

## Project Information

DCI Project No:
Project Address:
Assessor Parcel No:
Legal Description:

## 3025190, 6537439 (bldg)

2807 S Hanford St, Seattle, WA 9814
1282300440
HE NORTHEASTERLY 60 FEET OF LOTS 23 AND 24 BLOCK 5, BYRON ADDITION TO THE CITY OF SEATTLE, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED IN VOLUME 6 OF PLATS, PAGE 87, IN KING COUNTY, vASHINGTON.

Project Description: onstruction of new 6 -story, 11,888 SF, 33 unit SEDU apartment building on vacant lot

Contact Information

Owner:

Applicant/Architect:

ABBC LLC
1020 N Tacoma Ave, Tacoma, WA 98403 Contact: Anthony Hines
email: ahines@signaturecustomhomes.net
Motionspace Architecture + Design PLLC Contact: Nazim Nice
3104 Western Avenue \#107, Seattle Washington 98121 t: 206.204.0490
motion-space.com
www.motion-space.com
Swenson Say Faget Structural Engineering Contact: Ryan Reichman
934 Broadway, Suite 100, Tacoma WA 98402 t: $253.284 .9470 \times 1680$
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Located just 2 blocks South of the elevated Mt Baker Link light rail station and 1 block South of the busy Rainier Avenue and Martin Luther King Jr Way intersection, the site exists within an area of diverse uses, surrounded by single family residences, apartment buildings, small businesses, and larger institutions. The property's zoning designation is SM(Seattle mixed) 85, and it is located in the North Rainier hub urban village. The site is also within the Mt Baker Station overlay district within a frequent transit corridor, with multiple bus routes within a short walk, in addition to the light rail station.

The neighborhood provides many ground level shops and restaurants within a few blocks of the site. Proposed development immediately adjacent to the site (3208-3224 Claremont Ave) will add $150+$ units as well as new retail space next door to the building, while raising the density of the neighborhood by using much of the allowed 85 ft height limit.

We are proposing building a 6 story small efficiency dwelling unit (SEDU) apartment building on the currently empty lot. The proposed building contains 33 (3 on level 1, 6 on each of levels $2-6$ ) units and is roughly 70 ft tall. The gross floor area of the proposed design (per 23.84 A .014 ) is $11,888 \mathrm{SF}$.




- apartment building at 2900 S Byron St


D - Franklin High School nearby


G - restaurant at 2815 Hanford St, adjacent to project site


B - view across alley from project site


E - National Pride carwash, across street from project site
 below light rail line


C - light rail running along MLK nearby


F - triplex at 2801 S Hanford adhacent to project site



(1) Street Elevations - Hanford S

(2) Street Elevations - Hanford N






## Context and Site

CS2: URBAN PATTERN AND FORM
B. ADJACENT SITES, STREETS, AND OPEN SPACES C. RELATIONSHIP TO THE BLOCK

CS3: ARCHITECTURAL CONTEXT AND CHARACTER
A. EMPHASIZING POSITIVE NEIGHBORHOOD ATTRIBUTES

Guidance: Neighborhood is evolving, project should establish positive and desireable
context

## Response

The proposed design is in an evolving neighborhood. With the (relatively) new light rail station nearby, this location is ideal for small apartments with tenants who can benefit from proximity to the city center and many transit options. The proposed massing is not
up against the limits of the SM-NR-85 zone the proposed FAR is far less than would be allowed, and the proposed height is around 70 ft (rather than 85 allowed). However, the proposed massing is similar to other new proposed projects in the area, including the in for design review).

We are proposing locating the shared amenity space on the street side, where it can benefit from higher traffic and proximity to interior shared spaces (see PL and DC responses
below). In this location the planted amenity area can benefit the neighborhood as a whole, as well. The amenity area allows for a transition between public and private spaces, while allowing tenants in the lounge to provide some amount of eyes-on-the-street, as well

Each façade of the proposed building will be visible, so each has been designed with articulation and different materials - there is no "back" to the building. The only wall which is truly a party wall (there are no setbacks required in this zone) is the $W$ side of the stairwell, which is a small portion of the whole
W façade. This is a mid-block building between underdeveloped sites, and we have tried to design a building that can emphasize the street edge and be attractive from all directions, while realizing that someday soo


View towards site from MLK Jr Way pedestrian overpas
con

Hanford Street SEDU Apartment
2807 S Hanford St, Seattle, WA 98144

DR. 10
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Translucent-roofed covered
ike storage precedent


Section-perspecives showing public / private transition
through public lounge, amenity area, and public sidewalk

## esponse

response to comments during our pre-submittal conference we are now showing a low fence around the amenity area in ront of the building. This will emphasize that the amenity area is a semi-private" space, providing a larger measure of security or the tenants than planting alone can provide. At the same me, it will not block views into the amenity area, which will enefit from eyes on it, both from the street and from the mmunal space on the ground level.

Also, in order to make the amenity area more usable and defensible for the tenants, we're now showing a door providing direct access from the communal lobby to the planted amenity area. This access, along with the large windows between the
fwo spaces, will make the amenity area feel like an extension of wo spaces, will make the amenity area feel like an extension ransparency for a residential building. Locating the communa lobby on the ground floor along the street, along with the buffe of the planted amenity area between it and the street, allows this.
At the three ground level units, we're proposing a raised planting bed to provide separation from the street. Above the concrete retaining wall of this bed we're proposing a wooden fence, providing more privacy for the ground floor units, an interesting change in the street elevation composition contrasted with the low fence around the amenity area), and pedestrian level texture along the sidewalk.

At the rear of the building, we're proposing a bike shed made of ranslucent plastic material (see precedent image), with linear exterior lighting within. This will provide light to the bike storage area at all times, as well as providing an interesting glowing architectural element at night when the interior lights are on. and the waste storage enclosure is proposed along a wide, welllit hardscape off of the alley (see night renderings and lighting plan).
question was raised during the pre-submittal conference about whether access to the rear of the building would be better that providing it from the alley is better for a few reasons: - Particularly given the dedication required at the ally, E-W
space on the site is extremely limited. The configuration we have allows the most units along the street side of th building, which is the façade with the most long term per the building code. But it means that getting access to those units, and two stair wells, have to fit in the E-W dimension which required us using all of the available dimension.

- Any access that we were able to fit around the $W$ side of the building would necessarily be narrow. With the eventual likely development of the lot to the W , we felt better to provide the tenants a choice of access to the bike area- directly off the alley or through wide public L1 corridor. Neither of these routes has the potential to be adversely impacted by future development.

Access from the alley is required for waste pick-up. Access to the waste storage area is required for the enants. By combining these required accesses with the bike path we're able to offer the most generous, well-lit space for all three, rather than splitting them up which spaces.
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## Design Concept

## DC1: PROJECT USES AND ACTIVITIES

A. ARRANGEMENT OF INTERIOR USES
C. PARKING AND SERVICE USES

DC2: ARCHITECTURAL CONCEPT
A. MASSING
B. ARCHITECTURAL AND FACADE COMPOSITION D. SCALE AND TEXTURE

Guidance: Strive for articulation on all facades. Provide scale and texture through secondary architectural features and materials

## DC3: OPEN SPACE CONCEPT

A. BUILDING-OPEN SPACE RELATIONSHIP B. OPEN SPACES USES AND ACTIVITIES

## DC4: EXTERIOR ELEMENTS AND MATERIALS

A. EXTERIOR ELEMENTS AND FINISHES
D. TREES, LANDSCAPE, AND HARDSCAPE MATERIALS

## Guidance: Create attractive, usable outdoor space for residents. Consider public to private transition




Schematic design sketch showing concept of two boxes differentiated with siding

RESPONSE:
DC1
The building proposes all of the common spaces on the ground floor. In addition to being required for accessibility in a program with no elevator, this arrangement makes the most of the communal space
available by placing it together. The planted amenity area and street trees improve the quality of the lobby / lounge space. The shared laundry is close by, letting tenants enjoy the amenity area or lobby while running the laundry machines if they wish.
The ground floor plan is arranged around a central open corridor, transparent at both ends. Through this corrido the exterior (concrete) awning element gets expressed, tying the rear and front of the building together both architecturally and visually. The building is not providing car parking, but the bike lock-up access has been located so that tenants have options for how it is accessed corridor.
DC2
Despite having a relatively small footprint, the proposed mass is articulated into two main boxes. Each stairwell vertical element is also expressed on the exterior to the roof, expressed as a penthouse or parapet wall. Additionally, we're proposing expressing the open corridor and connection between the rear and front of the
building with a multi-story architectural element / awning at both the front and back.
Each façade will contain multiple planes and finish materials (see elevations and DC4 Response). There proposed party wall is the stair wall at the W of the sit.

At the street facing façade the shared lobby space provides transparency, activating the ground plane and providing direct access for the tenants to the shared menity space. Within the front (and rear) entry expression of the entry and provides more visual interes at the street.

Around the amenity area, a low wooden fence is proposed to help delineate public and semi-private area A similar fence is proposed around the raised planting These two fences provide fine grained texture at the sidewalk and pedestrian entry, and their offset (one low, one higher) contributes to the overall architectural expression of the building as two offset boxes.

DC3
The outdoor amenity area is located just outside the shared lobby space, with a window-wall and door directly
between the two. This helps the amenity area feel safer area feel more oxpansive bri-private space), and the lobby area feel more expansive, bringing the outdoors in at the shared space. The lobby area will also benefit from the while the street can take advantage of the greater transparency possible in the public shared lobby to activate the façade. See also the response to PL2.

## DC4

The design proposes to differentiate between the different masses of the buildings with different materials, breaking interest. The E box is proposed to be vertical cement board siding, while the W box is expressed with cement board lap siding. The boxes are then broken up a bit furthe with inset areas of larger cement board panels in a whit color, to provide contrast. The windows within these are
also white, allowing for a mix of white and black windows to further differentiate the various masses of the building.
At both entries to the building, the proposed concrete elements contribute to a sense of permanence and create base for the facade. These architectural features flow into floor, creating transparency through the building and creating connection between the interior and the exterior.

We are proposing sloped roofs with overhangs at the two articulated boxes, which provide visual interest and are also an opportunity to inject a bold colore into the siding materials and accentuate the top of the building.

The proposed landscape design chooses for a modern and natural aesthetic. All have been placed with an eye towards their sun / shade requirements- because the site is planting that will not receive some sun, so we have stayed away from proposing any plants that do better fully shaded (i.e.: ferns). The two proposed street trees (requested by SDOT urban forestry rather than keeping the existing cottonwoods) serve to frame the entry to the building and create a sense of place.

The improved sidwalk and site hardscape will be either pavers or saw-cut concrete, providing human-scale texture and helping the exterior areas belong to the proposed project in a neighborhood context with a lot of unbroke asphalt / gravel


Example of vertical cement board panels in multifamily housing project in South Lake Union
motionspace
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Level 4 Plan
$3 / 16^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$






## KINNIKINNICK (Arctostaphylos uva-ursi)

DWARF GOATSBEARD (Aruncus sylvestre)

MEXICAN MOCK ORANGE (Choisya ternata)

TALL OREGON GRAPE (Mahonia aquifolium)

## VINE MAPLE (Acer circinatum)

EVERGREEN HUCKLEBERRY (Vaccinium Ovatum)

ACCOLADE ELM (Ulmus 'Morton' Accolade)
NOTE: SDOT recommends removing (E) cottonwoods in ROW and replacing with Accolade Elms as shown. Per Ben Roberts, SDOT Forester


Evergreen Huckleberry Mexican Mock Orange



