City of Seattle
Gregory J. Nickels, Mayor
Department of Planning & Development
D.M. Sugimura, Director

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DOWNTOWN DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Project Numbers:	**3007606**
Addresses:	**1931 Second Avenue**
Applicant:	**Dan Foltz, Weber Thompson Architects for The Justen Company**
Meeting Date:	**September 9, 2008**
Report Date:	**October 7, 2008**
Board members present:	**Dana Behar** **Jim Falconer** **Marta Falkowska** **Bill Gilland, Chair** **Kelly Mann**
Board members absent:	**None**
DPD staff present:	**Lisa Rutzick, Land Use Planner**

SITE & VICINITY

The proposed development site is located at the corner of 2nd Avenue and Virginia Street in the Belltown neighborhood of downtown Seattle. The site is on the West side of 2nd, on the quarter block south of Virginia and contains two structures and a surface parking lot. Second Avenue is a Class 1 pedestrian corridor and principal transit street, while Virginia is a Class 2 pedestrian street and minor arterial. No Green Street or View Corridor designations exist for this project.

The site is zoned DMC 240/290-400. The height limit for this zone is 240 feet, however if a residential tower is proposed that participates in the creation or funding of low income house under SMC 23.49.015, and if the building is designed and built to at least a silver LEED level, it

is eligible for up to 400 feet in height. An additional 40 feet, or 10% of the maximum height limit, is available for screened rooftop mechanical equipment.

The site is 180' long in the north/ south direction and 108' in the east/ west direction. The alley is currently 16' feet wide, making it substandard, requiring a setback on the alley of two feet to a minimum height of 26' above the alley. The sidewalks on Second Avenue and Virginia Street meet the minimum code dimensional requirements.

The site to the west is occupied by the Terminal Sales building. To the south is a lower scaled commercial building for which a Master Use Permit has been issued for a 240-foot tall residential tower. A new proposal is under consideration for a new tower that would reach the 400-foot height limit, but would be subject to tower spacing requirements.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed development at 1931 Second Avenue is for a 38 story building with 11 floors containing 154 hotel rooms and 26 floors containing 190 unit residential units with 6,431 sq. ft. of retail commercial use at ground level. Parking for 288 vehicles will be located both below (five floors) and above (3 floors) grade.

This project was reviewed by the Design Review Board on the following occasions:

1. October 9, 2007 – Early Design Guidance
2. November 27, 2007 – Second Early Design Guidance
3. July 22, 2008 – Initial Recommendation
4. September 9, 2008 – Final Recommendation

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE: OCTOBER 9, 2007

DESIGN PRESENTATION

A joint site review for both the subject site and the proposed tower to on the southwest corner of the 2nd and Virginia intersection was provided through the presentation of graphics, photos and computer modeling showing the allowed zoning envelope for the project and massing of in relationship to the surrounding built environment. The presentation materials included three separate concepts for each project, including massing diagrams, location of parking, pedestrian and vehicular access and possible departures. However, the options were paired so that Option 1 north was coupled with Option 1 South. No specifics concerning materials were provided due to the early stage of design development and the overall purpose of this meeting.

The program of the south site included a residential lobby along Virginia Street, a hotel entrance on Second Avenue and ground level retail uses. Five floors of below grade parking and three

floors of above grade parking limited to the south half of the site in order to maximize hotel use along Virginia were presented. The program incorporates a corner retail space at 2nd and Virginia, along with potential sidewalk widening along 2nd Avenue. Access is proposed from the alley. Currently the proposal does not anticipate any existing buildings or portions of existing buildings will be reused on site.

The program of the north site included a residential lobby along 2nd Avenue with four floors of below grade parking and four floors of above grade parking. Access is proposed from the alley. The program incorporated a corner retail space at 2nd and Virginia. All of the schemes proposed a base that is eroded at the corner of 2nd and Virginia to include space for the retail entry and possible spillover of commercial activity. For the south tower options, the base steps back to relate to adjacent datum lines and reinforce the hotel program, while also creating landscaped terraces. For all of the north tower alternatives, the base relates to the adjacent architectural datum line established by Cristalla's base.

The first scheme (Option 1S) for the south site showed a rectilinear base with a tower that uses angled and fractured rectilinear forms compositionally to break down the tower massing and create long slenderizing lines on the façade. A distinctive, faceted vertical bar rises from the corner at 2nd and Virginia along Virginia St. which works with a similar bar on the north tower. The tower is approximately 57 feet from 1915 Second Avenue to the south

The first scheme (Option 1N) for the north site showed a rectilinear base with a tower that uses angled and fractured rectilinear forms compositionally to break down the tower massing and create long slenderizing lines on the façade. The Base element on Virginia is expressed at 2nd. A distinctive, faceted vertical bar hovers above the base and rises from the corner at 2nd and Virginia along 2nd which works with a similar bar on the south tower. The tower holds back from Virginia property line as a neighborly gesture, but aggressively holds the alley property line for a significant length of the west façade. The tower is approximately 77 feet from the Cristalla to the north and 16 feet from OPT's property line.

The second scheme (Option 2S) for the south site showed a rectilinear base with a tower that uses a base with a tower that mixes curved and angled rectilinear forms compositionally to break down the tower massing and create long slenderizing lines on the façade. A distinctive, faceted vertical bar rises from the corner at 2nd and Virginia along Virginia St. which works with a similar bar on the north tower. The tower's south façade is faceted to capture views while providing more relief to 1915 2nd Avenue. The tower is approximately 49 feet from 1915 Second Avenue to the south

The second scheme (Option 2N) for the north site showed a rectilinear base with a tower that mixes curved and angled rectilinear forms compositionally to break down the tower massing and create long slenderizing lines on the façade. A distinctive, faceted vertical bar rises from the corner at 2nd and Virginia along 2nd. which works with a similar bar on the south tower. The tower angles back from the Virginia property line, but aggressively holds the alley property line for a moderate length of the west façade. The tower is approximately 72 feet from the Cristalla to the north and 16 feet from OPT's property line.

The third and preferred scheme (Option 3S) for the south site showed a rectilinear base with a tower that mixes slightly curved and angled rectilinear forms compositionally to break down the tower massing and create long slenderizing lines on the façade. The tower's south façade is faceted to capture views while providing more relief to 1915 2nd Avenue. The tower is expressed at the corner. The tower is approximately 61 feet from 1915 Second Avenue to the south

The third and preferred scheme (Option 3N) for the north site showed a rectilinear base with a tower that mixes slightly curved and angled rectilinear forms compositionally to break down the tower massing and create long slenderizing lines on the façade. The tower angles back from alley property line touching the west property line at only one point, but approaches the Virginia property line at points on the south façade. The tower is expressed at the corner. The tower is approximately 71 feet from the Cristalla to the north and 16 feet from OPT's property line.

A conceptual plan for the right-of-way improvements along both Second Avenue and Virginia Street included widened sidewalks, open space at the entry points, special paving, landscaping, curb bulbs at the corners and alley intersections, street trees, seating and overhead weather protection.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Approximately 42 members of the public attended the Early Design Guidance meeting. Several additional comment letters were received. The following comments were offered:

- Concerned with the overwhelming impact of the canyon effect created by locating both towers close to Virginia.
- The design should be responsive to the historical buildings near to the sites. As proposed, the designs do not appear to recognize this aspect of the context in a significant way. The carving back of the proposed towers seems random.
- While the south side of the south tower has been narrowed, it appears to slam into the north façade of the approved 1915 2nd Avenue building. The north façade of the 1915 2nd Avenue building is primarily solid due to the proximity to the property line and the inability to secure an easement over the abutting property (the south tower). This design of this north façade may be revisited as a result of this proposed development.
- Wondering why the hotel use is proposed for the south tower and not the north tower.
- Neighbors appreciate outreach efforts of the design and development team.
- Strongly concerned that the 80' tower spacing requirement does not apply to the site. That the Code reduced the tower spacing to zero in this circumstance is indicative of a defective code. As a result, these projects should seek to limit the damage created by the problematic code.
- Important guidelines to consider are A1, B1, B2 and B3 which address reduction of the bulk and scale impacts and being sensitive to the three historic buildings in the immediate vicinity.
- Views of the project from neighboring units should be provided in future presentations. Shifting the north tower further to the north would preserve many views to the southeast.
- The neighborhood context has been built keeping view corridors down the east west streets in mind. This objective should be continued in these projects.
- Commend the alley improvements made along with the neighboring Cristalla development, which widened the alley, included lighting and provided space to have a dumpster-free alley.

- Concerned with the wind at these corners due to the hill in conjunction with the height and closeness of the towers.
- Additional graphics showing the proposed building footprints in context would be helpful.
- The 18' distance between the proposed north tower and the OPT building is very compact.
- The Terminal Sales Annex, located on the site, is an important building that represents an architectural style that is relatively rare in Seattle.
- The two towers represent significant impacts, particularly with regard to bulk and scale as viewed from certain vantage points. The unprecedented height of both buildings is difficult to comprehend. Therefore, increased separation between the two towers is critical.
- Residents of the Cristalla are concerned about the loss of light due to the proposed structure.
- Want to see more examination of the light and shadow impacts on the streets and nearby residential units.
- The safety of hotel workers is affected by building design. Therefore, the design of the hotel units should consider how the design may be improved to prevent unnecessary worker injury. The Unite Here Union is available for consultation on the design of the hotel units.
- Request to be listed as a Party of Record.
- Objections to the proposed building height.
- Request graphic studies of the site and context showing figure grounds, open spaces, shadows, zoning allowances and photos towards the site from neighboring buildings.

SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE: NOVEMBER 27, 2007

DESIGN PRESENTATION

At the second EDG meeting, extensive site review for both tower sites was provided through the presentation of graphics, photos and computer modeling exploring architectural relationships to adjacent structures, street context including across 2nd Avenue, massing in relationship to the surrounding built environment, and architectural responses to the previous EDG meeting direction in relation to adjacent structures.

The major ramifications and opportunities stemming from 15 iterations of tower placement combinations and scenarios were presented and discussed, with 2 acceptable alternatives identified. Also, the preferred design direction for tower shaping was discussed, and explained relating to the positives and negatives of each move affecting adjacent structures.

The towers were presented separately with the south tower first and the north tower second. The presentation materials built on the preferred alternative identified in the first EDG for each project, with modifications to address key issues of bulk, light and air relationships to adjacent structures. Three base studies were presented exploring a range of ideas more than presenting definitive options. No specifics concerning building materials were provided due to the early stage of design development and the overall purpose of this meeting. Landscape was deferred to a later meeting per the direction of the Board in the first EDG.

All of the options had similar assumptions regarding the proposed building programs as was presented at the previous EDG meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Approximately 11 members of the public attended the Second Early Design Guidance meeting. An additional comment letter was also received. The following comments were offered:

- Compliments to the applicant for responding so thoroughly to the EDG comments. Despite a defective city code with regard to tower spacing, the proposed schemes are extraordinarily sensitive to the neighbors. Would like to see a figure ground study of how the spaces are shaped to show views to the west.
- Appreciates the response by the design team to address neighbor's concerns with results that are both positive and creative. Feels that the two towers are spaced too closely across Virginia (76') and would encourage the south building to round off the sharp corners to increase this distance. Prefers rounded edges, rather than corners. Five residential floors of OPT face the alley and proposed alley façade of the north building. The design of this west elevation is therefore critical. The garage exhaust should not be dumped into the alley and these residential units. Encourage the developer to reach across 2nd Avenue and contact the property owners (Moore, Catholic Archdiocese, Josephinum) to look for opportunities to improve the east side of the street. Interested to see the materials, colors, streetscape treatment, as well as environmental studies associated with the proposed developments.
- Found this to be an excellent urban design analysis and supports the proposed tower placement locations. At the podium level is where the human scale is affected most. As such, the podium design must offer a substantial form that grounds the towers; the base should not look applied. And within the substantial base, the form should further break down to favor the pedestrian scale. Encourage the design to work for simpler, calmer, more consistent approach to the podium designs that complement (not compete with) neighboring buildings.
- The architectural expression of the two buildings should reflect the different sites and programs. Two similarly executed buildings will exacerbate the height, bulk and scale impacts. These should be treated as two different buildings that look like they were developed independently. Supports the proposed departure request given the public improvements proposed at the ground level.
- The alley raises a security issue with a blank façade offering no activity or views to the alley. Would like to see details of how the alley will be designed in terms of lighting, active uses, increased width, stairwell design and dumpster accommodation. Uses at the sidewalk level should offer multiple storefronts with generous and active pedestrian spaces, especially at the alley corners. The tower spacing and location of the south building appears well considered. The north building, however, should eliminate the bulge at the southeast corner towards the Cristalla. Such a projection is not respectful of the Cristalla residences. The Cristalla has a 23rd floor roof deck and common open space which should the design should be sensitive towards. The building footprint has become wider from east to west and would encourage a return to the previous small tower footprint. The maximum tower footprint is not guaranteed by the Code. Not concerned with the wind issues if the design is responsive to the studies.
- Agree that the bulge towards the Cristalla is detrimental. The towers look too unrelieved and monolithic without significant changes between them.
- This section of Second Ave feels uncomfortable for the pedestrian and needs to have more outdoor restaurant seating to activate the streetscape.
- Need to make the tower design friendly given the numbers of neighbors who will be viewing the buildings.

- The design has generally been responsive to the comments from the first EDG. The northeast corner of the south tower should be rounded off to soften the appearance and increase the distance between the towers. The alley design of the north building should be enhanced adjacent to OPT residential floors. Specifically, blank walls should be eliminated and special design enhancements should be included. Additionally, building venting and other noise generators should not be included along this façade.

INITIAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING: JULY 22, 2008

DESIGN PRESENTATION

At the Initial Recommendation meeting, several modifications to the design were presented to the Board, including:

- The project has evolved with a distinct character from the North Tower proposal.
- The base and tower have been designed in concert with Landmarks Architectural Review Committee (ARC) concerns for the Terminal Sales Annex (TSA). See comments below.
- The base designs presented at EDG #2 were too busy. With the addition of the TSA as an integrated façade element, all other facades have been designed to be subordinate to the TSA.
- The tower has been allowed to come to the ground in 2 places, the hotel entrance and the residential entrance, thus reinforcing the entries.
- The design of the alley façade has been integrated into the overall building design, will be lit for safety and a corner retail element wraps the alley entrance.
- The ground floor is a mix of retail and lobby space along the streets. The retail at the corner of 2nd and Virginia holds back from the property line to create a larger sidewalk and provide the possibility for outdoor cafes of retail spill-over. A retail location is also located at the alley off of Virginia, at the corner of 2nd and Virginia and along the 2nd avenue façade south of the hotel entrance. The hotel entrance and lobby is located off of 2nd Avenue and the residential entrance is located off of Virginia. A storage area for trash and recycle bins currently located in the alley has been provided with access from the alley.
- Level 2 is primarily parking w/ hotel wrapping all of the Virginia façade, 2-story retail, hotel use and "work studios" wrapping most of the 2nd Avenue Façade.
- Levels 3 and 4 are primarily parking w/ hotel wrapping all of the Virginia façade and hotel use and work studios wrapping most of the 2nd Avenue.
- Level 5 to 12 is for hotel use with conference rooms, administration areas, and outdoor terraces for hotel use.
- Levels 13-38 are residential units
- The roof level contains interior and exterior common recreation space, as well as mechanical spaces.

The applicant team has also met with the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) of the Landmarks Board on four occasions. The ARC has made several recommendations, which are summarized as follows:

ARC Meeting #1

- Terminal Sales Annex (TSA) was designed with the intent that other buildings would be developed to the north and south in scale with traditional development patterns.
- Perhaps some of the side wall should be expressed, so as to avoid "facadism."
- The adjacent structure to the north should be proportioned to be in scale with the landmark and it should read as if filling in missing teeth.
- Avoid having the project "loom" over the landmark—needs to give it breathing room and space.
- It would be acceptable for the glass curtain wall to ground itself between the TSA and the new building element to the south creating an architectural hyphen which helps define the entry to the south of the landmark.
- Need to pull the overhead weather protection back from the landmark to give it breathing room.
- One solution might be an "L" shaped project, pushing the project all the way to the south and to the west. [There was objection to this from the owner of the entitled project to the south.]
- A plaza at the NE corner might support the landmark, but the new structure might want to be flush.
- The high-ceilinged lobby inside the TSA primary elevation was welcomed.

ARC Meeting #2

- The new corner building element should approximate the height of the Terminal Sales Annex and should be held out to the Second Avenue property line to be flush with the Terminal Sales Annex. Base C "Medium Corner" concept was preferred.
- The glass curtain wall can extend down from the tower to the south of the Terminal Sales Annex, as it provides a nice transition to the building element to the south and creates a desirable recessed entry.
- The building element south of the curtain wall adjacent to Second Avenue could be of a lower height than the Terminal Sales Annex and new corner building element.
- The north elevation façade provides a nice transition from the height of the TSA to the height of the Terminal Sales Building across the alley. The glass element extending down from the tower between the tall and the shorter facades was desirable.
- Canopies should not be placed on the TSA building and canopies on each side should stop not less than two feet from the TSA.

ARC Meeting #3

- The committee felt the design was almost there, and not requiring major shifts in design.
- The committee supported the relationships made between our base elements and the Terminal Sales Building and Annex (TSA).
- The committee supported the simplicity and restraint provided by the architecture of the base elements.
- There were two concerns about the relationship of the hotel entrance on 2nd Avenue and the TSA.
    1) The applicant was urged to find a solution that exposed more of the south facade of the TSA similar to the setback expressed by the tower element above the TSA.
    2) The applicant was urged to explore an alternate to the glass tower "hyphen" at the hotel entry, possibly a more solid "construct" hyphen element.
- The applicant was asked to explore and present multiple options to discuss at the next meeting.

ARC Meeting #4

- The committee rejected both options #4 and #5 as too busy, and not in character with the other facade treatments.
- The committee reiterated support for the subdued architectural expression for the rest of the base.
- The committee largely preferred the base of option 1, maintaining the 3 bay parking structure element. This was seen to relate somewhat to the tri-partite base elements on the TSA facade.
- Some interest was shown for the 2-1/2 bay base in option #3 but that interest was deferred to the architects to choose what was best for the building.
- The committee largely preferred the tower of option 3, which moved the tower massing elements 5' to the south.
- The committee would like further exploration of any possible ways to physically or otherwise expose the south wall of the TSA more. Options include moving the glass plane back at the "hyphen" or exposing the wall through the clear glass entry and upper levels as a part of the interior design.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Approximately ten members of the public attended the Initial Recommendation meeting; the following comments were offered:

- Appreciate pulling the building back from the northeast corner making it less obtrusive to those neighbors to the northwest. Applicant has worked closely with neighboring property owners to explore improving the streetscape across 2nd Avenue; this work is on-going. Concerned with the volume of traffic on Virginia and the alley, especially if portions of the alley are only 18 feet wide.
- Pleased with the previous direction of the Board and cautions that the proposed building will set a precedent in terms of blocking views of the water and creating a wall along 2nd Avenue.
- Concerned that three towers are being proposed in close proximity to each other in this area of 2nd Avenue and that the designs should be mindful of this unique opportunity and condition.

FINAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING: SEPTEMBER 9, 2008

DESIGN PRESENTATION

At the Final Recommendation meeting, additional design details were presented for the entry canopy, parking screening, building materials and patterning and landscaping.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Approximately two members of the public attended the Final Recommendation meeting and one comment letter was received; the following comments were offered:

- The decisions made the DRB for this project have significant adverse impacts on the proposed project to the south.
- Both the subject property and the proposed development to the south are under review by the DRB. The shift of the tower five feet to the south was supported by the DRB. Such a shift requires that the proposed tower to the south also be shifted in order to accommodate the 80' tower separation requirement. If the tower spacing exception is not granted, there is a loss of floor area. Given this condition, the Board should recommend in favor of an exception for the project to the south for at least the five foot distance that was recommended to the subject tower.

DESIGN GUIDELINE PRIORITIES

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 following siting and design guidance and identified by letter and number those siting and design guidelines found in the City of Seattle's *Design Review Guidelines for Downtown Development* of highest priority to this project.

A. Site Planning

A-1 Respond to the physical environment. Develop an architectural concept and compose the building's massing in response to geographic conditions and patterns of urban form found beyond the immediate context of the building site.
Belltown-specific supplemental guidance: (a) Develop the architectural concept and arrange the building mass to enhance views. This includes views of the water and mountains, and noteworthy structures; (b) The architecture and building mass should respond to sites having nonstandard shapes. There are several changes in the street grid alignment in Belltown, resulting in triangular sites and chamfered corners; and (c) The topography of the neighborhood lends to its unique character. Design buildings to take advantage of this condition as an opportunity, rather than a constraint. Along the streets, single entry, blank facades are discouraged. Consider providing multiple entries and windows at street level on sloping streets.

The Board discussed at length the spacing of the towers on each of the sites. The Board felt that the two schemes presented did not reflect the possible range of alternatives for tower spacing. The Board agreed they would like to see additional alternatives that explore the towers being located towards the center of their respective sites, rather than at the edges. At the next meeting, the Board would like to see greater exploration of the siting of the towers on the base.

The Board also raised concerns with the canyon effect of having both towers situated against Virginia Street. They suggested that a wind tunnel analysis be completed to better understand the impacts of wind on the pedestrian realm.

At the Second Early Design Guidance meeting, a detailed study of tower spacing was presented exploring the balance between the two towers and their relationship to

each other and nearby buildings. Intervals of 0', 5', 10', 15', 20' and 30' setbacks for each building were shown.

In the preferred scenario, the tower of the south site was moved eight feet from the north property line. The applicant explained that greater than eight feet would necessitate full plate parking which was undesirable as it creates frontage of parking use along Virginia. The Board agreed that screening this façade with active hotel uses is preferable. The top of the tower was modified to step away from Virginia Street, down to adjacent structures and the massing was modified to step down to adjacent structures including OPT. The Board confirmed that the shifting of the tower by eight feet seemed a reasonable and realistic resolution.

On the north site, the building core was shifted ten feet to the north. The tower was reshaped to angle away from OPT reducing the bulk and proximity of the two towers to each other and opening up OPT to more light and air. Responding to the reshaping along the south and west facades, additional massing was added to the north façade. This mass was also reshaped to angle away from Cristalla, reducing the profile and proximity of the tower to Cristalla and allowing for greater light and air. The Board agreed that the sculpted curves of the north building provides a sensitive response to the OPT and Cristalla residents. They also felt that the additional bulge is acceptable given the balance achieved by all five towers considered together. The Board noted that perhaps the pointed edge at the southeast corner could be further setback.

The Board noted that the while the shaping of the north tower has been revised and the south tower has shifted to the south, as seen from a distance, the beveled condition of the north tower will not be evident – only the edges will be apparent – thus making the bulk seem greater.

An analysis of the building typologies in the immediate vicinity was presented showing patterns of frames, structural rhythm, taller datum lines, terra cotta detailing, masonry and concrete materials that can help inform the design of the two proposed buildings. The Board strongly agreed that the design of the two buildings should steer away from concepts or designs that are similar to each other. The two towers will appear as a pair from a distance and that alone is a sufficient commonality. The Board encouraged creating different building profiles that will read from a distance.

The applicants noted that a wind study is underway for the two sites and the preliminary results agree that shifting the towers away from each other and projecting the podiums outward is helpful in reducing adverse wind conditions.

The Board was pleased with the extensive studies responding to the EDG, particularly with tower spacing and shape.

At the Initial Recommendation meeting, the Board expressed appreciation for the presentation of reviews by the Architectural Review Committee of the Landmarks

Board and how the coordination of the both review bodies has resulted in a more restrained, simplified design that focuses on the detailing and materials around the landmark and tower above. The Board agreed that the building tower and base on either side of the TSA should defer to and relate to the TSA. The banding, columns, mullions, fenestration and detailing should takes cues from the TSA and endeavor to make the TSA the dominant element of the building base.

At the Final Recommendation meeting, the Board was very pleased with the material treatment of the building exterior as it relates to the TSA. In particular, the frame around the base along Second Avenue takes cues from the framing of the TSA façade. Furthermore, two shades of pre cast were selected to create primary and secondary framing along the base on both Second and Virginia streets. The lighter shade was used as the primary, outer frame and the darker color provides contrast as the secondary, inner frame. This same treatment wraps around the alley façade at the base. The Board also appreciated the open vertical space created in the interior of the hotel lobby behind the TSA façade.

The Board reiterated that the effort to incorporate the TSA into the façade both programmatically and aesthetically was successfully achieved and allows the TSA to stand out as the prominent focal point of the development that manages to straddle and activate both the exterior and interior spaces.

A-2 Enhance the skyline. Design the upper portion of the building to promote visual interest and variety in the downtown skyline.

The Board recognized that the proposed towers will be highly visible against the existing downtown skyline, especially given the grade at this intersection and the increased height limits. These two towers are proposed in such close proximity to each other and they will both reach a height not yet experienced in Belltown. The Board cautioned against treating these towers as twins; rather they should be designed as distinctive buildings in their own right. The also mentioned they would like to see greater contextual analysis that extends far enough to show other towers (existing and in proposed) in the vicinity. The Board also would like to see *fly-bys* of the site and vicinity that show what the permitted zoning would allow in the area. As well as the view provided from the water of the downtown skyline, the Board was interested in the view of the proposed structures from West Seattle and Victor Steinbrueck Park. The roofscape designs will be important considerations as the building forms develop.

At the Second EDG meeting, the Board agreed that the tower placement has sufficiently responded to the context and allowed prominent views down Virginia towards the water.

At the Initial Recommendation meeting, the Board felt that the detailing and refinement of both the subject development as well as the proposed tower to the south should respond to each other architecturally. This also applies to the 2015 Second Avenue tower, as all three buildings will create a dramatic addition to the skyline. The

uses within the building should be expressed in a subtle form with care given to the detailing.

B. Architectural Expression

B-1 Respond to the neighborhood context. Develop an architectural concept and compose the major building elements to reinforce desirable urban features existing in the surrounding neighborhood.
Belltown-specific supplemental guidance: (a) Establish a harmonious transition between newer and older buildings. Compatible design should respect the scale, massing and materials of adjacent buildings and landscape; (b) Complement the architectural character of an adjacent historic building or area; however, imitation of historical styles is discouraged. References to period architecture should be interpreted in a contemporary manner; (c) Design visually attractive buildings that add richness and variety to Belltown, including creative contemporary architectural solutions; and (d) Employ design strategies and incorporate architectural elements that reinforce Belltown's unique qualities. In particular, the neighborhood's best buildings tend to support active street life.

The Board would like to see consideration of the buildings across Second Avenue in the design development of the two buildings. The Board sees the built context to the east as more influential on these two sites, than the context to the west. The rich historical context of the area, especially the Moore Theatre and Josephinum buildings, should help inform the design. The Board struggled with the severe streetscape along the east side of Second Avenue in contrast with the lush streetscape improvements proposed and existing along the west side of Second Avenue. The two corners on the west side should endeavor to relate to the east side and bridge this gap.

The Board noted that they are waiting to learn about the landmark potential of the Terminal Sales Annex building and are not weighing in the landmark review or status.

The Board suggested that photos of the proposed towers from neighboring residences would be useful in understanding the view, light, shadow and bulk impacts. *Staff Note: While such an analysis will be helpful in understanding the light, shadow and bulk impacts resulting from the proposed structures, it is not appropriate to assess this from private nearby residences, since the City does not have the authority to preserve or protect views from private property (SMC 25.05.675.P)**.** Instead, staff has recommended that the architects prepare fly-by analyses (similar to that shown at the EDG) from lower elevations in order to capture a better understanding of the bulk, scale, light and shadow impacts as experienced from the pedestrian perspective, as well as from the broader environment. This understanding and response to patterns of urban form found nearby should inform the composition and massing of the proposed structures. Efforts should be made to enhance view opportunities from and around the proposed towers.*

At the Second EDG meeting, the Board discussed the emerging forms of the two tower designs. The south building has more regularity, while the north building is

responding to multiple conditions, thus the result is a somewhat tortured form. The Board recommended shaving back the point at the southeast corner by five feet to see whether this change results in a better relationship between the buildings and between the tower and the podium.

The Board was satisfied that the explorations of distances between the two buildings were well analyzed and they agreed with the preferred option.

The Board also noted at the datum lines established by the Cristalla and 1218 Second Avenue should be reflected in the design as a series of buildings. For both buildings, the Board would like to see more integration of the base design into the tower. The Board looks forward to reviewing three-dimensional images of the podium and tower designs and how they relate.

See A-1.

At the Initial Recommendation meeting, the Board was pleased with the overall massing of the base and the filling in of the corner open space. On the Virginia Street elevation, the Board appreciated the vertical reveal that marks the residential entrance, as well as the slightly increased height of the base along Virginia to respond to the Terminal Sales Building datum line to the west. Along Second Avenue, the Board also agreed that the indentation or "hyphen" between the TSA and the new building face creates a dramatic hotel entry space. The Board also liked that the cornice line of the corner building element was below and subservient to the TSA cornice line.

B-2 Create a transition in bulk and scale. Compose the massing of the building to create a transition to the height, bulk and scale of development in neighboring or nearby less-intensive zones.

The Board discussed the shape of the proposed towers and would like to see how various iterations of the building form would affect the pedestrian realm in terms of light and shadow impacts, as well as views down Second Avenue and Virginia Street. The Board encouraged consideration of the neighbors by softening the impacts to nearby residences through sculpting the building form. See also B-1.

The Board agreed that the design of the two buildings should be approached as separate structures and not as related twins. The close proximity and height of the two buildings will automatically create a common vocabulary.

See A-1.

At the Initial Recommendation meeting, the Board indicated interest in the integration of the new tower and base surrounding the TSA landmark. The Board was encouraged by the more delicate approach and refined mullion patterns that tie into the patterns established by the TSA. The Board also recommended carrying the scale of the TSA upwards as the building moves higher. Such treatment of the curtain wall would also help break the tower into a more residential scale in a contemporary

manner. The inclusion of the proposed operable windows will also help achieve this sense of residential uses.

B-3 Reinforce the positive urban form & architectural attributes of the immediate area. Consider the predominant attributes of the immediate neighborhood and reinforce desirable siting patterns, massing arrangements, and streetscape characteristics of nearby development.

Belltown-specific supplemental guidance: (a) Respond to the regulating lines and rhythms of adjacent buildings that also support a street-level environment; regulating lines and rhythms include vertical and horizontal patterns as expressed by cornice lines, belt lines, doors, windows, structural bays and modulation; (b) Use regulating lines to promote contextual harmony, solidify the relationship between new and old buildings, and lead the eye down the street; and (c) Pay attention to excellent fenestration patterns and detailing in the vicinity. The use of recessed windows that create shadow lines, and suggest solidity, is encouraged.

B-4 Design a well-proportioned & unified building. Compose the massing and organize the publicly accessible interior and exterior spaces to create a well-proportioned building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept. Design the architectural elements and finish details to create a unified building, so that all components appear integral to the whole.

At the EDG meeting, this was not addressed in detail by the Board.

At the Second Early Design Guidance meeting, three conceptual design options for each building base were presented. For the south building, Option 1 included a solid, grand frame that articulates and accentuates the entry to the hotel along 2nd Avenue. Material accents in the frame reappear as columnar elements along the retail portion of the façade, supporting a trellis or wing feature framing the hotel terrace at level 5. The parking is treated with translucent channel glass, mixed with accent panels. The ground level retail and work studios are glazed with vision glass. The hotel is treated as a frame of punched windows with dominant verticals, recalling some elements of the neighboring Terminal Sales Building. Some of the solid horizontals are visually broken (spandrel glass) allowing some "punches" to become elongated vertically creating a pleasantly random window pattern. This treatment alludes to some of the features of the TSB, but is decidedly contemporary in its treatment. The tower anchors itself at the corner of 2nd and Virginia, where the building is pulled back to provide extra area for sidewalk activation and utilization by the retail.

Option 2 for the base of the south building showed a stout frame element that articulates and accentuates the entry to the hotel along 2nd Avenue and is repeated at in the bay structure of the retail frontage. The parking is treated with translucent or colored glass in a random mullion pattern. The ground level retail and work studios are glazed with vision glass. The hotel is treated as a frame of punched windows with dominant horizontals, recalling some elements of the neighboring

Terminal Sales Building (TSB). Some of the solid verticals are visually broken (spandrel glass) allowing some "punches" to become elongated vertically creating a pleasantly random window pattern. This treatment alludes to some of the features of the Terminal Sales Building, but is more contemporary. The tower anchors itself at the corner of 2nd and Virginia, where the building is pulled back to provide extra area for sidewalk activation and utilization by the retail.

Option 3 for the base of the south building was a series of exposed decks that accentuate the hotel elevator lobbies and entrance, which is further defined by a grand canopy. The hotel and parking are treated with a similar, consistent frame of punched windows. Bays of colored glass overlay the grid, so that it is masking the grid behind. This treatment alludes to some of the features of the TSB, but is more contemporary in its treatment. The tower anchors itself at the corner of 2nd and Virginia, where the building is pulled back to provide extra area for sidewalk activation and utilization by the retail.

Option 1 for the base of the north building allows the tower to simultaneously hover above and meets the ground plane as layers of the façade are expressed at different levels. Solid and void are expressed as a study of program, with more solid elements occurring where parking would otherwise be visible and voids occurring where work studios and retail occurs. A layered façade is imagined to provide horizontal shading elements that further break down the façade and provide functional shading for the work studios. Spandrel and translucent glazing also provide a mechanism to break down the "solid" portions of the façade, specifically at night.

Option 2 for the base of the north building also allows the tower to simultaneously hover above and meets the ground plane as layers of the façade are expressed at different levels. Solid façade elements are wrapped in lighter "framing elements", accentuating and expressing the solid vs. the void. Solid elements are composed with deep reveals, overlapping the curved tower elements, expressing the residential entry. Punched openings articulate the locations of work studios and help break down the façade.

Option 3 for the base of the north building again allows the tower to simultaneously hover above and meet the ground plane as layers of the façade are expressed at different levels. A major bay structure is superimposed with framed elements, exposed columns and horizontal fins defining the base. The framed elements define parking bays, building entries, and work studios. The glazing within each bay responds to program. Spandrel, translucent or art / colored glass at parking, and glass accentuating the entry as well were shown.

The Board agreed that the strong commercial appearance and uses at the ground level is critical. The Board looks forward to reviewing conceptual ideas of how the designs will weave together the tower and podium designs. The Board felt unclear as to the factors driving the different base designs. Generally, the Board agreed that the architectural expression of the various base designs were too busy. The podium should respond to the scale and datum lines of the neighboring buildings.

At the Initial Recommendation meeting, the Board discussed at length the tower design and materiality. The tower was shown with four alternative designs for the curtain wall of the tower including no super grid, a horizontal banding (super mullions) at every third floor, vertical banding (super mullions) every ten feet or a combination of the horizontal and vertical banding (super grid). No preference was given and no preference was provided by the Board.

At the Final Recommendation meeting, the Board was extremely supportive of the proposed curtain wall grid which divides every third floor datum line with a charcoal colored horizontal datum belly band. This three floor grid established by the horizontal spacing reflects the height and proportion of the TSA at the building base. The vertical datum lines are also a charcoal color, which extend up entirely to the roofline and become part of the screening of the mechanical equipment. The vertical banding is confined only to the main building body and does not extend to the flanking elements on the southeast and northeast corners. The mechanical equipment screening consists of the vertical mullions alternating with dichroic glass panels and in-filled with fritted glass between the mullions and panels. The Board felt that the resolution of the building top was beautifully executed and successfully integrates the mullions, materials and introduction of the special dichroic glass. Overall, the Board was pleased with the proposed building massing, use of materials and proportions, as well as the design of the building top.

C. The Streetscape

C-1 Promote pedestrian interaction. Spaces for street level uses should be designed to engage pedestrians with the activities occurring within them. Sidewalk-related spaces should be open to the general public and appear safe and welcoming, and open to the public.

Belltown-specific supplemental guidance: Sidewalks should (a) reinforce existing retail concentrations; (b) Vary in size, width, and depth of commercial spaces, accommodating for smaller businesses, where feasible; (c) Incorporate the following elements the adjacent public realm and in open spaces around the building: unique hardscapes, pedestrian-scale sidewalk lighting, accent paving, seating, water features, art and landscape elements; and (d) Building corners are places of convergence.

The Board noted that this guideline will be a critical consideration for future reviews and that the details of the pedestrian level.

At the Initial Recommendation meeting, the Board noted that they would like to better understand the glazing and façade design at the base level. They also recommended exploring some architectural distinction between the work studio spaces and the parking at the base levels. In an effort for the architecture to express the different uses within the building, the Board also noted that the while increased height of the building base to 13 stories along Virginia to reflect the datum of the Terminal Sales building is desirable, it also creates a challenge because the building program changes

at the 12th floor (from hotel to residential). The Board suggested that the 13th level could be expressed slightly differently between the residential uses above and the hotel uses below and shown within a frame element.

At the Final Recommendation meeting, the Board was satisfied that the residential units above the hotel floors will have operable windows with solariums that terminate at the horizontal datum lines. These windows types will signify the change in uses within the tower. The Board was assured that the solariums will be a dark color to match the charcoal colored mullions.

The Board also appreciated how the building program worked with the preservation of the TSA to locate the hotel lobby in the sunken area of the TSA along Second Avenue. This use is well suited to the changing grade condition and will activate the street level.

C-4 Reinforce Building Entries. To promote pedestrian comfort, safety and orientation, reinforce the building entrance.

This priority guideline was added at the Second EDG meeting.

At the Initial Recommendation meeting, the Board was very enthusiastic about the vertical integration of the tower to the ground by extending the tower materials to the ground at the two main entry points.

At the Final Recommendation meeting, the Board continued to enthusiastically support the "zipper" like effect of continuing the tower elements directly to the ground at both entry points. The Board noted, however, that the tower lands at the revolving door on Second Avenue and perhaps this could be further examined and strengthened to ground this element.

The Board recommended including a plaque near the Second Avenue entrance (on the south side of the TSA) to commemorate the history and landmark status of the TSA.

C-5 Encourage overhead weather protection. Encourage project applicants to provide continuous, well-lit, overhead weather protection to improve pedestrian comfort and safety along major pedestrian routes.

Belltown-specific supplemental guidance: ***Overhead weather protection is an important design consideration in Belltown to provide human scaled proportions and pedestrian comfort in the public realm. Pedestrian activity and pedestrian oriented uses are facilitated when weather protection is provided adjacent to the public sidewalk.***

The Board noted a desire for continuous overhead weather protection along the street facing facades.

At the Second EDG, the Board noted a preference for stepped canopies to help reinforce the entries and uses.

At the Initial Recommendation meeting, a departure from the overhead weather protection along the TSA was requested given that as a landmark, this façade is protected from such additions.

C-6 Develop the alley facade. To increase pedestrian safety, comfort and interest, develop portions of the alley facade in response to the unique conditions of the site or project.

The Board felt that the mid-block curb bulbs shown for both sites at the alley was an excellent concept and that the building treatment should wrap around the corners to the alley facades. The Board encouraged rich, human-scaled materials, lighting and landscaping to be considered at the bulbs and alley. The configuration of ground level uses at the northwest corner of the south tower especially lends itself to activating and wrapping the corner. The Board also encouraged taking cues from the successful ally treatment established by the Cristalla building in terms of dumpsters and lighting.

At the Second EDG meeting, the Board agreed that the design of the alley façade is critical both from a safety standpoint, but also because several residential floors of OPT will face the proposed podium. The lighting and nighttime illumination plan for the alley is important. The Board reiterated support for having active uses and views of the alley from the proposed buildings, as well as developing the alley corners with curb bulbs, creating mini plaza spaces that are landscaped and extend into the alleyways.

At the Initial Recommendation meeting, the Board questioned how the height transition to the 125' zone across the alley would be addressed in the proposed design. They encouraged some level of detailing that acknowledges this datum line along the alley. The Board was extremely pleased with the wrapping of the retail use at ground level around the corner to the alley.

At the Final Recommendation meeting, the Board was pleased with the expanded size of the corner retail space at the alley corner, as well as the continuation of the materials and patterning from the street elevations around to the alley façade. The Board appreciated the presentation of the alley façade within the two block context that includes proposed developments, as well as the efforts to activate the alley with hotel rooms and work studio uses.

The Board encouraged the applicant to further explore the screening treatment of the above grade parking along the alley, so that the scrim feature does not appear to float in front of the west façade and is better integrated into the elevation.

D. Public Amenities

D-1 Provide Inviting and Usable Open Space. Design public open spaces to be visually pleasing, safe and active environment for residents, workers

and pedestrians. Views are solar access to the principal are of the open space should be especially emphasized.

This priority guideline was added at the Second EDG meeting. The Board noted string support for the concept of curb bulbs at the alley corners and using this opportunity to provide vegetation and streetscape enhancements.

At the Initial Recommendation meeting, the Board expressed strong support for the pedestrian experience created by the base design of this building. They liked how the base design also wraps into the alley.

The Board expressed clear unanimous support for the curb bulb at the alley and believes this to be an excellent opportunity to enhance the pedestrian experience.

D-2 Enhance the Building with Landscaping. Enhance the building and site with substantial landscaping, which includes special pavements, trellis, screen walls, planters and site furniture, as well as living plant material.

Belltown-specific supplemental guidance: Mixed-use developments are encouraged to provide useable open space adjacent to retail space, such as an outdoor café or restaurant seating, or a plaza with seating. Residential buildings should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating useable, attractive, well-integrated open space.

The Board unanimously supported the efforts to design the right-of-way to Green Street standards and concepts, particularly the widened sidewalks and the corner and mid-block curb bulbs. The Board was very pleased with the streetscape concepts presented at this meeting and supported the notion that this intersection is a gateway to Belltown.

At the Second EDG meeting, the Board encouraged the applicant to explore extending the landscaping and right-of-way improvements across Second Avenue.

At the Initial Recommendation meeting, the Board was supportive of the proposed landscape plan on Second Avenue, but suggested that perhaps the orthogonal shaping of the tower above could be translated onto the landscape design at street level. The Board continued to strongly encourage and support coordination with the other Second Avenue property owners to develop a right-of-way improvement plan that will enhance the streetscape.

At the Final Recommendation meeting, the Board expressed support for the proposed landscape design that strives for a more reserved, quiet palette that reflects the lines established by the TSA without competing for attention. The street level landscape design includes wider sidewalks, grouping of street trees to flank the entry points, concrete banding along the sidewalk and extending the paving treatment from the entry areas directly to the curb. The building base is granite with black sand blasted pre-cast to create texture at pedestrian level.

The Board was also pleased with the proposed open space at the 9th floor and the roof deck amenity open space, which has been well designed as an extension of the interior amenity room.

D-3 Provide elements that define the place and provide special elements on the facades, within public open spaces, or on the sidewalk to create a distinct, attractive, and memorable "sense of place" associated with the building.
Belltown-specific supplemental guidance: Art and History are vital to reinforcing a sense of place. Consider incorporating the following into the siting and design:(a) vestiges of Belltown Heritage, such as preserving existing stone sidewalks, curbs;(b) art that relates to the established or emerging theme of that area; and (c) install plaques or other features on the building that pay tribute to Belltown history. Green Streets are street rights-of-way that are enhanced for pedestrian circulation and activity with a variety of pedestrian-oriented features, such as sidewalk widening, landscaping, artwork, and traffic calming. Interesting street level uses and pedestrian amenities enliven the Green Street and lend special identity to the surrounding area.

The Board was very pleased with the conceptual streetscape improvements and encouraged the streetscape design to integrate information about the re-grade history through informational signage, artwork, etc that communicate the unusual history of the intersection and these sites. These four corners provide a critical juncture between downtown and Belltown due to the shift in the grid one block to the south.

At the Initial Recommendation meeting, the Board strongly reiterated its support for mid-block curb bulbs that provide visual relief and opportunities for additional landscaping in the urban environment.

At the Final Recommendation meeting, the Board noted that the preservation of the TSA elevation resulted in a calm, restrained and elegant building tower design. The preservation of the building elevation also creates a distinctive sense of place of historical significance.

D-6 Design for personal safety and security. Design the site to enhance the real and perceived feeling of personal safety and security in the immediate area.

This priority guideline was added at the Second EDG meeting.

At the Final Recommendation meeting, the Board recommended approval of the full exterior lighting concept plan showing illumination of the building with particular emphasis on the TSA.

E. Vehicular Access & Parking

E-2 Integrate parking facilities. Minimize the visual impact of parking by integrating parking facilities with surrounding development. Incorporate

architectural treatments or suitable landscaping to provide for the safety and comfort of people using the facility as well as those walking by.

The Board discussed the above grade parking levels proposed for each of the two buildings. They agreed that the parking levels shown on the north tower would have more exposure to the street and pedestrian environment. In particular, the portion that wraps the southeast corner of the building near the main entry. While the proposed screening is helpful, the uses along the corner should be as active as possible. The Board suggested shifting the work studios to the corner to help activate the space. The Board applauded the configuration of uses on the south tower and felt that it successfully minimizes the presence of parking along these facades. If solid material is selected to screen the above grade parking in both buildings, it should receive special treatment that provides visual interest to the pedestrian while remaining cohesive with the building design.

At the Second EDG meeting, the Board reiterated their support for taking all access from the alley. The Board was also very supportive of the efforts to screen the presence of parking uses in the above grade parking levels with active uses such as hotel rooms and work studios.

At the Initial Recommendation meeting, the Board was very supportive of the understated integration of the above grade parking levels into the overall building architecture and relationship to the TSA. The proposed design includes a combination of work studio units and opaque, fully fritted or frosted glass within a frame that responds to the proportionality and frame of the TSA.

At the Final Recommendation meeting, the Board was unanimous in support of the glazing proposed for the Second Avenue base. In order to screen the parking behind the fenestration of this base element, three treatments of glass panels are proposed for the multi-paned, large windows. The three treatments will be installed in a random pattern to recall the manner in which historic industrial building often replaced broken panes with a variety of glass, creating a patchwork effect using the same materials. One of the glass treatments will be used for approximately 85% of the panes, with the other two interspersed at random. This same treatment of the above grade parking screening will occur on the alley façade.

E-3 Minimize the Presence of Service Areas. Locate service areas for trash dumpsters, loading docks, mechanical equipment and the like away from the street where possible. Screen from view those elements which for programmatic reasons cannot be located away from the street front.

The Board was very pleased that the access has been proposed from the alley for both projects. The Board reiterated that accommodating the dumpsters within the buildings is strongly encouraged, so as to leave the alley less constrained. See also C-6.

At the Second EDG meeting, the Board was very pleased to hear that the proposed north tower intends to accommodate the existing dumpsters from the alley within the proposed structure. The Board agreed that the proposed buildings should either accommodate the existing dumpsters within the buildings or set back the building face more than the two feet that is required along the alley by Code.

At the Initial Recommendation meeting, the Board encouraged the applicant to investigate other proposed developments that are likely to occur along this alley and be aware of design and activity implications.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

Five departures from the Code were requested at this time.

1. **Maximum Tower Width (SMC 23.49.058 D.2).** The Code requires that the maximum facade width for portions of a building above 85 feet along the general north/south axis of a site (parallel to the Avenues) shall be 120 feet or 80 percent of the width of the lot measured on the Avenue, whichever is less. At levels 9-11, the proposed tower is approximately 125 feet wide or five feet wider than allowed.

   The proposed tower base along the alley has been designed to respond directly to the datum lines established by the Terminal Sales building, which measures nine stories tall at the alley. The proposed building base has been extended upwards to reinforce and relate to the bulk and massing of this neighboring building and give a sense of symmetry to the alley entry. The Board agreed that this design responds more appropriately to the existing context and voted unanimously in favor of the proposed departure. (B-1, C-1)

2. **Overhead Weather Protection (SMC 23.49.018).** Continuous overhead weather protection is required for new development along the entire street frontage of a lot. The proposed design is incorporation of a historic structure into the design. In order to preserve the character of the façade, the ARC directed that the design eliminate overhead canopies along the historic façade to preserve it current architectural condition. The ARC has recommended that the canopies stop at least two feet short of the historic faced on either side to avoid having projections that would obscure or alter the facade, thus creating a 49' (131') gap along 2nd avenue. The Board agreed that preservation of the TSA elevation in keeping with its historic form and detail is paramount and will greatly contribute to an enhanced pedestrian experience and voted unanimously in favor of the proposed departure. (D-3)

3. **Street Level Use (SMC 23.49.009.B3).** The Code requires that 75% street level uses occur within 10' of the property line. A departure has been requested to decrease the amount of requires street level use to 60% (a decrease of 25 linear feet).

   Because the proposal includes the preservation of a portion of the TSA fronting onto Second Avenue and due to limited street level transparency, sidewalk activation and the inability to create a retail entrance at this location, this portion of the façade has been incorporated into

the hotel lobby. The hotel lobby use does not count towards street level uses; however it is intended that the lobby will be an active space and will offer views to and from the sidewalk. The Board agreed that the integration of the building program into this existing building form has been successfully achieved and will contribute to a vibrant streetscape. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the proposed departure. The Board recommended the installation of a plaque with information about the historic nature and landmark status of the TSA be included near the hotel entryway, along the south façade of the TSA building. (C-1, D-3)

4. **Parking Stall Size Requirement (SMC 23.54.030.C).** The Code requires that a minimum of 35% of the stalls be striped for large vehicles. For the hotel parking only, the proposed design proposes to provide 0% large stalls (the required 15 large stalls would be striped instead as medium stalls).

   The width of the site cannot accommodate the floor to floor heights of the hotel use, the 20 feet of ramp required to access the above-grade parking and the dimensions of large stall sizes and aisle widths. The Board agreed that having the above grade parking share floors with hotel use, while allowing the hotel use to screen the parking along one street side was beneficial to the pedestrian environment by creating a more active façade. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the proposed departure. (E-2)

5. **Façade Setback Between 15' and 35' (SMC 23.49.056..B1.b2ii).** The Code requires that setbacks between the elevations of 15' and 35' above sidewalk be a maximum of 10. The proposed design includes a 15' setback at the entry area along Second Avenue.

   The Landmarks Preservation Board encouraged increased depth of the setback along Second Avenue at the entry area abutting the TSA structure, allowing the south facade to be further exposed. This deeper entry space creates a more dramatic view of the existing TSA, while also creating a more gracious and visible point of entry for pedestrians. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the proposed departure. (C-1, C-4)

The Board, therefore, unanimously recommended approval of the design as shown, including the requested departures.