# FINAL DESIGN REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS <br> OF THE <br> NORTHEAST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD 

Meeting Date: October 20, 2008
Report Date: October 27, 2008

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

| Project Number: | 3008972 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Address: | $450025^{\text {th }}$ Ave NE |
| Applicant: | Terry McCann of Blumen Consulting Group for <br> University Village |
| Board members present: | Craig Parsons, Chair <br> Susan Eastman Jensen <br> Tom Nelson <br> Shawna Sherman |
| Board members absent | Tricia Reisenauer, recused |
| DPD staff present: | Shelley Bolser, Land Use Planner |

## SITE \& VICINITY

The approximately 981,000 square foot corner site of University Village is located on a number of parcels bound on the south by NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St and on the west by $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave NE. The site is occupied by several retail structures and one retail/parking structure that are separated by walkways, plazas, and surface parking areas. The heights of the structures range from one to six stories.

The site slopes slightly from the west to the south and is zoned Commercial 1 with a 65' height limit (C1-65). This zoning continues to the northwest and west. More intensive Commercial 2 zoning with a 65' height limit is located to the east. Lower height commercial zoning regulated under the University of Washington Major Institution Overlay (MIO-50-C1-40) is located to the northeast and southwest. Multifamily Lowrise 1 zoning, also within the University of Washington Major Institution Overlay (MIO-37-L-1) is located to the south across NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St.

Surrounding uses are a mix of commercial and residential. Commercial areas flank $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave NE and NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St near the site. Multifamily residential development is located just north of the site and up the hill to the west. Nearby single family residential development is located primarily to the east of the site on the other side of NE Blakely St. Open space is located to the south across NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St.

Most of the nearby retail and single family structures are 1-2 stories tall. Newer multi-family residential structures are around 4 stories tall. The subject properties are located in a low spot
between the hill to the west and the hill to the east. The NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St viaduct rises from grade at the south property line up the hill to the west.

The area includes sidewalks and nearby transit stops. Bus stops are located on $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave NE and NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St. The NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St bus stop near the site is accessed via a pedestrian path under the NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St viaduct. Parking is predominantly in private surface parking lots, with some below
 grade and structured parking. There are no alleys adjacent to the site.

NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St on the side of the subject property includes a sidewalk that is interrupted by the NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St viaduct and does not include any vegetated buffer. $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave NE on the side of the subject property includes a sidewalk with a small vegetated buffer between the sidewalk and the traffic.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct three new structures including approximately $107,500 \mathrm{sq}$. ft . of new restaurant and retail and 797 parking stalls. The proposed development would include demolition of 423 existing surface parking stalls for a net increase of 374 stalls. One existing buildings would be demolished (Key Bank).

Approximately 12,000 square feet of the new retail/office space and removal of 21 parking stalls would be associated with additions to two existing buildings on site. Additions to existing buildings are not subject to design review. The review of total square footage and parking stalls will be considered during the Master Use Permit stage as part of the environmental review portion of the application.

The remaining 95,500 square feet of new office/retail and net addition of 433 parking stalls is associated with the three new proposed structures that are subject to both design review and environmental review.

Proposed building 1 is a 65 ' tall structured parking and retail building. Proposed building 1 would be located on the south property line adjacent to the NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St viaduct and would include
approximately 48,000 square feet of retail at the ground floor with 792 stalls located on the floors above. This building would require demolition of 202 existing surface parking stalls.

Proposed building 2 is a 48 ' tall "Village Center" located in the center of the site north of the existing Barnes and Noble bookstore. Proposed building 2 would include approximately 22,000 square feet of retail/restaurant space on two levels. The area to the west of building 2 would include an open plaza. This proposed structure would require demolition of 99 existing surface parking stalls.

Proposed building $\mathbf{3}$ is a 38 ' tall "Gateway Building" located immediately south of the primary vehicular entry mid-block at $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave NE. The proposed structure would include approximately 25,500 square feet of retail with 5 parking stalls inside the building. This building would require demolition of 101 existing surface parking stalls.

The environmental review at the Master Use Permit stage will also include consideration of buildings 1 A and 3 A , which are additions to existing buildings. These additions will include approximately 12,000 square feet of new floor area and demolition of 21 existing surface parking stalls.

## DESIGN GUIDELINE PRIORITIES:

 EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING (June $2^{\text {nd }}, 2008$ )At the Early Design Guidance meeting held on June $2^{\text {nd }}, 2008$ 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 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" and "Commercial Buildings and University Community Design Guidelines" of highest priority to this project:

A-1 Responding to Site Characteristics
A-2 Streetscape Compatibility
A-4 Human Activity
A-8 Parking and Vehicle Access
B-1 Height, Bulk, and Scale Compatibility
C-1 Architectural Context
C-2 Architectural Concept and Consistency
C-3 Human Scale
C-4 Exterior Finish Materials
C-5 Structured Parking Entrances
D-1 Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances
D-2 Blank Walls
D-3 Retaining Walls
D-5 Visual Impacts of Parking Structures
D-6 Screening of Dumpsters, Utilities, and Service Areas
D-7 Personal Safety and Security
D-9 Commercial Signage
D-10 Commercial Lighting
D-11 Commercial Transparency
E-1 Landscaping to Reinforce Design Continuity with Adjacent Sites
E-2 Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site
E-3 Landscape Design to Address Special Site Conditions

The primary guidance from EDG included:

- Height, bulk and scale of the proposed Building 1 (garage structure) is a major concern. Include methods to reduce mass, including stepped massing, deep modulation on the south façade, a break in the building, transparency, colors, materials, and landscaping.
- Pedestrian connections should strongly link to existing pedestrian pathways adjacent to the University Village site, especially the highly used pedestrian path below the NE 45th St viaduct and the sidewalks on 25th Ave NE.
o Pedestrian connections should include a path through proposed Building 1, if at all possible. If it is not possible to provide this connection, the applicant will need to demonstrate strong reasons in support of not providing the connection.
o The loading areas near Building 3 should not conflict with pedestrian circulation or plaza areas
o All pedestrian areas should be treated for safety and perception of safety (especially adjacent to the south wall of Building 1)
- Open space should be functionally usable and connected to other well-used open space areas
- Architectural context should respond to newer nearby development
- The northwest and southwest corners of Building 3 (adjacent to $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave NE) will be very visible from outside the site and should architecturally respond to this visibility
- Use quality finishes, especially on the south wall of Building 1 (the parking garage)
- Examine the impacts of new shadows cast on significant open spaces within the site
- Provide information on proposed lighting, signage, and transparency
- Use landscaping to soften building mass, especially for Building 1


## DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY (OCTOBER

20, 2008)
On July 29th, 2008, the applicant submitted for a Master Use Permit. On October 20th, 2008, the Northeast Design Review Board convened for a Final Design Recommendation meeting. Graphics and display boards presented for the Board members' consideration included color and material samples.

## DESIGN PRESENTATION

Matt Haba with University Village, Michael Lee with Callison Architects and Kris Snider with Hewitt Architects presented the design changes made based on the Board's design guidance from EDG:

Building 1 (South parking garage):

- Vegetation and paving improvements in the public right of way below the $45^{\text {th }}$ St viaduct to enhance the pedestrian environment adjacent to Building 1
- Lighting and low landscaping to improve visibility in walkway area
- Note: only $2 \%$ of pedestrians entering the University Village site enter from the access point under the viaduct south of Building 1
- Retaining existing mature trees in the public right of way adjacent to the north side of the NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St viaduct
- New walkway to connect to existing pedestrian areas west and east of the building
- Terracing the upper eastern levels and notching the corners to reduce massing
- Variety of modulation, glazing, materials/colors, and landscaping to reduce massing to the appearance of three narrower masses
- Lush landscaping and native plants at the west elevation

Building 2 (Village Center):

- Removal of the exterior stairs from the proposal (adjacent to the south side of the building)
- Creation of a Woonerf-style approach to the south side of the building adjacent to Barnes and Noble, for the purpose of pedestrian, auto, and service use
- Vehicle drop-off area adjacent to plaza instead of overlapped with plaza
- Shadows were examined in the plaza area and found that the plaza would receive sun most of the day except in the winter
- Modification to the upper levels of the building to create a second story outdoor dining area and a roof form intended to make the building stand out from other structures in $U$ Village
- Addition of a hip roof to the upper floor for the appearance of a penthouse addition, and to make the building a focal point in the site

Building 3 (adjacent to main vehicle entry at $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave NE):

- Modification of building location to make a larger plaza across from Starbucks and reduce the size of the upper plaza
- Reduction in the building height on the north and east facades, through removal of the third level of proposed office space from the proposal
- Significant architectural corner element with high degree of glazing on the north, west, and east facades
- Corner pulled back from the sidewalk at the $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave NE vehicular entry to allow ADA accessibility, landscaping adjacent to the building and a transition in grade from sidewalk to building
- Wider stair approach to the upper levels
- Landscaping and water runnel by the stairs to connect upper and lower levels
- Create a green wall on the wall south of the stairs
- Relocation of the loading area to reduce conflict with pedestrian areas, with special paving at the point it crosses the walkway areas

Departure

- There is now one departure request for Building 1, as described on page 10. The University Village site is across NE $45^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$ from a residentially zoned property owned by the University of Washington and currently used for outdoor recreation areas. Street level development standards apply due to this adjacent zoning.


## BOARD QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

The Board had the following questions and clarifying comments:

- Would signage be located on the south wall of Building 1, facing NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St?
o None at the upper levels, only signage to mark the parking entry on the west facade
- How would lighting be controlled within the garage to avoid glare as viewed from outside?
o Louvers would screen lighting from the outside, and the fixtures would include full cutoff treatments
o Spandrel conditions at the slab edge would be extended up 24-30" to block headlights
- Is the Woonerf intended to be a service road?
o The applicant didn't want to close this off completely, so instead will use landscaping, paving, and bollards to allow some one-way traffic and parking for tenant spaces along the walkways
o The area could be closed off with bollards for events
- The tables at the south side of the plaza for Building 2 appear to be in the shade. Is it possible to flip the water feature on the north side of the plaza with the tables on the south side?
o The north side of the plaza will get more sun and the water feature will have places for people to sit. The south side of the plaza will allow people a place to sit in the shade of trees, if they choose.
- Does the applicant have a conceptual signage plan?
o Building 3 would have perhaps one sign facing $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave NE, and if it's lit, it would be reviewed by University Village management to ensure it was lively, creative, and consistent with other University Village signage
- How much distance is between the south façade of Building 1 and the property line?
o It ranges from about 6" at the pilasters to 4' at the wider areas.
- How tall are the two-level façade pieces at the corners of Building 1?
o Approximately 30 ' tall, with a belt course that continues the expression through the south façade
- $2 \%$ of pedestrian access comes from the south - was this a current measurement, or a projection based on the proposed development?
o Current measurement
o It wasn't possible to take pedestrian access through Building 1 because of the garage ramp location which would only allow 8-9' of clearance height for a walkway
o It would also be a security issue for tenants if pedestrians passed through the service areas
- Would the proposed development be phased?
o Yes, Building 1 would be constructed first, followed by Buildings 2 and 3
- How will the proposed development affect the amount of vehicles entering the site, and the vehicular and pedestrian circulation within the site?
o It will increase the number of vehicles entering the southwest corner of the site and direct those vehicles quickly to the south parking garage, with the intent of improving pedestrian circulation inside the site and reducing pedestrian/vehicle conflicts
- How many parking spaces would be added?
o Approximately 440 net added spaces


## PUBLIC COMMENT

Seven members of the public attended the Final Design Recommendation meeting. The following comments were offered:

- The south parking garage building design is as good as it can be in regards to the NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St viaduct.
o The applicant should make sure the pedestrian paths are clear and well-lit
o Any clean-up under the viaduct would be positive
0 The garage will probably reduce congestion at the southwest vehicular entry, which is good
o How many more stalls would be in this building, compared to the north parking garage?
- Fewer stalls, but in a similar style
- The proposed gateway building close to $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave NE is a good addition
- The reduction in surface parking at the site is a positive move
- Enhance the pedestrian environment in any way possible
- QFC will be developing an apartment complex at their site next door, with a possible increase in retail space. The applicants for this project should work with QFC to coordinate developments.
- University Village is a gathering space for the public as well as a shopping center, and these additions will help that identity


## DESIGN GUIDELINES

After considering the proposed design and the project context, hearing public comment and reconsidering the previously stated design priorities, the three Design Review Board members came to the following conclusions on how the proposed design met the remaining identified design objectives from City of Seattle's Design Review: Guidelines for Multifamily and Commercial Buildings and Commercial Buildings and University Community Design Guidelines.

## A. Site Planning

A-1 Responding to Site Characteristics. The siting of buildings should respond to specific site conditions and opportunities such as non-rectangular lots, location on prominent intersections, unusual topography, significant vegetation and views or other natural features.

A-2 Streetscape Compatibility. The siting of buildings should acknowledge and reinforce the existing desirable spatial characteristics of the right-of-way.
Early Design Guidance: Proposed Building 1 is adjacent to the NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St viaduct which includes a pedestrian path below. The height and mass of Building 1 will have a significant visual effect on pedestrians and cars traveling up and down NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St, and a significant circulation effect on pedestrians using the paths below the viaduct to access the bus stop and NE 45th St.

Proposed Building 1 should include methods to improve the visual effect of the structure on the adjacent public right of way (see Hot Button 1), and the applicant should strive to improve pedestrian connectivity between the proposed development and the existing pedestrian connections near the viaduct (see Hot Button 2).

Final design recommendation: The applicant has worked to reduce the appearance of mass through articulation, reduction of mass at the building corners and sides, application of materials and colors, a vegetated wall, and landscaping.

The proposed development would be five stories tall as viewed from the south, with clear glazing at the ground level near the eastern edge of the south façade. The remainder of the façade would include some proposed glass block areas, landscaping, and lighting. The length of the façade, combined with the noise from the NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St viaduct, the height of the viaduct increasing to the west, and the fact that pedestrians have to travel around the 400' foot long façade to access the University Village site led the Board and DPD to have concerns about pedestrian
safety. The Board recommended that the applicant work to increase safety for pedestrians at the south façade of Building 1 through techniques such as low landscaping, maximum lighting, widened walkway in some areas, increase building transparency, possible artwork on blank wall areas, call boxes, and increased safety at the pedestrian connection across the driveway at the west building facade. The proposal satisfies this guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

Recommended condition: Incorporate design techniques to maximize pedestrian safety on the south façade of Building 1, including human scale transparent windows along the south façade, widen the sidewalk to 8 feet in some locations, incorporate low landscaping, maximize pedestrian scaled lighting, add artwork on blank wall areas, and add safety call boxes.

Recommended condition: Include special paving, signage, and traffic calming at the pedestrian/vehicular crossing at the west garage entry.

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

Early Design Guidance: Comments reflect those found in Hot Button 1, A-1 and A-2 regarding pedestrian paths near the NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St viaduct.

Final design recommendation: Comments reflect those found in A-1 and A-2 regarding pedestrian paths near the NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St viaduct. The proposal satisfies this guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

Recommended condition: Condition reflects recommended conditions in response to A-1 and A-2.

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.

Early Design Guidance: The circulation around and through proposed Building 1 should minimize pedestrian/vehicle conflicts, provide maximum pedestrian circulation, and minimize vehicle circulation conflicts. The Board specifically noted concerns with the pedestrian circulation connection to the walkway under the NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St viaduct, and the potential for vehicle circulation conflicts near the southwest driveway and vehicle entry to the west side of Building 1.

Final design recommendation: Comments reflect the discussion about the pedestrian connection across the driveway entrance at the west façade of Building 1, found in response to guidelines A1 and A-2. The proposal satisfies this guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

Recommended condition: Condition reflects recommended conditions in response to A-1 and A-2.

## B. Height, Bulk and Scale

B-1 Height, Bulk, and Scale Compatibility. Projects should be compatible with the scale of development anticipated by the applicable Land Use Policies for the surrounding area and should be sited and designed to provide a sensitive transition to near-by, less intensive zones. Projects on zone edges should be developed in a manner that creates a step in perceived height, bulk, and scale between anticipated development potential of the adjacent zones.


#### Abstract

Early Design Guidance: In addition to the comments reflect those found in Hot Button 1 and the response to guidelines A-1 and A-2, the Board noted that the proposed corners of proposed Building 1 require further study. The building scale warrants a larger scale corner treatment at the northwest corner of the building, in order to match the scale of the rest of the building. The southwest corner of the building may be quite visible from both NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St and $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave NE and should be addressed in the proposed building design.

Building 3 is also a concern on the north façade. The grade change and inclusion of parking inside the structure may result in blank walls adjacent to the sidewalk at the "gateway" to the site. The grade change also translates to a tall façade at the north side of the building. The proposed design should include maximum transparency adjacent to the sidewalk at the north and west facades, and include articulation and modulation to reduce the height and scale of the north façade.

Final design recommendation: The applicant modified and developed the corners of Building 1 to include stepped back upper levels, a two-story base façade expression, upper terraced planters, and significant architectural corner elements. The Board felt that the corner design response for Building 1 satisfied this guideline.

The modifications to Building 3, the Gateway Building adjacent to $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave NE, were also positively received by the Board. The reduction of the upper office level greatly reduced the façade height. The proposed storefront facing $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave NE and the north façade includes a high degree of transparency. The corner element creates a graceful visual transition between the north and west facades. The Board felt the proposed design for Building 3 satisfied this guideline.


## C. Architectural Elements and Materials

C-1 Architectural Context. New buildings proposed for existing neighborhoods with a well-defined and desirable character should be compatible with or complement the architectural character and siting pattern of neighboring buildings.

University Community Guideline \#1 (augmenting C-1). Although no single architectural style or character emerges as a dominant direction for new construction in the University Community, project applicants should show how the proposed design incorporates elements of the local architectural character especially when there are buildings of local historical significance or landmark status in the vicinity.

University Community Guideline \#2 (augmenting C-1). For areas within Ravenna Urban Village, particularly along 25th Avenue E, the style of architecture is not as important so long as it emphasizes pedestrian orientation and avoids large-scale, standardized and auto-oriented characteristics.

University Community Guideline \#3 (augmenting C-1). On Mixed Use Corridors, consider breaking up the façade into modules of not more than 50 feet (measured horizontally parallel to the street) on University Way and 100 feet on other corridors, corresponding to traditional platting and building construction. (Note: This should not be interpreted as a prescriptive requirement. Larger parcels may characterize some areas of the University Community, such as lower Roosevelt.)

Early Design Guidance: The site is located in a Mixed Use Corridor ( $25^{t h}$ Ave NE) and within the Ravenna Urban Center Village. In addition to the comments found in Hot Button 1, the responses to A-1, A-2, and B-1, the applicant should demonstrate how the proposed design meets these guidelines for architectural context.

The proposed buildings should respond to newer architectural context within the area where the façade faces the public right of way (ex. The west façade of Building 3 and the west and south facades of Building 1). The Board mentioned newer residential and commercial development on $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave NE, north of the site, as positive examples of newer architectural context.
Final design recommendation: The Board felt that the proposed façade treatments for Building 1 and Building 3 were in context with both University Village development and the surrounding newer development. The proposal satisfies this guideline.

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 roofline or top of the structure should be clearly distinguished from its facade walls.

Early Design Guidance: Proposed Building 1 is a large structure and it will be a challenge to create a building design that responds to neighborhood context, reduces bulk and scale, and results in a unified building form and concept. The applicant should demonstrate how the proposed development meets this guideline at the MUP stage (also see comments from Hot Button 1, A-1, A-2, B-1, and C-1).

Proposed Building 3 would face $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave NE and the southwest corner would be visually prominent because the adjacent development is set back far from the street. The proposed design of Building 3 should include attention to both the northwest and southwest corners of the building.
Final design recommendation: The Board felt that the proposed massing reduction techniques and façade treatments responded to neighborhood context, reduced bulk and scale, included appropriate corner treatments, and resulted in unified building forms and concepts. The proposal satisfies this guideline.

C-3 Human Scale. The design of new buildings should incorporate architectural features, elements, and details to achieve a good human scale.
Early Design Guidance: Comments reflect those found in Hot Button 1, A-1, A-2, B-1, and C-1. Final design recommendation: The Board recommended that the south façade of Building 1 include modifications to achieve human scale at the ground level adjacent to the walkway. This includes fenestration, lighting, artwork, and other treatments that respond to the human scale of pedestrians on that path. The proposal satisfies this guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

Recommended condition: Condition reflects recommended conditions in response to A-1 and A-2.

C-4 Exterior Finish Materials. Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.
University Community Guideline \#1 (augmenting C-4). New buildings should emphasize durable, attractive, and well-detailed finish materials, including:

- Brick (especially appropriate)
- Concrete (if it features architecturally treated texture or color, other refined detailing, and/or complementary materials)
- Cast stone, natural stone, tile
- Stucco and stucco-like panels, if they feature an even surface and properly trimmed joints and edging around doors and windows. Heavily textured finishes with obvious trowel marks are not generally appropriate. Stucco should be avoided in areas that are susceptible to vandalism and graffiti. Stucco and stucco-like panels must be detailed and finished to avoid water staining and envelope failure. Overhangs and protective trim are encouraged to increase weather resistance
- Art tile or other decorative wall details
- Wood, especially appropriate for residential structures

University Community Guideline \#2 (augmenting C-4). Sculptural cast stone and decorative tile are particularly appropriate because they relate to campus architecture and Art Deco buildings. Wood and cast stone are appropriate for moldings and trim.

University Community Guideline \#3 (augmenting C-4). The materials listed below are discouraged and should only be used if they complement the building's architectural character and are architecturally treated for a specific reason that supports the building and streetscape character:

- Masonry units. If concrete blocks (concrete masonry units or "cinder blocks") are used for walls that are visible from a public street or park, then the concrete or concrete block construction should be architecturally treated in one or more of the following ways:
o Use of textured blocks with surfaces such as split face or grooved
o Use of colored mortar
o Use of other masonry types, such as brick, glass block, or tile, in conjunction with concrete blocks
o Treated to avoid the gray "weeping" effect of wet concrete masonry
o Provided with substantial wood or metal trellis and maintained vine planting such as flowering hydrangea vine, or other non-pest vine
- Metal siding. If metal siding is used as a siding material over more than 25\% of a building's façade, the metal siding should have a matted finish in a neutral or earth tone, such as buff, gray, beige, tan, cream, white, or a dulled color such as barn-red, bluegray, burgundy, or ocher. If metal siding is used over $25 \%$ of the building façade, then the building design should include visible window and door trim painted or finished in a complementary color and corner and edge trim that covers exposed edges of the sheet metal panels.
- Wood siding and shingles except on upper stories or on smaller-scale residential projects.
- Vinyl siding.
- Sprayed-on finish with large aggregate.
- Mirrored glass. This is especially inappropriate when glare could be a potential problem.

University Community Guideline \#4 (augmenting C-4). Where anodized metal is used for window and door trim, then care should be given to the proportion and breakup of glazing to reinforce the building concept and proportions.

University Community Guideline \#6 (augmenting C-4). Awnings made of translucent material may be backlit, but should not overpower neighboring light schemes. Lights, which direct light downward, mounted from the awning frame are acceptable. Lights that shine from the exterior down on the awning are acceptable.

Early Design Guidance: The Board noted that it will be important to include a variety of quality materials and finishes, especially to reduce the scale of Building 1. The applicant should also demonstrate that the south wall of Building 2 would include quality finishes and would not represent a blank wall.

Final design recommendation: The Board appreciated the variety of colors and materials on all buildings, and noted the proposed change to storefront and Woonerf at the south side of Building 2. The proposal satisfies this guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

Recommended condition: Applicant should provide to the Land Use Planner either the material and color boards presented at the Design Recommendation meeting, or provide photos of the material and color boards along with manufacturer information (material, style, color reference number) for each material and color.

C-5 Structured Parking Entrances. The presence and appearance of garage entrances should be minimized so that they do not dominate the street frontage of a building.
Early Design Guidance: Comments reflect those in response to guidelines A-1 and A-2.
Final design recommendation: Comments reflect those found in response to guidelines A-1 and $\mathrm{A}-2$. The proposal satisfies this guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

Recommended condition: Condition reflects recommended conditions in response to A-1 and A-2.

## D. Pedestrian Environment

D-1 Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances. Convenient and attractive access to the building's entry should be provided. To ensure comfort and security, paths and entry areas should be sufficiently lighted and entry areas should be protected from the weather. Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.
University Community Guideline \#1 (augmenting D-1). On Mixed Use Corridors, consider setting back a portion of the building to provide small pedestrian open spaces with seating amenities. The building façades along the open space must still be pedestrian-oriented.
Pedestrian-oriented open spaces should meet the objectives below as well as the Citywide Design Guidelines. Required open space may be reduced up to $50 \%$ if a substantial amount of the street-level open space (on the order of at least 200 square feet), meets the following objectives:

- Plazas should be centrally located, on major avenues, close to bus stops, or where there are strong pedestrian flows on neighboring sidewalks.
- Plazas should be sensitively proportioned and designed. For example: not more than 60 feet across and no more than 3 feet above or below the sidewalk.
- Plazas should have plenty of benches, steps, and ledges for seating. For example: at least one linear foot of seating per 30 square feet of plaza area should be provided; seating should have a minimum depth of 16 inches.
- Locate the plaza in a sunny spot and encourage public art and other amenities. For example: at least $50 \%$ of the total frontage of building walls facing a plaza should be occupied by retail uses, street vendors, building entrances, or other pedestrian oriented uses.
- Provide plenty of planting beds for ground cover or shrubs. For example: one tree should be provided for every 200 square feet and at a maximum spacing of 25 feet apart. Special precaution must be taken to prevent trees from blocking the sun.

Early Design Guidance: The proposed development is located on a Mixed-Use Corridor (25th Ave $N E)$.

Proposed Building 2 would be located north of an existing taller building. The applicant should demonstrate how the proposed open space at the terraced steps would be affected by the shadows cast from the existing building. Consider providing a connection from the top of the steps to the existing building to the south, in order to provide better connectivity and destinations at both the top and bottom of the stairs.

The courtyard at the bottom of the stairs would be normally occupied by parking, as currently proposed. The Board noted that in the overall scheme of University Village, the number of parking spaces provided in this area is negligible. Some part of the area may work well as a 'drop-off' circulation or valet temporary parking, but the parking spots would be better used as dedicated plaza area.
Proposed Building 3 includes a proposed plaza facing $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave NE and another at the interior of the site facing east.

The Board noted that due to the existing use patterns of the site, the plaza at the interior of the site should be larger and more pedestrian-oriented. The proximity to the plaza across the internal street to the east (near Starbucks) will result in more consolidated usable open space for the site.
The applicant should clearly demonstrate how the proposed loading and vehicle access at Building 3 will not conflict with the pedestrian oriented open space, and how the open space will have clear pedestrian connections to existing sidewalks and stairways nearby.

The plaza on the $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave façade could be smaller, and should include landscape and other means to buffer users from the traffic noise of $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave NE. A street wall of retail would be a positive addition to that street front where many of the commercial storefronts are set back far from the sidewalk and not easily accessible to pedestrians.
Final design recommendation: Proposed Building 2 (the Civic Center Building) was modified by the applicant to include a plaza at the west façade instead of open steps at the south façade. This modification allowed maximum sun to the plaza and avoided significant shadowing by the existing building to the south. The plaza was also modified to exclude parking or vehicular access, and a water feature was proposed for the north end of the plaza. The Board responded positively to these modifications.
Proposed Building 3 (the Gateway Building) was modified to reduce the size of the upper plaza and increase the size of the lower plaza across from Starbucks. The two plazas would be connected by a wider set of stairs with vegetation and a water runnel. The loading area would be
accessed away from the lower plaza, crossing a walkway instead of the plaza area. The Board agreed with these modifications and noted that the revised plan will create very good pedestrian connectivity and maximize the plaza opportunities at this site. The proposal satisfies this guideline.

D-2 Blank Walls. Buildings should avoid large blank walls facing the street, especially near sidewalks. Where blank walls are unavoidable they should receive design treatment to increase pedestrian comfort and interest.

Early Design Guidance: In addition to the comments regarding Building 1 in Hot Button 1, the applicant should also demonstrate how the other two proposed buildings meet this guideline. Areas of concern include the south wall of the staircase at Building 2 and the west and north facades of Building 3. Potential methods to mitigate blank walls include modulation, articulation, colors and material applications, and vegetation.
Final design recommendation: Comments reflect those found in response to guidelines $A-1, A-2$, and B-1. The proposal satisfies this guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

Recommended condition: Condition reflects recommended conditions in response to A-1 and A-2.

D-3 Retaining Walls. Retaining walls near a public sidewalk that extend higher than eye level should be avoided where possible. Where higher retaining walls are unavoidable, they should be designed to reduce their impact on pedestrian comfort and to increase the visual interest along the streetscapes.

Early Design Guidance: If any retaining walls are proposed, the applicant should demonstrate how the proposed design meets this guideline.
Final design recommendation: The applicant modified the area between Building 2 and the sidewalk and walkway areas near $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave NE. Any retaining walls will be minimal and coordinated with landscaped areas. The proposal satisfies this guideline.

D-5 Visual Impacts of Parking Structures. The visibility of all at-grade parking structures or accessory parking garages should be minimized. The parking portion of a structure should be architecturally compatible with the rest of the structure and streetscape. Open parking spaces and carports should be screened from the street and adjacent properties.

University Community Guideline \#1 (augmenting D-5). The preferred solution for parking structures is to incorporate commercial uses at the ground level. Below grade parking is the next best solution for parking.

Early Design Guidance: The applicant proposes to include retail at the ground floor of Building 1 and Building 3, the two proposed structures that include structured parking. Comments reflect those found in Hot Button 1, A-1, A-2, and D-2.

Final design recommendation: Comments reflect those found in response to guidelines $A-1, A-2$, and D-1. The proposal satisfies this guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

Recommended condition: Condition reflects recommended conditions in response to A-1 and A-2.

D-6 Screening of Dumpsters, Utilities, and Service Areas. Building sites should locate service elements like trash dumpsters, loading docks and mechanical equipment away from the street front where possible. When elements such as dumpsters, utility meters, mechanical units and service areas cannot be located away from the street front, they should be situated and screened from view and should not be located in the pedestrian right-of-way.

Early Design Guidance: The applicant has noted that service areas would be located on the east façade of each building. The applicant should demonstrate how those areas meet this guideline.

Final design recommendation: The applicant modified the service areas to be inside the parking areas. They noted that trash pickup and deliveries are performed early in the morning, before University Village is open for business. The proposal satisfies this guideline.

D-7 Personal Safety and Security. Project design should consider opportunities for enhancing personal safety and security in the environment under review.
Early Design Guidance: Comments reflect those found in Hot Buttons 1 and 2 regarding connections to the pedestrian paths under the NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St viaduct. The existing paths are already dark and somewhat enclosed by the NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St viaduct. The paths would be further walled in and made darker by the proposed 6 -story structure adjacent to the north side of the viaduct.
Proposed Building 1 design should include techniques to enhance safety and security in this area through methods such as storefront windows on the south façade, enhancing pedestrian connections between the site and that path, lighting, and visual connections through the building.

Final design recommendation: Comments reflect those found in response to guidelines A-1 and A-2. The proposal satisfies this guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

Recommended condition: Condition reflects recommended conditions in response to A-1 and A-2.

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.
University Community Guideline Signage Guideline \#1 (augmenting C-4, but pertains to D-9). The following sign types are encouraged, particularly along Mixed Use
Corridors:

- Pedestrian-oriented shingle or blade signs extending from the building front just above pedestrians
- Marquee signs and signs on pedestrian canopies
- Neon signs
- Carefully executed window signs, such as etched glass or hand painted signs
- Small signs on awnings or canopies

University Community Guideline Signage Guideline \#2 (augmenting C-4, but pertains to D-9). Post mounted signs are discouraged.

University Community Guideline Signage Guideline \#3 (augmenting C-4, but pertains to D-9). The location and installation of signage should be integrated with the building's architecture.

University Community Guideline Signage Guideline \#4 (augmenting C-4, but pertains to D-9). Monument signs should be integrated into the development, such as on a screen wall.

Early Design Guidance: The applicant should demonstrate how the proposal meets these guidelines at the MUP stage of review.

Final design recommendation: The applicant explained that there would be no signage on the south wall of Building 1, with the exception of a sign noting the garage entry near the west façade. Any other signage would be reviewed by University Village to be consistent with other signage in the Village. The applicant provided pictures demonstrating examples of such signage. The proposal satisfies this guideline.

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 overhead weather protection, on and around street furniture, in merchandising display windows, in landscaped areas, and/or on signage.

University Community Guideline \#7 (augmenting C-4 but pertains to D-10). Light standards should be compatible with other site design and building elements.

Early Design Guidance: The applicant should demonstrate how the proposal meets these guidelines at the MUP stage of review.
Final design recommendation: The applicant provided a lighting plan and photos of proposed light fixtures. Additional lighting should be incorporated at the south façade of Building 1 to maximize pedestrian safety, as discussed in response to guidelines A-1 and A-2. The proposal satisfies this guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

Recommended condition: Condition reflects recommended conditions in response to A-1 and A-2.

Recommended condition: All lighting within the parking areas for Building 1 should be fully shielded, as viewed from outside the building from the viewpoint of pedestrians and drivers on adjacent walkways and streets.

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.

Early Design Guidance: The applicant should demonstrate how the proposal meets these guidelines at the MUP stage of review.

Final design recommendation: The Board noted appreciation for the proposed transparency facing $25^{\text {th }}$ Ave NE, but noted that additional transparency at a human scale should be incorporated on the south facade of Building 1, adjacent to the walkway that is mostly in the public right of way for NE $45^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$. The proposal satisfies this guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.

Recommended condition: Condition reflects recommended conditions in response to A-1 and A-2.

## E. Landscaping

E-1 Landscaping to Reinforce Design Continuity with Adjacent Sites. Where possible, and where there is not another overriding concern, landscaping should reinforce the character of neighboring properties and abutting streetscape.
Early Design Guidance: The applicant has noted that large amounts of landscaping would be provided at the street level and on the buildings. The landscaping at the property edges should respond to neighborhood context.

Final design recommendation: The proposed landscaping includes a variety of plant types, including native plants. The applicant's landscape architect is working with the Center for Urban Horticulture to develop a plant palette appropriate to this site. The proposal satisfies this guideline.

E-2 Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site. Landscaping, including living plant material, special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, site furniture, and similar features should be appropriately incorporated into the design to enhance the project.
E-3 Landscape Design to Address Special Site Conditions. The landscape design should take advantage of special on-site conditions such as high-bank front yards, steep slopes, view corridors, or existing significant trees and off-site conditions such as greenbelts, ravines, natural areas, and boulevards.
Early Design Guidance: The applicant has noted the intent to provide landscaping to soften the proposed buildings and reduce the scale of Building 1 as viewed from the side and above. The proposed landscape plans should demonstrate how the proposal meets these guidelines.

Final design recommendation: The applicant proposes to retain the existing trees in the public right of way adjacent to the NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St viaduct. The Board noted that if these trees should be damaged during construction, they should be replaced with mature large trees that provide a similar canopy to the existing trees.
The roof of Building 1 would include open parking areas. These areas would likely be visible from above, as viewed from the upper areas of NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St or the residential units at the top of the hill. The applicant should either provide landscaping and/or trellises to visually break up this open parking area, OR demonstrate to the Land Use Planner that the parking area would not be visible from either NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St or the residents on the hill above the site.
The proposal satisfies this guideline, subject to the conditions listed below.
Recommended condition: Retain the existing trees in the NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St public right of way, or replace with similar trees (size at installation should be approximately the same as existing trees).

Recommended condition: Either provide landscaping and/or trellises to visually break up the open parking area on the top floor of Building 1, OR demonstrate to the Land Use Planner that the parking area would not be visible from either NE 45th St or the residents on the hill above the site.

## RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

The recommendations summarized below were based on the recommendation packet date stamped October $15^{\text {th }}, 2008$ and materials presented at the October $20^{\text {th }}, 2008$ meeting. Design, siting or architectural details not specifically identified or altered in these recommendations are expected to remain as presented in the plan set and other drawings from the October $15^{\text {th }}, 2008$ and materials presented at the October $20^{\text {th }}, 2008$ meeting.

After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities, and reviewing the plans and renderings, the Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design and the requested development standard departures from the requirements of the Land Use Code (listed above). The Board recommends the following CONDITIONS for the project. (Authority referred to via letter and number in parenthesis):

1. Incorporate design techniques to maximize pedestrian safety on the south façade of Building 1, including human scale transparent windows along the south façade, widen the sidewalk to 8 feet in some locations, incorporate low landscaping, maximize pedestrian scaled lighting, add artwork on blank wall areas, and add safety call boxes. The proposed modifications should be reviewed and approved by the Land Use Planner prior to publishing of a Master Use Permit decision. (A-1, A-2, A-4, A-8, C-3, D-2, D5, D-7, D-10, D-11)
2. Include special paving, signage, and traffic calming at the pedestrian/vehicular crossing at the west garage entry. The proposed modifications should be reviewed and approved by the Land Use Planner prior to publishing of a Master Use Permit decision. (A-1, A-2, A-4, A-8, C-5, D-7)
3. The applicant should provide either the material and color boards presented at the Design Recommendation meeting, or provide photos of the material and color boards along with manufacturer information (material, style, color reference number) for each material and color. The proposed color palette should be reviewed and approved by the Land Use Planner prior to publishing of a Master Use Permit decision. (C-4)
4. All lighting within the parking areas for Building 1 should be fully shielded, as viewed from outside the building from the viewpoint of pedestrians and drivers on adjacent walkways and streets. The applicant should note this on the plan set prior to issuance of a Master Use Permit. (D-10)
5. Retain the existing trees in the NE 45th St public right of way, or replace with similar trees (size at installation should be approximately the same as existing trees). The applicant should note this on the plan set prior to issuance of a Master Use Permit. (E-2, E-3)
6. Either provide landscaping and/or trellises to visually break up the open parking area on the top floor of Building 1, OR demonstrate to the Land Use Planner that the parking area would not be visible from either NE 45th St or the residents on the hill above the site. This information should be reviewed and approved by the Land Use Planner prior to publishing of a Master Use Permit decision. (E-2, E-3)

## DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

| STANDARD | REQUIREMENT | REQUEST | APPLICANT'S JUSTIFICATION | BOARD <br> RECOMMENDATION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Street level development standards for commercial zones across the street from residential zones (Lowrise zoning to the south on the University of Washington property) <br> SMC <br> 23.47A.008.A.1.c <br> 23.47A.008.A. 2 <br> 23.47A.008.B.2.a | The south wall of Building 1 may not have more than 20' or 40\% width of blank wall between 2' and 8' of wall height; <br> The south wall of Building 1 must have at least 60\% transparency between 2' and 8' of wall height | The south wall of Building 1 would have 211' width of blank wall between 2' and 8' of wall height; <br> The south wall of Building 1 would have 8.8\% transparency between 2' and 8' of wall height | The residential zoning located across NE 45 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ St is University of Washington land used as open recreation area. The property is separated from this zone by the NE $45^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$ viaduct and most of the pedestrian walkway would not be visible from the public street. <br> The proposed design includes landscaping, lighting, and pedestrian amenities. The building façade includes articulation, modulation, landscaping and a variety of colors and materials to improve the appearance as viewed from NE $45^{\text {th }}$ St. | Recommended approval by 4 Board members, subject to the conditions listed above |

