



## SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE OF THE NORTHEAST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Project Number: 3013913

Address: 12706 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Northeast

Applicant: Wayne Ivary, Ivary and Associates, Architects

Date of Meeting: Monday, November 03, 2014

Board Members Present: Martine Zettle (Chair)  
Ivanna Begley  
Eric Blank

Board Members Absent: Julia Levitt  
Christina Pizana

DPD Staff Present: Tami Garrett, Senior Land Use Planner

### SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: Neighborhood Commercial 3 (NC3-65) & Lowrise 2 (LR2)

Nearby Zones: (North) NC3-65 & LR2  
(South) NC3-65 & LR2  
(East) LR2  
(West) Commercial 1 (C1-65)

Lot Area: 37,492 square feet (sq. ft.)



### **Current Development:**

The project site contains three existing structures: a one-story recreational building (Aqua Dive Pool) and two one-story apartment buildings.

### **Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:**

Surrounding development includes a mix of single family homes, multifamily residential buildings, and small to medium-sized commercial buildings. The site abuts single-family residences and townhouse developments to the east; a three-story apartment building and townhouse development to the north; and an office building and apartment building to the south. There are several commercial uses (retail, restaurants, grocery stores, etc.) in the immediate vicinity of the project along Lake City Way Northeast. A three-building mixed-use residential/commercial development ("Solara Apartments") is across 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Northeast to the south. A multi-purpose store ("Fred Meyer") is one block north of the site. Two multi-story Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) residential properties ("Lake City House" and "Lake City Village") are south of the site abutting the 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Northeast block front.

The project site is located within the Lake City Hub Urban Village, one block east of Lake City Way Northeast. The general character of this block along this street is a mix of small office buildings, multi-story multifamily residential developments and some newer mixed-use buildings containing commercial and parking at ground-level/below grade with residential units placed at the upper floor levels. At present, there is a modest amount of commercial activity along 33rd Avenue Northeast. Also, several surface parking areas accessory to commercial businesses fronting along Lake City Way Northeast are situated and accessed via 33rd Avenue Northeast. Consequently, the minimal amount of commercial business activity fronting along the west side of 33rd Avenue Northeast detracts from a pedestrian-friendly streetscape. The neighborhood is in transition to becoming more pedestrian-oriented, with pedestrian sidewalks installed along the west side of 33rd Avenue Northeast. There are civic buildings (library, community center, etc.), retail shops, restaurants and grocery stores in the area concentrated along or near Lake City Way Northeast: all within walking distance of the site.

### **Access:**

Vehicular access to the project site is possible from 33rd Avenue Northeast and from an existing ingress/egress easement at the adjacent property immediately north of the project site (12728 33rd Avenue Northeast).

### **Environmentally Critical Areas:**

The site's existing topography is characterized with grades descending gradually approximately 19' from the east to the southwest corner of the property. The southwest corner of the site is mapped Environmentally Critical Areas (ECAs)-ECA3 Riparian Corridor.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is for the design and construction of a mixed-use structure with five levels of residential use (159 units) over ground-related commercial (5 live-work units or retail), and two levels of parking (128 stalls) at and above-grade.

<b>FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: May 20, 2013</b>
--

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3013913) at this website:

[http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design\\_Review\\_Program/Project\\_Reviews/Reports/default.asp](http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp).

The packet is also available to view in the project file, by contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

**Mailing Public Resource Center**

**Address:** 700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000  
P.O. Box 34019  
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

**Email:** [PRC@seattle.gov](mailto:PRC@seattle.gov)

## DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

The applicant (Wayne Ivary with Ivary & Associates) began his presentation by providing a historical background of past development efforts at the project site. He explained that, on September 21, 2009, a mixed-use proposal (#3010576) was presented to the Northeast Design Review Board (DRB) by a different design firm (Myhre Group Architects). The Northeast DRB at that time supported the applicant's preferred design scheme (Option #3); identified the priority design guidelines; and, recommended that the applicant proceed to the Master Use Permit (MUP) application stage. Further development of the proposal was halted and no MUP application for that proposal was submitted to DPD. The project property was then sold to the current owner which, in turn, had hired a new design team (Ivary & Associates).

Three alternative design schemes were presented to the Board for their consideration. The project team's design development goals were to create a mixed-use residential building utilizing the initial design work along with past response comments/direction from the Board and City Staff. All three options presented included a six-story mixed-use structure with one ground-related level of commercial (retail/live-work) and five stories of residential above the base. Onsite parking, accessed via two locations abutting 33rd Avenue Northeast (garage drive and ingress/egress easement), was proposed for all three design schemes.

The first scheme (Option 1) was a refinement of the prior applicant's preferred design scheme previously identified as Option #3. Massing above the first street level depicts a modulated front façade offering some terraced upper level outdoor residential amenity area facing the street. This "C-shaped" building mass included upper level massing setback along all facades. Mass of the upper levels has two corridor ends that surround an upper level central courtyard oriented to the east. No portion of the proposed building mass extended into the identified LR2-zoned area. This option included 175 residential units, seven live-work units and a retail space at grade, 159 parking stalls within the partially below grade garage. This design would require code departures for vehicle access, live-work street-level street-facing façades and non-residential street-level floor-to-floor height requirements.

The second scheme (Option 2) also showed a "C-shaped" building mass with upper levels surrounding an upper level central residential courtyard oriented to the east. This building mass included modulated stepped offsets along the west-facing street-front façade that extended from the street-level continuing along the upper levels. This design illustrated a portion of the building mass extending into the LR2-zoned area of the site. The scheme was comprised of 161 residential units, six possible live-work or commercial tenant spaces at grade and 136 parking stalls within the garage parking levels. This design would necessitate design departures from vehicular access and live-work street-level street-facing façades requirements.

The third and applicant preferred scheme (Option 3) also included a "C-shaped" building mass with design features similar to those mentioned above for option 2; however the upper levels surrounding an upper level courtyard area was oriented to the south. This scheme consisted of 161 residential units, five possible live-work or commercial tenant spaces at grade and 130 parking stalls within the two garage parking levels. This design would also necessitate design departures from vehicular access and live-work street-level street-facing façades requirements.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Several members of the public attended this Early Design Guidance Review meeting. The following comments, issues and concerns were raised (with Board/applicant response in *italics*):

- Property owner and residents from the neighboring apartment development (12728 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Northeast) north of the project site:
  - Distributed photos showing existing site conditions between the project site and their property pertaining to the ingress/egress easement area.
  - Explained that the ingress/egress/utility easement was negotiated with the prior owner of the project site. Stated that the intent of easement was to encourage a more interior design to capture the light, allow service vehicle access (i.e. fire department) and utility service. Stated that the easement was not intended to be used as ingress or egress for 80 cars.
  - Concerned that increased vehicular traffic utilizing the proposed driveway will create a safety hazard to the residents at the apartment development-especially the children that play onsite.

- Concerned about light and glare impacts from vehicle headlights directed towards apartment units and vehicular noise disrupting existing residents' peaceful environment.
- Concerned about the proposed location of the trash room.
- Concerned about shadow impacts associated with the height of a seven-story building.
- Encouraged the creation of more courtyards to reduce the design's building mass and establish a softer building edge. Mentioned the Lake City Village development as a good example to emulate.
- Concerned about the commercial spaces-sense that commercial use may not be appropriate at the project site.
- Stated the proposal should accommodate parking for the proposed commercial uses onsite.
- Concerned the construction of the seven-story building will assist in creating a "canyon-like" effect along 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Northeast.
- Questioned where the proposed points of vehicular access would occur from.  
*Both points of access would occur from 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Northeast.*
- Supportive of live-work as a proposed commercial use. Feels the commercial use with large storefront glazing would encourage more "eyes on the street" and would be highly desirable.
- Supportive of the applicant's preferred scheme (3<sup>rd</sup> Option) in comparison to what was originally proposed. Liked the larger courtyard with the exposure to the south.
- A representative from the Lake City Community Council:
  - Commended the architect for incorporating design elements (balconies, modulation, decks) that creates opportunities for people to be outside. Stated the design should activate the street and more eyes on the street will be beneficial.
  - Encouraged the inclusion of plaza and landscaping similar to the plaza and landscape design followed at the SHA property to create a continuity of providing a friendly pedestrian open space/landscape area along 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Northeast.

<b>SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE November 3, 2014</b>
--

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3013913) at this website:

[http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design\\_Review\\_Program/Project\\_Reviews/Reports/default.asp](http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp).

The packet is also available to view in the file, by contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

**Mailing Public Resource Center**

**Address:** 700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000  
P.O. Box 34019  
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

**Email:** [PRC@seattle.gov](mailto:PRC@seattle.gov)

## DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

The project architect (Wayne Ivary) began his presentation by providing a brief overview of the project site and current neighborhood context.

The applicant preferred massing scheme (Option 3) was presented to the Board. The building design presented to the Board had evolved in response to Board comment and public comment. The project architect explained in detail how concerns regarding height, bulk, scale and architectural consistency; pedestrian/resident access, amenities and uses along 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Northeast public realm and onsite; and vehicular access to the site had been addressed in the proposed design since the first EDG meeting. Additional information pertaining to trash and recycling receptacle storage, access and staging; and blank wall treatments were presented to the Board. The presentation also included landscaping design details (with green factor calculations), building sections, streetscape vignettes/perspectives and conceptual exterior lighting information.

Development standard departures associated with vehicular access and live-work street frontage use limitation requirements were presented to the Board for feedback.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

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

- Representatives of the Lake City Community Council:
  - Pleased that the design retained friendly pedestrian gathering areas and friendly landscaped entries along 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Northeast.
  - Voiced concerns regarding the proposed green walls effectiveness as a blank wall treatment and the offset of the grade to accommodate access to future commercial and residential entrances along the building's street-facing façade.
  - Encouraged the inclusion of live-work units at grade along 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Northeast.
  - Concerned about the viability of future commercial uses other than live-work along this block which is surrounded by properties that are mainly residential in character.

## 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.

### FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE May 20, 2013

1. **Design Concept, Consistency and Massing:** The design of the new building should be compatible with the anticipated scale of development, respectful of adjacent properties and complement the architectural character and siting pattern of neighboring buildings.

- a. The Board agreed that the preferred design scheme Option 3 is a good concept and supported the basic direction of the design development. However, the Board had several concerns related to height, bulk, scale, and architectural consistency:
    - i. The Board stated that height, bulk and scale had not been addressed with the proposed massing for the lower residential zone transition (LR3) to the east. At the next EDG meeting, the Board expects to review an enhanced massing design with significant design elements (ground-level setbacks, landscaping buffer, material changes, modulation, roof forms or other design mediums) that aid in addressing this guideline appropriately. The Board requested more information be provided regarding the proximity of the existing structures to the east and existing topography (site section cut) to more clearly demonstrate possible solutions to perceived height, bulk and scale. (A-5, B-1)
    - ii. The Board commented that the illustrations provided in the design packet made it difficult to capture the scale of the fenestration, modulation and decks. The Board's initial feedback was that further development of the building's hierarchy is necessary. The Board advised that part of the solution to address the building hierarchy issue could be incorporating modulation that is significant and is tied to the program of the building form. The Board requested that building sections be provided at the next meeting to assist in addressing this and other concerns. (C-2, C-3)
    - iii. The Board questioned the placement of a gabled roof over the elevator penthouse when the design appeared to be more horizontally focused and stated consistency with architectural detailing as a concern which needs to be addressed. (C-2)
  - b. The Board stated support for a design that situates the courtyard to the south. (A-7, B-1, C-2)
2. **33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Northeast Frontage:** The design of the new building should incorporate architectural features, elements and details to achieve a good human scale, encourage human activity, and are attractive and secure for pedestrians and residents at 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Northeast. (A-1, A-2, A-4, A-6, C-3, D-1)
- a. The Board reiterated the building design should make a significant move to incorporate areas for public space at the street edge. The creation of a public open space near the building's northwest corner should also be explored and discussed at the next EDG meeting. The Board expects to review conceptual street-level vignettes to visualize the design's direction concerning the public realm. (A-2, A-4)
  - b. The Board stated it is very supportive of a design that incorporates landscaping that reinforces the character of the neighboring properties and abutting streetscape; and illustrates the manner in which pedestrian access circulates on the site. The Board noted additional information describing existing streetscape conditions hadn't been provided with the EDG materials. Therefore, the Board directs the applicant to explain at the next EDG meeting conceptual design for the surrounding streetscape environment in terms of enhancing the public

environment at grade; continuing a sense of street circulation at grade (SDOT Conceptual Street Improvement Plans for 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Northeast); identifying cues taken from existing neighboring properties (Lake City Village) and environment conditions. The Board encouraged the applicant to explore ways to apply required landscaping (green factor) to the front of the proposed building. (A-2, E-1)

- c. The Board acknowledged that all visible blank walls (north and south facades) will need to be addressed. The Board expects to review details pertaining to any landscaping and/or design treatments proposed to address this concern at the Recommendation phase. (D-2, E-2)
- d. The Board was very concerned about a downward sloping condition (pit) being created to manipulate grade to accommodate future non-commercial (live-work) and the main residential entrances at the northernmost portion of the building street-facing façade. The Board also recognized that this design could impact visibility of the entrances from the street, create an unsafe condition for pedestrians and create a challenging transition to the building entrances from the street. At the next EDG meeting, the Board expects to review drawings with details (finished floor levels shown in relation to sidewalk grades) to understand how all ground-level uses/entrances will relate to the street and resolves the abovementioned concerns. (A-6, D-1, D-7, D-12)

### **3. Vehicular Access:**

- a. The Board voiced strong opposition for a design that includes two vehicular driveway access points and stated that the applicant needs to provide more information to justify a code departure to allow two access curb cuts from the street edge. Situating one vehicular access driveway to the south edge of the site is preferred. However, the Board acknowledges additional information is necessary before the Board can offer any design feedback. Therefore, the Board expects to review an enhanced site plan that clearly delineates the easement configuration/dimensions, turning radius, existing easement encroachments (gate location, parking spaces, etc.) and proximity of the existing residential building (lobby, entrance, stairs, etc.) to the north. (A-5, A-8, D-1)
- b. The Board supported a design that screened the trash/recycling within the structure and away from the pedestrian right-of-way. However, the Board voiced several concerns pertaining to the absence of information explaining how direct access to the aforementioned area would occur. The Board commented that sole access via the existing ingress/egress easement would potentially be problematic and may not be the optimal solution. The Board stated further analysis of the garage access by residents and non-residents (trash collection) and review of best practices in terms of trash/recycling removal is necessary. The Board expects a diagrammatic demonstration on the circulation concept for trash access at the next EDG meeting. The Board also requested that the applicant explore a design concept that also moves the trash/recycling service area to the south. (C-2, D-6)

## SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE November 3, 2014

1. **Design Concept, Consistency and Massing:** The design of the new building should be compatible with the anticipated scale of development, respectful of adjacent properties and complement the architectural character and siting pattern of neighboring buildings. (CS2.C.2, CS2.D, CS2 NORTH DISTRICT/LAKE CITY-III.ii & iii)
  - a. The Board voiced continued support of the preferred design scheme Option 3 and the basic direction of the design development. Still, the Board had some concerns related to building massing and architectural consistency:
    - i. The Board voiced concerns with the gabled roof forms and commented that they appeared out of proportion with the overall building design. The Board felt that the modern aesthetic for the architectural design intent of the building was appropriate and reasonable; however, the gables as presented seemed contrary to the building's design intent. Therefore, at the Recommendation meeting, the Board would like to review studies of other roof forms (clearstories, shed, flat, etc.) at the roof and main entry that are more in keeping with the building's modern aesthetic. (CS2.C.2, CS2 NORTH DISTRICT/LAKE CITY-III.ii & iii)
    - ii. The Board recognized that a better definition of the design intent of the building's exterior is necessary in order to inform the subsequent conditions. The Board requested further development of the building's hierarchy as the design evolves. (DC2.B, DC2 NORTH DISTRICT/LAKE CITY-II & III.i)
    - iii. The Board reviewed the proposed massing for the lower residential zone transition (LR3) to the east and commented that it was an appropriate architectural response to the Board's concerns voiced at the prior EDG meeting. (CS2.D, CS2 NORTH DISTRICT/LAKE CITY-III.ii & iii)
  - b. The Board stated that it is very important that building exteriors be constructed of durable, high quality, attractive and maintainable materials that will age well in Seattle's climate. The Board mentioned exterior material detailing (panel layouts) in enlarged elevations will be important because of its dominance applied to most of the building's facades. At the Recommendation meeting, the Board expects to review physical materials and a color palette that are in keeping with the Board guidance and neighborhood-specific guidance. (DC4.A, DC4 NORTH DISTRICT/LAKE CITY-I)
2. **33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Northeast Frontage:** The design of the new building should incorporate architectural features, elements and details to achieve a good human scale, encourage human activity, and are attractive and secure for pedestrians and residents at 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Northeast. (CS1.C, CS1 NORTH DISTRICT/LAKE CITY-II, CS2.B, PL1.A-C, PL2.B, PL2 NORTH DISTRICT/LAKE CITY-V.b, PL3 NORTH DISTRICT/LAKE CITY-II, DC2 NORTH DISTRICT/LAKE CITY-II)
  - a. The Board appreciated the inclusion of a public open space new the building's northwest corner and encouraged the applicant to continue to incorporate areas for public space at the street edge. The Board looks forward to reviewing street-level vignettes to visualize the design's direction concerning the public realm at

the Recommendation meeting. (CS1 NORTH DISTRICT/LAKE CITY-II, CS2.B.2, PL1.B.3)

- b. The Board reviewed the proposal's conceptual landscape design and commented that the overall landscaping was good and was supportive of the applicant's initiative to provide landscaping specifics (green factor calculations) during the EDG phase. The Board provided the following feedback concerning landscaping:
  - i. The Board voiced concern over the small width of the landscaping shown at the depressed area outside of the commercial spaces against the retaining wall and at the building's edges. The Board cautioned against the creation of planting beds less than one foot wide.
  - ii. The Board commented that permeable paving tends to become "slippery and mossy" over time and would require maintenance in order to address this condition. Therefore, the Board advised the applicant to be mindful of this concern.
  - iii. The Board voiced concerns regarding the quantity, viability and lack of clarity of the location of the proposed green walls. Additional Board discussion concerning this subject is found in item #2.c.

At the Recommendation meeting, the Board expects the abovementioned concerns to be addressed. Also, regarding all design and landscaping within the right-of-way (R.O.W.), the applicant is directed to address Board concerns directly with SDOT during the initial Master Use Permit (MUP) review process and provide street improvement design specifics (landscaping, street trees, design elements, etc.) at the Recommendation meeting. (DC2.B.2, DC4.D)

- c. The Board recognized the resolution of all visible blank wall conditions is still in development but voiced that this concern will need to be addressed. The Board encouraged openings/windows and other alternatives. An overreliance on the utilization of green walls was discouraged by the Board. The Board still expects to review details pertaining to any landscaping and/or design treatments proposed to address visible blank walls at the Recommendation meeting. The Board also requested that the proposed visible mechanical equipment (louvers, grilles, venting, etc.) should also be identified. (DC2.B.2, DC4.D.1)
- d. The Board reviewed drawing details (finished floor levels shown in relation to sidewalk grades) to better understand how all ground-level uses/entrances would relate to the street. The Board felt that it was important that the main residential entrance should have a more direct physical connection to the street/sidewalk. Therefore, the Board strongly encouraged the applicant to explore a ground-level design where the northernmost commercial space (without a mezzanine) and main residential entrance would vertically align with the sidewalk level and the remaining proposed commercial (live-work units with mezzanines) space entrances' would be recessed at a lower grade. At the Recommendation meeting, the Board expects to also review an ensemble of elements (doors, canopies, glazing, hardscape, landscaping, lighting, signage, etc.) that encourage interest at the street-level, provide security and clarify building entries/edges. (PL3.A.1&2, PL3.B.3, PL3.C.2, PL3 NORTH DISTRICT/LAKE CITY, DC2.C.1, DC4)

**3. Vehicular Access:**

- a. The applicant’s design had been revised to illustrate one main vehicular driveway entrance/exit at the south edge accessed from 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Northeast to the garage parking stalls accessory to the proposed commercial/residential uses. The Board was in agreement that the vehicular access location as shown was acceptable and stated issues voiced at the prior EDG meeting regarding this concern had been resolved. (CS2.D.5, DC1.B.1)
- b. The Board reviewed a design that had been revised to indicate that the existing ingress/egress easement situated on the neighboring property to north would be utilized solely for the purpose of access by service providers to an internal waste/recycling storage area. The Board was in agreement that this design solution was acceptable and resolves past concerns voiced by the Board. (CS2.D.5, DC1.B.1, DC1.C.4)

**DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES**

The priority Citywide and Neighborhood guidelines identified by the Board as Priority Guidelines are summarized below, while all guidelines remain applicable. For the full text please visit the [Design Review website](#).

**CONTEXT & SITE**

**CS1 Natural Systems and Site Features: Use natural systems/features of the site and its surroundings as a starting point for project design.**

**CS1-C Topography**

**CS1-C-2. Elevation Changes:** Use the existing site topography when locating structures and open spaces on the site.

***North District - Lake City Supplemental Guidance:***

**CS1-II Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site**

**CS1-I-i. North/South Streets:** Little Brook Creek could be used to enhance landscaping of new developments on 33rd Avenue Northeast, and at the proposed park site nearby.

**CS2 Urban Pattern and Form: Strengthen the most desirable forms, characteristics, and patterns of the streets, block faces, and open spaces in the surrounding area.**

**CS2-B Adjacent Sites, Streets, and Open Spaces**

**CS2-B-2. Connection to the Street:** Identify opportunities for the project to make a strong connection to the street and public realm.

**CS2-D Height, Bulk, and Scale**

**CS2-D-3. Zone Transitions:** For projects located at the edge of different zones, provide an appropriate transition or complement to the adjacent zone(s). Projects should create a step in perceived height, bulk and scale between the anticipated development potential of the adjacent zone and the proposed development.

**CS3 Architectural Context and Character: Contribute to the architectural character of the neighborhood.**

**CS3-A Emphasizing Positive Neighborhood Attributes**

**CS3-A-4. Evolving Neighborhoods:** In neighborhoods where architectural character is evolving or otherwise in transition, explore ways for new development to establish a positive and desirable context for others to build upon in the future.

**PUBLIC LIFE**

**PL1 Connectivity: Complement and contribute to the network of open spaces around the site and the connections among them.**

**PL1-B Walkways and Connections**

**PL1-B-1. Pedestrian Infrastructure:** Connect on-site pedestrian walkways with existing public and private pedestrian infrastructure, thereby supporting pedestrian connections within and outside the project.

**PL1-B-3. Pedestrian Amenities:** Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian oriented open spaces to enliven the area and attract interest and interaction with the site and building should be considered.

**PL2 Walkability: Create a safe and comfortable walking environment that is easy to navigate and well-connected to existing pedestrian walkways and features.**

**PL2-A Accessibility**

**PL2-A-1. Access for All:** Provide access for people of all abilities in a manner that is fully integrated into the project design. Design entries and other primary access points such that all visitors can be greeted and welcomed through the front door.

**PL2-A-2. Access Challenges:** Add features to assist pedestrians in navigating sloped sites, long blocks, or other challenges.

**PL2-B Safety and Security**

**PL2-B-1. Eyes on the Street:** Create a safe environment by providing lines of sight and encouraging natural surveillance.

**PL2-B-2. Lighting for Safety:** Provide lighting at sufficient lumen intensities and scales, including pathway illumination, pedestrian and entry lighting, and/or security lights.

**PL2-B-3. Street-Level Transparency:** Ensure transparency of street-level uses (for uses such as nonresidential uses or residential lobbies), where appropriate, by keeping views open into spaces behind walls or plantings, at corners, or along narrow passageways.

**North District - Lake City Supplemental Guidance:**

**PL2-I Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances**

**PL2-I-v. North/South Streets: 33rd Avenue NE (NE 125th St. to NE 130th St.)**

a. Encourage a new development(s) to provide an open space pedestrian passageway, safe for pedestrians and secure for site tenants, which connects 33rd Avenue Northeast to 35th Avenue Northeast; and, 33rd Avenue Northeast to Lake City Way, preferably near Northeast 127th Street.

- b. Create visual interest in the block, building-faces or walls by adding small pedestrian indentations for seating and outdoor eating.
- c. New development is encouraged to support development of a new park midblock to offset anticipated increases in low-income and affordable housing.

**PL3 Street-Level Interaction: Encourage human interaction and activity at the street-level with clear connections to building entries and edges.**

**PL3-A Entries**

**PL3-A-2. Common Entries:** Multi-story residential buildings need to provide privacy and security for residents but also be welcoming and identifiable to visitors.

**PL3-B Residential Edges**

**PL3-B-2. Ground-level Residential:** Privacy and security issues are particularly important in buildings with ground-level housing, both at entries and where windows are located overlooking the street.

**PL3-B-3. Buildings with Live/Work Uses:** Maintain active and transparent facades in the design of live/work residences. Design the first floor so it can be adapted to other commercial use as needed in the future.

**PL3-C Retail Edges**

**PL3-C-2. Visibility:** Maximize visibility into the building interior and merchandise displays. Consider fully operational glazed wall-sized doors that can be completely opened to the street, increased height in lobbies, and/or special lighting for displays.

**North District - Lake City Supplemental Guidance:**

**PL3-II Human Activity**

**PL3-II-ii. Pedestrian-friendly building entrances:** These should face 33rd Avenue Northeast. Consider orienting the building to define the public street and civic spaces in this area and to encourage walk-in traffic.

**DESIGN CONCEPT**

**DC2 Architectural Concept: Develop an architectural concept that will result in a unified and functional design that fits well on the site and within its surroundings.**

**DC2-B Architectural and Facade Composition**

**DC2-B-1. Façade Composition:** Design all building facades—including alleys and visible roofs—considering the composition and architectural expression of the building as a whole. Ensure that all facades are attractive and well-proportioned.

**DC2-B-2. Blank Walls:** Avoid large blank walls along visible façades wherever possible. Where expanses of blank walls, retaining walls, or garage facades are unavoidable, include uses or design treatments at the street level that have human scale and are designed for pedestrians.

**DC2-D Scale and Texture**

**DC2-D-1. Human Scale:** Incorporate architectural features, elements, and details that are of human scale into the building facades, entries, retaining walls, courtyards, and exterior spaces in a manner that is consistent with the overall architectural concept

**DC2-D-2. Texture:** Design the character of the building, as expressed in the form, scale, and materials, to strive for a fine-grained scale, or “texture,” particularly at the street level and other areas where pedestrians predominate.

**DC2-E Form and Function**

**DC2-E-1. Legibility and Flexibility:** Strive for a balance between building use legibility and flexibility. Design buildings such that their primary functions and uses can be readily determined from the exterior, making the building easy to access and understand. At the same time, design flexibility into the building so that it may remain useful over time even as specific programmatic needs evolve.

**DC4 Exterior Elements and Finishes: Use appropriate and high quality elements and finishes for the building and its open spaces.**

**DC4-A Exterior Elements and Finishes**

**DC4-A-1. 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.

**DC4-C Lighting**

**DC4-C-1. Functions:** Use lighting both to increase site safety in all locations used by pedestrians and to highlight architectural or landscape details and features such as entries, signs, canopies, plantings, and art.

**DC4-D Trees, Landscape, and Hardscape Materials**

**DC4-D-1. Choice of Plant Materials:** Reinforce the overall architectural and open space design concepts through the selection of landscape materials.

**DC4-D-2. Hardscape Materials:** Use exterior courtyards, plazas, and other hard surfaced areas as an opportunity to add color, texture, and/or pattern and enliven public areas through the use of distinctive and durable paving materials. Use permeable materials wherever possible.

**DC4-D-3. Long Range Planning:** Select plants that upon maturity will be of appropriate size, scale, and shape to contribute to the site as intended.

**DC4-D-4. Place Making:** Create a landscape design that helps define spaces with significant elements such as trees.

**DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES**

The Board’s recommendation on the requested departure(s) will be based on the departure’s potential to help the project better meet these design guidelines priorities and achieve a better overall project 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 **SECOND** Early Design Guidance, the following departures were requested:

1. **Vehicular Access (SMC 23.47A.032.A.1.b):** The Code states vehicular access is permitted from the street and limited to one two-way curb cut, if access is not provided from an

alley and the lot only abuts one street. The applicant proposes two, two-way curb cuts: a curb cut situated across the property boundary line; and, widening an existing curb cut serving the neighboring property to the north in order to expand an existing 15' wide ingress/egress easement an additional 5' creating vehicular access that would straddle the north property line. The applicant proposed this departure to assist in reducing traffic congestion at 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Northeast associated with vehicles entering and exiting the development at a primary entrance the parking garage and allow for the secondary access (ingress/egress easement) to be solely utilized for service vehicular access to the project site.

The Board indicated they would be inclined to support this departure, provided that the design of the secondary access (ingress/egress easement) is utilized primarily for service access to the property. The Board requested more information regarding code requirements and feedback from DPD in consultation with SDOT regarding vehicular access and curb cut width requirements be provided to demonstrate how the requested departure better meets the intent of specific Design Review Guidelines. (CS2.D.5, DC1.B.1, DC1.C.4)

2. **Live-work Street Frontage Limitation (SMC 23.47A.004.G.3):** The Code states that in Lake City Hub Urban Villages, live-work units shall not occupy more than 20% of the street-level street-facing façade. The applicant proposes 50% of the street-front commercial space to be categorized as live-work units.

The Board reiterated that they would be inclined to entertain a departure to allow live-work units to occupy more than 20% of the street-level street facing façade provided that the live-work units are designed to read as commercial uses at the street front and not be too residential in appearance. The Board also indicated it was important to reveal if the live-work units would be designed to have the flexibility to transition to other viable commercial uses in the future. The applicant will need to demonstrate that the floor layout and street-level designs warrants this departure. (PL3.B.3, DC1.A.1, DC1.A.3, DC2.E)

<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
------------------------

**BOARD DIRECTION**

At the conclusion of the SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE meeting, the Board recommended moving forward to MUP application.