

**DESIGN GUIDELINE PRIORITIES
OF
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FOR AREA 1 NORTHWEST**

**Meeting Date: July 9, 2007
Report Date: August 23, 2007**

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Project Number: 3007237

Address: 10552 Greenwood Avenue North

Applicant: Radim Blazej, Caron Architecture LLC for Telus Corporation

Board Members present: Elizabeta Stachisin-Moura, Chair
Bill Singer
Guy Peckham
Mark Brands

Land Use Planner present: Tamara Garrett, Land Planner

SITE AND VICINITY DESCRIPTION

The site is located at 10552 Greenwood Avenue North. This approximately 14,647 square foot (sq. ft.) is a corner lot with frontage on the east side of Greenwood Avenue North and the south side of North 107th Street. A self serve car wash facility and detached storage building exists on the subject site. This paved site has vegetation mainly along the site's easternmost property line.

The site's topography is relatively flat with an upward sloping condition from west to east resulting in an eight foot grade change occurring near the site's easterly boundary line. This property is located within the Commercial 1 (C1-40) zone.



Surrounding property is zoned as C1-40 west and south of the subject property. Lowrise 3 (L-3) zone is north of the subject site and Single Family 7200 (SF 7200) is the sole zoning designation east of the proposal.

Existing development in vicinity of the proposal includes single family residences to the east and north; a restaurant and mixed use residential building all to the west; and an apartment complex to the south

PROJECT PROPOSAL

The proposal is to remove the existing commercial buildings and develop a series of buildings consisting of townhouses and live-work units. Accessory parking for a maximum of sixteen (16) vehicles is proposed at grade in a surface parking area and within some of the townhouse units.

ARCHITECT'S PRESENTATION

The proposal was presented to the Board as a PowerPoint presentation. The project architect, Radim Blazej, offered examples of past residential developments his firm has designed and gave a description of the project site and surrounding development in the immediate area. He explained the following unique traits inherent to the site:

- Street improvements including sidewalks, street trees, landscaping and a natural swale were installed along North 107th Street as a result of a pilot project conducted by SPU in order to create alternative stormwater drainage opportunities.
- The absence of curbs or sidewalks along that portion of Greenwood Avenue North that immediately abuts the subject property.
- An upward sloping condition consisting of vegetation occurring along the site's easterly boundary line that abuts the residential neighbor's detached garage.

The architect presented three (3) project alternatives or schemes, all of which included a four-story mixed-use residential/commercial development consisting of a combination of live-work and townhouse units with open space oriented along the site's perimeter and private penthouse access to individual roof terraces on each unit. The alternative massing diagrams are distinguished by the orientation of the residential/commercial entries; location of vehicular and pedestrian access; parking layouts; and the arrangement of live-work units with townhouse units. Green Factor (landscaping) analysis and building locations were also shown. The diagrams incorporated the neighborhood context and future conditions based on area zoning.

The first scheme (Alternative A) included a cluster development consisting of three building masses: one (1) six-unit townhouse building, one (1) four-unit townhouse building and one (1) two-unit live-work building. Vehicular access to ten (10) individual garage stalls within the townhouse units and two (2) surface parking spaces via Greenwood Avenue North is proposed. This scheme illustrates commercial entries oriented along Greenwood Avenue North and residential entries facing North 107th Street and the southernmost property line respectively. There are departure requests from street-level development standards, solid waste and recycling storage standards and parking access that are proposed.

The second scheme presented (Alternative B), which the applicant identified as the code complying design, entailed four (4) building masses consisting of the following uses: one (1) four-unit live-work building, one (1) two-unit live-work building and two (2) four-unit townhouse buildings. This scheme demonstrates commercial entries along the live-work buildings' west façades facing Greenwood Avenue North and residential entries abutting North 107th Street and an interior auto court. Vehicular access to eight (8) garage stalls within some townhouse units and six (6) surface parking spaces via Greenwood Avenue North is proposed. This alternative requests the same departures as Alternative A.

The third scheme (Alternative C) showed three (3) building masses consisting of the following uses: one (1) five-unit townhouse building, one (1) seven-unit townhouse building and one (1) building consisting of two (2) live-work units and two (2) townhouse units. In this scheme, the live-work unit entries and the residential entries along the townhouse building's western façade are oriented towards Greenwood Avenue North. Alternatively, the residential entries to the seven-unit townhouse are proposed to abut the subject site's eastern property line. Sole vehicular access to nine (9) individual garage stalls in several of the townhomes and seven (7) surface parking stalls are proposed via North 107th Street. Departures from street-level uses, street-level development standards and solid waste and recycling storage standards are requested.

The architect presented the third scheme (Alternative C) as the preferred scheme because it allows for development of a stronger corner element and more easily permits the creation of an attractive development that complements its context and neighboring buildings in comparison to the other options.

BOARD CLARIFYING COMMENTS

The Board made clarifying questions and comments with applicant response (*in italics*).

- Describe in more detail the proposed development along the eastern edge of your property and explain the sloping condition near there?
The site is relatively flat leading up to a 2' tall retaining wall that contains a landscaped berm sloping upwards a maximum of 8' towards the residential properties to the east. Propose to maintain grade and limit the amount of grading and excavation in order to bury the building's garages into the slope so that the pedestrian entries facing the easterly property line will occur on the second floor and the vehicular courtyard will occur 8' below that grade.
- Does the proposal include a pedestrian walkway along the easternmost property line?
Yes.
- Utilizing the aerial photo, describe the residential properties east of the subject site including how close are the single family structures are to the property line.
The closest structure to the subject site's east property line is a detached garage whose access is via North 107th Street....the residences are more closely situated near Phinney Avenue North.

- How many properties abut the proposal to the east?
Two (2) residential properties abut the subject property.
- Clarify again the existing uses on the properties along Greenwood Avenue North, south of the proposal.
The two (2) properties immediately south of the proposal are multifamily and the remaining properties are commercial.
- Clarify the current uses along the west side of Greenwood Avenue North.
Restaurant, mixed-use residential development and retail building.
- Verified that the planted landscape buffer at the rear of the site is within the subject site's property boundaries.
- Explain your reasoning for not having more live work spaces along Greenwood Avenue North.
Want to align the proposed residential use with two (2) properties residential south of the proposal and the owner is concerned about viability of commercial uses on site based on the continual commercial vacancies occurring in the mixed use property across the street from the subject site.
- Do you envision that if you did do live work, the live work portion would not be interconnected at all?
It would be the option of the owner but it could allow for separation.
- Clarify how future solid waste and recycling material containers will be stored on site and how those containers are collected.
Similar to most townhome developments, each individual unit would be responsible for their own trash service. It is expected that each unit would have residential sized containers kept inside of their structure and those containers would be rolled out to the curb on waste collection days.
- Could they be accommodated in the trash areas that you show?
It could be accommodated....the issue is that in the future the property will be subdivided and each owner will be responsible for his/her own trash....want to avoid the situation of owners utilizing containers that aren't theirs.
- In reference to the preferred scheme (Alternative C), what would the entry levels be on Greenwood Avenue North and how far are they setback from the property line?
The live-work entries would be at street level within the 10' required setback...the requested departures would allow the townhomes to be setback from Greenwood Avenue north 10' and allow stoops 2' above sidewalk grade.
- Clarify the roof deck landscaping?
Envision a combination of green roofs and potted plants.
- On the east side you have a sidewalk that would abut the detached garage and open lot area on the abutting residential properties. What is your solution to this?
Propose to erect a fence along the easternmost property line.
- Clarify the parking layout shown on Alternate C and explain how it meets parking requirements.
Propose garage parking for nine (9) townhomes and surface parking for five (5) townhomes and the two (2) live-work units.
- Would the SE unit be required to wheel their trash bin to North 107th Street or Greenwood Avenue North for pick-up?

Unknown at this time.....Future owners would coordinate pick-up location with Seattle Public Utilities (SPU).

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Five (5) members of the community attended the Early Design Guidance meeting. The comments and concerns offered were as follows:

- Excited to see development at this site in hopes that it will discourage past illegal activity that occurred when it was a car wash.
- Encouraged a proposal that respects setbacks (especially the easterly property line) and height limits. Hopes the future structures respect the setbacks and the height limit from the grade of Greenwood Avenue North.
- Concerned that future grading and excavation methods may compromise the foundation of the detached garage located on the residential property east of the proposal. *(architect stated no excavation is planned to occur within 10' of the east property line)*
- Informed the Board that residential neighbors have complained at past public meetings about spillover parking generated by the restaurant across the street from the proposed development. Neighbor hopes that this proposal will not exacerbate this parking situation. *(architect stated he is consulting with SDOT regarding installing angled parking along Greenwood Avenue North in order to accommodate more on-street parking.)*
- Concerned that vehicular entrance via North 107th Street will increase traffic onto Phinney Avenue North where children play and “cut-through” traffic occurs.
- Encouraged a good design that would be attractive to the neighborhood; would say “Welcome to Broadview”; and have varied open design amongst the individual units.
- Support for a design that orientates the commercial units closer to the commercial properties south of the subject site.
- Advised the architect to be aware of the CPTED plan (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) and requests these elements are incorporated in the design.
- Not supportive of any of the requested departures.
- Encouraged a design that incorporates good quality landscaping.
- Clarification on whether or not the existing landscaped berm will be removed.

BOARD DELIBERATIONS

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the siting and design guidance described below and identified by letter and number those siting and design guidelines found in the City of Seattle’s “*Design Review: Guidelines for Multifamily and Commercial Buildings*” of highest priority to this project.

DESIGN GUIDELINES

A. Site Planning

A-3 Entrances Visible from the Street

Entries should be clearly identifiable and visible from the street.

A-4 Human Activity

New development should be sited and designed to encourage human activity on the street.

A-5 Respect for Adjacent Sites

Buildings should respect adjacent properties by being located on their sites to minimize disruption of the privacy and outdoor activities of residents in adjacent buildings.

A-7 Residential Open Space

Residential projects should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive, well-integrated open space.

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.

A-10: Corner Lots

Building on corner lots should be oriented to the corner and public street fronts. Parking and automobile access should be located away from corners.

The Board emphasized the importance of developing a respectful and consistent relationship of the overall massing and design of the development to the streetscape, pedestrian environment and general pattern of development in the neighborhood. The Board stated future design should be respectful of the single family zoned properties east of the subject property. The Board complemented the architect on creating a design that minimizes substantial excavation and maintains existing grade near the residential properties east of the subject site.

The Board acknowledged that there is not a defined streetscape to be compatible with. Nevertheless, the Board felt future development should set precedent for how future growth will be envisioned on Greenwood Avenue North. Therefore, the Board agreed that orienting as many entries on the two (2) streets would assist in creating a strong presence at street-level and enhance human activity. The Board also stated parallel parking along Greenwood Avenue North would be desirable (if possible) and encourages the applicant to consult with DPD and Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) regarding this specific street improvement proposal.

The Board looks forward to reviewing a high-quality well programmed and well landscaped design that incorporates roof landscaping and ground level landscaping. The Board encouraged the architect to provide permeable surfaces (i.e. pavers) and landscaped islands in the surface parking area to assist in lessening the scale of the auto court area for those units facing the courtyard.

The Board is concerned that the proposed corner building mass at North 107th Street and Greenwood Avenue North will not relate well to the North 107th street front. Therefore, the Board stated that both the west and north building facades should be designed to fully

address the street face. Additionally, any pedestrian entries and façade treatments (i.e. window treatments, materials, canopies) for the live-work units oriented along Greenwood Avenue North should wrap the corner and smoothly transition to a more residential environment at some point.

B. Height, Bulk and Scale

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 near-by, 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 of the adjacent zones.

The Board discussed at length the proposed massing configurations. It was during this discussion that the Board discovered that Alternative B's site plan and massing diagrams (described in the Architect's Presentation section of this report) illustrated in the EDG packet did not correspond with one another. *(Alternative B's site plan illustrated five (5) building masses consisting of one (1) four-unit live-work building, one (1) two-unit live-work building, one single family residence, one (1) two-unit townhouse building and one (1) four-unit townhouse building. Vehicular access to seven (7) garage stalls and six (6) surface parking spaces via North 107th Street is proposed.)* The architect concurred with the Board's observations and explained that after realizing vehicular access from Greenwood Avenue North would not be allowed, he revised the site plan but did not update the massing diagrams. This revision resulted in a loss of one (1) townhome in order to accommodate vehicular access from North 107th Street. In an effort to achieve a code-complying design that includes a total of eight (8) townhomes instead of seven (7), the architect mentioned that Alternative B's site plan would be further revised to include a corner building configuration similar to what's illustrated on Alternative C's site plan *(one (1) building consisting of two (2) live-work units and two (2) townhouse units with the live-work units facing Greenwood Avenue North and the townhome's residential entries facing east).*

The Board debated the merits between Alternative B and Alternative C (preferred scheme) and discussed which scheme would have the following attributes: be least imposing to the residential neighbors; reinforce the commercial frontage on Greenwood Avenue North and insure that all entries face the streets as much as possible. In general, one (1) Board Member was supportive of the concept of allowing a few townhomes on a streetscape-especially when certain streetscapes have difficulty supporting viable commercial and are situated near the end of the commercial zone boundary. Currently, this property would potentially be a good representation of this concept based on the current development surrounding the subject site. However, the Board was concerned that by supporting a design that would allow additional residential uses along the Greenwood Avenue North streetscape, it may set a precedent that would potentially be followed by the neighboring properties south of the subject site which the Board recognizes will eventually be developed in the near future.

Ultimately, the Board was supportive of Alternative B because it is more responsive to the commercial nature of Greenwood Avenue North and it breaks the mass of the building along the east side nearest to the single family zoned properties. However, the Board did voice concern regarding the possibility of Alternative C's corner building configuration being incorporated with Alternative B's design-mainly because the townhouse units would face a tiny compressed area and could create a lengthy blank wall façade along North 107th Street. Also, a design that situates the commercial buildings closer to Greenwood Avenue North is desirable. Therefore, the Board would like to review a scheme that reinforces the commercial frontage on Greenwood Avenue North; breaks the building mass near the eastern property line; ensures all entries are facing the streets; and relocates other entries away from the eastern property line in order to not populate that area as much as possible.

C. Architectural Elements and Materials

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.

C-4 Exterior Finish Materials

Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.

The Board did not highlight a single architectural expression to develop given the varied collection of buildings in the vicinity. Rather, the Board encouraged innovative residential and commercial design that is cohesive and applied evenly throughout the buildings. The Board did concur that the street-level façade concepts provided in the EDG packet are good examples that would be appropriate along Greenwood Avenue North. The Board would like to see details of the street-level façades along both streets.

No future building materials were presented during the meeting. However, the Board looks forward to reviewing a more detailed, high quality materials and color board at the next meeting.

D. Pedestrian Environment

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.

D-2 Blank Walls

Buildings should avoid large blank walls facing the street, especially near sidewalks. Where blank walls are unavoidable, they should receive design treatment to increase pedestrian comfort and interest.

D-6 Screening of Dumpsters, Utilities and Service Areas

Building sites should locate service elements like trash dumpsters, loading docks and mechanical equipment away from the street front where possible. When elements such as dumpsters, utility meters, mechanical units and service areas cannot be located away from the street front, they should be situated and screened from view and should not be located in the pedestrian right-of-way.

D-7 Personal Safety and Security

Project design should consider opportunities for enhancing personal safety and security in the environment under review.

D-11 Commercial Transparency

Commercial storefronts should be transparent, allowing for a direct visual connection between pedestrians on the sidewalk and the activities occurring on the interior of a building. Blank walls should be avoided.

D-12 Residential Entries and Transitions

For residential projects in commercial zones, the space between the residential entry and the sidewalk should provide security and privacy for residents and a visually interesting street front for pedestrians. Residential buildings should enhance the character of the streetscape with small gardens, stoops and other elements that work to create a transition between the public sidewalk and private entry.

Given the orientation of the commercial and residential building masses, the Board feels strongly that the design should avoid blank walls facing the streets and sidewalks. The Board wants the design to include a good degree of transparency, sufficient lighting and overhead weather protection along Greenwood Avenue North. Additionally, the Board would like to better understand the view potentials along the south-facing facades of the proposed structures. At the next meeting, the Board wants to review proposed south façade treatments and a conceptual lighting plan.

The Board was concerned that if a trash and recycling collection area was not provided onsite, an abundance of waste containers will be rolled out to the right-of-way on trash collection days. Therefore, the Board would prefer a trash collection area onsite that would be enclosed and screened in an architectural form reflective of the development and not intrusive to pedestrian. If this is neither possible nor practical due to the possibility of future platting actions on the site which would create fee simple ownership, the Board requests the applicant to provide some alternatives based on preliminary approval from DPD and the SPU-Solid Waste division.

The Board stated the proposed design does a good job of addressing personal safety and security and encourages the architect to continue to incorporate CPTED principles into the design.

E. Landscaping

E-1 Landscaping to Reinforce Design Continuity with Adjacent Sites

Where possible, and where there is not another overriding concern, landscaping should reinforce the character of neighboring properties and abutting streetscape.

E-3 Landscape 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.

Landscaping should enhance the prior guidelines, by creating a transition from neighboring lots and from the street, softening edge conditions and by helping create a green streetscape. The Board looks forward to reviewing a detailed landscape plan that includes landscaping and screening along the property lines, residential amenity areas (roof decks) and residential entries. The plan should also include details regarding proposed screening along the eastern and southern property lines.

The Board encourages continued coordination with DPD and Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) regarding potential additional improvements along North 107th Street (natural swale) and Greenwood Avenue North (parallel parking, tree pits, etc.). The applicant will be expected to provide feedback regarding this coordination at the next meeting.

DEPARTURES FROM DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Six (6) departures from the Code are requested at this time.

1. STREET-LEVEL USES (SMC 23.47A.005.D.3)

The Code states that residential uses may not exceed, in the aggregate, 20% of the street-level street-facing façade when facing an arterial (Greenwood Avenue North). The preferred design illustrates 71% of the street-level street-facing façade being comprised of townhomes. The Board Members clearly stated that they will not be favorably inclined towards granting this departure. The Board also acknowledged that this departure request is also the reason why subsequent departures are requested.

The Board's recommendation on the requested departure will be reserved until the Final Recommendation meeting and will be based upon the departure's potential to help the project better meet these design guideline priorities and achieve a better overall design than could be achieved without the departure.

2. STREET-LEVEL DEVELOPMENT SETBACK STANDARDS (SMC 23.47A.008.A.3)

The proposed design includes townhomes along Greenwood Avenue North situated 10' from the street lot line. The Code requires that street-level street-facing facades of structures containing a residential use must be located within 10' of the street lot line, unless wider sidewalks, plazas, or other approved landscaped or open spaces are provided.

The Board's recommendation on the requested departure will be reserved until the Final Recommendation meeting and will be based upon the departure's potential to help the

project better meet these design guideline priorities and achieve a better overall design than could be achieved without the departure.

3. STREET-LEVEL DEVELOPMENT TRANSPARENCY STANDARDS (SMC 23.47A.008.B.2)

The Code states 60% of the street-facing façade between 2' and 8' above the sidewalk shall be transparent. The applicant is requesting to allow transparency requirements to be reduced from 60% to 30% for the townhomes.

The Board's recommendation on the requested departure will be reserved until the Final Recommendation meeting and will be based upon the departure's potential to help the project better meet these design guideline priorities and achieve a better overall design than could be achieved without the departure.

4. STREET-LEVEL DEVELOPMENT INTERIOR SPACE HEIGHT STANDARDS (SMC 23.47A.008.B.3.b)

The Code states that nonresidential uses at street level must have a floor-to-floor height of at least 13'. The applicant requests a departure that would allow a floor-to-floor height of 11' for the live-work units with the reasoning that a lower floor-to-floor height minimizes the overall height of the structure.

The Board Members clearly stated that they will not be favorably inclined towards granting this departure.

The Board's recommendation on the requested departure will be reserved until the Final Recommendation meeting and will be based upon the departure's potential to help the project better meet these design guideline priorities and achieve a better overall design than could be achieved without the departure.

5. RESIDENTIAL STREET-LEVEL REQUIREMENT STANDARDS (SMC 23.47A.008.D.2)

The applicant requests to allow the first floor of the townhomes, with street-level street-facing façades closer than 10' to the property line, begin 2' above the sidewalk grade instead of the required 4' above sidewalk grade.

The Board's recommendation on the requested departure will be reserved until the Final Recommendation meeting and will be based upon the departure's potential to help the project better meet these design guideline priorities and achieve a better overall design than could be achieved without the departure.

6. SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLABLE MATERIALS STORAGE SPACE (SMC 23.47A.029.A)

The Code requires 75 square feet (sq. ft.) storage space required for 7-15 residential units; and 125 sq. ft. storage space required for 5,001-15,000 sq. ft. of commercial uses. Rear loading is required. The applicant is requesting to not provide a common waste storage

area with the intent of creating ample space in each commercial/residential unit that will allow for ample waste storage to be contained within the units.

The Board indicated that they would consider this departure request based on feedback from the Solid Waste Division of SPU. However, the Board's recommendation on the requested departure will be reserved until the final Board meeting and will be based upon the departure's potential to help the project better meet these design guideline priorities and achieve a better overall design than could be achieved without the departure.

NEXT STEPS

MUP Application:

1. Submit application for Master Use Permit (MUP) application. Please contact Tamara Garrett at (206) 684-0976 or tamara.garrett@seattle.gov once the intake meeting date for the MUP submittal has been determined.
2. Please include a written response to the guidance provided in this EDG. Plan on embedding four (4) 11x17 colored and shadowed elevations, landscape plans, and right-of-way improvement plans and three-dimensional street level vignettes showing design character of the residential/commercial entries into the front of the MUP plan set as Design Review sheets (DR-1,2, etc.).

Recommendation Meeting:

1. The Board would like to review details of the landscaping and residential amenity areas (roof decks) and clarify which areas are counted towards land use code requirements (Green Factor).
2. The Board would like to review site sections in several areas of the site.
3. The Board would like to see a detailed color and materials board with actual samples.
4. The Board would like to review details and elevations (north, east, south and west) of the pedestrian walkways and residential/commercial entrances.
5. Please provide colored renderings and/or graphics showing the proposed development from the pedestrian perspective along both streets.
6. Please submit a conceptual lighting plan.