



# City of Seattle

Department of Planning & Development  
Diane M. Sugimura, Director



## EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE OF THE WEST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Project Number: 3012798

Address: 221 Minor Avenue North, Seattle

Applicant: Freiheit & Ho Architects

Date of Meeting: Wednesday, January 04, 2012

Board Members Present: David Delfs (Chair)  
Jill Kurfirst  
Bo Zheng  
Mindy Black  
Jacob Connell

Board Members Absent: N/A

DPD Staff Present: Colin R. Vasquez, Senior Land Use Planner

### SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: SM/R 55-75

Nearby Zones: (North) SM/R 55-75  
(South) SM-125  
(East) SM-75  
(West) IC-85

Lot Area: 43,200 SF



Current Development: A majority of the site is currently used as a surface parking lots accessed off Minor Avenue and the alley. A two story commercial building, approximately 50' x 130' is located near the mid-point along Minor Avenue.

Access: Vehicular access from the East off Minor Avenue and West off the alley.

Surrounding Development: Alcione apartments to the North; to the East lies residential use, commercial, a day care and a surface parking lot; to the South lies Mirabella retirement community; and to the West is a two story commercial building. Diagonally across the intersection of Thomas Street and Minor Avenue (to the Northeast) is Cascade Park and Pea Patch.

ECAs: N/A

Neighborhood Character: Cascade neighborhood has an interesting mix of new and historic buildings. Historic structures include Immanuel Lutheran Church and St. Spiridon Russian Orthodox Cathedral. New residential developments include Alley24, Alcione Apartments, both of which successfully built street frontage accessed units, and interestingly incorporated neighborhood artwork. South of the property site is a large scale senior living retirement community. The project site is located diagonally across the corner from landmark Cascade Park and Cascade Pea Patch.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Seven story mixed-use building to provide 279 residential market rate apartments, consisting of studio, one bedroom, and two bedroom units. Project will also include approximately 5,000 s.f. of commercial retail space related to Thomas Street. All of the parking (approximately 280 stalls) for the proposed development is to be provided in a below grade garage that is accessed from the alley.

**EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: January 4, 2012**

## DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

Three alternative design schemes were presented.

The first scheme (Option A) showed building massing nearly to the limit allowable by zoning regulations, with upper level setbacks at Thomas Street and the alley. This scheme focused on the relationship of the building to Cascade Park. The building will have iconic tower element at northeast corner facing Cascade Pea Patch. A potential restaurant seating area will be provided around the tower base to share open space with the community. Residential entry is at northern portion of the building, and an internal ramping in lobby is designed to accommodate the 10'

grade change. Loading, trash, and vehicular entry to the below grade parking would be from the alley.

The second scheme (Option B) showed aimed to activate the entire Minor avenue frontage by providing a series of recessed entry courtyards and setting the building frontage 5' back off the property line, enough to accommodate stoops into ground floor units and provide for a privacy landscape buffer. The lobby was changed further to the south to better work with the 10' grade and eliminate internal ramping requirements. Bay windows were explored at the alley side to trade off the building setback at Minor Street and increase opportunities for views down the alley.

The third scheme (Option C) is the preferred scheme of the applicant. This addressed the "fourth" side of the project—the alley. The middle portion of the building will have at least 22' alley setback to create green space and allow better sunlight penetration. The massing at either end of the alley has been increased to form end caps that allow for a larger proportion of the apartments to have street views, and reduce the number of cross alley facing units. Lobby and building amenity moves to the south end of the building facing John Street to revolve the south unit privacy and grade issues. Both the lobby and main amenity spaces will open onto alley green space to utilize the outside space and provide security. Southern-end located lobby allows for more street accessed units with stoops along Minor Street, and recessed entry courtyards & park plaza concepts will still be maintained. This building will have green roof located at the north end to optimize views and solar exposure.

## **BOARD CLARIFYING QUESTIONS**

Board's clarifying questions to the Architect:

1. Question: Clarify use on Thomas.  
Answer (by Architect): Retail use on Thomas at street level is proposed in all three massing options.
2. Question: Clarify the 85' height extension—has this been discussed with the Planner?  
Answer (by Planner): Yes, the City has stated the 85' height limit is an option available to this project provided the project can demonstrate the exceptions can be met. This review will be done at MUP.  
Answer (by Board Chair): For EDG, deciding 75' vs 85' is not in purview of this board.
3. Question: Regarding programming, are there units larger than one bedroom?  
Answer (by Architect): Yes, there are a few two bedroom units proposed for this project.
4. Question: Did the Architect do any massing studies using a Mid-block crossing?  
Answer (by Architect): Yes, an early massing study did review option for mid-block crossing in the project but it was discovered that the scheme was not very strong due to limited connectivity with the neighborhood. The existing block to the East currently does not have a crossing and a current design proposal on Pontius would eliminate any chance of connecting to the Alley 24 crossing. Also, as the project is only one half of the block, it is uncertain that the mid-block crossing can be continued to the west.
5. Question: Any exterior finishes considered for the project?  
Answer (by Architect): Not yet.
6. Board Question: are the existing trees within the property boundary?  
Answer: Yes, the existing trees are within the property boundary.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

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

- A member of the public noted the Architect spoke about design approaches along Thomas Street and Minor Avenue but not as much about John Street. It was also questioned why the top of the building was not reviewed. This same individual also expressed he was glad to see the alley being addressed. The Architect explained the project will have a rooftop garden/amenity space that will be located on the North side of the project, oriented toward Cascade Park & Pea Patch.
- A member of the public asked if the project will be 85' or 75' in height.
- A member of the public asked, referencing design guideline A-4, who is the target residents for this project? They would like to see more families in the neighborhood.
- A member of the public asked where parking was accessed. The Architect clarified parking access will be from the alley.
- A member of the public stated the setback to the alley is not about volume but about width. Furthermore, the alley design appears to be focused on the project inhabitants rather than for the public.
- A member of the public asked why the roof garden was not located on the South side of the project. The Architect noted that the Mirabella building at a height of 120' casts a shadow over the project and creates challenges for a successful garden.
- A member of the public cited the South Lake Union Neighborhood Framework calls for John to potentially become a Green Street in the future.
- A member of the public cited the South Lake Union Neighborhood Framework calls for residential projects to provide 2 & 3 bedroom units as a goal.
- A member of the public asked if the existing flowering cherry trees along the edge of the project will be considered in the design.
- A member of the public recommended that the Architect consider locating the roof top garden at the South end of the project and that shade is an acceptable environment for plant growth; that sunlight isn't the deciding factor.
- A member of the public is concerned the proposed alley setback deviation isn't visible from John and Thomas Streets.
- A member of the public asked where the mechanical units will be located on the roof. The Architect responded by clarifying that rooftop equipment had not been designed yet at this early stage, but some mechanical equipment will be located within the volume of the building.
- A member of the public asked how much and where the commercial use will be. The Architect responded there would be approximately 5,000 sf of commercial use that will be located on the street level along Thomas Street.
- A member of the public asked why the public notice read "5-stories". It was clarified that the notice was based on the best available information at the time of posting, and would be update as more information becomes available as the project develops.
- A member of the public cautioned the Architect about the stoop entries proposed, that the depth of these areas is important in their success.

- A member of the public noted there needs to be something more interesting along John Street.
- A member of the public is concerned about parking stating there is currently a shortage of parking in the area. The Planner responded that the project will be required to provide the parking necessary to meet the regulations set forth in the zoning code; street parking not related to the project cannot be controlled.
- A member of the public is concerned the sidewalks in the Cascade neighborhood, particularly those of Alcylene & Alley 24 are too narrow and those buildings are too monolithic at the street.
- A member of the public stated there is too much commercial space that needs to be driven to, that these spaces should be walked to.
- A member of the public is concerned the proposed additional alley setback, central to the project, isn't contiguous/isn't addressed at either end of the project so it isn't noticeable by the public.
- The Board Chair summarized the public comments into the following categories which the Board will review during their discussion: John Street elevation, Rooftop, Unit mix, Mature trees, Sidewalk life.

## 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 & Neighborhood specific guidelines (as applicable) of highest priority for this project.

The Neighborhood specific guidelines are summarized below. 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.**

**SLU-specific supplemental guidance:**

- Encourage provision of “outlooks and overlooks” for the public to view the lake and cityscapes. Examples include provision of public plazas and/or other public open spaces and changing the form or facade setbacks of the building to enhance opportunities for views.
- Minimize shadow impacts to Cascade Park.
- New development is encouraged to take advantage of site configuration to accomplish sustainability goals. The Board is generally willing to recommend departures from

development standards if they are needed to achieve sustainable design. Refer to the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design\*(LEED) manual which provides additional information. Examples include:

- Solar orientation
- Storm water run-off, detention and filtration systems
- Sustainable landscaping
- Versatile building design for entire building life cycle

At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board discussed that a plaza at street grade addressing the park could be appropriate for outdoor restaurant and be well received by the neighborhood. It questioned whether a strong tower element addressing the park would be an appropriate scale.

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

SLU-specific supplemental guidance:

The vision for street level uses in South Lake Union is a completed network of sidewalks that successfully accommodate pedestrians. Streetscape compatibility is a high priority of the neighborhood with redevelopment. Sidewalk-related spaces should appear safe, welcoming and open to the general public.

- Provide pedestrian-friendly streetscape amenities, such as: tree grates; benches; lighting.
- Encourage provision of spaces for street level uses that vary in size, width, and depth. Encourage the use of awnings and weather protection along street fronts to enhance the pedestrian environment.
- Where appropriate, consider a reduction in the required amount of commercial and retail space at the ground level, such as in transition zones between commercial and residential areas. Place retail in areas that are conducive to the use and will be successful.
- Where appropriate, configure retail space so that it can spill-out onto the sidewalk (retaining six feet for pedestrian movement, where the sidewalk is sufficiently wide).

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

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

SLU-specific supplemental guidance:

- Create graceful transitions at the streetscape level between the public and private uses.
- Keep neighborhood connections open, and discourage closed campuses.
- Design facades to encourage activity to spill out from business onto the sidewalk, and vice-versa.
- Reinforce pedestrian connections both within the neighborhood and to other adjacent neighborhoods. Transportation infrastructure should be designed with adjacent sidewalks, as development occurs to enhance pedestrian connectivity.
- Reinforce retail concentrations with compatible spaces that encourage pedestrian activity.
- Create businesses and community activity clusters through co-location of retail and pedestrian uses as well as other high pedestrian traffic opportunities.
- Design for a network of safe and well-lit connections to encourage human activity and link existing high activity areas.

At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board discussed that they like the proposed idea of space at both the alley and Minor Avenue, but would balance more space on Minor Avenue so that adequate depth can be allotted to create successful stoop transitions.

- A-5 Respect for Adjacent Sites. Buildings should respect adjacent properties by being located on their sites to minimize disruption of the privacy and outdoor activities of residents in adjacent buildings.**

See the Board’s Discussion section below.

- A-6 Transition Between Residence and Street. For residential projects, the space between the building and the sidewalk should provide security and privacy for residents and encourage social interaction among residents and neighbors.**

**SLU-specific supplemental guidance:**

Consider designing the entries of residential buildings to enhance the character of the streetscape through the use of small gardens, stoops and other elements to create a transition between the public and private areas. Consider design options to accommodate various residential uses, i.e., townhouse, live-work, apartment and senior-assisted housing.

At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board discussed that stoops should be provided with landscaping to soften the transition at the street.

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

- 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.
- A-9 **Location of Parking on Commercial Street Fronts.** Parking on a commercial street front should be minimized and where possible should be located behind a building.
- 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.

|                                  |
|----------------------------------|
| <b>B. Height, Bulk and Scale</b> |
|----------------------------------|

- 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.

SLU-specific supplemental guidance:

- Address both the pedestrian and auto experience through building placement, scale and details with specific attention to regional transportation corridors such as Mercer, Aurora, Fairview and Westlake. These locations, pending changes in traffic patterns, may evolve with transportation improvements.
- Encourage stepping back an elevation at upper levels for development taller than 55 feet to take advantage of views and increase sunlight at street level. Where stepping back upper floors is not practical or appropriate other design considerations may be considered, such as modulations or separations between structures.
- Relate proportions of buildings to the width and scale of the street.
- Articulate the building facades vertically or horizontally in intervals that relate to the existing structures or existing pattern of development in the vicinity.
- Consider using architectural features to reduce building scale such as: landscaping; trellis; complementary materials; detailing; accent trim.

At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board discussed that they liked the strategy of carving out entry courtyards along Minor avenue.

## 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.

SLU-specific supplemental guidance:

- Support the existing fine-grained character of the neighborhood with a mix of building styles.
- Re-use and preserve important buildings and landmarks when possible.
- Expose historic signs and vintage advertising on buildings where possible.
- Respond to the history and character in the adjacent vicinity in terms of patterns, style, and scale. Encourage historic character to be revealed and reclaimed, for example through use of community artifacts, and historic materials, forms and textures.
- Respond to the working class, maritime, commercial and industrial character of the Waterfront and Westlake areas. Examples of elements to consider include: window detail patterns; open bay doors; sloped roofs.
- Respond to the unique, grass roots, sustainable character of the Cascade neighborhood. Examples of elements to consider include: community artwork; edible gardens; water filtration systems that serve as pedestrian amenities; gutters that support greenery.

**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.

SLU-specific supplemental guidance:

Design the “fifth elevation” — the roofscape — in addition to the streetscape. As this area topographically is a valley, the roofs may be viewed from locations outside the neighborhood such as the freeway and Space Needle. Therefore, views from outside the area as well as from within the neighborhood should be considered, and roof-top elements should be organized to minimize view impacts from the freeway and elevated areas.

At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board discussed that views on to roof from the adjacent Mirabella building should be considered as design progresses.

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

- 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.
- 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.

## 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.

SLU-specific supplemental guidance:

- New developments are encouraged to work with the Design Review Board and interested citizens to provide features that enhance the public realm, i.e. the transition zone between private property and the public right of way. The Board is generally willing to consider a departure in open space requirements if the project proponent provides an acceptable plan for features such as: curb bulbs adjacent to active retail spaces where they are not interfering with primary corridors that are designated for high levels of traffic flow; pedestrian-oriented street lighting; street furniture.

- 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.

- 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.

- D-4 **Design of Parking Lots Near Sidewalks.** Parking lots near sidewalks should provide adequate security and lighting, avoid encroachment of vehicles onto the sidewalk, and minimize the visual clutter of parking lot signs and equipment.

SLU-specific supplemental guidance:

Providing parking below grade is preferred.

**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.

**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.

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

SLU-specific supplemental guidance:

- Enhance public safety throughout the neighborhood to foster 18-hour public activity. Methods to consider are: enhanced pedestrian and street lighting; well- designed public spaces that are defensively designed with clear sight lines and opportunities for eyes on the street; police horse tie-up locations for routine patrols and larger event assistance.

**D-8 Treatment of Alleys.** The design of alley entrances should enhance the pedestrian street front.

At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board discussed that it in general liked the “bookend” massing proposed in the preferred scheme for the alley. Further exploration needs to be done to address the alley entrance at John street to create a better sense of entry to the pedestrian.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**D-12 Residential Entries and Transitions.** For residential projects in commercial zones, the space between the residential entry and the sidewalk should provide security and privacy for residents and a visually interesting street front for pedestrians. Residential buildings should enhance the character of the streetscape with small gardens, stoops and other elements that work to create a transition between the public sidewalk and private entry.

## **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.

SLU-specific supplemental guidance:

- Support the creation of a hierarchy of passive and active open space within South Lake Union. This may include pooling open space requirements on-site to create larger spaces.
- Encourage landscaping that meets LEED criteria. This is a priority in the Cascade neighborhood.
- Where appropriate, install indigenous trees and plants to improve aesthetics, capture water and create habitat.
- Retain existing, non-intrusive mature trees or replace with large caliper trees.
- Water features are encouraged including natural marsh-like installations.
- Reference the City of Seattle Right Tree Book and the City Light Streetscape Light Standards Manual for appropriate landscaping and lighting options for the area.

At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board discussed the feasibility of maintain the existing cherry trees, and concluded that it would be a challenge giving the location and size of existing root balls.

**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.

SLU-specific supplemental guidance:

- Consider integrating artwork into publicly accessible areas of a building and landscape that evokes a sense of place related to the previous uses of the area. Neighborhood

themes may include service industries such as laundries, auto row, floral businesses, photography district, arts district, maritime, etc.

**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.

SLU-specific supplemental guidance:

Landscaping should be designed to take advantage of views to waterfront and downtown Seattle.

### **DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES**

The Board's recommendation on the requested departure(s) will be based upon the departure's potential to help the project better meet these design guideline priorities and achieve a better overall design than could be achieved without the departure(s). The Board's recommendation will be reserved until the final Board meeting.

At the time of the Early Design Guidance meeting, the following departure was requested:

- 1. Alley Setback (Section 23.48.012A.2):** The Code requires structures abutting an alley to provide an upper-level setback for any portion of the structure greater than 25' in height. Section 23.48.012 B further stipulates that the structure shall be setback 1' for every 2' above 25', up to a maximum required setback of 15'. The applicant proposes this requirement be waived for 85' at the North and South ends of the building abutting the alley. In return for this, we propose to increase the setback of the 190' central portion to a minimum of 22', and extend this setback all the way down to alley level. In analysis, this provides three times the volume in setback as the encroachment would take.

The Board indicated favorable towards considering request at Thomas Street side of project but less inclined to consider departure for John Street side.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION SUMMARY**

1. Discussed that the Mirabella residents views would be impacted by development. Request the Architect develop and provide more information about the modulation and character of elevations along John Street.
2. Discussed methods in which the roof top could be designed to help mitigate views from the Mirabella. A separate amenity area, beyond the green roof garden, could be located at the North end of the project to improve and screen the views. Board agreed that locating amenities for the residents to the north made sense given views and solar orientation. Encouraged architect to provide a more detailed roofscape design.

3. Requested that the Architect review uses along John Street for opportunities to further activate the streetscape.
4. Discussed that establishing unit mix is beyond the Board's purview, but that massing changes could result in larger units as a byproduct.
5. Discussed that it would be extremely challenging to keep the trees given the size of the root ball and location within the property line. Board can request applicant to provide cherry trees to meet the street tree requirement, however, we are at SDOT's mercy. Cherry trees were never intended to be street trees.
6. Requested that the Architect and Landscape Architect review landscape opportunities around the building base to ease transition between building face and pedestrians.
7. Review of the three massing schemes presented:
  - Some board members liked the tower element presented in scheme A however it was commented that a tower at this corner appears too high in relation to the existing two story residential buildings to the East. The open plaza area at the base of the tower in this scheme, like the tower, does speak to the Cascade Park diagonally across the intersection. Scheme C has this similar plaza element. Board recommends this plaza stay at grade.
  - Scheme C's additional setback at the alley may be too deep. A concern that the alley deeply recessed could become a negative aspect to the project. The Board recommends the Architect consider trading some of the alley area to the Minor Avenue side of the project. It was discussed that the stoops would need more than 5' to be successful in accommodating appropriate landscaping buffers and providing adequate privacy at the street.
  - Board expressed that in general, it liked the "bookend" massing scheme of Scheme C. The board was inclined to grant the alley departure at the Thomas street end, but had questions about the alley departure at John Street. Concerns were voiced about how the south entrance to the alley might be uninviting given the continuous massing. The Board recommends the Architect explore design options to soften the corner. These may include: a similar treatment as proposed at John Street and Minor Avenue corner, or some stepping of the building—the opening at the alley corner doesn't have to drop all the way down to street level, or wrapping street uses around the corner into the alley.
  - The Board suggested the Architect review the project program to capitalize on program elements that can further activate John Street as well as address the John Street/Alley corner concern.

## **BOARD DIRECTION**

**At the conclusion of the EDG meeting, the Board recommended the project should move forwards to MUP Application in response to the guidance provided at this meeting**