



City of Seattle

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

DESIGN
REVIEW

FINAL RECOMMENDATION OF THE EAST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Project Number: 3016024

Address: 2203 Eastlake Avenue E

Applicant: Maria Barrientos, Barrientos LLC

Date of Meeting: Wednesday, April 08, 2015

Board Members Present: Natalie Gualy (Chair)
Curtis Bigelow
Dan Foltz
Christina Orr-Cahall

Board Members Absent: Kevin Price

DPD Staff Present: Shelley Bolser

SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: Split zoned Neighborhood Commercial One (NC1-P30) and Lowrise Two (LR2 RC)

Nearby Zones: North: LR2 RC
South: NC1P-30
East: NC1P-30
West: LR3

Lot Area: 12,296 sq. ft.

Current Development: Retail store and office building.



Surrounding Development: The subject site is located on the northwest corner of Eastlake Avenue E and E Boston Street. The subject lot is currently split zoned Neighborhood Commercial One with a Pedestrian Overlay (NC1P-30) and Lowrise Two multifamily with a Residential Commercial Overlay (LR2 RC). Lots to the south and east are zoned NC1P-30. Lots to the north are zoned LR2 RC. Lots to the west, across the alley are zoned Lowrise Three (LR3). The site contains two parcels with two existing commercial buildings. The site contains an approximately 10 foot grade change from the east to the west property line. The west lot line, along the alley, is the low point of the site. To the north is a two story motel. To the south is a one story restaurant and to the east is an office building and a multistory residential structure. To the west across the alley is a multifamily structure.

ECAs: None.

Neighborhood Character: This neighborhood, located within the Eastlake Residential Urban Village, includes multifamily housing, community services, restaurants and shopping. Eastlake Avenue E contains a number of multi-story multifamily mixed use structures and one story commercial structures. To the west, three blocks, is Lake Union. Two blocks to the east is Interstate 5. Uses along Eastlake Avenue Street are varied and include single family homes, multifamily apartment buildings, multi-story mixed used building and commercial structures. Zoning along Eastlake Avenue E is primarily Neighborhood Commercial with heights ranging from 30-40 feet. Pockets of Lowrise multifamily zoning are also located on Eastlake Avenue E particularly south of the Eastlake Avenue E and E Boston Street intersection. Zoning is almost entirely multifamily one half block to the east and west of the Eastlake corridor. The majority of buildings are between one and two stories with a few three and four story structures. Within walking distance from the site, services include a restaurants, grocery stores, shopping, and parks. Natural amenities in the area include Lake Union.

Eastlake Avenue E is a major Metro bus corridor providing service from Downtown Seattle to many districts north of Lake Union. Eastlake Avenue E provides connections to the Burke Gilman Trail. Eastlake Avenue E is designated as a principal arterial street.

After the first EDG meeting, an Exceptional Tree was identified near the north property line. The 26" Japanese Maple was determined to be in good health.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Council Land Use Action to rezone a parcel of land from NC 1P 30' and LR2 RC to NC 2P 40' (CF #314127). Project includes future construction of a 5-story structure containing 45 residential units and 3,423 sq. ft. of commercial space at ground level. Parking for 39 vehicles to be provided below grade. Existing structures to be demolished.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: May 14, 2014

DESIGN PRESENTATION

The EDG packet includes materials presented at the EDG meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3016024) 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 3016024), 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

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

- Would like to see the height of the structure reduced to maintain existing views.
- Would like to see the retail spaces located partially below grade to reduce the overall structure height.
- Felt an upper level setback should be provided on the south façade at the 3rd floor level to preserve views adjacent to the right-of-way.
- Noted the building would benefit from an additional ground level setback on the south facade, adjacent to the sidewalk to provide additional landscaping.
- Felt proposal is out of scale with the existing structures.
- Concerned building will reduce available sunlight on Eastlake Ave E.
- Felt proposal should contribute to the historic character of the neighborhood by providing thoughtful streetscape, planting, signs, and lighting.
- Preferred high-quality materials used throughout the building.
- Preferred massing Scheme One which is a story lower.

- Would like to see landscaping maximized at ground level.
- Would like to see a more traditional building and material application respectful of the surrounding neighborhood.

SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: July 23, 2014

The packet includes materials presented at the 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

Several members of the public were in attendance at the Second Early Design guidance meeting held on July 23, 2014. The following comments, issues and concerns were raised:

- Felt the maximum allowed building height should be measured from the low point of the site to the top of the stair and elevator penthouse.
- Would like to see the courtyard designed to be open and inviting.
- Felt a third massing option which maintains both the tree and courtyard should be provided.
- Felt the tree massing option can incorporate an appropriate corner treatment.
- Expressed concern about the reduced north setback, noting the smaller setback would impact light and air to adjacent properties.
- Expressed concern regarding the height and bulk of a four story façade on Eastlake Ave E.

FINAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING: APRIL 8, 2015

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

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

The applicant noted that the proposed development design is focused on providing large windows and curated retail spaces to complement the Eastlake neighborhood.

There is an Exceptional Tree on site near the alley, which is currently growing in a structure. The applicant noted that the project arborist evaluated the tree and found that due to the existing conditions, the tree would be unlikely to survive adjacent development. The applicant showed graphics demonstrating the impacts tree retention would have on the proposed development, and explained that the proposal is to remove the tree in favor of providing better landscaped usable open space on the site.

The applicant summarized changes to the design in response to the Second EDG meeting and DPD staff input, including modified setbacks and departure request for the north façade, extending the building near the northeast corner to create a strong street wall, with an upper level setback of 3'3" above the base. A 5'3" upper level setback was shown at the Boston St (south) façade, to preserve public views toward Lake Union to the west. The alley façade would also be setback 8'3" above the base. The applicant explained that landscaping and paving will be designed to provide public seating opportunities in the plaza and street edges, with layered landscaping at the south edge and adjacent to the alley residential units. The Boston St façade was shown with a cable rail system for climbing vines.

The applicant noted that the intent of the proposed design concept is to create a heavy masonry base with a lighter top, in response to similar nearby context. Dark bronze metal accents would be used at windows and balcony railings. The intent of the signage and lighting plans express minimalism and integration with the building design. In response to Board questions, the applicant further clarified that the north façade treatment would possibly include green screens with climbing vines, or art.

Two of the departures were clarified at the meeting. The floor to floor height was requested to be 12'3" in order to have commercial spaces with entries at the same grade as the sidewalk. The departures for setbacks were in response to the increased setbacks at the south, west, and northwest edges and the Board's request to hold the street edge at Eastlake Ave E.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Several members of the public were in attendance at the Final Recommendation Meeting held on April 8, 2015. The following comments, issues and concerns were raised:

- The analysis of the context in the presentation should have focused on the subject property block rather than sites further north and south on Eastlake Ave E. The immediate context is lower height buildings.
- The proposed development should be designed with minimal or no structures on the roof, similar to nearby context.
- The proposed development massing should step down on all sides, in response to the lower height buildings and the change in topography to the west.
- The public notice of the meeting location was confusing.
- Concerned about traffic and vehicular circulation in the alley.
- The entry ramp in the southeast plaza should be lower or flat to make the plaza more usable.
- The departure to reduce the floor to floor height for the commercial spaces should not be granted in order to make the commercial spaces more viable for future uses.
- Concerned with the review process that requires design review meetings in advance of a rezone decision.
- Any commercial parking provided in the garage should have proper signage and easy circulation.
- The overhead pedestrian weather protection should be deeper than 3'.
- The overall development is too large for the neighborhood.

The DPD Planner also summarized public comment that related to design review, and was received by DPD prior to the Recommendation meeting:

- The building should be designed to transition to lower nearby buildings and zones (CS3 and DC2)
- The proposed design should be designed using the examples in Guideline CS2 to:
 - Reduce height, bulk, and scale
 - Maintain light and air to nearby buildings and streets
 - Preserve public views from adjacent streets to Lake Union
 - Step down to the west, with the topography
- Rooftop stair towers should be oriented east-west to maximize views across the site and minimize appearance of building height
- Support for the proposal's increased retail along Eastlake
- Support for the proposal's positive impact on pedestrian activity
- Support for the overall design
- Support for the removal of existing curb cuts that impact pedestrians and bicyclists
- Development along Eastlake should focus on the streetscape as a hub of the neighborhood, rather than a corridor
- Support for the proposed southeast corner plaza

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the

following siting and design guidance. The Board identified the Citywide Design Guidelines of highest priority for this project.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE May 21, 2014

1. Massing. The Board felt Massing Option 3 should move forward to MUP submittal with the following guidance:

- a) The Board preferred Massing Option 3 which locates the central entry courtyard at the corner of Eastlake Avenue E and Boston Street. The Board agreed the corner courtyard promotes pedestrian activity, provides a gateway to the community, and sets a precedent for a more open intersection (CS2-C, PL1-A2, PL3-A2).
- b) The Board noted Massing Option 3 was preferable with commercial uses on each street and live work uses wrapping onto the alley. At the Recommendation Meeting, the Board requested vignettes of each façade to show how the commercial spaces relate to the pedestrian experience (CS2-B2, PL3-B3).

2. Eastlake Avenue. The preferred massing proposal includes commercial space at ground level with residential units above.

- a) The Board provided guidance to maintain a strong street wall along Eastlake Ave E to the north property line in the area of the required setback (CS3-A).
- b) The Board also noted they were amenable to additional departure requests along the north setback. The Board felt the structure adjacent to Eastlake Avenue E should be located adjacent to the north property line. The Board provided guidance that further reduction in the north setback should facilitate a generous south setback to provide a larger courtyard space and landscape buffer along the south street property line (CS2).
- c) The Board encouraged the applicant to consider an optional second EDG meeting to resolve any proposed changes to the massing location along the north and south property lines (CS2).
- d) The Board provided guidance stating the ground level street façade must maintain a strong street edge, but that the upper levels should be setback. The Board felt the provided setback should provide relief from the large façade on Eastlake Ave E. The Board did not state a setback requirement but thought an investigation of successful upper level setbacks in the neighborhood could inform an appropriate setback (CS2-D4 and D5).
- e) The Board felt the applicant should investigate use of the setback as a private amenity feature for residents (CS2-B).

3. Entry Courtyard. The preferred massing option locates a common entry courtyard at the corner intersection.

- a) The Board felt the courtyard provides the opportunity for the building to transition from the commercial Eastlake façade to the quieter more residential Boston street. At the Recommendation Meeting, the Board requested information on the design of

- the courtyard to create a quality open space activated by spillover of commercial uses and resident's path of travel (PL1, PL3).
- b) The Board noted the applicant should study existing neighborhood developments such as the Cloe and Eastlake lofts for examples of successful activation of space (PL3).
- 4. Boston Street. The preferred massing option locates live work units at the ground level with residential units above.**
- a) The Board noted the south façade needed a more successful transition to the residential neighborhood. The Board felt this transition could be achieved in a variety of ways, but felt the applicant should investigate an upper level setback above the live work units. Board provided an example of a two story live work base with a setback above as potential solution (CS2-D).
 - b) The Board noted the live work entry off Boston was important to break the up the ground level massing while providing additional opportunities to incorporate landscaping. At the Recommendation Meeting, the Board requested vignettes of the pedestrian experience and the live work entry treatment (PL3-B).
- 5. Roof. The Board noted the overall grade transition down to Lake Union will provide views onto the roof surface.**
- 1. The Board felt the roof should be developed as a 5th façade. The Board noted that the addition of the green roof would help add visual interest to the roof plane (CS2)
 - 2. At Recommendation, the Board would like to see additional detail on the development of the roof as a common amenity space maximizing the existing views to the lake (CS2-B).
- 6. Material and Architectural Context. The Board felt the architectural and material concept should be informed by existing building context.**
- a) The Board felt the proposed building should incorporate material cues, such as brick, to reference the existing context (CS3-A4, DC4-A).
 - b) The Board noted the application should include durable long lasting materials at the base. The Board requested complete material demonstration at the Recommendation Meeting (CS3-A-4, DC4-A).
 - c) The Board would like to see the architectural concept evolve to include large windows (DC2).
 - d) At the Recommendation Meeting, the Board requested street level vignettes demonstrating the material application on Eastlake Ave E and Boston Street facades (DC4).

A second EDG meeting was held to determine whether the exceptional tree should be maintained on site with a revised massing alternative.

At the Second Early Design Guidance 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. The Board unanimously preferred massing scheme 1 which maintains an open entry courtyard at the intersection of E Boston Street and Eastlake Ave E.

- a) The Board felt the courtyard massing option provides a more substantial public benefit than maintaining an Exceptional Tree that cannot be seen from either right-of-way (CS2-A, CS2-B, CS2-C).
- b) The Board agreed the preferred massing option provided the better design solution by incorporating a more generous setback at ground level along E Boston Street and the alley. The Board felt the additional setback space should be treated to provide a visual amenity to passing pedestrians (PL1-A).
- c) The Board was pleased with the upper level setbacks provided on floors 2-4 adjacent to the right-of-way. The Board agreed the revised street facade massing provided an appropriate response to the First Early Design Guidance provided (CS2-D).
- d) At the Recommendation Meeting the Board would like to see rendering and perspectives taken from each side of the building (CS2-D).

2. Courtyard. At the Recommendation Meeting, the Board would like to see a fully designed courtyard space with hardscape material, landscape plantings, materials, lighting and signage identified.

- a) The Board felt the entry courtyard should include a substantial tree canopy to soften the hard edge of the building and provide human scale (PL1-A, PL3-A, DC4-D).
- b) The Board agreed the example courtyard imagery provided within the 2nd Early Design Guidance packet suggested a positive direction for the courtyard treatment (PL1-A, PL3-A).
- c) The Board did not fully understand the use and design of the trellis within the courtyard area. If the trellis is maintained moving forward the Board would like to see more detail on the materials and landscaping proposed. The Board was particularly concerned with how the trellis will look in winter (DC4-D1).
- d) The Board noted the context has a small neighbor character. The Board would like to see the courtyard space developed with a sense of intimacy (PL1-A, PL3-A0, DC4-D).

3. Live Work Unit Along the Alley. The Board supported living spaces along the alley with entrances to live work and residential units.

- a) The Board noted the applicant should explore how the live work entry on the alley will function if the space is ever converted to a residential use. The Board felt the entry should be visible but also maintain a sense of privacy (PL3-A).
- b) The Board expressed support for slightly elevated terraces along the alley to provide a sense of separation between the alley and the residential uses (PL2-B).

- 4. E Boston Street. The Board discussed the substantial grade change on E Boston Street and noted the live work unit is two stories. The Board felt additional efforts were necessary to define the relationship between the live work unit and the adjacent sidewalk.**
 - a) The Board provided guidance to explore how the building, live work floor levels, and fenestration meet the adjacent sidewalk grade. At the Recommendation Meeting, the Board would like to see how the live work unit is designed to create a comfortable transition between the unit, sidewalk, and the alley (PL3-B).
 - b) At the Recommendation Meeting, the Board would like to see a detailed landscape plan which provides a multilayered landscape buffer within the setback space provided on E Boston Street (DC4-D).

- 5. Architectural Concept. The Board supported the modern, highly transparency architectural and material concept presented with the 2nd Early Design Guidance Packet.**
 - a) The Board felt the architectural and material concept should be informed by existing building context. The Board did note they support the use of masonry at ground level (CS3-A4, DC4-A).
 - b) The Board noted the level of transparency and size balconies presented within the 2nd Early Design Guidance packet created a handsome building that should be maintained as the design progresses (DC4-A).

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS: APRIL 8, 2015

- 1. Height, Bulk, and Scale. The Board discussed the design response to the nearby context, including the adjacent block and the context of the Eastlake neighborhood beyond that block, based on images in the packet and the Board's experience visiting the site and neighborhood.**
 - a) The Board noted that the question of building massing and related analysis had been previously addressed in the Early Design Guidance meetings, and the design is consistent with the Board's guidance on massing. (CS2-D, DC2-A)
 - b) The setbacks as shown for the upper building levels help to ease the massing transition to adjacent development and address the change in topography from east to west. (CS1-C, CS2-D)
 - c) The Board acknowledged that the sloped topographical conditions of the Eastlake neighborhood can be challenging, but the proposed setback at the alley creates a sufficient transition to the west. (CS1-C, CS2-D, DC2-A)
 - d) The Board agreed that the upper level balconies were designed to provide visual interest without adding additional bulk to the building. (CS2-D)

- 2. Exceptional Tree.** The Board felt the design with the southeast courtyard and related landscape plan provided a more substantial public benefit than maintaining the Exceptional Tree. As the Board noted in the Second Recommendation meeting, the tree can only be seen from the alley, but the street facing courtyard will have open space available for public use (CS2-A, CS2-B, CS2-C, DC4-D)

3. **Materials.** The Board recommended approval of the materials palette, which provides a quiet façade, elegant overall composition, and expresses the architectural concept. (CS2-C, CS3-A, DC2-B, DC4-A)
4. **Courtyard.** The proposed southeast courtyard is designed to clearly identify the primary building entry and provide usable open space adjacent to the street.
 - a) The Board recommended approval of the courtyard design, with the ramp to provide direct access to the residential entry. The ramp serves to delineate the potential outdoor seating area from the entry route. (PL3-A)
 - b) The Board recommended approval of the courtyard design, removal of the trellis that was proposed at EDG, and the overall design response to the corner. (CS2-B, PL1-A)
5. **Alley.** The Board recommended approval of the vehicular alley access, and noted that the 20' public right of way in the alley is wider than many other alleys with garage entries. Therefore, the Board did not recommend any additional design measures related to safety. (PL2-B)
6. **Roof Deck.** The Board recommended approval of the roof deck design. The Board suggested the applicant consider expanding the roof deck to the east edge of the building to activate the street frontage and provide visual interest for neighbors uphill to the east, but declined to recommend a condition for that change. (DC2-B, DC4-D)
7. **North Façade.** The Board noted the applicant's proposal to include green screens with climbing vines or art at the north façade, in the area without fenestration. The Board suggested that the applicant consider a variation in siding or other visually interesting treatment, since the façade is visible from Eastlake Ave E. However, the Board declined to recommend a condition for this item. (CS2-D-5)

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The priority Citywide and Neighborhood guidelines are summarized below. 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-A Energy Use

CS1-C Topography

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

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-A Location in the City and Neighborhood

CS2-A-1. Sense of Place: Emphasize attributes that give a distinctive sense of place. Design the building and open spaces to enhance areas where a strong identity already exists, and create a sense of place where the physical context is less established.

CS2-A-2. Architectural Presence: Evaluate the degree of visibility or architectural presence that is appropriate or desired given the context, and design accordingly.

CS2-B Adjacent Sites, Streets, and Open Spaces

CS2-B-1. Site Characteristics: Allow characteristics of sites to inform the design, especially where the street grid and topography create unusually shaped lots that can add distinction to the building massing.

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

CS2-B-3. Character of Open Space: Contribute to the character and proportion of surrounding open spaces.

CS2-C Relationship to the Block

CS2-C-1. Corner Sites: Corner sites can serve as gateways or focal points; both require careful detailing at the first three floors due to their high visibility from two or more streets and long distances.

CS2-D Height, Bulk, and Scale

CS2-D-1. Existing Development and Zoning: Review the height, bulk, and scale of neighboring buildings as well as the scale of development anticipated by zoning for the area to determine an appropriate complement and/or transition.

CS2-D-2. Existing Site Features: Use changes in topography, site shape, and vegetation or structures to help make a successful fit with adjacent properties.

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.

CS2-D-4. Massing Choices: Strive for a successful transition between zones where a project abuts a less intense zone.

CS2-D-5. Respect for Adjacent Sites: Respect adjacent properties with design and site planning to minimize disrupting the privacy of residents in adjacent buildings.

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.

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

PL1-A Network of Open Spaces

PL1-A-1. Enhancing Open Space: Design the building and open spaces to positively contribute to a broader network of open spaces throughout the neighborhood.

PL1-A-2. Adding to Public Life: Seek opportunities to foster human interaction through an increase in the size and quality of project-related open space available for public life.

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

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.

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-1. Design Objectives: Design primary entries to be obvious, identifiable, and distinctive with clear lines of sight and lobbies visually connected to the street.

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-A-3. Individual Entries: Ground-related housing should be scaled and detailed appropriately to provide for a more intimate type of entry.

PL3-A-4. Ensemble of Elements: Design the entry as a collection of coordinated elements including the door(s), overhead features, ground surface, landscaping, lighting, and other features.

PL3-B Residential Edges

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.

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-A Massing

DC2-A-2. Reducing Perceived Mass: Use secondary architectural elements to reduce the perceived mass of larger projects.

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.

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-A-2. Climate Appropriateness: Select durable and attractive materials that will age well in Seattle’s climate, taking special care to detail corners, edges, and transitions.

DC4-B Signage

DC4-B-1. Scale and Character: Add interest to the streetscape with exterior signs and attachments that are appropriate in scale and character to the project and its environs.

DC4-B-2. Coordination with Project Design: Develop a signage plan within the context of architectural and open space concepts, and coordinate the details with façade design, lighting, and other project features to complement the project as a whole, in addition to the surrounding context.

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-C-2. Avoiding Glare: Design project lighting based upon the uses on and off site, taking care to provide illumination to serve building needs while avoiding off-site night glare and light pollution.

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 was based upon the departures’ potential to help the project better meet these design guideline priorities and achieve a better overall design than could be achieved without the departures.

- 1. Street Level (SMC 23.47A.012):** The code requires a minimum commercial floor to floor height of 13 feet in order to obtain an additional four feet in height. The applicant proposed a floor to floor height of 11'-4 to 12'-2" in order to allow for commercial entries to be level with the adjacent sidewalk and avoid stairs or ramps to the commercial spaces.

This departure would provide an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Review Guideline PL-3 by providing entries that are more directly connected with the adjacent sidewalk, and Design Review Guideline CS2-B by designing the commercial spaces to connect to the sidewalk and respond to the change in topography.

The Board unanimously recommended that DPD grant the departure, based on the proposed design with direct connections between the sidewalk and commercial spaces. The Board also observed that if the Director approves the additional 4' of building height, and a 13' floor to floor base were required, the overall building would be 10" taller than the proposed development.

The proposed departure is for the floor to floor height only. The DPD Director will make the decision whether to grant the additional 4' height as a Type I decision, based on several criteria in SMC 23.47A.012.

- 2. Setbacks (SMC 23.47A.014.B.1):** The code requires a setback at the intersection of a side and front lot line in a residential zone. The resulting setback is a 15 foot triangular area at the northeast corner of this site. The applicant proposed a zero-foot setback in this area.

This departure would provide an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Review Guideline CS3-A by maintaining a strong street wall along Eastlake Ave E, consistent with the Board's first Early Design Guidance for this proposal.

The Board unanimously recommended that DPD grant the departure.

- 3. Setbacks (SMC 23.47A.014 E):** The code requires 15 foot setback for structures over 13 feet in height abutting a lot in a residential zone. The applicant proposes to eliminate the setback along the north property line for a length of 30'9" near the east edge, and provide a 5'3" setback for the north façade in the western portion of the property.

The proposed design with a reduced setback on the north, courtyard on the southeast corner, strong street wall on Eastlake Ave E, and upper level setbacks better meets the intent of PL1-A and CS2-D. The Board clarified that the proposed design creates a strong street wall, provides windows on a portion of the north façade, and results in a design that transitions well to nearby context.

The Board unanimously recommended that DPD grant the departure.

- 4. Setbacks (SMC 23.47A.014.E):** The code states no entrance, window, or other opening is permitted closer than 5 feet to an abutting residentially zoned lot. The applicant proposed windows and openings within 5 feet of a residentially zoned lot to the north of the site. The residentially zoned lot is currently occupied by a lodging use with a surface parking lot adjacent to the subject site. Windows on the east façade would be within 1'5" of the north property line.

This departure would provide an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Review Guideline CS3-A by maintaining a strong street wall along Eastlake Ave E, consistent with the Board's first Early Design Guidance for this proposal. The addition of windows on the east façade will not create privacy impacts to the existing neighbor to the north or any future development at that site. The addition of windows on the east façade is consistent with the rest of the design concept and expression of the building design, and therefore better meets the intent of DC-2.

The Board unanimously recommended that DPD grant the departure.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated April 8, 2015, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the April 8, 2015 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the four Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design with no conditions.