling units = 10 req’d.

The proposal complies with this section of the Land Use Code.

Northgate Overlay District

23.71.030 - Development Standards for transition areas within the Northgate Overlay District.
B.2. Apply to development on lots in NC3-40 zones.

23.71.030.D.2 Rear Setback of 20 feet when abutting a SF residential zone.
D.4 - Setback shall be landscaped.

Forty (40) foot height limit may not exceed a density of one (1) dwelling unit for every six hundred (600) square feet of lot area

The proposal complies with this section of the Land Use Code.

23.71.014 - Open Space
A.1. Minimum of 10 percent of lot area shall be provided as landscaped or usable open space. A min. of 1/2 of required open space shall be landscaped open space and a min. of 1/3 of the required open space shall be usable open space.
B. Urban Garden - intended to provide color and visual interest to pedestrian and motorists and are characterized by such amenities as specialized landscaping, paving materials and public seating.
C. Urban gardens shall be developed with unit paving and plant materials in a garden-like setting. Landscaping shall include a mix of seasonal and permanent plantings, including trees and shrubs. A water feature is encouraged.
d. A minimum of seventy-five percent of the garden area shall receive solar exposure from 11 AM until 2 PM, between the spring and autumn equinox.
e. The garden shall be open to the public at least 5 days a week from 8 AM until 7 PM.

The proposal complies with this section of the Land Use Code.

23.71.036 - Maximum width & depth of structures.
Table A Above a height of 30 feet, wall length shall not exceed 80% of the length of the abutting lot line, to a max. of 60’.
Building Envelope Diagram

Project Data:

Proposed Building Area = 118,200 gsf
Allowable FAR Building Area (3.25) = 118,300 g sf
PLACE HOLDER FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AS NEEDED
CS - CONTEXT & SITE

CS2-B 2: Connection to the Street:
The siting of the live/work units along 15th Ave NE provide a more pedestrian friendly scale along with mid-block access for cars, pedestrians, and bicycles at the urban garden.

CS2-B 3: Character of Open Space:
The main plaza will provide a gathering space for residents and the general public along with additional areas for residents to interact.

CS2-C 2: Mid-Block Sites:
Response to adjacent properties in siting the building massing was a high priority along with breaking up the clusters of units into a smaller and more pedestrian friendly scale.

CS2-D 1: Existing Development and Zoning:
The proposed Live-work units height and size will meet the existing context that is already well established (3-stories if common up and down 15th) and is not intended to overpower any of the nearby properties along 15th Ave NE. The clustering of the townhouse units versus long continuous rows helps breakdown the overall massing to a more residential level of scale. The maximum potential development would be much more out of scale and the local context if constructed as is

CS2-D 3: Zone Transitions:
Positioning the townhouse units so they end at the east property line, versus continuing along that boundary helps provide view openings between structures for the residential units. The end units will be 3-stories along with a 10’ wide landscaping buffer along that boundary that provides a softer transition as well.

CS3-A 4: Evolving Neighborhoods:
Within this existing neighborhood there is an eclectic mix of architectural styles and character that continues to change with each new project that is developed. The recent remodel/reconstruction of the Safeway project is a good example of recognizing that the scale for that project needed to be sensitive to the area residents and break up the “big-box” stereotype for this location.

PL - PUBLIC LIFE

PL1-B 3: Pedestrian Amenities:
Pedestrian and public open space amenity is provided at middle of site along public right of way enhancing opportunities for interaction and place gathering.

PL2-B 3: Street-Level Transparency:
Ensure transparency of street-level uses and include views into open spaces beyond where appropriate. Window glazing will be provided as much as possible.

PL3-B 3: Buildings with Live/Work Uses:
Active and transparent facades at the live/work units help activate the interaction between resident and passersby.

PL3-B 4: Interaction:
Provide opportunities with the urban garden, and gathering of the unit entries, for interaction between residents and nearby neighbors along.

DC - DESIGN CONCEPT

DC1-B1: Vehicle Access Location and Design:
Dual access provides best opportunity for this to minimize the amount of surface paving (increasing landscaping) and divides the flow and potential amount of traffic.

DC2-C 1: Visual Depth and Interest:
Adding depth to facades through cantilevered portions, bay windows, and additional modulation will help add depth and create visual interest along the facade. Varying the materials by type, color, texture from level to level can also help enhance this effect.
• MASSING
  Break up buildings to smaller and more residential scaled groups.

• VARIATION
  Provide unit type and elevation variations to create an interesting experience through the project.

• COMMUNITY
  Provide pedestrian areas of various sizes, for community members to congregate.

• TEXTURE
  Use texture on drives and pathways to create an understanding of the access drives dual use for pedestrians and vehicles. Use various materials on buildings to break down mass and add visual interest.

• SCALE
  Use both ground elevation and building elevation to make different visual experiences through the project and vary the building forms.
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