



# City of Seattle

Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections  
Nathan Torgelson, Director



## FIRST RECOMMENDATION OF THE EAST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Project Number: 3019411

Address: 510 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue

Applicant: Bill Singer of Environmental Works

Date of Meeting: Wednesday, February 22, 2017

Board Members Present: Natalie Gualy (chair)  
Curtis Bigalow  
Christina Orr-Cahall  
Sarah Saviskas

Board Members Absent: Barbara Bussetti  
Dan Foltz

DPD Staff Present: Carly Guillory, Land Use Planner

### SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: Neighborhood Commercial 1 –  
40-Foot Height Limit (NC1-40)

Nearby Zones: (North) NC1-40  
(South) NC1-40  
(East) Lowrise 2 (LR2)  
(West) NC1-40

Lot Area: 4,780 square feet (sq. ft.)

**Current Development:** The subject site is currently developed with one, two-story commercial structure, ground level open space, and surface parking accessed via the alley.

**Surrounding Development and Architectural Style:** The neighborhood contains a variety of building types of various ages and architectural styles. Structures along 19<sup>th</sup> exhibit elements such as bay windows, recessed entries, and aluminum storefront windows. Properties to the east, across the alley are residential, some



taking vehicular access from the alley. Some notable structures in the area include: Miller Community Center/Nova & World School at Meany, Miller playfield, St. Joseph School, and Holy Names Academy.

**Access:** Access to the site is proposed via one shared pedestrian entry on 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. Vehicular access to the site is not proposed.

**Environmentally Critical Areas:** None.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Design Review Early Design Guidance application proposing a 4-story building with 8 residential units and 9,000 sq. ft. of medical services on the 1st and 2nd floor. Existing structure to be demolished.

### EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE October 14, 2015

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3019411) at this website:

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

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

**Mailing Public Resource Center**

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

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

## PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment received included:

- Concerned about impacts to existing ADA parking space located near the alley.
- Supported a 15-foot or greater setback at the alley to avoid impacts to the existing ADA parking space to the west.
- Supported a 15-foot setback from the alley at ground level and upper levels.
- Concerned about construction impacts such as noise, dust, and traffic in the alley.
- Concerned about impacts to light and air to the courtyard adjacent to north.
- Encouraged modulation to maximize the amount of light and air within the courtyard abutting to the north.
- Noted that the alley to the east of the subject site is a nice pedestrian space with a high level of pedestrian traffic.
- Noted that a number of large trucks (such as garbage trucks) use the alley and have a difficult time navigating the “T” intersection of the north-south alley with the east-west alley.
- Concerned that the project will not provide a setback at the east property line.
- Described the “T” alley intersection as an unusual condition.
- Encouraged including affordable housing.
- Encouraged the alley façades to be articulated and designed to respond to the existing vibrancy of the alleys.

- Encouraged creating a space for pedestrians to gather adjacent the alleys.
- Suggested moving the rooftop features to the south to reduce impacts to light and air to the north.
- Recommended elements such as: materials with texture (such as brick), light colors, articulation, and bay windows.
- Recommended not using floor-to-ceiling glass windows.
- Described the existing structure as a last vestige of Seattle’s history. Noted the importance of historical preservation, and encouraged the project to preserve the street façade.
- Described the block as one in transition.
- Described the history of the existing structure, including Betty Lee.

<b>PRIORITIES &amp; BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
---

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.

**EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE October 14, 2015**

1. **Streetscape and Public Realm:** The site abuts two alleys (to the east and south). The Board was sensitive to the described character of the alley (as an active, lively pedestrian space), and supported Option 3 as the best response. The Board recommended the design retain the existing character of the alleys.
  - a. The Board agreed that Option 3 responded best to the alley condition with upper level setbacks at the east property line. The Board recommended consideration of balconies at the east façade to contribute to the existing active alley spaces. (CS2-B, PL1-A)
  - b. The Board discussed the functionality of the alleys, asking how service vehicles navigate the space. While the Board noted that it is not the responsibility of this site to solve the problems resulting from a 10-foot wide alley, they did request additional a traffic analysis/more information describing the functionality of the alleys. Information should include diagrams illustrating how service vehicles navigate the space, particularly at the “T” alley intersection; include specific turning radius dimensions. (DC1-C)
  - c. The Board noted that services should be carefully planned in order to preserve the lively pedestrian character of the alleys. The Board requested a plan illustrating/describing the location and functionality of garbage pickup, loading/unloading, and service deliveries. (CS2-B, DC1-C)
  - d. With accessibility of the alley a concern, the Board supported the chamfered corner at the southeast portion of the building to allow additional space for vehicle circulation. (CS2-B, DC1-C)
  - e. The mixed use structure abutting to the north is constructed to the east property line, with upper level setbacks. The Board supported an east setback that is consistent with the abutting development to the north. (CS2-B, PL1-A)
  - f. One shared entrance is proposed along 19<sup>th</sup>. The Board supported co-locating the residential and medical services entrances in one vestibule. (CS2-B, PL2-B)
  
2. **Architectural Concept:**
  - a. The Board encouraged study of the abutting courtyard to the north and being sensitive to impacts to the available light of that space. (CS1-B)

- b. The Board encouraged masonry or brick (at the first two levels) and transom windows on the west elevation. (DC2-B, DC2-D)
- c. In response to the described character of the alleys, the Board encouraged consideration of including a pedestrian entry on the east façade to further engage the alley. (CS2-B, PL1-A, DC2-B)
- d. The structure appears to have been built in 1925 under the common name *Betty Lee Manor*. The Board encouraged incorporating historical elements into the new project as a means of storytelling. (CS3-B, DC2-B)

#### **FIRST RECOMMENDATION February 22, 2017**

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The following public comment was offered at the first Recommendation meeting:

- Supported the green screen and metal screen on the east elevation facing the alley.
- Requested the use of bright or light colors on the east and south elevations to reflect light to adjacent development.
- Expressed concern about potential impacts to the functionality of his existing surface parking spaces accessed via the alley.
- Expressed concern about potential impacts for emergency vehicle use of the alley.
- Recommended further chamfering the corner to allow greater accessibility of existing vehicle parking at the alley.
- Recommended the installation of a sidewalk along the south elevation.
- Discouraged the installation of a sidewalk along the south elevation.
- Supported the west elevation composition.

#### **PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **FIRST RECOMMENDATION February 22, 2017**

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.

1. **Façade Composition, West Elevation.**
  - a. The project included office uses on the first and second floors, with residential units on floors three and four. The architect explained that the intent of the west façade composition was to express the internal programming. Brick was proposed along the ground level, with cement panel on floors two through four. Windows in a grouped pattern on floors three and four are intended to express a residential character and nod to the bays of adjacent development. The Board supported the concept expressing the internal programming on the west elevation and the use of brick and dark colors. However, concern was expressed that the composition was difficult to understand – namely the window patterns and horizontal band at the second floor. The Board agreed the number/variety of window patterns should be simplified. The horizontal band was described as an anomaly as it did not appear to successfully relate to the first floor below or third and fourth floors above. The Board recommended further development of the

west elevation. Extending the brick up to the second floor would be supported. Wrapping materials around from the west to south elevations is important. (DC2-C, DC2-D)

- b. The Board was not convinced that the façade composition was a successful response to the adjacent context. Include in the packet elevations that include adjacent structures.
- c. The Board requested vent locations be shown on all elevations (DC2-C, DC2-D).

**2. Façade Composition, South Elevation.**

- a. The south elevation has the appearance of two masses, separated by a vertical application of glazing. The Board described this condition as a type of transparent gasket that successfully breaks down the perceived mass of the structure. In further refinement of the façade composition, maintain this gasket expression. (DC2-C, DC2-D)
- b. Again, in discussing the south elevation, the Board noted the architect’s intent of a commercial character for the front mass and a residential character for the rear. The Board supported this concept, but questioned whether it was necessary. Agreeing with public comment, the Board recommended the application of lighter colors at this south elevation to ensure the maximization of light. This lighter color application should also wrap to the east elevation. (DC2-C, DC2-D)
- c. The east volume proposed a window pattern with a strong horizontal expression at the first and second floors. The Board supported this fenestration alignment, but expressed concern that the horizontal language did not respond to the window patterns above. The Board recommended a stronger relationship of all windows on the south elevation of the east volume DC2-C, DC2-D).
- d. The Board requested vent locations be shown on all elevations (DC2-C, DC2-D).

**3. Façade Composition, East Elevation.** In response to the Board’s EDG guidance to activate the adjacent (north-south) alley, the proposal included an intricate metal screen, door, and green screen at the ground level. The Board supported the graphic metal screen, door, and green screen, but questioned the viability of plants on the east elevation. To mitigate this concern, the Board recommended reducing the size of the green screen to wrap the door only, rather than span the width of the metal screen. The Board requested vent locations be shown on all elevations. (CS2-B, PL1-A, DC2-B, DC2-D)

**4. Adjacency, Light and Air.** The structure adjacent to the north has a light well providing sunlight to residential units. In response to this condition and Board guidance from the EDG meeting, the massing responds with setbacks to allow light and green screen to soften the condition. Further, privacy concerns are mitigated by avoiding direct unit to unit visibility. The Board supported this response. (CS1-B)

**DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES**

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

**CONTEXT & SITE**

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

**CS1-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-B Adjacent Sites, Streets, and Open Spaces**

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

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

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

**CS3-B Local History and Culture**

**CS3-B-1. Placemaking:** Explore the history of the site and neighborhood as a potential placemaking opportunity. Look for historical and cultural significance, using neighborhood groups and archives as resources.

**CS3-B-2. Historical/Cultural References:** Reuse existing structures on the site where feasible as a means of incorporating historical or cultural elements into the new project.

**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-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.

**DESIGN CONCEPT**

**DC1 Project Uses and Activities: Optimize the arrangement of uses and activities on site.**

**DC1-C Parking and Service Uses**

**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-B Architectural and Facade Composition**

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

**DC2-D Scale and Texture**

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

**DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES**

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

At the time of the first Recommendation departures were requested:

1. **Street-Level Development Standards (SMC 23.47A.008.D.1):** Where residential uses are located along a street-level street-facing façade, the Code requires at least one of the street-level street-facing facades containing a residential use have a visually prominent pedestrian entry.

The Board indicated support for the departure request, finding the façade composition at ground level provided a great deal of transparency that allowed for eyes on the street as well as a greater connection to the street (PL2-B, CS2-B).

2. **Setback Requirements (SMC 23.47A.014.B.3.a.):** The Code requires, for structures containing a residential use, a setback along any side or rear lot line that abuts a lot in a residential zone or that is across an alley from a lot in a residential zone, or that abuts a lot that is zoned both commercial and residential if the commercial zoned portion of the abutting lot is less than 50 percent of the width or depth of the lot, as follows 15-feet for portions of structures above 13-feet in height to a maximum of 40 feet. The applicant proposes a reduction of the upper level setback to 10-feet.

The Board indicated support for the departure request, finding that the façade composition at the alley offered design elements such as metal screening, green screen, and direct access that contributed to the existing lively character of the alley space (CS2-B, PL1-A, DC1-C).

**BOARD DIRECTION**

At the conclusion of the first RECOMMENDATION meeting, the Board recommended the project return for another meeting in response to the guidance provided.