



FINAL RECOMMENDATION OF THE NORTHEAST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Project Number: 3015818

Address: 5019 Roosevelt Way NE

Applicant: Eric Blank, Runberg Architecture Group

Date of Meeting: Monday, September 22, 2014

Board Members Present: Martine Zettle (Chair)
Julia Levitt
Christina Pizana

Board Members Absent: Ivana Begley
Eric Blank (Recused)

DPD Staff Present: Lindsay King


SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: Split zone Neighborhood Commercial 2 (NC2-40) and Lowrise Two (LR2)

Nearby Zones: North: NC2-40
South: NC2-40
East: NC2-40
West: LR2

Lot Area: 13,607 sq. ft.

Current Development: One story retail.



Surrounding Development: The subject site is located midblock on the west side of Roosevelt Way NE between NE 50th Street and NE 53rd Street. Roosevelt Way NE serves as a one-way south-bound arterial along the north south axis traveling through the Roosevelt Neighborhood.

Along Roosevelt Way the zoning is Neighborhood Commercial with a 40 foot height limit. South of NE 45th Street, toward the UW campus, the zoning changes to allow a 65-85 foot height and the uses transition to newer multi story commercial and mixed use structures. North of NE 45th Street zoning allows a 40 foot height limit and uses are a mix of smaller one to four story commercial and residential buildings. To the east zoning changes to Lowrise Two multifamily. Existing buildings are primarily single family residences. Directly south of the subject lot is the University Library, a City of Seattle Landmark structure. To the north is an existing four story mixed use building. To the north of the mixed use building is the University Child Development School.

The subject lot contains substantial grade change from the low point on the street property line to the high point on the west property line, where an existing retaining wall is located along the shared property line. In total, the grade change is approximately 13 feet. The site is mostly rectangular with a small dog-leg in the southwest corner that projects into the Lowrise Two zone. The site is landlocked along three sides, pedestrian and vehicles access is available from the Roosevelt Way NE right-of-way.

ECAs: Steep Slope

Neighborhood Character: Roosevelt Way NE serves as a commercial corridor. Uses transition to multifamily and single family toward the west. The neighborhood consists of small commercial buildings, multistory mixed used buildings, apartment structures and single family homes.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Design review application to allow a 4-story structure containing 49 low-income units above 6,225 square feet of retail use. Parking for 10 vehicles to be provided. Existing structures to be demolished.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: January 6, 2014

DESIGN PRESENTATION

The EDG packet includes materials presented at the EDG meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3015818) at this website:

http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp.

The EDG packet is also available to view in the project file (project number 3015818), 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

The applicant presented three design alternatives. Each option includes a mixed-use structure containing 49 units, 6,225 square feet of commercial space, and approximately 10 parking stalls. Each design option locates the commercial space, intended to be a community food bank and restaurant space, in the southeast corner of the site along Roosevelt Way. The vehicle entry is positioned to the north of the commercial space with access from Roosevelt Way NE. Each massing option locates the building outside of the dog-leg in the Lowrise Two zone.

Massing Option A includes a residential lobby in the SE corner of the building along Roosevelt Way NE. To the north is the commercial space with a café. Vehicle access to ground level parking is located in the far NE corner. The upper level massing is rectangular and located adjacent to the street property line creating an upper level setback to the west, adjacent to the residential zone. Open space and roof decks are provided at level 2 and at the upper level roof deck adjacent to the east façade. The upper level setback ranges from 31-42 feet. Massing Option A is a code complying alternative.

Massing Option B includes a residential lobby in the NE corner of the building along Roosevelt Way NE. To the south is the vehicular access to ground level parking. The commercial space, with a café, is located in the SE corner of the site. The upper level massing is composed of two offset rectangles. The north rectangle is located along the street property line providing a 32 foot upper level setback to the west. The south rectangle is positioned more in the center of the site providing 26 foot upper level setback to the west and 17 feet to the east right-of-way property line. Open space is provided a roof decks on level 2 in the east and west setback, and at the upper level roof deck. Massing Option B is a code complying alternative.

Massing Option Three (Preferred Option) includes a residential lobby in the NE corner of the building along Roosevelt Way NE. To the south is the vehicular access to ground level parking. The commercial space, with a café, is located in the SE corner of the site. The upper level massing is a canted rectangle. The rectangle is located with the mass shifted to the east at the north of the site and to the west at the south portion of the site. The angled façade provides a 21 foot upper level setback in the NW corner of the site and a 13 foot setback to the west in the

south portion. The upper level setback in the SE corner is 26 feet. Open space is provided on roof decks on level 2 in the east and west setback along the south half of the site and at the upper level roof deck. Massing Option C requires departures from parking location and size standards, parking screening and rear setback requirements.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following comments, issues and concerns were raised during the public comment portion of the Early Design Guidance meeting:

- Expressed excitement about the prospect of a future partnership between the library and the Low Income Housing Institute. Felt collaborative work between the two organizations would help further the library's mission.
- Expressed concern that noise from outdoor café will impact library staff when windows are open during summer months.
- Expressed excitement about future café in this location.
- Noted the building integrates well with the adjacent library.
- Supportive of preferred design alternative which includes a canted building form with an upper level setback in the southeast corner adjacent to the library.
- Felt insufficient parking is provided.
- Felt a loading zone should be provided in front of the building for people pick-up and drop-offs.
- Felt solid waste and recycling should be incorporated into the building and not located along the street.
- Felt more information should be provided on how food deliveries will occur on site.
- Concerned insufficient space is provided to support box truck deliveries.
- Felt the garage entrance should be attractive.
- Would like to see a great mix of unit sizes which encourages diversity among the tenants.
- Encouraged applicant to present project to the Roosevelt Neighborhood Association.
- Supported urban agriculture proposed on the roof deck.
- Expressed concern about removal or pruning of the trees adjacent to the west property line.
- Expressed concerned about privacy impacts and windows facing the residential units to the west.

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](#).

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE:

- 1. Site Programming.** The Board felt additional analysis was necessary at the recommendation phase showing how the proposed uses would function on this tight infill site. The Board requested a visual analysis showing how pedestrian access, resident access, food bank queuing, parking and truck access, and the restaurant space would work in concert.
 - a) The Board requested visual explanation showing how loading/unloading, garbage movement to and from the site and, pedestrian movements will be accommodated throughout the day (A-3, A-4, A-8, D-6).
 - b) Board noted there are multiple distinct user groups for the building: a) food bank patrons, b) restaurant patrons, c) residents, and d) staff. The Board felt that the applicant should observe other LIHI buildings to understand how people use the space day-to-day. The Board noted the long term success of the development requires the design be informed by the study of human behavior (A-4).
 - c) The Board requested the applicant demonstrate how users will approach the site and how the building will accommodate users upon arrival. The Board felt the building and site design should collect people and provide intuitive places for people to gather off of the Roosevelt right-of-way (A-4).
 - d) The Board requested incorporating a larger setback along Roosevelt to accommodate the large number of people queuing outside of the building (A-1, A-4).
 - e) The Board felt the café facing the park was a great addition to the project. The Board felt the applicant should demonstrate through design how the restaurant space relates to the food bank (A-1, A-4).
 - f) The Board felt specific focus should be given to building setbacks, architectural detailing, such as site wall and leaning rails, paving treatment, landscaping and signage to demarcate space for users (A-1, A-3, A-4, A-6, D-1).
- 2. Residential Use.** The Board felt additional consideration should be given for the residential use within the building.
 - a) The Board agreed the residential entry needed more prominence. The Board requested the applicant consider and demonstrate a gracious entry experience for the residents of the building (A-3).
 - b) The Board would like to see more information at the Recommendation meeting showing the design of the podium roof deck amenity space (A-7).
- 3. Garage Entrance.** The Board felt the garage entrance was too prominent along the street façade. The driveway approach and structured parking entrance should be minimized to the greatest extent possible.
 - a) The Board noted the parking entrance currently reads as a public plaza. The Board suggested the applicant work with building form, a combination of hardscape and landscape features to minimize the driveway approach and designate the approach as a shared space for cars and pedestrians. The Board noted they would entertain future design departure to minimize the site of the curbcut (A-8, C-5, E-1).

- 4. Privacy and West Property Line.** The Board noted the west and north façade treatment should consider and mitigate privacy impacts for the existing residential units to the north and west.
- a) The Board requested the applicant develop the architectural concept and façade fenestration so it is informed by the site’s sensitive relationship to adjacent residential structures (A-5, C-2).
 - b) The Board requested the applicant provide a privacy study including the location of windows and outdoor space for adjacent residential structures across the west property line. The Board noted the apartment building to the north has minimal secondary windows facing the subject site. The applicant will need to demonstrate how the architectural concept, window glazing and deck location will address privacy concerns for adjacent residential structures (A-5 and C-2).
 - c) The Board requested a clear demonstration of how the building design will relate to the grade change on the west property line. The Board noted that the large retaining wall depressions at the building wall and parking garage should be designed to mitigate visual impacts on adjacent residents and be designed so that they are not a collection area for weeds and trash (A-5, A-8).
- 5. Material and Architectural Context.** The Board felt the architectural and material concept should be informed by existing building context and the intended use of the site.
- a) Page 13 of the EDG Packet shows nearby architectural context photographs, including the adjacent landmark library. The Board noted the existing architectural context includes unique window groupings and detailing around the windows, entrances and roof. The Board did not feel that the development needed to duplicate the existing context, but felt the building should incorporate design cues from these buildings to reference the existing context (C-1, C-4).
 - b) The Board noted the application should include durable long lasting materials. The Board requested complete material demonstration at the recommendation meeting (C-4).
 - c) The Board felt the proposed canopy was a good addition to the project which should be maintained through design development (C-4).
 - d) The Board noted ground level materials must be durable to withstand the daily traffic supported at ground level (C-4).
- 6. Trees and Landscaping.** The Board noted the trees located along the west property line had been reviewed during a site visit and the specimens did not warrant special site design or additional analysis.
- a) The Board noted that the trees located along the west property line were generally in poor condition based on their health. The Board did not feel additional study of the trees was necessary (A-1).
 - b) The Board felt tree species and location in the right-of-way were important to the overall streetscape experience. The Board requested additional details on the right-of-way landscaping at the recommendation meeting (E-2).

FINAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING: September 22, 2014

The packet includes materials presented at the Recommendation meeting, and is available online by entering the project number at this website:
http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp

or contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

Address: Public Resource Center
700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98124

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following comments, issues and concerns were raised during the public comment portion of the Early Design Guidance meeting:

- Expressed concern about the daily operation of building and potential impacts to adjacent buildings and tenants but could also see the positive contribution to the neighborhood.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

At the Recommendation meeting, the Board discussed the response to the EDG and offered the following recommendations for the proposal to meet the applicable Design Review Guidelines identified at the EDG meeting.

1. **Massing and Materials.** The Board agreed the massing and material treatment was responsive to EDG guidance.
 - a) The Board expressed support for the material composition including a dark grey metal frame with varied green and white alternating panels. The Board felt the color combination was tastefully composed (C-2, C-4).
 - b) The Board agreed the contrasting red color palette at the ground level successfully differentiates the upper level residential from the lower level non-residential uses (C-2, C-4).
 - c) The Board expressed concern about the durability of the cement panel materials and encouraged the applicant to incorporate metal panels where the budget may allow (C-4).
 - d) The Board felt the cement panel should be well detailed and requested the applicant investigate incorporating additional depth at the material change depth between metal panel and the cement panel or between the cement panel and windows (C-4).

2. **Ground Level Treatment.** The Board felt the overall ground level treatment was responsive to the Board’s Early Design Guidance. The Board felt minor modifications would enhance the site design.
 - a) The Board discussed the merits of incorporating overhead weather protection at the café entrance on the south façade. Ultimately, the Board felt an architectural treatment was unnecessary and that seasonal weather protection could be provided by site specific outdoor furniture (C-3).
 - b) The Board agreed that the café space should be differentiated from the adjacent library driveway. The Board agreed the lighting fixtures would provide the necessary visual queue to users of the pace but felt at least one additional light, for a total of three should be used (A-1, A-4).
 - c) The Board recommended a condition to provide a decorative metal gate as one artistic piece so that when closed the entire 32 feet create a cohesive mural (A-8).

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.**

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: The pedestrian-oriented street streetscape is perhaps the most important characteristic to be emphasized in the neighborhood. The University Community identified certain streets as “Mixed Use Corridors”. These are streets where commercial and residential uses and activities interface and create a lively, attractive, and safe pedestrian environment. The Mixed Use Corridors are shown in Map 1.

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

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: Reinforcing the pedestrian streetscape and protecting public view corridors are particularly important site planning issues. Stepping back upper floors allows more sunlight to reach the street, minimizes impact to views, and maintains the low- to medium rise character of the streetscape. Roof decks providing open space for mixed-use development can be located facing the street so that upper stories are, in effect, set back.

Guideline - Solar Orientation: Minimizing shadow impacts is important in the University neighborhood. The design of a structure and its massing on the site can enhance solar exposure for the project and minimize shadow impacts onto adjacent public areas between March 21st and September 21st. This is especially important on

blocks with narrow rights-of-way relative to other neighborhood streets, including University Way, south of NE 50th Street.

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

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: Another way to emphasize human activity and pedestrian orientation, particularly along Mixed Use Corridors, is to provide clearly identifiable storefront entries. In residential projects, walkways and entries promote visual access and security.

Guidelines:

- 1. On Mixed Use Corridors, primary business and residential entrances should be oriented to the commercial street.**
- 2. In residential projects, except townhouses, it is generally preferable to have one walkway from the street that can serve several building entrances.**
- 3. When a courtyard is proposed for a residential project, the courtyard should have at least one entry from the street.**
- 4. In residential projects, front yard fences over four (4) feet in height that reduce visual access and security should be avoided.**

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

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: Pedestrian orientation and activity should be emphasized in the University Community, particularly along Mixed Use Corridors. While most streets feature narrow sidewalks relative to the volume of pedestrian traffic, wider sidewalks and more small open spaces for sitting, street musicians, bus waiting, and other activities would benefit these areas. Pedestrian-oriented open spaces, such as wider sidewalks and plazas, are encouraged as long as the setback does not detract from the “street wall.”

Guidelines: On Mixed Use Corridors, where narrow sidewalks exist (less than 15' wide), consider recessing entries to provide small open spaces for sitting, street musicians, bus waiting, or other pedestrian activities. Recessed entries should promote pedestrian movement and avoid blind corners.

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.

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: This Citywide Design Guideline is particularly important where a building’s back side, service areas or parking lots could impact adjacent residential uses. Map 2 (page 8) shows potential impact areas—these are where Lowrise zones abut commercial zones.

Guideline: Special attention should be paid to projects in the zone edge areas as depicted in Map 2 to ensure impacts to Lowrise zones are minimized as described in A-5 of the Citywide Design Guidelines.

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.

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.

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: In Lowrise residential developments, single-lane driveways (approximately 12 feet in width) are preferred over wide or multiple driveways where feasible.

C. Architectural Elements and Materials

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

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: Buildings in the University Community feature a broad range of building types with an equally broad range of architectural character. Because of the area’s variety, no single architectural style or character emerges as a dominant direction for new construction. As an example, the University of Washington campus sets a general direction in architectural style and preference for masonry and cast stone materials, however, new buildings on and off campus incorporate the general massing and materials of this character, rather than replicating it.

Guidelines:

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

2. For areas within Ravenna Urban Village, particularly along 25th Avenue NE, the style of architecture is not as important so long as it emphasizes pedestrian orientation and avoids large-scale, standardized and auto-oriented characteristics.
3. On Mixed Use Corridors, consider breaking up the façade into modules of not more than 50 feet (measured horizontally parallel to the street) on University Way and 100 feet on other corridors, corresponding to traditional platting and building construction.
4. When the defined character of a block, including adjacent or facing blocks, is comprised of historic buildings, or groups of buildings of local historic importance and character, as well as street trees or other significant vegetation (as identified in the 1975 Inventory and subsequent updating), the architectural treatment of new development should respond to this local historical character.

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.

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.

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Guidelines:

1. New buildings should emphasize durable, attractive, and well-detailed finish materials, including: Brick; Concrete; Cast stone, natural stone, tile; Stucco and stucco-like panels; Art tile; Wood.
2. Sculptural cast stone and decorative tile are particularly appropriate because they relate to campus architecture and Art Deco buildings. Wood and cast stone are appropriate for moldings and trim.
3. The materials listed below are discouraged and should only be used if they complement the building's architectural character and are architecturally treated for a specific reason that supports the building and streetscape character: Masonry units; Metal siding; Wood siding and shingles; Vinyl siding; Sprayed-on finish; Mirrored glass.
4. Where anodized metal is used for window and door trim, then care should be given to the proportion and breakup of glazing to reinforce the building concept and proportions.
5. Fencing adjacent to the sidewalk should be sited and designed in an attractive and pedestrian oriented manner.

6. Awnings made of translucent material may be backlit, but should not overpower neighboring light schemes. Lights, which direct light downward, mounted from the awning frame are acceptable. Lights that shine from the exterior down on the awning are acceptable.
7. Light standards should be compatible with other site design and building elements.

Signs

Context: The Citywide Design Guidelines do not provide guidance for new signs. New guidelines encourage signs that reinforce the character of the building and the neighborhood.

Guidelines:

1. The following sign types are encouraged, particularly along Mixed Use Corridors – Pedestrian oriented shingle or blade signs extending from the building front just above pedestrians; Marquee signs and signs on pedestrian canopies; Neon signs; Carefully executed window signs; such as etched glass or hand painted signs; Small signs on awnings or canopies.
2. Post mounted signs are discouraged.
3. The location and installation of signage should be integrated with the building’s architecture.
4. Monument signs should be integrated into the development, such as on a screen wall.

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.

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: The University Community would like to encourage, especially on Mixed Use Corridors, the provision of usable, small open spaces, such as gardens, courtyards, or plazas that are visible and/or accessible to the public. Therefore, providing ground-level open space is an important public objective and will improve the quality of both the pedestrian and residential environment.

Guidelines:

1. On Mixed Use Corridors, consider setting back a portion of the building to provide small pedestrian open spaces with seating amenities. The building façades along the open space must still be pedestrian-oriented.

2. On Mixed Use Corridors, entries to upper floor residential uses should be accessed from, but not dominate, the street frontage. On corner locations, the main residential entry should be on the side street with a small courtyard that provides a transition between the entry and the street.

- 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.
- 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.

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.
- 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.

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: The retention of existing, large trees is an important consideration in new construction, particularly on the wooded slopes in the Ravenna Urban Village. The 17th Avenue NE tree-lined boulevard is an important, visually pleasing streetscape.

Guidelines:

1. Retain existing large trees wherever possible. This is especially important on the wooded slopes in the Ravenna Urban Village.

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 Final Recommendation meeting, the following departures were requested:

- 1. Driveway Width (SMC 23.54.030 D2a):** The Code requires a 22 foot wide two way driveway for commercial uses. The applicant proposed a 12 foot driveway.

The Board unanimously approved the requested driveway width departure request. The Board agreed that minimizing the driveway width and associated curbcut would minimize parking garage impacts on the pedestrian environment consistent with Design Review Guideline A-8, Parking and Vehicle Access. The Board recommended a condition of approval to provide a decorative metal gate as one artistic piece so that when closed the entire 32 feet create a cohesive mural to further minimize the parking and driveway impacts to the adjacent pedestrian space.

- 2. Parking Space Distribution (SMC 23.54.030 B2a):** The Code a minimum of 75% of parking spaces provided to be striped for large vehicles when 10 or fewer parking spaces are provided. The applicant proposed less than the required large vehicle spaces.

The Board unanimously approved the requested departure from the parking space distribution requirements. The Board also noted that the tight site design requires creative space programming and the parking was designated for staff and not visitors to the site. Reducing the size of the parking garage minimizes impacts on the pedestrian environment consistent with Design Review Guideline A-8, Parking and Vehicle Access. The Board recommended a condition of approval to provide a decorative metal gate as one artistic piece so that when closed the entire 32 feet create a cohesive mural to further minimize the parking and driveway impacts to the adjacent pedestrian space.

- 3. Parking Location (SMC 23.47A.032 B1b):** The Code states street level parking shall be separated from the street-level, street facing facade by another permitted use. The applicant proposed two parking spaces that are not separated from the street by another use.

The Board unanimously approved the requested departure from parking location requirements. The Board felt the proposed ground level massing with two canted frames with a decorative metal gate spanning the space between provided the better massing and design solution for the overall building and site design. The Board felt by providing the decorative metal gate negative parking impacts to the pedestrian environmental would be minimized consistent with Design Review Guideline A-8, Parking and Vehicle Access.

- 4. Street Level Development Standards (SMC 23.47A.008 A3):** The Code requires street level street facing facades to be located within 10 feet of a street lot line. The applicant proposed the garage entrance be set back 13'-1" and 18'-10" from the street lot line.

The Board unanimously approved the requested departure from the street level setback. The Board noted that the garage entrance is flush with the building line from level two to the roof. The Board felt the flush façade provided a better architectural response than a projecting parking garage. The Board agreed that the garage and associated setback helped minimize the garage entrance rather than draw attention to it consistent with Design Review Guideline A-8, Parking and Vehicle Access. The Board recommended a condition of approval to provide a decorative metal gate as one artistic piece so that when closed the entire 32 feet create a cohesive mural to further minimize the parking and driveway impacts to the adjacent pedestrian space.

- 5. Parking Screening and Landscaping (SMC 23.47A.016 B3m):** The Code requires an unenclosed parking garage on lots abutting a lot in a residential zone to provide 6 foot high screening and 5 feet deep landscape area. The applicant proposed to provide parking without the 1'-4" depth of landscape area.

The Board unanimously approved the requested departure from the parking screening requirements. The Board noted the parking was mostly below grade and the provided separation between the parking and the adjacent single family homes would minimize the impact of the parking on adjacent uses consistent with the intent of Design Review Guideline A-5, Respect for Adjacent Sites.

- 6. Setbacks (SMC 23.47A.014 B3):** The Code requires a 15 foot setback along any side or rear lot line that abuts a residential zone for portion of a structure above 13 feet in height. The applicant proposed a triangular encroachment in the setback area as demonstrated on Page 45 of the EDG packet.

The Board unanimously approved the requested departure from the setback requirement. The Board agreed that the building massing cant provided more than the required setback to the north adjacent to the single family residences. The Board felt the building massing met the intent of Design Review Guideline A-5, Respect for Adjacent Site and B-1, Height, Bulk and Scale.

- 7. Amenity Area (SMC 23.47A.024 B2):** The Code requires all amenity area to be located outside of the structure and not enclosed. The applicant proposed 44% of the required amenity area be located within the structure.

The Board unanimously approved the requested departure to allow amenity area to be enclosed within the structure. The Board agreed the LIHI programming to create shared spaces within the building for community building for residents meets the intent of amenity

space. The Board also noted locating the amenity space in exterior decks facing the street and within the building minimizes noise impacts to the single family homes along the west property line consistent with Design Guideline A-5, Respect for Adjacent Sites.

BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation summarized below was based on the design review packet dated September 22, 2014, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the September 22, 2014 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, three Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design. The Board recommends the following CONDITIONS (Authority referred in the letter and number in parenthesis):

1. Add one additional light fixture (for a total of three) along the south property line to differentiate the café seating from the adjacent driveway.
2. Provide a decorative metal gate as one artistic piece so that when closed the entire 32 feet create a cohesive mural.