



City of Seattle

Department of Planning & Development
D. M. Sugimura, Director



INITIAL RECOMMENDATION OF THE NORTHEAST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Project Number: 3012601

Address: 3400 Stone Way

Applicant: Wendy Pautz, LMN Architects for Lisa Picard, Skanska

Date of Meeting: Monday, March 19, 2012

Board Members Present: Joe Hurley (Chair)
David Delfs, Substitute
Salone Habibuddin
Peter Krech
Christina Pizana

Board Members Absent: Martine Zettle


DPD Staff Present: Lisa Rutzick

SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: Industrial Commercial-45 (IC-45)

Nearby Zones: North: IC-45
South: IC-45
East: IC-45
West: IC-45

Lot Area: 39,600 sq. ft.



Current Development: One-story brick building and a one-story wood frame building and surface parking lot.

Access: Existing access is from Stone Way. Proposed vehicle access would be from North 35th Street. Service truck access would be a right-turn only from North 34th Street to a driveway along the east side of the lot.

Surrounding Development: The site is surrounded on three sides by arterial streets: North 34th Street to the south, North 35th Street to the north and Stone Way to the west. The North Transfer Station occupies the site to the east. The transfer station is proposed for redevelopment; an application for a Master Use Permit has not yet been submitted to the Department of Planning and Development.

ECAs: None.

Neighborhood Character: The building environment is a mix of retail, commercial and industrial uses on all sides. To the northeast is a primarily residential portion of the Wallingford neighborhood. The site is technically within the Fremont Village Urban Hub overlay which extends to the west across Stone Way. The topography of this site within this context is analogous to the bottom of a bowl which rises gradually in all directions. The Burke Gilman Trail “daylights” at this intersection. The trail is a significant bike and recreation route through a section of the City with the highest percentage of bike commuters.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is for the design and construction of a five-story, approximately 113,850 sq. ft. office building with 20,000 sq. ft. of ground floor retail and below grade parking for 216 vehicles. Project is participating in the Living Building Challenge Demonstration Program.


EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: September 19, 2011

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT


The first half of the presentation focused on explaining the Living Building Challenge program and how the proposed development is anticipating meeting the goals of the Living Building Challenge and associated Living Building Ordinance (C.B. 116740) passed by City Council as a pilot program. The Living Building Challenge requires meeting 20 “*Imperatives*” with seven organizing “*Petals*”. The seven Petals are: responsible site selection, net zero water, net zero energy, health, materials, equity and beauty.

The second half of the presentation included an analysis of the neighborhood context, site, design considerations and conceptual design massing diagrams. The applicants presented three options for developing the property. All of the alternatives showed vehicular access from North 35th Street and service access from a right-turn only movement from North 34th Street onto a driveway that runs along the east side of the lot.

The first alternative (Concept 1) showed a code-compliant 45-foot tall building form situated directly at the property lines without setbacks provided (none are required in the IC zone) filling in the parallelogram shaped site. The applicant noted that the proposed design would have more difficulty in potentially meeting the imperatives of the Living Building Challenge due to the resultant floor to floor height that minimizes daylight penetration. This alternative also did not include a retail use at ground level; the entire building was office use.



The second and third options assumed the passage of a proposed code amendment to the Living Building Pilot Ordinance that would allow a height departure for up to 20 feet (for a total base building height of 65 feet) and the ability to not count the retail use towards the Floor Area Ratio calculation. Both of these options included four floors of office use above one floor of retail use.



The second alternative (Concept 2) "Offset Planes" included a rectangular building form where the floor plates would shift in and out slightly to capture views, respond to the context and provide a more dynamic appearance. All floor plates, including the ground level were rectangular in shape. The entry lobby was situated off of North 34th Street. The situating of the rectangular building form on the parallelogram shaped site resulted in triangular ground-level open space plaza areas at the southeast and northwest corners of the site.



The third and preferred alternative (Concept 3) "Stepped Façade" included massing that stepped back from Stone Way to create ground level open spaces at the corner where the principal intersection is located and across from where the Burke Gilman Trail becomes visible. The upper level floor plate extended beyond the ground level floor plate to create a more regular rectangle shape with a singular notch inward south of the stairwell feature. The mass was articulated by an outboard stair well that defines and grounds itself in the main entry

lobby space. A triangular open space at the northwest corner was proposed similar to the second option.

PUBLIC COMMENT


Approximately 30 members of the public attended this Early Design Review meeting and three comments letters were received prior to the meeting. The following comments, issues and concerns were raised:

- Stated that this site cannot accommodate the proposed building mass and height.
- Objected to view impacts caused by the proposed building.
- Encouraged green design, energy efficiency, sustainability and the living building concept.
- Concerned with the proposed building height and that it will be out of proportion to the surrounding context.
- Believes proposed project will block connection to the lake from the neighborhood. Proposed height is too tall and will dwarf community.
- Support connectivity concept to the Burke Gilman Trail, as well as interaction with the community.
- Supports the preferred alternative because it opens up views to the tails, lake and downtown.
- Would like to see added bike lanes.
- Supportive of setting back the upper floor and ground level and raised plaza area, but not supportive of the overall scale and mass.
- Concerned that rooftop equipment will add even more height to the overall bulk and scale. Would like to know more information at this early stage about the rooftop features that will add height and how these will be screened and located.
- Opposed to the modern architectural concept at this location; should consider use of brick.
- Supportive of development for the economic activity and vibrancy it will bring to the neighborhood.
- Would like to see whimsical art incorporated into the site and/or building.
- Would like to see view analysis to understand true height and massing impacts.
- Future meeting should be held in Fremont.
- Considerable time and effort has been spent working on the design of the transfer station and this process has not engaged the neighborhood to the same extent.
- Concerned with parking and traffic impacts. (The DPD Planner indicated that this is not within the purview of design review, but parking will be reviewed by DPD. These comments should be directed to Lisa Rutzick rather than the Design Review Board).

SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: November 21, 2011

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

The applicant presented a series of massing diagrams illustrating how the current building form has been modified to respond to concerns about bulk, scale and neighborhood context. The current massing utilized a combination of series of ‘push’/’pull’ approaches the Board found favorable from the two massing options reviewed in the first EDG meeting. The current massing has been pushed back from N. Stone Way to provide for more open space and relief for pedestrians along Stone Way. The massing at the south and west corner stepped back an additional 13 feet to create a larger view corridor to the south when looking down Stone Way and provided a larger pedestrian space for gathering at the corner of Stone Way and N 34th Street, where the building interacted with the Burke-Gilman trail. Additional step backs were added to the 3rd and 4th floors on the south, west, and north sides of the building massing to address the scale of the surrounding neighborhood context. Finally the building corners were sculpted to address bulk by responding to the unique shape of the site.



The current massing further developed the idea of the main stair at the building entry discussed at the first EDG. The latest approach added the concept of a ‘green wall’ on the exterior of the wall of the stair that would include climbing plant species to reinforce the notion of a ‘green’ ground plane that wraps up the building façade onto the roof, across the roof, and onto the mechanical screen. The uniqueness of the green wall would also reinforce the location of the building entry.

The applicant’s landscape architect reviewed current traffic counts for pedestrians and bicycles at the site, and proposed circulation routes for both through and around the site. The current plaza/open space concepts were presented, which included a series of ‘rooms’ along Stone Way separated by landscape features and site amenities. The scale of the ‘rooms’ and the amount of connectivity to the sidewalk were designed to reflect the anticipated pedestrian densities and

activities. The applicants reviewed a series of renderings and site sections indicating proposed scale and quality of retail facades and amenities, such as canopies and the inter-relationship between the open space and these retail components.

Several 'before' and 'after' images depicting current view corridors around the site and how those views might be impacted by the proposed project massing at 5 stories/ 65' feet of height were presented. The following views were illustrated:

- Looking south from N. 38th Street and Stone Way N.;
- Looking south from N. 36th Street and Stone Way N.
- Looking west from N. 35th toward the Aurora Bridge
- Looking east from N. 34th street near the intersection with Stone Way N.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Approximately 65 members of the public attended this Second Early Design Review meeting and three comments letters were received prior to the meeting. The following comments, issues and concerns were raised:

- Appreciated that plaza concept included opportunities for runners to meet/stretch at the site.
- Impressed with ground floor design plan, but concerned that the overall building height was too tall and would create too much volume and building mass for the neighbors to the west. Also concerned about the generation of traffic and parking needs associated with the proposed development. Concerned that the proposed height would establish a dangerous precedent for future buildings.
- Noted that the human element of the Living Building goals and plaza design should accommodate children.
- Supported project concept design and noted that Stone Way is changing and this project should be commended for striving towards Living Building standards. Liked that the ground level retail concept was being planned for a destination and gathering space.
- Supported the proposed building massing concept as responsive and sensitive to the surrounding conditions. Pleased that community business will benefit from the redevelopment of this site.
- Impressed with presentation and agreed that the proposed building will be a positive addition to Stone Way and that the building form has been well-modulated and setback. Did not feel that the 65-foot height would be problematic.
- Liked idea of bicycle maintenance feature and air pump included in the plaza and was pleased to see a youthful company relocate from the suburbs to an urban locale. Would be a positive addition to the neighborhood.
- Pleased with the evolution of the project design between the first meeting and the second and felt that the design has responded to the Board's and public comments and guidance. Felt that the efforts to work towards Living Building standards, connection to the Burke Gilman trail and willingness to locate next to the transfer station are justifications for the increased building height.

- Suggested that the community involvement that occurred with the transfer station should occur at this site.
- Recommended that curb bulbs be considered to benefit pedestrians and cyclists.
- Felt that the amount of height and FAR relief should be proportional to the percentage of achievement to the Living Building objectives.
- Pointed out that this is historically an industrial area and the proposed development would be a benefit to the neighborhood and screen the transfer station. Suggested that open space be located at the rooftop.
- Questioned the equitableness of the exceptions being requested; the gain is not equal to what is being given. Would like to see more accurate illustrations that better show exterior materials and adjacent buildings.
- Pointed out that the proposed building will not be a Living Building because it will not meet 100% of the imperatives, but will be given the benefits of being a Living Building with the height increase. Opposed site specific re-zoning and aggressive timeline that circumnavigated the public process. The building mass should continue to be eroded away to be less massive.
- Excited about the project and the opportunity for the building and City to take leadership role in the environment.
- Reiterated that Stone Way is changing and that green buildings should be encouraged.
- Supported redevelopment of the site and identified guidelines A1, A2, A5 and B1 as important in terms of achievement in good urban design, connection to the water. Found the renderings to be misleading.
- The Wallingford Community Council expressed serious concerns with the proposed building height.
- Noted that reduced greenhouse gases was a commendable development goal. Suggested that bike accommodations such as covered bike parking be provided.
- Did not see any design changes since the previous meeting. Felt that all retail storefront should be at the sidewalk and not set back. Objected to the style of renderings shown. Suggested that the proposed material should be predominantly brick and not glass. Disagreed that glass is an environmentally sound building material. Noted that the upper floors should be set back substantially and setbacks from power lines were not satisfactory. Covered bike parking should be provided.
- Noted that the Chamber is excited by new jobs and businesses brought by the proposed development. Also pleased with the proposed design and height. Considered this project to be a future landmark. Supported corner plaza element and that the building mass would screen the transfer station.
- Noted that the massing of the building will set an important precedent and the neighborhood should take risk by supporting such an ambitious project.
- Did not like proximity of the building mass and height to the shoreline.
- Would like to see more specificity for the rooftop design. Suggested that the energy savings should be quantified and that water and air should be provided to cyclists.
- Concerns about views to the lake being blocked.
- Supported plaza design and place making opportunity in a currently ill-defined location.

- Supported by the Quality Growth Alliance.
- Noted that ADA access considerations and public safety using CEPTED principles should be integrated into the project. Would have liked to see the other façade views, which would also be very visible. Has found the developer to be responsive to the issues raised.
- Noted that a 55-foot tall building was not presented and felt that brick is a predominant material found in the context and should be integrated into the building. Would like to see greater setback along 34th, as well as inclusion of solar panels, sky lights and atrium to allow for natural day-lighting. Felt that the massing of the entry at the SW corner was too high and the overall massing should be sculpted back to increase sunlight at grade level and minimize the scale. Would like to see massing broken down into three elements rather than the two shown. Overhead weather protection should be included.
- Supported the scale adjustments made but still objected to the 65 foot height.
- Supported project goals, urban growth issues, environmental enhancement of the building, and recognition of the urban trailhead. Pleased with the height, bulk and scale response and opportunities for future retail.
- Concerned with the process associated with the legislative text amendment.

INITIAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING: March 19, 2012

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

The design has evolved since the Second EDG meeting in four main areas: building form, open spaces, entry and architectural expression. The rendering below is from the intersection of Stone Way and North 34th Street.



[Type a quote from the document or the summary of an interesting point. You can position the text box anywhere in the document. Use the Text Box Tools tab to change the formatting of the pull quote text box.]



Building Form

The building has been set back substantially from the property lines on all four sides and sculpted at the SE, SW and NW corners to enhance the ground level pedestrian oriented activity spaces, give scale to the building with adjacent neighborhoods preserving corridor views down Stone Way. Step backs in the building form are used to reduce the scale of the building and connect human activity on building terraces with the natural environment and the community. An additional step back is placed at the fifth floor of the SW corner to signify the corner and give reduce the sense of scale at the pedestrian perspective.

Open Spaces

The open areas included the corner plaza in combination with a variety of connecting spaces along all street frontages and have programmed to activate the spaces for gathering, meeting, rest and relaxation. Amenities for bicyclists, runners, walkers and urban pedestrians included an bicycle amenities and extensive parking around the site and within the building, drinking fountain, stretching bars and variously sized furnishings to engage various groups in sunny and shady locations. Transparent, full height retail storefronts and overhead weather protection were proposed in the design.

Building Entry and Stair

The highly visible stair at the building entry was presented as a signature element of the project. Complete transparency on the east and west enclosure walls of the stair allowed for views into the building from the pedestrian perspective. Use of this focal circulation element was intended to enhance connectivity between the building user and the public. In addition to transparency and helping to establish the corner, the stair was differentiated from the building façade through a transition in materials including a steel-like frame beginning at the building base and extending to the top of the stair with dramatic lighting on the interior wood north and south enclosure walls. The building entry included distinct paving, trees framing the entry and primary building stair and other pedestrian amenities including overhead weather protection, site furnishings and exterior lighting.

Architectural Expression

The architectural expression included materiality and detailing at the ground level to recall the neighborhood character with a strong desire for the success of the retail. Patterns of two-tone green spandrel glass dominated the midsection of the building and transition at key areas to highlight the predominant corner (SW) and neighborhood corners (SE and NE) where vertical landscaping becomes an integral element of the pattern. At the upper level a pattern of sky blue spandrel glass, unique to this floor of the building, recedes into the background of the sky.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Approximately 75 members of the public attended this Initial Recommendation meeting and several written comments were submitted. The following comments, issues and concerns were raised:

- Supportive of building design, but concerned with building scale.
- Concerned about future empty retail spaces or generic chain shops.
- Pleased with bike connectivity around site including proposed enhancements.
- Felt information justifying the proposed departures has not been provided.
- Impressed with building proposal and green aspects of the building and contribution to the neighborhood.
- Noted that impacts to neighborhood views of the water will be compromised. Concerned that proposed development does not fit in within neighborhood character.
- Proposed height plus the rooftop mechanical screening is incompatible with context.
- Asserted that proposed project will set a precedent for future development.
- Noted that the project should be more of a trailblazer with a more assertive design.
- Applauded efforts, but noted that the legislation to allow the proposed building not yet in place.
- Pleased with the proposal presented.
- Concerned with view impacts from the water up the hill.
- Excited by proposed development's potential to bring new commerce, safety and good design to the community.
- Pleased with the proposed design's contribution to Stone Way.
- Concerned that sustainable building shouldn't be exchanged for another set of environmental concerns.

- Noted that the proposed design does not meet design guidelines.
- Stated that the building should stay within the current zone height.
- Suggested pushing mass to property line and lowering overall building height. Would like to see a code-compliant scheme.
- Pleased with the ground level amenities and setbacks on a site that is currently lacking a sense of place.
- Pleased with entry stairwell.
- Supportive of proposed gathering spaces, setbacks and green design precedent.
- Concerned that proposed development is out of place on the subject site. Green building incentives should not be tied to additional height.
- Questioned the accuracy of the graphics.
- Would like to see more public benefits.
- Suggested eliminating frame projection at upper corner and further setting back top floor.
- Felt that the transfer station development was more respectful of view corridors.
- Supportive of projects innovation and sustainability.
- Noted that development of this site will strengthen the link between the Fremont and Wallingford neighborhoods which is currently underdeveloped.
- Encouraged building over the driveway easement.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the following siting and design guidance. The Board identified the Citywide Design Guidelines of highest priority for this project. For the full text please visit the [Design Review website](#).

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.**

At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board reinforced the unique site characteristics presented in the analysis that include a prominent and busy intersection, a highly visible corner, adjacency to the “daylighting” of the Burke Gilman Trail, location at the intersection of two vibrant and distinct neighborhoods of Wallingford and Fremont, proximity to Lake Union and the transfer station, as well as topographical changes within the site that extend far beyond the site to a broader topographic system. In order to better hone in on the specific site constraints, at the next meeting, the Board would like to see contour lines for the subject site, as well as sections through the entire site and transfer station site, as well as view studies of the existing site and proposed development.

At the Second Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board discussed these issues extensively and focused on the site level analysis – see guidance provided under B-1.

At the Initial Recommendation Meeting, the Board provided related recommendations under B-1.

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

At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board strongly supported the concept of the entry stairwell both as an architectural element of the building massing, as well as an identifier of the main entry at the ground level. The Board encouraged a hierarchy of uses and entries that include the stair feature, retail, bike entry, office lobby, etc. The Board expressed enthusiasm for the predominant entrance point of the office lobby at the base of the stairwell and would like to see the stair feature well-integrated into the architectural design.

At the Second Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board reinforced the unique site conditions – see guidance provided under D-1.

At the Initial Recommendation Meeting, the Board provided related recommendations under B-1.

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

At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board agreed the urban design analysis was very well done, but asserted that that same level of examination needs to occur at the site level as well. The ground level design of the building and open spaces are critical considerations and additional information is needed to fully understand the different conditions that occur around the site perimeter. Defining the street edge is appropriate at some locations, whereas setting back the building is preferred at other locations. The Board supported the ground level concept presented in the preferred alternative that begins to address these conditions and considerations. The Board pointed out that the three side street sides of the site have unique qualities and levels of activity and engagement and the design should strive to enhance each. At the next meeting, the Board would like to review “plaza studies” - concepts of how and where the sidewalk will interact with the plaza and where it will be separated, as well as how the office and retail entries will interact with these ground level spaces. Mapping out existing and future pedestrian circulation would also be helpful.

The Board also encouraged operable windows at the retail level and throughout the building to add activity and a sense of dynamic quality to the building. The Board referenced another project presentation that did a good job providing character sketches

and sidewalk views that may be of assistance in preparing graphics that respond to this guidance.

At the Second Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board appreciated the studies of the plaza space outlined in section and perspective views. The Board expressed interest in the further refinement of these ground level details.

At the Initial Recommendation Meeting, the Board provided related recommendations under B-1. The Board was very enthusiastic about the well considered and design of ground level open spaces, landscaping, and programming presented through site sections and details outlined in graphics.

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.

At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board was supportive of the proposed vehicular access from North 35th Street and the truck access via right-turn only from North 34th Street. At the next meeting, the Board would like to see details about this proposed service access along the east edge of the site. The Board would also like to better understand the bicycle circulation to the site, as well as how bikes will be accommodated on site.

At the Second Early Design Guidance Meeting, the design included a variation from the previous meeting whereby the service access would enter off of 35th Street and exit, right only, onto 34th Street. The Board did not comment on the revision and was pleased that the location of the access drive was still along the east property line.

At the Initial Recommendation Meeting, the Board was satisfied with the proposed parking and bike access.

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

At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board noted that there are two retail corners each with a different character. The southwest corner is highly visible and enjoys significant activity associated with the intersection and trail, whereas the northwest corner is quieter. Therefore how and where the retail meets these corners and open spaces should be designed accordingly. See also A-4.

At the Second Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board stated that they would like to see a clear strategy for the building corner design in terms of responding to the context, bulk, and scale. At the most prominent corner (Stone and 34th), the design concept needs to be more fully articulated. The Board would also like to see significant moves to erode this corner back.

At the Initial Recommendation Meeting, the Board was very pleased with the corner setback, plaza design and amenities, and provided some related recommendations under B-1.

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.

At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board acknowledged and discussed the height, bulk and scale issues associated with the proposed development. In order to better understand the context and specific impacts of the proposed building, at the next meeting, the Board would like to see a physical model. The Board would also like to see more of a contextual view analysis showing existing conditions compared with various proposed building forms. The Board is also interested in see other strategies for dealing with the overhanging portions of the building. The push/pull concept of the floor plates should be more fully developed and considered in response to the context. The Board is interested in where and by how much would these plates shift and suggested that erosion of the upper levels would be appropriate. The Board agreed that Option 2 felt less massive and perhaps the floors could be treated differently to achieve the objective of minimizing the bulk and scale. The Board encouraged the design to be creative in how the building nestles into the topographical bowl of the site.

At the Second Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board agreed that many positive moves have been made to reduce the sense of height, bulk and scale including the ground level setbacks from the property lines, responsiveness to the adjoining property conditions and the open plaza area at the southwest corner. The Board agreed however, that additional sculpting of the building form is needed. The Board recommended greater setback and upper level erosion from the property line along 34th Street. The additional height should not read from the pedestrian vantage point on 34th. Along Stone Way, the Board would like to see stepping back at the top and modulation to reduce perception of the building height and bulk. The proposed massing shown in the

perspective rendering on page 27 of the packet begins to address these issues and should be further evolved.

At the Initial Recommendation Meeting, the Board recommended the following refinements to the design:

- 1) Further distinguish the entry stair volume of the building with a slight recess to allow the elevation materials to wrap the façade materials around the corners to meet the entry stair elevation.
- 2) Step back the uppermost level of the building on the northwest portion of the building to recede from views at the pedestrian level at the intersection of Stone and 34th. Such a condition is very effectively shown with the perspective along the 35th Avenue shown on page 29. Decreasing the ground level open space at the north side of the project (along 35th) would be acceptable to the Board.
- 3) Eliminate or soften the appearance of the projecting trellis feature shown at the top of the southwest corner to reinforce the fading of the building height and mass.
- 4) Strengthen the cornice line at the fourth level to emphasize the capping of the building at this lower floor. The cornice designs should vary to reinforce the independent masses and avoid a singular continuous line or design.
- 5) The northern portion of the building along the Stone Way elevation should read as more distinct from the southern portion. This could be achieved by carrying the material language of the fourth level to the south and down the two bays which meet the retail level. Alternatively, the projecting second and third floor massing could be extended to the south to meet the central entry stair volume. The use of wood at the retail ground level retail should extend further south to complete the base of this northern module.
- 6) Provide a distinct canopy at the building entrance, at the base of the central stair volume.
- 7) A transition between materials should be accompanied by a change in plane:
 - a. See #5 above.
 - b. The other location where this condition occurs is at the top floor at the southwest corner.

C. Architectural Elements and Materials

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.

At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board indicated support for a contemporary, modern architectural design and looks forward to reviewing additional details at future meetings as the project design evolves. The Board warned, however, that the early

concept appears more like an office building and doesn't clearly express the retail character yet. The Board did not feel that the use of brick is necessary at this location given the variety of building materials used in the surrounding context. At the next meeting, the Board would like to see the ground level expression further developed.

At the Second Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board suggested that the design be more revelatory of the Living Building program and highlight Living Building features and systems, providing an educational aspect to the project. The Board also encouraged the architecture to push creative boundaries for the building design. The Board was supportive of the urban street edge appearance of the building base, but warned against using more suburban office building vernacular for the upper stories.

The Board also discussed breaking the building down into distinct elements, keeping it as a unified cohesive form or creating a iconic design. The Board agreed that any of these approaches could be successful provided the concept is applied consistently throughout the development.

At the Initial Recommendation Meeting, the Board provided related recommendations under B-1.

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

At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board gave guidance as noted in response to Guideline A-4.

At the Second Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board was enthusiastic about and would like to see more detail and information regarding how pedestrians, runners and cyclists will engage with the ground level open spaces. Some initial concepts were introduced including a stretching station and bike maintenance amenities; the Board expects to see further development of these features.

At the Initial Recommendation Meeting, the Board was satisfied with the ground level amenities and did not discuss this guideline further.

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.

The Board noted that they will be interested in reviewing these details at the Recommendation phase.

At the Second Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board reiterated and emphasized the importance of the materiality and transparency at the street level – the detail of which they expect to review at the next meeting. The Board reiterated that they do not feel brick is a necessary exterior building material for this project in this location. They did note that the materials palette should project a sense of permanence, respond to the context and be appropriately scaled to the size of the street and intersection at this location.

The Board also expressed interest in the transition of wall façade to the roof and how this will occur architecturally and materially.

The Board noted that the details of the rooftop design and mechanical screening will be critical considerations for the next meeting.

At the Initial Recommendation Meeting, the Board was satisfied with the proposed material palette and did not discuss this guideline further.

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.**

At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board stressed the importance of the design of the proposed corner open spaces for integration into the community, as well as creating new gathering spaces and encouraging new levels of activity at this intersection. Several sections through the right-of-way were presented and the Board reinforced that the area between the building façade and the curb line should include integration of landscaping, hardscaping, defensible space, seating, grade changes, and other amenities.

At the Second Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board acknowledged the significant strides the project design has taken since the first meeting in terms of developing the ground level design. The Board agreed that the main building entry and grand stair case should not be in the same plane as the building face. These features should be more distinguished by either being recessed or protruding from the main face of the building. The stairs should be more visible and prominent on Stone Way. The Board also stressed that more information and development of the experience of the entry sequence needs to be more evident.

The Board also noted that overhead weather protection is an important feature to be included along the building base and perhaps at the main building entry. Overhead

canopies may pose a challenge in terms of maximizing the sense of open space, but are a pedestrian necessity in this climate.

The Board concluded that the usability of the open space design is essential.

At the Initial Recommendation Meeting, the Board provided related recommendations under B-1.

D-7 Personal Safety and Security. Project design should consider opportunities for enhancing personal safety and security in the environment under review.

At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board discussed that this intersection currently includes multiple modes of travel that will increase with the proposed development. Maintaining and enhancing the safety of all modes of transport is paramount: pedestrian, running, bicycling and driving.

At the Second Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board reiterated the same sentiments expressed at the first meeting.

At the Initial Recommendation Meeting, the Board was satisfied with the exterior lighting, clear sight lines, conceptual signage plan and enhancement of the non-motorized activities on and round the site and did not discuss this guideline further.

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 noted that they will be interested in reviewing these details at the Recommendation phase.

At the Initial Recommendation Meeting, the Board was satisfied with the conceptual signage plan and did not discuss this guideline further.

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.

The Board noted that they will be interested in reviewing these details at the Recommendation phase.

At the Initial Recommendation Meeting, the Board was satisfied with the conceptual lighting plan and did not discuss this guideline further.

- 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.**

The Board noted that they will be interested in reviewing these details at the Recommendation phase.

At the Initial Recommendation Meeting, the Board was satisfied with the expanse of commercial transparency of the large storefront window system and minimal blank walls and did not discuss this guideline further.

E. Landscaping

- 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.**

At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board noted that the design of the corner open spaces will be a critical consideration of how the site integrates and orients the site plan with the Burke Gilman Trail, and the confluence of movement and activity that occurs at this intersection.

At the Second Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board continued their guidance from the first meeting and discussed these issues under A-3, A-4, C-3 and D-1.

At the Initial Recommendation Meeting, the Board was satisfied with the interesting, varied and well-considered landscape plan and design and did not discuss this guideline further.

- 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.**

At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board appreciated the analysis of the site within the larger topographic context, as well as the grade changes on the site itself. The Board looks forward to seeing how the proposed massing responds to the site's topography.

At the Second Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board noted that the proximity to Lake Union is an unusual site condition that should be explored as part of the landscape design. The Board would like to see more information and details of how the users of the Burke Gilman Trail will be attracted to and use the ground level open spaces. See A-3, A-4, C-3 and D-1.

At the Initial Recommendation Meeting, the Board was satisfied with the integration of pedestrian amenities into the landscape plan and programming of users of the Burke Gilman Trail to circulate on and around this site and did not discuss this guideline further.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

At the time of the Initial Recommendation meeting, the following departures were requested:

Living Building Departures:

The Board's recommendation on the requested departures is based upon the departure's potential to help the project better meet the Living Building Challenge objectives, and that these design guideline priorities and achieve a better overall design than could be achieved without the departure. The Board's recommendation will be reserved until the final Board meeting.

- 1. Structure Height (SMC 23.50.026):** A height departure is sought for up to 20 additional feet above the base height of the IC zone (45'). The additional floor-to-floor height is desired to meet the requirements for the Living Building Challenge.

This departure request is pending a code amendment under consideration by City Council. Additional height is related to meeting the Living Building Imperatives associated with human comfort, health, community connection, and car-free living. The departure also facilitates allowing the building to have a narrower floor plate, opening up the public plaza and better meeting the intent of design review guidelines A-4 (human activity), B-1 (height bulk and scale), C-3 (human scale), D-1 (pedestrian open spaces and entrances), E-2 (landscaping to enhance building/site), and E-3 (landscape design to address special site conditions). The Board indicated that the response to the B-1 considerations outlined above, as well as more information regarding the Living Building imperatives as related to height are warranted before they can provide direction regarding such a departure request.

- 2. Floor Area Ratio (SMC 23.50.028):** The Code requires that retail use be counted towards FAR calculations. The applicant proposes a twofold departure related to FAR: to not count the retail use towards the FAR calculation and to increase the FAR by 15%.

This departure request is pending a code amendment under consideration by City Council. The Board indicated strong support for retail at the ground floor at this location. The

addition of ground floor retail will help meet the human scale/humane places petal, democracy and social justice petal, and beauty and spirit petal. The addition of ground floor retail (which would not occur if it were not FAR exempt) will also allow the building to better meet the following design review guidelines: A-2 streetscape compatibility, A-4 (human activity), C-3 (human scale), D1(Pedestrian open spaces and entrances), D-12 (commercial transparency). The project seeks to use 15% FAR departure for incorporating Advanced Building Systems (Design + Technology Allowances). These Advanced Design Concepts and Green Technologies will be utilized to meet LBPP Petals such as Energy [>75%Energy Reduction];Water [Storm + Water Usage]; Health[Civilized Environment]; Beauty [Inspiration + Education] through the use of rain water& gray water collection cisterns, water filtration systems, thermal storage, mechanical system & heat recovery unit). The Board indicated that the response to the B-1 considerations outlined above, as well as more information regarding the Living Building imperatives as related to height are warranted before they can provide direction regarding such a departure request.

- 3. Structure height Exception (SMC 23.50.020.A4):** The Code allows that stair and elevator penthouses may extend up to 15 feet above the height limit. The applicant proposes to extend the height of the elevator penthouse to 18 feet – three feet above the height maximum.

This departure request is pending a code amendment under consideration by City Council. The departure is necessary to allow for elevator access to the rooftop. Access to the rooftop via an elevator is necessary to provide maintenance for sustainability features including green roofs, green walls, mechanical equipment, and future PV array, as well as provide an accessible route for mobility-impaired individuals accessing the roof terrace. This departure helps address Imperatives associated with ecological water flow, energy, democracy and social justice. The Board indicated that the response to the B-1 considerations outlined above, as well as more information regarding the Living Building imperatives as related to height are warranted before they can provide direction regarding such a departure request.

BOARD DIRECTION

At the conclusion of the EDG meeting, the Board recommended the project should return to the Board for a Final Recommendation meeting.