



City of Seattle

Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

Nathan Torgelson, Director

DESIGN
REVIEW

SECOND RECOMMENDATION OF THE EAST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Project Number: 3019411

Address: 510 19th Avenue

Applicant: Bill Singer of Environmental Works

Date of Meeting: Wednesday, April 12, 2017

Board Members Present: Curtis Bigalow (chair)
Barbara Bussetti
Dan Foltz
Christina Orr-Cahall
Sarah Saviskas

SDCI 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 19th 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 19th 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 (**Error! Reference source not found.**) at this website:

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 SDCI:

Mailing Public Resource Center

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

Email: 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.

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.

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 19th. 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

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)

SECOND RECOMMENDATION April 12, 2017

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

- Concerned about the durability of the proposed materials. Encouraged materials that require minimal maintenance over time.
- Described the historic significance of the existing building, the Betty Lee Manor, noting that the proposed historic plaque on the west façade is an appropriate gesture.
- Supported the metal screen proposed at the east elevation.
- Supported the massing because it allows for light and air to the residential development to the east.

- Encouraged the use of yellow siding, rather than blue.
- Supported project's commitment to meeting LEED (*Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design*) standards.
- Supported the proposed materials, finding they are compatible with the existing neighborhood.
- Supported the west façade design, noting the first and second floors express the medical use, while the third and fourth floors expressed the residential use.
- Supported the upper level setbacks at the east, noting this tiered condition allowed for more access to sunlight while reducing the perceived mass of the building.
- Supported the proposed colors: gray, blue, and off-white.
- Supported the height of the structure, noting it is compatible with the existing neighborhood.
- Supported the cultural appropriateness of the design, noting that it was reflective of both new and historic construction in the neighborhood.
- Many expressed support for the organization.

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.

1. **West Elevation, Window Pattern.** Discussion of the windows on the west elevation (page 14, *Recommendation Packet*, April 12, 2017) concluded that the Board could support the composition if the large, grouped windows at the third and fourth floors are de-emphasized, a condition is included. The discussion leading up to that condition included the following comments:
 - a. The west elevation was described as a compositional inversion: that instead of emphasizing the main, ground level use (medical services), the residential use above was highlighted.
 - b. The large grouped windows were framed with metal, and protrude from the façade. The appropriateness of the proposed color of this frame (a metallic gray) (page 16, *Recommendation Packet*, April 12, 2017), was questioned, and described as too industrial for a façade intended to express a residential character.
 - c. The grouped windows were supported. Similar to public comment, the grouped windows were described as a metaphorical interpretation of the existing context – a modern interpretation of a bay window.
2. **West Elevation, Materials.** In response to guidance provided at the First Recommendation meeting, the design was modified to remove the horizontal band at the second floor, and extend the horizontal lap siding down to meet the brick (page 5, *Recommendation Packet*, April 12, 2017). The Board supported these design moves.
 - a. The use of brick was again supported, and described as compatible with adjacent development.
 - b. The application of the brick, as it relates to the second-floor windows, was discussed further (page 5, *Recommendation Packet*, April 12, 2017). While the Board did not reach

- a consensus that the brick-window relationship should be modified, they did agree to include a condition recommending further study of this relationship.
- c. The Board concluded and recommended a condition that additional work was needed to explore creating a separation between the second-floor windows and the brick. Attention should be made to simplify the façade composition.
3. **South Elevation.** Discussion of the architectural composition of the south elevation (page 7, *Recommendation Packet*, April 12, 2017) concluded with the Board in support the composition if the gasket expression at the center of the elevation (page 14, *Recommendation Packet*, April 12, 2017) were modified to appear as glazed as possible by using one color for the metal panels and fiber-cement panel siding above, a condition is included. The discussion leading to that condition included the following comments:
- a. Disappointment was expressed that the central gasket expression was modified to reduce the amount of glazing.
 - b. Support was expressed for the color modification to the fiber-cement panel siding above, from dark gray to light gray (page 7, *Recommendation Packet*, April 12, 2017).
 - c. It was noted that the window pattern was minimally developed, with a change to window sizes at level two and removal of the horizontal band element.
 - d. The elevation was described as minimally visible from 19th Ave.
 - e. The windows at the dental offices along the first floor were supported.
4. **East Elevation.** The Board agreed the design responded to the guidance provided at the first Recommendation meeting, supporting the reduction to the size of the green screen, changing the color from dark red to blue, and maintaining the metal screen at ground level. The public also expressed support for the change in color, the green screen, and the metal screen. The following comments were expressed during discussion of the east elevation:
- a. The metal screen is illustrated on page 15, 19, and 20 of the *Recommendation Packet* (April 12, 2017). The Board did not support the screen as rendered on page 15, shown as dark and difficult to read the figures. A condition was recommended requiring the metal screen to be as represented on pages 19 and 20: light, perforated metal with dark painted, scaled figures.
 - b. This elevation was described as the “quietest” of all elevations, with fewer material applications and window patterns.
 - c. The Board agreed with public comment that the massing moves with upper level setbacks allowed for greater light and air to development to the east.

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 Façade 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 departures 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 departures.

At the time of the second 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 unanimously recommended approval of 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 better meeting Design Guidelines PL2-B: Safety and Security and CS2-B2: Connection to the Street).

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 unanimously recommended approval of 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 better meeting

Design Guidelines **CS2-B: Urban Pattern and Form, PL1-A: Network of Open Spaces, DC1-C: Parking and Service Uses.**

BOARD DIRECTION

At the conclusion of the Second RECOMMENDATION meeting, the Board recommended approval of the project with conditions.

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated April 12, 2017, and the materials provide, shown and verbally described by the applicant at the April 12, 2017 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 and departures with the following conditions.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

1. At the west elevation, de-emphasize the large grouped windows at the third and fourth floors to ensure a residential character and simplified composition.
2. At the west elevation, further study the relationship between the brick and the second-floor windows. Attention should be made to simplify the façade composition.
3. Revise the composition of the gasket expression at the center of the elevation (page 14, *Recommendation Packet*, April 12, 2017) to include as much glazing as possible and by using one color for the metal panels and fiber-cement panel siding above.
4. Ensure the metal screen on the east elevation at ground level is constructed as shown on pages 19 and 20 of the *Recommendation Packet* (April 12, 2017): light, perforated metal with dark painted, scaled figures.