

**SECOND DESIGN REVIEW RECOMMENDATION MEETING
OF THE
NORTHWEST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

**Meeting Date: July 14, 2008
Report Date: July 17, 2008**

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Project Number: 3007752

Address: 100 North 36th Street

Applicants: David Wu of TSE Architects and Jamie Fleckenstein of Studio 342 representatives for Sahagun Restaurant Consulting Inc.

Board members present: Guy Peckham, Chair
Mark Brands
Joe Giampietro
Bill Singer
Jean Morgan

Board members absent None

DPD staff present: Nora Gierloff, Land Use Planner

PROJECT STATUS

An Early Design Guidance report for this project, describing 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 Board developed a list of eight correction items. A second recommendation meeting was held on July 14, 2008 and the design guidance given by the Board at that meeting is listed further below. A final recommendation meeting will be scheduled once the applicant has submitted a design that responds to the Board's comments.

SUMMARY OF 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:

- The 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)

SUMMARY OF FIRST 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 shifted 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 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 PUBLIC COMMENTS

No members of the public attended either Recommendation meeting.

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

After reviewing the initial design response the Board asked the applicant to address the following specific items:

- 1) Explore the need for a concrete wall or guardrail where there is a 30" or greater dropoff adjacent to the townhouse driveway.
- 2) The width of the seating area should be increased by pulling the ground floor back to line up with the upper stories.
- 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.
- 4) Replace the proposed ground floor cement board siding with one of the types of masonry units used elsewhere on that level.
- 5) Eliminate the middle accent band (between the second and third floor) and refine the cornice with a built-up profile.
- 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.
- 7) The planting bed should be revised together with the retaining wall and fence revisions.
- 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.

The applicant was asked to address all priority guidelines and Board recommendations in a revised proposal to be presented at a second recommendation meeting.

SECOND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY (JULY 14, 2008)

The Board started its review by asking the architect to present his response to each of the correction items identified at the initial recommendation meeting.

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

Applicant Response: The revised design has a metal guardrail fence on a concrete curb at the top of the retaining wall along the length of the sunken restaurant service ramp. Vines are proposed at the base of the wall to soften the appearance of the concrete retaining wall and ultimately provide a green screen along the metal fence. The zoning reviewer has sent a correction stating that a 25% driveway slope is the maximum that will be allowed so the proposed 30.7% shown will need to be revised.

Board Response: The Board generally thought that the design of the wall and fence responded to their direction. However the additional detail about the configuration of the northwest corner of the site raised some questions about the functionality of the driveway and dumpster area. The Board thought that due to the proposed restaurant use the dumpsters would likely be heavy and it could be quite difficult to roll them up an 8.75% slope. This could be a safety concern if one started to roll down the steep driveway. They raised the idea of moving the pedestrian access ramp to be adjacent to

the dumpster area rather than along the north property line in order to allow for a more gentle slope at the dumpsters.

Board Recommendation:

A. Resolve the driveway slope and dumpster access issues prior to returning for the final recommendation meeting.

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

Applicant Response: The 36th Street façade has been brought into one plane and the entrances are popped out at a consistent angle.

Board Response: The Board was pleased with the 7' width of the seating area.

- 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.

Applicant Response: The requested changes have been made to the elevation.

Board Response: Generally the Board thought that the façade was much more unified and consistent in its treatment of elements such as the commercial entries. The Board did question the decision to angle the entryways and balconies parallel to the street rather than perpendicular to the building.

Board Recommendation:

B. Extend the balconies and commercial entries perpendicular from the building facades and square them off parallel to the building.

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

Applicant Response: The entire first floor has been changed to brick veneer with a protruding darker brick accent band. The upper floors have been changed to all elastomeric paint over cement plaster stucco.

Board Response: The Board was confused that sheet A-11 still referenced painted cement board if that material was no longer being used. They questioned the accuracy of the colors between the different sheets in the packet and thought that they didn't have the level of information they needed to make a decision without a color and material sample board. They also raised the question of whether the conical exterior light fixture presented at the last meeting was still appropriate to the more modern expression of the revised building design.

Board Recommendation:

C. Provide a materials board with actual material samples and accurate color chips to the next meeting. Window materials and light fixture specifications should be included.

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

Applicant Response: The accent band has been removed. The cornice is still a rectangular section. The roof will have parapets and internal roof drains, though that is not shown on the perspective drawings in the packet.

Board Response: The Board still wanted to see a cornice line with more detail and hierarchy. The wall segments show vertical modulation with higher and lower elements, perhaps those should have different cornice treatments to emphasize the change. There is an area on the east elevation where the parapet drops, though there is no reveal or color change on the wall beneath. The north elevation lacks detail, though it will be highly visible to the adjacent residential development.

The discussion of the roof treatment raised the issue of mechanical equipment screening. The roof top will be visible to properties up the hill to the north. The applicant said that equipment could be screened with slatted chain link fences but the Board did not think that would be adequate.

Board Recommendation:

- D. Develop two cornice profiles that differentiate between the higher and lower parapet areas. Reflect the shift between a high and low element with a color change, modulation or reveal on the wall.**
- E. Use color, varying parapet heights and possibly modulation to refine the north elevation.**
- F. Provide screening of roof top mechanical equipment that is coordinated with the design of the building in color and possibly material.**

- 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.

Applicant Response: The residential entry was brought out to be within 10' of the property line to remove the previous departure request. It will be even with the common deck above. A canopy that matches the ones along 36th will provide weather protection.

Board Response: The Board thought that though the design did not provide much emphasis for the residential entry it responded adequately to their earlier direction. They were concerned about the full height wing wall between the entrance and the north end of the outdoor seating area. The Board agreed that combined with the protruding dumpster enclosure on the north side of the entrance it could pose a safety hazard by creating a hiding area. Due to the change in grade level some barrier would be required but it could be lower and/or visually permeable.

Board Recommendation:

- G. Modify the brick wall on 1st Avenue between the residential entry and the outdoor seating area to be no more than 42" high on the uphill side and possibly include an open railing section as in the wall segment facing 36th Street.**

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

Applicant Response: The drawings show an 18" planting strip with groundcover and vines that are shown growing up the retaining wall and onto the fence. The landscape architect showed photos of a site in Fremont where vines were growing from an 8" wide planting bed.

Board Response: The 6" thickness allowed for the retaining wall seems questionable and exterior ramps have a minimum width of 3'6" so there might not be much room left for a planting bed. They also had concerns about the available soil depth.

Board Recommendation:

H. A planting bed of 8" to 12" with a soil depth adequate to support the vines chosen must be provided at the base of the northern retaining wall in order to soften the appearance of the tall retaining wall and provide a green screen for the townhouses to the north.

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.

Applicant Response: The roof top plantings have been removed from the design and the Green Factor requirement met by potted plants on the common decks and other planting areas.

Board Response: The response to this item is adequate.

In the course of responding to the Board's correction items the applicant also made additional changes to the design including:

- Brought the 36th Street façade into one plane;
- Added a landscape area between the two commercial entrances on 36th;
- Eliminated the outdoor passageway to the exit stairs and windows into the retail space along the ground floor of the east elevation;
- Revised the color scheme of the building;
- Added weather protection over the western seating area;
- Eliminated the arched windows on the third floor of the south elevation; and
- Consolidated four windows into two on the south elevation.

The only one of these items of concern to the Board was the uncertainty about the color and material scheme of the project to be addressed by Recommendation B above. They decided that they needed the applicant to return for a final recommendation meeting that would be narrowly focused on applicant responses to recommendation items A through H listed above.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

Three departures from the development standards were proposed at the second recommendation meeting.

1) 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 away from the residential use.

2) 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, due to the 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.

3) 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.

The Board indicated its continued support for these departures in the context of the current design proposal. However, the Board's recommendation on the departures will be reserved until the final Board meeting and will be based upon the departures' potential to help the project better meet these design guideline priorities and achieve a better overall design than could be achieved without the departure.

RECOMMENDATION

The Board recommends and DPD concurs that the project return for review at a third 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 July 1st, 2008 and presented at the July 14th, 2008 meeting.