



City of Seattle

Gregory J. Nickels, Mayor

---

**Department of Planning & Development**

D.M. Sugimura, Director

**EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE  
OF THE  
QUEEN ANNE/MAGNOLIA  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

---

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

**Project Number:** 3007688  
**Address:** 201 W Harrison Street  
**Applicant:** Steve Lampert, Nicholson Kovalchick Architects

**Date of Meeting:** October 17, 2007  
**Date of Report:** December 19, 2007

**Board Members Present:** Patrick Doherty, Chair  
John Rose  
Bill Vandeventer

**Board Members Absent:** Maria Barrientos  
Matt Roewe

**DPD Staff Present:** Holly Anderson, Land Use Planner  
Peter Dobrovlny, Green Building Team

---

**SITE AND VICINITY**

The proposal site is located in the Uptown neighborhood at the southwest corner of the intersection of W Harrison Street and 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue W. The site is zoned NC3-65 with 60 feet of frontage on W Harrison Street and 118 feet along W Harrison Street. The surrounding area is within the Uptown Urban Center, and is zoned NC3-65 for several blocks on all sides. Currently the site is used as a surface parking lot with stalls for 26 vehicles. The area is a mix of office buildings and mixed-use apartment buildings built between the 1960s to the 1990s as well as numerous surface parking lots. Immediately to the south of the site is a two story concrete masonry warehouse followed by a surface parking lot and a 4 story 1970s office building. Across 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue W from the site are a 6-story stucco apartment building and a two story Allstar Fitness gym. To the north of the site across W Harrison Street is a four story office building over an open parking garage. Across the alley to the west is a two story office building and the old Mountaineers Building to the south. There is a proposal under review for a 7-story 195 unit mixed-use

apartment building for this entire half-block on the west side of the alley containing the mountaineers site (project 3007073).

<b>EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: 3/8/07</b>
--

### **DESIGN PRESENTATION**

Three schemes for a six-story mixed-use apartment building were presented at the meeting by Steve Lampert of Nicholson Kovalchick Architects. All options include retail space on the corner of 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue W and W Harrison Street with live/work units continuing the façade on W Harrison Street, and 5 floors of apartments above (up to 41 units). All options propose an underground parking garage of about 21 spaces, with access from the alley. Option 1 is a podium scheme with two blocks of residential units above separated by a raised courtyard. This option contains the largest retail space with three live/work units and the residential entry on 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue W. Option 2 proposed an L-shape scheme placing the courtyard at level one facing west. Retail remains at the corner with three live/work units along 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue W and places the residential lobby further to the west. Option 3, the applicant's preferred option, was for a U-shape building around an internal courtyard. The residential entry is located south of the retail space on W Harrison Street and the north façade contains five live/work units. All circulation is hidden from the street. Some green building materials and systems will be integrated into the project.

Regarding context, the existing buildings in the area pre-date the City's design review program; they are institutional in scale and do not relate well to the sidewalk. However, the landscaping and street trees do provide a pleasant context for the buildings. The proposed design will relate better to the street with its mixture of uses, than the existing buildings, and will respond to our time, the way previous buildings responded to their time.

### **BOARD CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS WITH ANY ANSWERS**

- The Board asked how the live work units will relate to the street given the topography which causes the live-work to be above the street, with a portion of the wall of the parking garage at the sidewalk level.

*The applicant will work with stoops set back from sidewalk, and will balance need for ceiling height with need for relationship to the sidewalk. More study of this will be done.*

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments received; no one from the general public attended the meeting.

## **PRIORITIES IDENTIFIED:**

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing no 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. The recommendations made were agreed to by the three Board members present, unless otherwise noted. While the priority guidelines noted below indicate the guidelines the Board found most important, all of the Guidelines for Multifamily and Commercial Buildings apply.

### **A. Site Planning**

#### **A-2 Streetscape Compatibility – The siting of buildings should acknowledge and reinforce the existing desirable spatial characteristics of the right-of-way.**

Improving the quality of the streetscape is of utmost importance. The neighborhood in general has pleasant, walkable, pedestrian-scaled streetscapes in the residential and retail commercial sections to the north and east. This experience breaks down in this section of the neighborhood due to numerous surface parking lots and office buildings with minimal relationships to the street. This proposal should work to improve the quality of the pedestrian environment and enliven the street experience. The Board was supportive of locating the retail at the corner and stretching down 2nd Avenue W. Of concern to the Board was the quality of relationship between the live/work units and the sidewalk on W Harrison Street. The applicant was instructed to minimize or eliminate any blank walls of the garage in this area and to focus the design on the spatial relationship between the units and the sidewalk. The building should meet the street. Also of concern was the proposed amount and quality of glazing along this section of the façade.

#### **A-3 Entrances Visible from the Street – Entries should be clearly identifiable and visible from the street.**

Entries to the retail, residential lobby and live/work units should be clearly identifiable and distinguish the activity of the space beyond. While Option 3 is the applicant's preferred option, the Board expressed a preference for the residential lobby location in Option 2 with its more central location and wider presence. Option 3 shows a small lobby in the southeast corner that could be lost in the façade. Option 2 expresses the vertical circulation in the building façade and helps to clearly reinforce the location of the residential lobby, tying the use above to the street.

The live/work units proposed along W Harrison Street need to be designed to relate well with the street and to communicate a commercial character. A tenant business in one of

these units should be able to display goods in an inviting way or present an office-like appearance in a flexible way.

**A-4 Human Activity – New development should be sited and designed to encourage human activity on the street.**

Placing the retail/commercial space on the corner creates a good opportunity to enliven the street. The Board emphasized the importance of meeting the transparency requirements in regards to the live/work units facing the street.

**A-7 Residential Open Space – Residential projects should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive, well-integrated open space.**

The Board noted that Options 2 & 3 will lose sunlight if and when the site to the south redevelops. The applicant should consider keeping the courtyard open to the west to keep light and air access in the future. The roof deck will provide for year-round access to light.

**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.**

All schemes presented parking garage access from the alley and the Board recommends that this be maintained in the design. The Board is concerned regarding the slope of the ramp into the garage, but the applicant assured the Board that this ramp will meet code.

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

Placing the retail at the corner helps to meet this objective, but the Board recommended that the whole building mass should reinforce the fact that this is a corner building. The Board suggested knitting together the retail and residential segments in the facades to visually ground the corner. The Board likes the way the bay at the corner in Option 3 partially does this. Creating a more cohesive image on the east and north façades would help reinforce the public street front. The Board also expressed concern regarding exposed PT concrete slabs at this location.

**C. Architectural Elements**

**C-2 Architectural Concept and Consistency – Building design elements, details and massing should create a well-proportioned and unified building form and exhibit an overall architectural concept. Buildings should exhibit form and**

**features identifying the functions within the building. In general, the roof line or top of the structure should be clearly distinguished for its façade walls.**

The Board felt that that architectural statement could be simpler. All three renderings showed were a bit muddled and overly complex. The Board did support a contemporary or modern aesthetic at this location and stated that it would be appropriate given the context. The penthouse expression is a nice addition and the design would benefit from exploring different roofline expressions.

**C-3 Human Scale – The design of new buildings should incorporate architectural features, elements and details to achieve a good human scale.**

The Board encourages the applicant to provide street level detailing of lights, signage, and landscaping to reinforce this at the street front.

**C-4 Exterior Finish Material – 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.**

A potential palette of architectural concrete, metal siding and fiber board siding was discussed by the architect. A color and materials board should be brought to the recommendation meeting so the Board can see the actual materials proposed. The details of the materials and color palette will be discussed at the recommendation meeting.

## **D. Pedestrian Environment**

**D-9 Commercial Signage – Signs should add interest to the street front environment and should be appropriate for the scale and character desired in the area.**

The Board recommended designing a signage plan for the building to avoid unintended appendages to the building, and discouraged use of bulky lighted boxes.

**D-10 Commercial Lighting – Appropriate levels of lighting should be provided in order to promote visual interest and a sense of security for people in commercial districts during evening hours. Lighting may be provided by incorporation into the building façade, the underside of weather protection, on and around street furniture, in merchandising display windows, in landscaped areas, and/or signage.**

The Board encourages integration of the street-level lighting plan with the overall building design.

**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.**

Avoid blank retaining walls like that shown in Option 3. With the site's slope, the building may have trouble meeting the transparency requirements if this issue is not addressed early in the design.

**D-12 Residential Entries & 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.**

Many buildings that are primarily residential, as this design is, have residential entrances that are difficult to find between the commercial street frontages. The Board prefers the residential entry to be on Harrison Street, and differentiated from the rest of the street wall.

## **E. Landscaping**

**E-2 Landscaping to Enhance Building and/or Site – 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.**

The existing street landscaping in the neighborhood is great; it is important to continue this in the proposed design at the street level.

### **DEPARTURE REQUESTS**

No departure requests are sought by the applicant at this time.

### **STAFF COMMENTS & NEXT STEPS:**

#### **Prior to MUP Submittal**

- Meet with the project planner to discuss the design response to the Board's Guidance.
- As the project is designed, remember to coordinate with other departments on any relevant issues, such as Seattle City Light (power line clearances – see CAM 122), SDOT (street tree issues; Street Improvement Plans; street use permits for building overhangs), the Green Building Team, and utility service providers. Invite the DPD planner to any SDOT meetings.

## **MUP Submittal:**

Please provide the following for the MUP Submittal:

### Standard Requirements

1. SEPA Checklist (5 copies) filled out.
2. Response (2 copies) to the EDG document (Attachment B of CAM 238). Please respond to each cited guideline and its accompanied bulleted guidance statement above, this will facilitate the review process.
3. The full MUP plans (4 sets) with completed DPD cover sheets.
4. Four color elevations and a color landscaping plan embedded in the front of the MUP plan set and labeled "DR" sheets.

### Additional Items to be submitted at MUP Intake

5. Analysis of parking demand and parking spillover based on ITE parking generation estimates for the new uses and loss of existing 26-space parking lot. If there is parking spillover, a Utilization Study may be required per CAM 117 (<http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/publications/cam/cam117.pdf>). Contact John Shaw with any questions on this.
6. Submit permit information for the last permitted use on the site and history of any parking covenants on the site for adjacent uses.

## **Recommendation Meeting**

**1. Scheduling.** After the initial zoning and land use reviews, have been completed, and all major correction items addressed, call the planner to schedule a recommendation meeting with the Design Review Board.

**2. Recommendation Proposal Packets.** A draft recommendation design proposal packet should be submitted 3 weeks prior to the recommendation meeting to allow for review and any changes prior to development of seven final hard copy 11 x 17 packets.

Send a .pdf file of the final recommendation packet to [brandi.barker@seattle.gov](mailto:brandi.barker@seattle.gov) per instructions on the web 5 days prior to the guidance meeting.

See [www.seattle.gov/designreview](http://www.seattle.gov/designreview) for instructions for preparing recommendation packets.

In addition to any items requested through the land use review, the Recommendation packets should include the following:

- 3-D character sketches of the streetscapes, the alley, and the open space environment
- Color elevations of all facades, north, south, east and west.
- Site plans and floor plans of all levels.
- Landscaping plans and illustrations.

- A conceptual signage and lighting plan
- Justification for any requested departures, in the following format:

STANDARD	REQUIREMENT	REQUEST	JUSTIFICATION
		None at this Time	

- The applicant is required to bring a colors and materials board to the recommendation meeting.

Please contact Peter Dobrovolny, DPD Green Team, for information and technical assistance regarding green building opportunities (206) 615-1094.

H:\Project Review\3007688 EDG Report.doc