

Department of Planning & Development

D. M. Sugimura, Director



## EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE OF THE EAST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Project Number:	3019001
Address:	2220 E. Union Street
Applicant:	Ed Weinstein, Weinstein A+U Architects+ Urban Designers, for Lake Union Partners
Date of Meeting:	Wednesday, March 25, 2015
Deevel Marchara Dresent.	Natalia Cualy Chair

Board Members Present: Natalie Gualy, Chair Curtis Bigelow Krystal Brun Christina Orr-Cahall Dan Foltz Kevin Price

DPD Staff Present: Michael Dorcy

#### **SITE & VICINITY**

Site Zone:	NC2P-40 (NC2P-65)		┝ <u></u> <u> </u>	1	-
Nearby Zones:	(North) SF 5000 and NC2P-40 (South) NC2P-65 (East) NC2P-40 (West) NC2P-30		1418 1 <sup>419</sup>		
Lot Area:	29,000 SF	6		3RD AVE	1
		EUN	NON ST	2	
					_

# **Current Development**

A single-story gas station and minimart, a single-story building housing a boxing and martial arts gym, a small urban farm.

## Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:

The project site lies within Seattle's Central Area neighborhood and is located in the 23<sup>rd</sup> & Union-Jackson Residential Urban Village and is part of the northernmost Union Core of the three community nodes along 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue identified in the 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Action Plan Urban Design Framework. Immediately to the north of the proposal site a zoning line divides the west half of the block zoned single-family from the eastern half which, like the subject site, is zoned neighborhood commercial. The block to the east of the site contains a carwash, Mt. Calvary Church, the Neighborhood Lady (a bar) and Uncle Ike's (a retail marijuana shop). Directly to the south, across E. Union Street is a mixed-use building, primarily of residential units, still under construction. That structure is being erected under benefit of a Contract Rezone which allows a height of 65 feet at that site. The planning node, the northernmost of the three extending along the spine of 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and comprising the Residential Urban Village, extends narrowly at various widths along either side of 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and E. Union Street. The node lies within a wide swath of single-family residences, extending out from the tight commercial core at the center.

The topography of the site is marked by elevation changes of just over two feet along both the 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue frontages and less than a foot along the E. Union Street frontage. 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue is a major arterial connecting to Mt. Baker to the south and the University District to the north. E. Union Street is a minor arterial connecting west to Capitol Hill and Downtown. The site is served by two King County Metro bus lines, #48 which runs north and south, and #2 which runs west and east.

# Access:

Access to parking would be from 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue which abuts the subject property along its west property line. The residential lobby is proposed along E. Union Street, from the sidewalk that abuts the south property line of the site.

# **Environmentally Critical Areas:**

There are no ECAs on the site; as noted, the site is relatively flat.

# **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The applicant proposes construction of a 6-story building with 140-150 residential units, retail/commercial at ground level, and parking for approximately 110 vehicles. This development would be proposed as part of a Contract rezone that would replace the NC2-40

zoning now in place on site with NC2P-65. (The P represents an existing pedestrian overlay which would persist with the change in allowable height from 40 to 65 feet.

#### FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE March 25, 2015

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3019001) at this website: www.seattle.gov/dpd/aboutus/news/events/DesignReview/SearchPastReviews/default.aspx

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: <u>PRC@seattle.gov</u>

#### **DESIGN DEVELOPMENT**

The applicant presented three alternative development schemes for the site (check the alternatives in the on-line packets). The first proposal arranged commercial street-level uses along 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and E. Union Street, with some of the residential units arrayed about a courtyard that faced west onto 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. A second proposal wrapped some of the units around a north-south running, podium level courtyard that was open to the north. The third and preferred alternative shared an organization similar to that proposed in the second alternative. But a primary difference in schemes was a separation in access points to commercial and residential parking on 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. This scheme also offered a slight difference in the arrangement, if not the quantity, of modulation on the three street-facing facades. While the west (residential side) of this scheme showed residential units at ground level along 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, the ground-level area all along 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue (the commercial side) was characterized as an array of connected, commercial market places.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Public comments touched upon a number of issues and observations, including the following:

- Surprise that the residential lobby was located on E. Union Street; would like to see the size of the residential lobby shrunk to allow more room for retail uses along the street.
- Appreciation that the orientation of the courtyard allowed more sunshine to reach neighbors to the north.
- Intrigue with the "market" concept shaping the retail/commercial development along 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue.
- Support for the design, but thought the two vehicle entries along 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue could hurt the pedestrian vitalization of that sidewalk.
- In favor of the town-home-like ground-level residential units proposed for 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue.

# **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.

Among the issues identified by the Board were the following:

- Regarding the height, bulk and scale of each of the alternatives shown, there was
  concern that the proposed structure overpowered its site; it seemed especially top-heavy
  on the 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue side, above the townhomes and overly bulky at the corner with E.
  Union in each of the schemes presented.
- There is a need for a four-season shadow study to assess impacts on adjacent residential buildings north of the site.
- The point of view of the presentation drawings was primarily from the southwest which did not give a clear perspective of transitions along the north property line of the proposal. A clearer depiction of this important transition area was needed. Some street-level perspective drawings would help to illustrate more clearly, the relationship between the proposed structure and the existing single-family residence at the property and zone edge at the northwest corner of the site.
- More details are needed regarding the commercial unloading to service the retail inside the paring area.
- Provide more details regarding the garbage/recycle storage and staging for both the residential and commercial uses.
- The residential lobby off E. Union Street was characterized by the Board as "a design problem," and one that could be resolved without constricting or minimizing the importance of an active retail street front.
- The Board would expect to see a fuller and more detailed landscape plan at the time of the Recommendation Meeting as well as perspectives of the proposed courtyard that convey a more realistic sense of the space.
- The opportunity for more overhead weather protection than shown, both along 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and E. Union Street should be explored and shown.
- There was something of an awkwardness the way the commercial spaces shown along 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue comported with the idea of a "market" which the Board generally thought was rich in potential.
- The Board expressed enthusiasm for the market concept and how it might enliven both the street and the interior parking space.
- The use of high quality materials, especially at the prominent corners of the project, was essential for setting precedents for other new development in the area.
- The Board looked forward to seeing more of the courtyard terrace.
- Provide clear visual guides to help in explaining the six requested departures.

#### **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 <u>Design Review website</u>.

#### **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-B Sunlight and Natural Ventilation

**CS1-B-2.** Daylight and Shading: Maximize daylight for interior and exterior spaces and minimize shading on adjacent sites through the placement and/or design of structures on 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-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-2. Contemporary Design:** Explore how contemporary designs can contribute to the development of attractive new forms and architectural styles; as expressed through use of new materials or other means.

**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-A Network of Open Spaces

**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.

# 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-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-C Retail Edges

**PL3-C-1. Porous Edge:** Engage passersby with opportunities to interact visually with the building interior using glazing and transparency. Create multiple entries where possible and make a physical and visual connection between people on the sidewalk and retail activities in the building.

**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.

**PL3-C-3. Ancillary Activities:** Allow space for activities such as sidewalk vending, seating, and restaurant dining to occur. Consider setting structures back from the street or incorporating space in the project design into which retail uses can extend.

PL4 Active Transportation: Incorporate design features that facilitate active forms of transportation such as walking, bicycling, and use of transit.

# PL4-A Entry Locations and Relationships

**PL4-A-1. Serving all Modes of Travel:** Provide safe and convenient access points for all modes of travel.

# PL4-B Planning Ahead for Bicyclists

**PL4-B-2. Bike Facilities:** Facilities such as bike racks and storage, bike share stations, shower facilities and lockers for bicyclists should be located to maximize convenience, security, and safety.

**PL4-B-3. Bike Connections:** Facilitate connections to bicycle trails and infrastructure around and beyond the project.

# **DESIGN CONCEPT**

#### DC1 Project Uses and Activities: Optimize the arrangement of uses and activities on site. DC1-B Vehicular Access and Circulation

**DC1-B-1.** Access location and Design: Choose locations for vehicular access, service uses, and delivery areas that minimize conflict between vehicles and non-motorists wherever possible. Emphasize use of the sidewalk for pedestrians, and create safe and attractive conditions for pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers.

# DC1-C Parking and Service Uses

**DC1-C-1. Below-Grade Parking:** Locate parking below grade wherever possible. Where a surface parking lot is the only alternative, locate the parking in rear or side yards, or on lower or less visible portions of the site.

**DC1-C-2. Visual Impacts:** Reduce the visual impacts of parking lots, parking structures, entrances, and related signs and equipment as much as possible.

**DC1-C-3. Multiple Uses:** Design parking areas to serve multiple uses such as children's play space, outdoor gathering areas, sports courts, woonerf, or common space in multifamily projects.

**DC1-C-4. Service Uses:** Locate and design service entries, loading docks, and trash receptacles away from pedestrian areas or to a less visible portion of the site to reduce possible impacts of these facilities on building aesthetics and pedestrian circulation.

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-1. Site Characteristics and Uses:** Arrange the mass of the building taking into consideration the characteristics of the site and the proposed uses of the building and its open space.

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

# 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

# **DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES**

At the time of the Early Design Guidance meeting six departures were identified as potentially necessary to achieve the preferred design alternative. (See EDG packet, unnumbered p.6 following page 24). Departures listed were from the following Code requirements: SMC 23.47A.008.D, setbacks and height relationship to sidewalk grade for residential units; 23.47A.014.B.1, triangular setback from residential zone to the north; 23.47A.014.B.2, side setback above 13 feet for residential zone to north; 23.54.030.B.2, required distribution of size of parking spaces; 23.54.030.D.2, driveway widths; 23.54.030.G, sight triangles for existing driveways.

The Board indicated a willingness to entertain the requests, but requested further information how the departures made for a better design and clear illustrations regarding the functionality and impacts of the departures as the design progressed.

# **BOARD DIRECTION**

At the conclusion of the EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE meeting, the Board recommended 5-0 that the applicant move forward to MUP application.

At the Recommendation Meeting the Board would expect to see clear responses to the issues stated on page 4, above, and:

- A study of adjacencies of windows on the north façade vis-à-vis those on the building to the north, as well as other adjacency impacts.
- A complete Landscape Plan and Green Factor worksheet.
- A four season pertinent hour shadow study.
- A Materials Board.
- A Lighting Plan.