



# City of Seattle

Department of Construction and Inspections

Nathan Torgelson, Director



## RECOMMENDATION DESIGN GUIDANCE OF THE NORTHEAST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Project Number: 3019441

Address: 4201 Stone Way N.

Applicant: David May, Caron Architects

Date of Meeting: Monday, February 27, 2017

Board Members Present: Ivana Begley (Chair)  
Eric Blank  
Blake Williams  
James Marria

Board Members Absent: None

SDCI Staff Present: David L. Landry, AICP, Land Use Planner

### SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: Neighborhood Commercial 2,  
Pedestrian Designation 40' height  
limit (NC3P-40)

Nearby Zones: (North) NC3P-40  
(South) NC2P-40  
(East) NC2P-40  
(West) SF 5000

Lot Area: 12,670 square feet (sq. ft.)

Overlay: Wallingford Residential Urban Village  
Frequent Transit



**Current Development:**

The site currently contains two adjacent single-story masonry buildings with one retail storefronts and a separate single-family residential structure to the rear of the project site, front N. 42<sup>nd</sup> Street.

**Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:**

The site is located at the northwest corner of Stone Way N. and N 42<sup>nd</sup> Street, within the Wallingford Neighborhood district. The project is made up of four distinct parcels with unique assessor parcel numbers. The project site is located within the Wallingford Residential Urban Village, with in a Frequent Transit Corridor in which the provision of off street parking is not a requirement for this site. The area is characterized as a mix of small commercial shops and newer multi-story apartment buildings in both directions of the project site. There are older residential structures located to the west along Midvale Ave N., which runs parallel to Stone Way N. Located immediately to the south of the site are two single-story masonry commercial buildings. Located to the north on the north side of the alley is the Stone Way Manor apartments built in 1989.

This area, especially further to the north and south, is an active pedestrian node with a focus on pedestrians, bicyclist and transit riders.

**Access:**

Proposed vehicular access into the site will be west off of Stone Way N. via the alley along the project's northern property line. Primary pedestrian access to the residential units will be via a mid-block entry off of N. 42<sup>nd</sup> street with a secondary entry located further west, along a paved walkway.

**Environmentally Critical Areas:**

There are no mapped Environmentally Critical Areas onsite.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

A 4-story mixed-use residential/commercial retail development at the corner of N. 42<sup>nd</sup> Street and Stone Way N. The development includes 2,800 square feet of ground level commercial space, six ground floor residential units and surface parking for 4 vehicles off the alley. The remaining 45 units are located on floors 2-4 and make up a total floor area of 36,363 square feet.

Parking is not required for the site since it is located within a frequent transit corridor.

## FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE February 22, 2016

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3019441) at the following website:

<http://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 SDCI:

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

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

### PUBLIC COMMENT

At the EDG meeting, members of the public were present and several speakers provided comments and raised the following issues:

- Concerned about height and mass of building in relation to adjacent residential properties
- Concerned about reduced ability to maintain the eastern edge of the adjacent residential property due to the projects close proximity.
- Concerned about the possible lack of light and air due to the proposed building being located so close to eastern property line.
- Concerned about the 2.5' minimal setback from the second ADU along the projects western property line.
- Concerned that the proposal does not take into account potential noise, odor, visual and shade impacts to the adjacent ADU.
- Concerned that the massive size of the proposal will create continuous shade thus destroying the vegetation located along the western property line.
- Concerned that there will be no windows or modulation on the rear façade.
- Concerned that small efficiency dwelling units are not allowed in this zoning district.
- Concerned that the existing trees were not properly identified through an arborist review.
- Expressed concern that the proposed structure is being pushed west-ward toward the existing single-family residences while asking for a departure on the opposite of the structure to accommodate the design for a wider sidewalk.

## 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. Massing & Relationship to Context:** At EDG, the Board expressed concerns that essentially only two massing options were explored, instead of three. The Board also noted that the siting of the two non-code compliant options did little to respect the location of adjacent residential properties. The non-code compliant options relied heavily on departures while imposing heavily on the adjacent project with extremely small setbacks and height and massing that will impact the residences on the adjacent site. In addition, the Board did not endorse the goals of the applicant's preferred option, as the option did not demonstrate why it was the best alternative or how it would meet both the Citywide and Wallingford design guidelines. The Board encouraged the applicant to further explore massing options that either break up the building façade (possibly consolidating some elements and widening others), or develop a scheme that celebrates building entryways or building corner with grander gestures.

- a. The Board directed the applicant to explore other massing alternatives including a code compliant townhouse option that does not rely on departures that impact the ground level commercial spaces or one that eliminates the parking all together. The Board also suggested that there might be a better location for the façade break that was depicted in the preferred option. The Board stated that by introducing parking, the project is forced to deal with a self-imposed hardship impacting the commercial floor area, outdoor amenity space and site and circulation planning. **(CS2-C-2, CS3-A-4, DC2-I-1)**
- b. The Board expressed concerns with how the proposal did not respond to adjacent structures located to the west and north. For the next meeting, the applicant should explore opportunities for additional relief along the property's western property line and look at how negative spaces between buildings could help the proposal to better relate to the neighboring properties. **(CS1-B-2, CS2-D-5)**
- c. The applicant should provide additional study and information on the existing conditions of the adjacent property, including setbacks, openings, and an arborist report. **(CS1-B-2, CS2-D-5)**
- d. For the next meeting, the applicant should further develop conceptual treatment of any proposed blank facades and look at both precedence and innovative solutions for how to address any blank wall conditions located on the west and north sides of the structure. **(DC1-II-ii, DC2-B-2)**

## **2. Entries/Access & Security**

- a. The Board expressed general support for an open-air internal courtyard concept presented at EDG, but noted that the courtyards presented in Options 1 and 3 were constrained spaces that will most likely become dead zones.

- b. The Board wanted to see a better defined entry hierarchy that is more recognizable in character. This could possibly be achieved by removing living units, removing parking and/or relocating and widening stair entryways or defining the south east corner in a grand design gesture.
- c. The Board suggested that the stair and entryway should be more inviting allowing visitors to see into the courtyard space, affectively drawing people deeper into the building visually and physically. The Board also suggested a circulation scheme that would allow pedestrians to enter into a courtyard from street level and then move upward to the residential levels via stair entry. For the next meeting, the Board directed the applicant to develop design options that have a stronger connection between the how the entry steps and walkways lead into the interior courtyard.
- d. The Board was concerned that the placement of the mail room forces activities (sense of community etc.,) to the rear of the building when it could be placed in a location that would better foster communal activity. **(PL2-A-1, PL2-B-1, 2, & 3, PL2-C-3, PL2-D-1, PL3-I, PL4-B-2)**
- e. The Board was not convinced that the placement of the trash, electrical vaults and bicycle storage were optimal locations as presented in Options 1 and 3. The Board expressed concerns that trash receptacles located immediately adjacent to the ADU on the adjacent property could have a potential impacts in terms of smells and noise. The Board was much more impressed with the placement of 'back of house' elements along 42<sup>nd</sup> St., as depicted in the preferred option, Option 2. The Board was interested in seeing easier access to 'back of house' components such as bike parking, mail boxes, and garbage as depicted in the non-code compliant options, and directed the applicant to incorporate better the back of features for easier accessibility. For the next meeting, the Board requested additional information on the placement of these facilities. **(PL4-A-2, PL4-B-2)**
- f. The Board was generally not supportive of the proposed site circulation and entries for both the residential and commercial uses as they felt that the parking aided in the creation of a self-imposed hardship as the parking unnecessarily constrained the site, which unnecessarily required the applicant to ask for departures for reduced commercial space depths and height which would otherwise not be necessary. **(CS2-III-1&5, PL2-A-1, PL2-A-2, PL2-B-1, PL2-B-3, PL2-I, PL3-I-1, DC2-I-1, DC2-I-3)**

### 3. Pedestrian Realm, Streetscape & Uses

- a. The Board raised concerns and requested more information on how the proposal responds to pedestrian circulation and the streetscape. Of primary concern was that the courtyard space and entry were not inviting and did not foster a sense of community. The Board suggested that the south east corner of the site could have a grander gesture with a better visual as well as a physical connection from an entry at the corner into an interior courtyard for the purpose of making it more inviting and possibly helping to foster a sense of community and activity. **(CS2-B-2, CS2-I-1, CS2-I-2, CS2-II-5, PL3-A-1-a&d, PL2-I-1)**
- b. The Board generally did not express support for the commercial retail floor space presented at EDG although they felt that the commercial layout in the code compliant option worked better in terms of depth of commercial space but were still

concerned with the pedestrian circulation pattern and the lack of a grand gesture marking the buildings entries. The Board wanted to see more interior connections and porosity into the site from the street and for residential and retail entries relate better to the street. **(PL2-B-3, PL3-I, DC2-I-3)**

#### **4. Architectural Character**

- a. The Board was generally not supportive of the architectural character of the imagery depicted in the EDG packet as there were no grand gestures or welcoming connections from the street edge into the building's interior. **(DC2-I-1, DC2-I-2, DC2-II-3, DC2-B-1, DC2-D-1)**
- b. The Board agreed that materials and façade treatments would be important for the success of the project and directed the applicant to explore different textures and materials designed to create interest. For the next meeting, the applicant should include conceptual sketches of material character and application, showing how the façade will be treated. **(DC4-A-1, DC4-A-2)**

<b>SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE September 12, 2016</b>
--

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](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**

At the second EDG meeting, members of the public were present and several speakers provided comments and raised the following issues:

- Expressed disappointment that there is no underground parking.
- Concerned that there will not be enough parking for the number of residential units proposed.
- Suggested that all overhead canopies need to drain back toward the building and not onto sidewalk.
- Suggested that granting the second departure request to allow residential uses at sidewalk grade with a setback of less than 10 feet would be imposing to pedestrian traffic.
- Stated that the new development would result in reduced views and access to the narrow strip of land located on the east side of the residence used to gain access to maintain the property.

- Concerned that the east side of the development would result in the creation of a 49 foot tall sheer vertical wall facing the residential property and that this wall should be modulated.
- Suggested that departure number one should be denied.
- Stated that the shadow study demonstrated that the preferred option cast a greater amount of shadow on the adjacent residential structure.
- Concerned that the placement of the trash so close to the adjacent unit would create impacts in terms of noise and odors and suggested that the trash should be enclosed.
- Suggested that the applicant should be required to provide a parking study.
- Suggested that the minimum 15 foot setback requirement should be maintained and that the first departure request from SMC 23.47.008.B.3 should not be granted.
- Concerned that the height at the southwest corner directly abutting the single family residence in the revised proposal is significantly higher than the previous townhouse scheme.
- Worried that the character of the neighborhood as a result of this project will block light and force areas into shade.

## 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. **Massing and Context.** The Board appreciated the explanation of how major issues from the first EDG were addressed, and felt that the proposed massing for Option 3 demonstrated best overall approach to the development proposal. **(CS2-D, DC2-A, DC4-A)**
  - a. The Board directed the applicant to provide more vignettes from eye level all around the project site and from the neighbor's property located to the west, depicting proposed setbacks, modulation along the western wall and requested departures. **(CS2-D)**
  - b. Board members discussed at length the possibility of increasing the building setback from the adjacent residential property. One Board member suggested the possibility of increasing the setback in light of the west facing unit being fairly deep. However other Board members felt that the proposed design met the intent of the code with all three eventually agreeing that the proposed west setback was acceptable. **(CS2-B, DC1-A)**
  - c. An individual Board member discussed the possibility of increasing the modulation of the western building façade as a means of breaking up the visible mass of the wall. In the end the applicant team was not directed to make any additional revision to the west facing building façade. **(CS2-B, CS2-D, DC2-A, DC2-B)**

2. **Gateway.**
  - a. The Board felt that the southeastern corner should be treated more like a gateway entry and wanted to see that design furthered developed. **(PL3-A, PL3-C, PL4-A, CS2-I, CS2-III)**
  - b. The Board wanted to see more detail on how the building entrances and exits work. **(PL3-A, PL3-C, PL4-A)**
3. **Residential Edge.** Some Board members were concerned with the placement of ground level units directly at grade. They were concerned that the ground units might not be safe and suggested that the units could be designed with sleeping lofts to create more of a privacy buffer from the more sensitive rooms. Other Board members felt that there was an adequate landscape buffer for security and safety for the ground floor units facing N 42nd St. **(PL2-B, PL3-A, PL3-B).**
4. **Parking and Storage.** The Board acknowledged that there is no requirement to provide parking.
  - a. The Board suggested that the small amount of parking being provided should be considered in combination with a ride share or car share program and bike parking. **(DC1-C, DC1-I)**
  - b. The Board also wanted to see more detail about bike parking and storage space identified. **(PL4-B)**
5. **Trash.** The Board was concerned with possible impacts from odors and noise and therefore felt that trash should be moved or relocated to a different location or enclosed and ventilated in order to respect the adjacent residence to the west. **(DC1-C.4)**
6. **Trees.** While not exceptional, the Board directed the applicant to develop a scheme for preserving the trees on the adjacent residential property to the west. **(PL3-B, DC4-D, DC4-1, DC-4-II)**
7. **Exterior Materials.** The Board stated that they wanted to see the use of high quality materials for the whole project. **(DC2-B, DC4-A, DC4-)**

**RECOMMENDATION February 27, 2017**

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3019441) at this website:

<http://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 SDCl:

**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**

The following comments were offered at the Recommendation meeting:

- Concerned that only one image depicting the edge or transition between the two land use zones NC3P 40 and SF 5000 and the western façade of the proposed building were shown at the second EDG meeting.
- Concerned that not enough vignettes from eye level as seen from all around the project site and from the neighbor's property were not provided.
- Concerned that the Board saw only one water color image as seen from N. 42<sup>nd</sup> St. looking northward at what the proposed building might look like in relationship to the adjacent SF 5000 zone and existing single-family residence located to the west of the proposed project site. Concerned that the image influenced the Boards decisions.
- Concerned that what was depicted in the water color rendering was inaccurate as it depicts the proposed project and single-family residence at approximately the same height or elevation and felt that the image under representative the western façade of the building.
- Concerned that the Board saw for the first time at the Recommendation meeting the revised eye level vignettes that show the true character of the massing, the size, the setbacks and modulation or lack thereof of the western wall of the proposed building structure and its relationship to the adjacent houses.
- Concerned that the western façade creates an unbroken out of scale wall that feels like a fortress looming over the neighbors residence that will cause heavy shadows and impact privacy.
- Concerned that the departure requested at the second EDG of 13 feet was represented substantially larger, an added five feet, than was representative in the revised Recommendation packet which is substantially larger.
- Concerned that there was only a cross section depiction of the requested departure only and not an accurate depiction of its length.

- Concerned that the Design Guidelines noted by the Board and issued in the Second EDG report and the priority guidelines called out in the Recommendation packet do not correlate to one another.
- Concerned that the departure being asked for at the structures southwest corner, which has the greatest visual impact, would not make the design more in line or more consistent with the Design Guidelines or make the project better.
- Concerned that the measurement for the second departure was not measured from actual grade but rather from the lowest point of the site corresponding to the sites actual grade.
- Concerned that the overhead weather protection on the east side is not large enough to protect pedestrians.
- Concerned that there are no upper level setbacks along Stone Way.
- Concerned that the elevator tower will be white and a visual impact.
- Suggested that the upper floor units facing west could be reduced in size and made a similar size as the opposing units on the east side which would enable the building to be designed with a greater upper story setback.
- Suggested that there needs to be more rain garden to help offset the overflow of storm drainages in the area.
- Concerned that the 'upright' bike storage is not easy to access.

SDCI staff also summarized design related comments received in writing prior to the meeting:

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the project number: <http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/>

### **RECOMMENDATION MEETING (February 27, 2017)**

1. **Massing Context Response.** The Board generally felt that the revised design responds adequately to their Early Design Guidance; as demonstrated in the relocation of the trash room, and the detailing of the commercial floor spaces as examples. The Board also appreciated how the design team had spent time revising design elements in response to public comment **(CS2-D, CS2-I, CS2-III, DC2-A, DC2-I, DC4-A)**
2. **Vignettes.** Early Design Guidance the Board directed the applicant to provide more vignettes from eye level all around the project site and from the neighbor's property located to the west. While members of the public felt that there were not enough vignettes to inform the design, the Board felt that the design team had provided enough information for them to understand the project per their earlier EDG guidance.
3. **Gateway.**

- a. The Board supported the use of gold colored panel on the south and east building facades designed to emphasize how the corner transitions into a gateway entry per their EDG guidance. **(PL3-A, PL3-C, PL4-A, CS2-I, CS2-III, CS2-IV)**
  - b. The Board was satisfied that their EDG guidance has been followed in terms of the design team showing more detail on how the building entrances and exits work. **(PL3-A, PL3-C, PL4-A)**
4. **Residential Edge and Entry.**
- a. The Board felt that their earlier guidance had been met and fully supported the placement of ground level units directly at grade, the clarity and hierarchy of the residential entries and how the design elements wrap around the south west corner. **(PL2-B, PL3-A, PL3-B).**
  - b. The Board felt that the added landscaping at the residential edge designed to provide more privacy along N 42<sup>nd</sup> St. had been satisfied and responds adequately to their Early Design Guidance **(PL2-B, PL3-A, PL3-B)**
  - c. The Board encouraged the design team to use bottom up shades in the street level units along N 42<sup>nd</sup> St. as an added layer of ‘screening’ that would allow the infiltration of light.
  - d. The Board encouraged the design team to use double doors or one-way hardware at the stairs as security measure at the entry leading from the parking to the building.
5. **Arrangement of Interior Uses.** The Board expressed support for the commercial retail floor space and felt that their guidance asking for more flexibility in the floor spaces given at the EDG meeting had been met. **(PL2-B-3, PL3-I, DC1-A, DC2-I-3)**
6. **Trash.** The Board supported the relocation of the trash room to the interior of the building and which responds adequately to their earlier design guidance. **(DC1-C-4)**
7. **Exterior Elements and Finishes.** The Board generally supported the use of color and materials with some minor adjustments.
- a. The Board supported the use of brick as a finish material but wanted to see the wrapping of the brick at southwest corner pulled back from the edge of the windows so that the windows are totally framed by proportionately with the horizontal panel above the third story window as seen on page 36 of the Recommendation packet dated February 27, 2017. The Board recommended this as a condition. **(CS2-A-2, DC2-B, DC2-D-2)**
  - b. On the north and east elevations, the Board agreed that the horizontal portion of the window frame of the upper most and lower most windows should align with the joints of the exterior panels or the addition of a lintel at the top edge of the upper most and lower edge of the lower most windows. The Board recommended this as a condition. **(DC2-B-1, DC2-C-1, DC2-D-1, DC4-A)**

- c. The Board was in support of the use of the gold panel on the south and east building facades which helps to emphasize the gateway nature and corner transition of the building. **(PL3-A, CS2-I, CS2-III, DC4-A)**
- d. The Board agreed with public sentiment that the stair tower should not be white and recommended a condition to revise this tower using a darker color. **(DC2-C3)**
- e. The Board recommended a condition that the brick band located on the east side of the residential entry, on the south elevation leading from ground level to the roof deck be reduced in height, to the floor level of the 4<sup>th</sup> floor, to match the blue finish (identified as FC1 on page 33 of the February 27<sup>th</sup> Recommendation packet) of the rest of the fourth floor. **(CS2-A-2, DC2-B, DC2-D-2, DC4-A)**
- f. The Board recommended a condition that the overhead protection along Stone Way be increased from a six foot depth to an eight foot depth. **(PL1-C-3.c, PL2-I, PL3-A-2.a)**

## DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The priority 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](#).

<b>CONTEXT &amp; SITE</b>
---------------------------

**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.

***Wallingford Supplemental Guidance:***

**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-I. Responding to Site Characteristics:**

**CS2-I-i.** Upper level building setbacks and setbacks along the building base are encouraged to help minimize shadow impacts on public sidewalks.

**CS2-I ii.** Design public and private outdoor spaces to take advantage of sun exposure.

**CS2-I iii.** Development along North 45th Street, Stone Way North and other north-south streets south of North 40th Street with water, mountain and skyline views should use setbacks to complement and preserve such views from public rights-of-way.

**CS2-III. Corner Lots:**

**CS2-III-i.** Buildings on corner lots should be oriented to the corner. Parking and vehicle access should be located away from the corner.

**CS2-III-ii.** Provide definition, as described in CS2.C.2, at gateways to Wallingford (North 45th Street and I-5; North 45th Street and Stone Way North; and Stone Way North and Bridge Way North). Redevelopment of lots at these intersections should include special features that signal and enhance the entrance to the Wallingford neighborhood including a tower, fountain, statue or other expression of local creativity that provides a physical transition for motorists and pedestrians and communicates “Welcome to Wallingford.”

**CS2-III-iii.** Provide definition at other main intersections.

**CS2-III-iv.** Developers are encouraged to propose larger setbacks to provide for wider sidewalks or plazas and to enhance view corridors at gateway intersections in consideration for departures from lot coverage or landscaping requirements.

**CS2-III-v.** Typical corner developments should provide:

- a. A main building entrance located at corner;
- b. An entrance set back to soften corner and enhance pedestrian environment; and
- c. Use of a hinge, bevel, notch, open bay or setback in the massing to reflect the special nature of the corner and draw attention to it.  
(Example: Julia’s open bay with bevel.)

**CS2-IV. Height, Bulk, and Scale Compatibility:**

**CS2-IV-i.** Cornice and roof lines should respect the heights of surrounding Structures

**CS2-IV-iii.** To protect single-family zones, consider providing upper level set-backs to limit the visibility of floors that are above 30 feet.

**CS2-IV-vi.** Consider dividing building into small masses with variation of building setbacks and heights in order to preserve views, sun and privacy of adjacent residential structures and sun exposure of public spaces, including streets and sidewalks.

**CS2-IV-vii.** Consider additional setbacks, modulation and screening to reduce the bulk where there are abrupt changes, which increase the relative height above grade along the street or between zones.

**CS2-IV-viii.** Be sensitive to public views on North 45th Street, Stone Way North and north-south avenues south of North 40th Street:

- a. Consider stepping back floors five feet per floor.
- b. Notching or setbacks at corners of buildings or ground floors are encouraged.

**PUBLIC LIFE**

***Wallingford Supplemental Guidance:***

**PL2. Walkability: Create a safe, comfortable, and interesting environment that encourages walking for pleasure and for transportation.**

**PL2-I. PEDESTRIAN OPEN SPACES ENTRANCES:** Provide convenient, attractive and protected pedestrian entry for both business and upper story residential uses.

**PL2-I-1.** Entries for residential uses on the street (rather than from the rear of the property) add to the activity on the street and allow for visual surveillance for personal safety.

**PL3. Street-Level Interaction: Encourage human activity and interaction at street level.**

**PL3-I. ENTRIES VISIBLE FROM THE STREET:** Primary business and residential entrances should be oriented to the commercial street (for development along North 45th Street and Stone Way North).

**DESIGN CONCEPT**

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

**DC1-A. ARRANGEMENT OF INTERIOR USES**

**DC1-A-1. Visibility:** Locate uses and services frequently used by the public in visible or prominent areas, such as at entries or along the street front.

**DC1-A-2. Gathering Places:** Maximize the use of any interior or exterior gathering spaces by considering the following:

- a. A location at the crossroads of high levels of pedestrian traffic;
- c. Amenities that complement the building design and offer safety and security when used outside normal business hours.

**DC1-A-4. Views and Connections:** Locate interior uses and activities to take advantage of views and physical connections to exterior spaces and uses, particularly activities along sidewalks, parks or other public spaces.

***Wallingford Supplemental Guidance:***

**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-I. ARCHITECTURAL CONCEPT AND CONSISTENCY**

**DC2-I-1.** The massing of large buildings should reflect the functions of the building and respond to the scale of traditional buildings by including major façade elements, which help to break the building into smaller pieces with distinctive appearances.

**DC2-I-3.** Illuminate distinctive features of the building, including entries, signage, canopies, and areas of architectural detail and interest. Encourage pedestrian scale pole lights along streets and walks.

**DC2-I-4. Signage:**

- Signage should reflect the pedestrian scale of the neighborhood.

**DC3 Open Space Concept: Integrate open space design with the design of the building so that each complement the other.**

**DC3-A. BUILDING-OPEN SPACE RELATIONSHIP**

**DC3-A-1. Interior/Exterior Fit:** Develop an open space concept in conjunction with the architectural concept to ensure that interior and exterior spaces relate well to each other and support the functions of the development.

#### **DC3-B. OPEN SPACE USES AND ACTIVITIES**

**DC3-B-1. Meeting User Needs:** Plan the size, uses, activities, and features of each open space to meet the needs of expected users, ensuring each space has a purpose and function.

**DC3-B-3. Connections to Other Open Space:** Site and design project-related open spaces should connect with, or enhance, the uses and activities of other nearby public open space where appropriate. Look for opportunities to support uses and activities on adjacent properties and/or the sidewalk.

**DC3-B-4. Multifamily Open Space:** Design common and private open spaces in multifamily projects for use by all residents to encourage physical activity and social interaction. Some examples include areas for gardening, children’s play (covered and uncovered), barbeques, resident meetings, and crafts or hobbies.

#### **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.

#### **DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES**

The Board’s recommendation on the requested departure(s) was based on the departure’s potential to help the project better meet both the Citywide and Wallingford design guidelines priorities and achieve a better overall project design than could be achieved without the departure(s).

At the time of the Recommendation meeting, the following departures were identified:

##### **Setback Abutting a Side or Rear Lot Line of a Residentially-Zoned Lot. (SMC 23.47A.014.B.3):**

The Code requires that for a structure that is across an alley from a lot in a residential zone, a setback shall be provided at 15 feet for portions of structures above 13 feet in height to a maximum of 40 feet.

The applicant is requesting a reduction from the required 15 foot setback to a 10 foot setback for a portion of the building that extends above 13 feet or in this case 14'-6" (1'-6" above 13 feet), in lieu of adhering to the required 15 foot setback for those portions of structures above 13 feet in height for the full length of the western building façade.

The Board felt that granting this departure would provide greater setback relief to the adjacent single-family residence. Board members also felt that because the building portion that extends above the 14'-6" has a setback of 15 feet greater than the allowed setback of 10 feet, the design guideline intent of increasing side setbacks to increase privacy had been better met. CS2-D-3, Height, Bulk and Scale (Zone Transition), CS2-B-2, Daylight and Shading CS2-I.i Responding to Site Characteristics.

The Board voted unanimously in support of this departure.

**Setback Abutting a Side or Rear Lot Line of a Residentially-Zoned Lot. (SMC 23.47A.014.B.3):**

The Code requires that for a structure that is across an alley from a lot in a residential zone, the setback for each portion of a structure above 40 feet in height, additional setback shall be at the rate of 2 feet of setback for every 10 feet by which the height of such portion exceeds 40 feet.

- a. Relief from the requirement that for each portion of a structure above 40 feet in height, an additional setback at a rate of 2 feet of setback for every 10 feet by which the height of such portion exceeds 40 feet or in this case the upper most portion of the building along south west corner; (including roof parapet at a height of 44 feet) may extend beyond the allowable building envelope.
- b. The applicant requested this departure to allow for a viable unit with balcony at the building's south west corner. The Board believed that the unit could be made just as viable without the departure by 'tweaking' the floor fourth floor, floor plan.

The Board felt that there was insufficient justification as to how this departure would better meet the design guidelines or make the design better. Members felt that the roof parapet and associated living units could be redesigned so that a departure not necessary. **CS2-IV-iii, Height, Bulk and Scale Compatibility.**

The Board voted unanimously **not** to support this departure request.

**3. Residential Uses Located Along a Street-level Street-facing Façade. (SMC 23.47A.008.D.2):**

The Code requires that the floor of a dwelling unit located along the street-level street-facing facade shall be at least 4 feet above or 4 feet below sidewalk grade or be set back at least 10 feet from the sidewalk.

The applicant is requesting a departure allow two of the three ground level living units located along N. 42<sup>nd</sup> St. to encroach into the required 10 foot setback resulting in total setback of 6'-6".



The Board was in support of the departure as they felt that the landscaping treatments helped in screen the units from the sidewalk area. Board members also liked the resulting articulation of the massing as the two units being pulled closer to the sidewalk would allow for greater privacy of the balconies at the building's southwest corner as well as a greater emphasis to the residential entry. **(DC2-A-2 Architectural Façade Composition, PL1-B-3, Pedestrian Amenities, PL3-B-1 Residential Edges (Security and Privacy), CS2-IV-viii.b, Height, Bulk and Scale Compatibility.**

The Board voted unanimously in support of the departure.

#### **BOARD RECOMMENDATION**

After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the three Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design and departures, with the following conditions based on the design review packet dated February 27, 2017 presented at the Design Recommendation meeting:

1. Wrap the brick around the southwest corner of the building and pulled back from the edge of the windows so that the windows are totally framed by proportionately with the horizontal panel above the third story window as seen on page 36 of the Recommendation packet dated February 27, 2017. **(CS2-A-2, DC2-B, DC2-D-2)**
2. Revise the horizontal portion of the window frame of the upper most and lower most windows to align with the joints of the exterior panels or the addition of a lintel at the top edge of the upper most and lower edge of the lower most windows. **(DC2-B-1, DC2-C-1, DC2-D-1, DC4-A)**
3. The brick band located on the east side of the residential entry, on the south elevation leading from ground level to the roof deck should be reduced in height, to the floor level of the 4<sup>th</sup> floor, to match the blue finish (identified as FC1 on page 33 of the February 27<sup>th</sup> Recommendation packet) of the rest of the fourth floor. **(CS2-A-2, DC2-B, DC2-D-2, DC4-A)**
4. Use a darker color at the elevator and stair penthouses. **(DC2-C3)**
5. Increase the overhead protection along Stone Way from 6 feet to 8 feet. **(PL1-C-3, PL2-C-1)**