INITIAL DESIGN REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS
OF THE
NORTHWEST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Meeting Date: March 24, 2008
Report Date: March 26, 2008

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Project Number:	**3007752**
Address:	**100 North 36th Street**
Applicant:	**David Wu of TSE Architects** **representative for Sahagun Restaurant Consulting Inc.**
Board members present:	**Guy Peckham, Chair** **Mark Brands** **Joe Giampietro** **Bill Singer**
Board members absent	**Elizabeta Stachisin-Moura (excused)**
DPD staff present:	**Nora Gierloff, Land Use Planner**

PROJECT STATUS

An Early Design Guidance report for this project, which describes the site, proposal and initial Board direction, was issued on November 27th, 2007 and is available in the MUP file and online at the City's Design Review web site under Project Reviews/Archives. A recommendation meeting was held on March 26, 2008 and the design guidance given by the Board at that meeting is listed further below. A second recommendation meeting will be scheduled once the applicant has submitted a design that responds to the Board's comments.

DESIGN GUIDELINE PRIORITIES ESTABLISHED AT THE EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING

At the Early Design Guidance meeting held on November 19th, 2007 and after visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, the Design Review Board members provided the following siting and design guidance of highest priority to this project:

- North 36th Street front façade should be designed to create an architecturally consistent structure and an active streetscape
    - Include a clear base, middle, and top to the building

    - Relocate the proposed stair tower so that the retail and restaurant is visually prominent in the façade and not hidden behind that structure (group the retail and restaurant uses)
    - Consider relocating the residential entry and stair tower to the east façade or near the intersection
    - Consider stepping back upper facades, instead of the proposed upper story building overhang shown at EDG
    - Outdoor seating for the restaurant use is encouraged
- Architectural context:
    - Materials should reflect durable materials found in nearby recent commercial developments
    - Architectural context includes rectilinear industrial forms
- Adjacent residential development:
    - Carefully design the building massing, blank facades, landscaping, and window placement in relation to the proposed townhouses to the north, especially considering the requested departure to reduce this setback
    - Carefully design the proposed parking access adjacent to this use; use screening, vegetation, and consider reducing the curb cut width to minimize impacts to the adjacent residences
    - The proposed design should relate to the sloped lot
    - Minimize blank walls at the sidewalk or facing adjacent residential development
- Proposed trash areas should be fully enclosed to minimize appearance and odors
- Minimize 'dead-end' corridors with fencing and/or gates
- Provide conceptual signage and lighting plans at MUP stage of review
- Provide schematic landscape plan with MUP level detail (plant sizes and materials)

RECOMMENDATION MEETING DESIGN PRESENTATION

David Wu, the architect for the project presented the design changes made based on the Board's early design guidance.

- The driveway to the underground parking is reduced in width from 24 to 16 feet, requiring a departure
- The residential entrance is on 1st Avenue NW
- The stair towers are now away from the street facing façades to locations within the building near the northwest corner and mid-way along the eastern façade
- The retail entrance is now placed close to the 36th Avenue frontage
- The current design includes materials that echo nearby buildings such as brick and EIFS
- Outdoor seating for the restaurant wraps the corner, requiring a departure from the requirement for a 50 foot separation of outdoor uses from residential zoning

RECOMMENDATION MEETING BOARD QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

The Board had the following questions and clarifying comments shown in italics, with responses from the applicant:

- *Please discuss the landscape plan*. There will be a small courtyard at the residential entry, landscaping will be used as a buffer to the townhouses to the north (tree on the property line will be removed), potted plants will be used to screen the mechanical equipment on the roof and a strip of landscape is proposed on the east property line.

- *Please explain the proposed use of materials*. A textured cultured stone veneer will be used on the first story in a brick-like running bond. A different color smooth brick will be used at the column bases with an accent soldier course. The upper residential floors as well as some accent areas on the ground floor will be painted cement board. A metal flashing piece will be used to create reveals between the boards. The archways, cornice and accent bands at the second and third floor levels will be constructed from EIFS. The storefront and residential windows will be aluminum with a clear finish. Painted metal canopies will be used over most of the ground floor windows. Aluminum solar screens that protrude 2 to 3 feet will be used on the residential windows. Balcony railings will be either cables or thin metal horizontals.

- *Please explain the grades and designs for walls along the north side of the site.* Most of the retaining wall shown on A11 would be below grade (as shown on the cross section at A9). A wooden fence 4-6 feet high is proposed at the property line and a 6" planting bed is proposed to allow for vines to grow up along the fence. Next would be a walkway to the rear kitchen entrance to be used for egress and deliveries. Another retaining wall and guardrail would separate the walkway from the sloping garage driveway entrance.

- *Please describe the outdoor seating area.* A narrow seating area (just over 5 feet clear) would wrap around the corner of the building. Because it would stay level as the 1st Avenue grade rises it would be approximately 3 feet below grade at the northern end. A solid wall would separate it from the residential entry.

- *How much headroom would there be underneath the common deck at the residential entrance?* The deck cantilevers out from the second floor to form a roof over the residential entrance, which is inset 21'8" from the property line. The first floor commercial space would be 13' floor to floor, then subtracting out about 3 feet for the grade change along 1st Avenue and the depth of the structure would leave maybe 8 or 9 feet clear.

- *What is the scale of the horizontal bands at the floor levels on the façade?* They would measure 1.5 to 2 feet vertically and extend horizontally at least 8 inches, more where the façade steps back or they form a balcony.

- *How would this building affect the privacy of the planned townhouses to the north?* The buildings would be similar in height, though the floor plates would be offset a bit. There would be about 19 feet between the buildings.

RECOMMENDATION MEETING PUBLIC COMMENT

No members of the public attended the Recommendation meeting.

INITIAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY (MARCH 24TH, 2008)

After reviewing the initial design response the Board gave the applicant additional design direction as explained below. The applicant should address all priority guidelines and Board recommendations in a revised proposal to be presented at a second recommendation meeting.

A. Site Planning

The Board did not think that the transition from the adjacent site to this one along the north property line was fully explained by the drawings, especially A11. It is difficult to see how the entrances to the townhouse driveway and the project driveway both could be at street level and yet have a grade difference of 6' over a horizontal distance of perhaps 7' (Sheet A9). If there is indeed a dropoff of 6 feet between the townhouse driveway and the project walkway something sturdier than a wooden fence would be needed for safety.

> Rec. 1) Explore the need for a concrete wall or guardrail where there is a 30" or greater dropoff adjacent to the townhouse driveway.

The Board thought that the organization of the commercial façade reflected their EDG direction. The upper floors are now set back rather than overhanging the commercial space and the stair towers are in less prominent locations. The Board approved of the location of the outdoor seating area and the activity it could contribute to the corner. However they questioned whether the approximately 5 feet of clear space would be sufficient to be functional.

> Rec. 2) The width of the seating area should be increased by pulling the ground floor back to line up with the upper stories.

The Board supported the proposed departure for reduction of the driveway from 24 to 16 feet and the inclusion of a solid fence of 4 to 6 feet in height at the property line as ways to minimize the impact of the development on the townhouses to the north.

In the current design the plazas on 36th have been largely eliminated in favor of the outdoor seating area, except for a small inset at the retail entrance where the building is skewed away from the angle of the street. At the Recommendation meeting the Board thought that the two commercial entries should be treated consistently. One is shown at the property line and has an archway while the other is inset and has a canopy. The Board recommends that a consistent architectural vocabulary be used to indicate entrances, changes in angle and changes in massing.

> Rec. 3) Refine the massing along 36th using a consistent architectural vocabulary to indicate windows, modulation and shifts in angle. Create a consistent treatment for the commercial entries by replacing the ground floor arches with canopies and angling the entries away from the street to create recesses.

B. Height, Bulk and Scale

At the Recommendation meeting the Board found that the current design of the project was generally compatible with the scale of adjacent buildings.

C. Architectural Elements and Materials

The Board expressed approval of the masonry proposed for the ground floor. They thought that the areas of cement board siding detracted from that expression.

> Rec. 4) Replace the proposed ground floor cement board siding with one of the types of masonry units used elsewhere on that level.

The proposed building has bands of EIFS at approximately the second and third floor levels as well as a matching cornice treatment. These are proposed to be painted colors that would contrast with the color of the cement panel board that is the main wall material for the upper stories. At the Recommendation meeting the Board thought that the effect was too heavy, the middle band (between the second and third floor) should be eliminated and the cornice refined with a built-up profile instead of a flat cross-section.

> Rec. 5) Eliminate the middle accent band (between the second and third floor) and refine the cornice with a built-up profile.

D. Pedestrian Environment

The proposed solid waste collection area is fully enclosed and the Board thought that that was sufficient to address the concerns expressed at the EDG meeting. Fences and gates were shown at the entrances to the walkways at both the north and eastern property edges and the Board found that that addressed the safety concerns. Schematic sign designs were included in the packet and the Board made no further recommendations regarding compliance with the earlier guidance.

At the meeting the architect proposed a different light fixture than that shown on the plans. Instead of a translucent fixture with open top and bottom he suggested a conical painted metal downlight. The Board agreed that this would be more effective at limiting spillover lighting and would be compatible with the ground floor masonry.

The transparency calculation for the proposed design was listed on page A14 of the packet.

The Board recommended approval of the location of the residential entrance in the middle of the 1st Avenue façade. However they thought that the combination of the overhanging deck and the recessed doorway created a dark and cavelike space that would not be safe or inviting.

> Rec. 6) The second floor common deck should be pulled back to be even with the façade and the residential entry door should be brought forward toward the street. A few feet of weather protection should be provided either by the overhanging deck or a canopy matching those for the commercial spaces.

E. Landscaping

The Board recommended that the proposed 6” wide planting bed along the north property line be made wide enough to be successful in growing the proposed plantings.

> Rec. 7) The planting bed should be revised together with the retaining wall and fence revisions.

The Board expressed the opinion that the proposed roof top plantings were not likely to survive, especially since no one would be up on the roof on a regular basis to monitor them. Since the roof will not be visible to adjacent properties and no roof deck is proposed the Board recommends that those plantings would be more beneficial elsewhere.

> Rec. 8) The roof top plantings should be relocated to a more visible location on site, perhaps the exposed roof of the ground floor along the north property line.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

Rear and side setback requirements for lots adjacent to residential zones SMC 23.47A.014.B.3

Requirement: 0' setback for areas up to 13' tall; 15' setback along the north property line where the building is more than 13' tall

Request: 5' setback at the base of the building; 10' setback for areas above 13' height on the north property line

Board Response: Continue to include this in the proposed design because it keeps the noisy ground floor kitchen and service area further from the residential use.

Outdoor activities adjacent to a residential zone SMC 23.47A.011.E

Requirement: Outdoor eating and drinking areas shall be located at least 50' from the north property line, since there is a residential zone to the north

Request: Restaurant seating area proposed at 38'8" from the north property line

Board Response: Continue to include this in the proposed design since it is similar to an existing condition, it will be buffered from the residences by a grade change and solid walls and it responds to an identified EDG priority.

Driveway widths for non-residential uses SMC 23.54.030.D.2.a.2

Requirement: The commercial driveway at the northwest corner of the site shall be minimum 22', and maximum 25', wide

Request: Proposed driveway width is 16'. Driveway would be shared by both residential and commercial uses.

Board Response: Continue to include this in the proposed design as it minimizes the impact on the adjacent residential use, an identified EDG priority.

Street level facing facades – maximum setback at street level SMC 23.47A.008.A.3

Requirement: Street level street facing facades shall be located within 10' of the street lot line

Request: The residential entrance is set back 21'8" and the second residential exit door at N. 36th St would be set back 53'8" from the south property line.

Board Response: The Board directs that the residential entrance be moved toward 1st Avenue to improve the safety and appearance of that space. The Board is unsure if a departure is needed for the residential exit to 36th, but requests no change.

Residential Amenity Areas SMC 23.47A.024

Requirement: Residential amenity areas equal to 5% of the gross residential floor area

Request: The Board's recommendation to reduce the size of the common deck drops the amenity area below 5%

Board Response: The Board directs the architect to explore a roof deck or possible departure from the 6' width requirement in order to maintain the amenity space while improving the appearance of the residential entry.

RECOMMENDATION

The Board recommends and DPD concurs that the project return for review at a second Recommendation meeting after the architect has incorporated the direction expressed above into the building and site design. These comments are based on the recommendation packet date stamped March 14, 2008 and presented at the March 24th, 2008 meeting.