# City of Seattle

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

DESIGN REVIEW

**FIRST RECOMMENDATION OF THE NORTHWEST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

| | |
|---|---|
| Project Number: | 3019810 |
| Address: | 8228 Green Lake Dr. N |
| Applicant: | Lucas Branham, Studio Meng Strazzara |
| Date of Meeting: | Monday, February 01, 2016 |
| Board Members Present: | Ellen Cecil, Chair<br>Dale Kutzera<br>Marc Angelillo<br>Chris Bell<br>Keith Walzak |
| Board Members Absent: | None |
| DPD Staff Present: | Katy Haima |

**SITE & VICINITY**

Site Zone: C1-40

Nearby Zones: (North) SF 5000
(South) C1-40
(East) SF 5000
(West) C1-40

Lot Area: 16,553 SF

**Current Development:**

The site is currently used as an auto showroom and car lot; the site contains a 596 sq.ft. single-story wood frame building.

**Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:**

The site is located at the northeast corner of the Green Lake neighborhood at the intersection of Aurora Ave N, Green Lake Dr. N, and N 83rd Street. It is trapezoidal in shape, bounded by N 83rd Street to the north and Green Lake Drive N to the southwest.

Abutting the site to the east and to north across N 83rd Street are craftsman-style single family homes built in the early 1900's. A one-story commercial building is located across N 83rd Street, along Aurora Ave N. An auto sales building and surface parking lot is located across Green Lake Dr. N to the south.

In this area, Aurora Ave. N is a six-lane commercial corridor characterized by 1-2 story buildings with varying setbacks and numerous surface parking lots. Many of the buildings reflect a 1920-1950 commercial character that includes features such as playful signage and simple post WWII architecture.

The site is located within an area designated in the Green Lake Design Guidelines as an "entry location" at the transition from the commercial character of Aurora to the Green Lake neighborhood.

The immediate area is served by numerous bus routes on Aurora Ave N. Green Lake Way has on-street bicycle lanes that lead directly to Green Lake Park.

**Access:**

The property has access via curb cuts from Green Lake Drive N and N 83rd Street. N 83rd Street is restricted to one-way traffic heading west. Green Lake Drive N has a center turn lane.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The proposal is for a four-story building containing 4 live-work units at grade, 66 units, and parking for 64 vehicles at grade. The existing structure would be demolished.

**EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE: May 4, 2015**

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3019810) 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 DPD:

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

**Email:** PRC@seattle.gov

**DESIGN DEVELOPMENT**

The applicant provided context for the project, noting the prominent corner and the designation of the site as a gateway location. The applicant mentioned contextual influences, including the adjacent single family homes and the commercial character and heavy traffic on Aurora Avenue N. The applicant also highlighted transit and bicycle connections to the site.

The applicant presented three massing options at the EDG Meeting. All three options locate screened parking at grade along N 83rd Street and the east property line, buffered by landscaping. Live-work units and a residential amenity space are located along Green Lake Drive N and at the corner. Option 1 is based on an interior courtyard, and the building mass is pushed toward the lot boundaries. Option 2 utilizes deep recesses to break upper floors into two perceived masses. Option 3 (preferred) incorporates greater setbacks along the north, south, and east sides to pull the mass into the site.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Members of the public attended this Early Design Review meeting. The following comments, issues and concerns were raised:

- Would like to see the design of the project respond more appropriately to the neighborhood context; this includes the overall height, bulk, and scale of buildings; continuity of the streetscape; compatibility with the residential architecture in the Green Lake neighborhood.
- Concerned over the impact of the height and bulk on neighboring properties and the streetscape, especially in regards to shadowing and zone transitions. Encouraged setbacks and careful location of stair towers to help mitigate shadow and bulk impacts.
- Noted that the overall height bulk and scale is not compatible with surrounding architecture, and that the design should to visually integrate massing with the context.
- Stated that the proposal does not respond to the designated “gateway” in the neighborhood design guidelines. Encouraged the applicant to consider an opportunity for art or other landmark gateway feature.
- Opposed the parking access proposed for 83rd, noting that it is a one-way street near a busy intersection.

- Noted that the project would be setting a precedent for projects along Aurora that are adjacent to single-family zones.
- Stated that the recently developed Starbucks is an example of an appropriately scaled building.
- Concerned about the density of the project and the lack of parking.
- Encouraged a more thorough urban analysis of contextual cues.
- Expressed desire for more landscaping and more emphasis on the Olmstead theme of Green Lake Park.

## 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.

**FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE May 4, 2015**

1. **Massing and Design Concept**: The Board agreed that the massing options did not adequately respond to the site characteristics and corner and gateway location, as well as to the zone transition on the north and east sides of the site. (CS2-A, CS2-B, CS2-C, CS2-D, CS2-I, CS2-II, DC2-A)
    a. The corner element needs more presence and articulation. The massing of the corner should reinforce the prominence of the corner as a gateway to the Green Lake Neighborhood, make a gesture to the public realm, and be a distinctive design feature that is reflected in the massing, not just in materiality. (CS2-A, CS2-C, CS2-I)
    b. The massing should respond to the change in zoning to the north and east by providing a more sensitive transition in height and scale. The Board suggested significant setbacks at the upper levels that step down to the single family residences and minimize shadow impacts. (CS1-B, CS2-B, CS2-D, CS2-II)
    c. The Board would like to see the massing studies revised to reduce the visual bulk of the building and to relate the scale of the adjacent single family zone. The Board agreed that this does not necessarily require breaking the massing into two portions; however the Board noted that this approach, as presented in Option 2, might lend itself to responding to the transition by differentiating the character and height of each portion. (CS2-B, CS2-D, CS2-II, DC2-A)

2. **Architectural Context & Character.** The Board discussed the response of the design alternatives in regards to the established architectural character of the Green Lake Neighborhood and commercial corridor of Aurora, noting that the timing of the project is conducive to setting a precedent for future development in the area. (CS3-A, CS3-I, DC2-B, DC2-C, DC2-D, DC4-I)
    a. The Board requested a more thorough analysis of the urban context, focusing on how the design can respond to or reinterpret elements from the single-family areas and

commercial corridor. Consider craftsman-style features, fenestration patterns, proportions, and materiality to create a unique, but compatible architectural style. (CS3-A, DC2-A, DC2-B, DC2-C)

b. Modulation and secondary architectural features should be functional, and may provide an opportunity for the design to relate to the architectural context and create a compatible scale. (CS3-A, DC2-C)
c. The building should be visually integrated into the context in regards to scale and streetscape continuity, regardless of height. The Board requested images that show the proposal set within the context. (CS3-A)

3. **Street-Level Uses and Streetscape Design:** The Board recognized and agreed that the design and programming of street-level uses needs to respond to the varied context of each façade. (CS2-D, CS2-II, PL1-B, PL3-A, PL3-B, PL3-II, DC2-A, DC2-C)
   a. The Board was concerned about the access from 83rd Street, as it is a one-way street lined with single-family residences. The Board recommended access to be taken from Green Lake Drive, as the character of this streetscape is more conducive to both bicycle and vehicle traffic. (PL4-A, PL4-B, DC1-B)
   b. The Board would like to see more detail regarding the screening of the parking and associated landscaping along 83rd. The design of the parking should be designed to minimize noise and traffic impacts as to respect the established character along 83rd. (DC1-C, DC2-B, DC4-A)
   c. The Board recognized that the location of waste storage may change; however, it is not appropriate to be located adjacent to 83rd. (DC1-C)
   d. The streetscape along Green Lake Drive should be designed to encourage commercial uses and enhance pedestrian activity. Consider the arrangement of uses and design of the streetscape to encourage activity along Green Lake Drive. (PL1-B, PL3-B, DC3-A)
   e. The internal programming at the corner should respond to the context and design in a way that promotes human activity and enlivens the prominent and highly visible corner. The Board encouraged retail at the corner instead of residential amenity space. (CS2-C, CS2-I, PL1-A, DC1-A)
   f. The Board would like to see more information regarding the design concept and relationship of the open space at the corner to the building design and internal programming. (DC3-A, PL1-A, DC3-C, DC3-I, DC4-D)
   g. Consider an Olmstedian aesthetic in the design of the Green Lake Drive streetscape and corner open space. (CS2-A, DC3-I, DC4-D)

## SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE: July 27, 2015

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3019810) 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 DPD:

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

**Email:** PRC@seattle.gov

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

The following comments, issues and concerns were raised:

- Expressed the desire to have use other than existing car lot on site.
- Does not feel that the Aurora commercial character is appropriate, and that the building should express an architectural character more akin to that found in the Green Lake neighborhood.
- Concerned that the building is too massive.
- Concerned about the lack of parking.
- Disliked the conceptual "Green Lake" sign.
- Concerned over shadow impacts to existing structures and gardens on 83rd.
- Noted that the datum line used was that of the home with the highest elevation on the block.
- Appreciated the materials, felt the building is aesthetically pleasing.
- Encouraged the applicant to make the setbacks (whole structure and upper level setbacks) as large as possible to lessen the visual and shadow impacts.
- Supported the intended level of texture and detail.
- Supported the change of access to Green Lake Dr.
- Felt the design was a big improvement from the previous EDG, and appreciated the increased setbacks.
- Encouraged the applicant to limit the building height to 30 feet. Noted that there are no 40 foot tall buildings along Aurora in the vicinity, and that the proposal is out of character.
- Interested in tree species being proposed.
- Felt the façade composition was improved, but would like to see further evolution.
- Encouraged the applicant to design the building to blend into the streetscape.

## 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.

**SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE July 27, 2015**

1. **Massing and Context Response:**
    a. The Board felt the proposed massing and setbacks demonstrated a thoughtful response to the corner location and zone transition on the north and east sides of the site. (CS2-A, CS2-B, CS2-C, CS2-D, CS2-I, CS2-II, DC2-A)
    b. The concept of the setback of the upper level was supported by the Board as a strategy to reduce the perceived height of the building. However, the plane shift of the upper level set back is minimal. The Board encouraged the applicant to explore setting back the upper floor further, and/or bringing out the lower floors slightly to increase the distance of the setback. (CS1-B, CS2-B, CS2-D, CS2-II)
    c. The differentiated expression at the upper story helps to reduce the perceived height and bulk of the building, and the Board encouraged the applicant to explore design strategies that further achieve this objective. (CS1-B, CS2-B, CS2-D, CS2-II)
    d. The Board was concerned about the massing not engaging the streetscape at the location of the ground-level parking, and requested a study that demonstrates why the parking could not be lowered further to minimize the impacts on the streetscape and bring the second-level units closer to the sidewalk to help activate the street front. (CS2-B, PL1-B, DC1-B, DC1-C, DC2-B, DC3-A)
    e. Materials should be selected with consideration of how they relate to the uses and intended character. The Board suggested that the proposed wood may be more appropriate for the north façade instead of the gateway element as a more traditional residential material that would help transition to the residential zone. (DC2-B, DC4-A)

2. **Gateway & Corner Element**
    a. The massing, materials, and programming at the corner should demonstrate an integrated design response to the gateway corner. The Board encouraged the applicant to provide imagery of precedent studies that informed the design response to the gateway corner. (CS2-C, CS2-I, CS3-I, DC2-A, DC2-B, DC3-A)
    b. The materials used at the highly visible gateway corner should be durable, high quality, and reinforce the design concept. (CS2-C, CS2-I, PL3-A, DC4-A
    c. The Board requested more information regarding the materials and detailing of the upper three levels, including how these levels interact with the ground level. (DC2-A, DC2-B)
    d. The landscape element at the corner should be integrated into the design of the building and gateway corner element, and have a programmatic relationship to the ground-floor uses to encourage activity. The Board was concerned that the proposed landscape concept at the corner did not appear to relate to the design language of the building. In addition, the Board noted that the design should take the existing features (light poles, power poles, etc.) into consideration. (DC3-A, DC3-C, DC3-I)

3. **Parking & Streetscape at 83rd Ave**
    a. The generous set back is an appropriate response to the context and zone transition. (CS2-D, CS2-II)
    b. The ground-level façade and landscaping should engage the streetscape and contribute to the pedestrian experience and public realm. The Board noted that the landscaping appears to be designed for mitigating the visual impacts of the wall as opposed to being integrated into the overall design. The Board suggested various remedies, including adding live-work units or lowering the parking (see item 1.d above), and requested more detail regarding the screening approach for the parking, including how it interacts with the sidewalk. The Board was not enamored with the proposed wood fence, and suggested retaining walls or creating a podium at this level as possible design strategies. (PL1-B, DC1-C, DC2-A, DC2-D, DC2-B, DC3-A, DC4-D)
    c. The Board appreciated the extent of landscaping area provided, but expressed concern that the design is intended to hide the building. Explore options to integrate the landscaping with the design of the building. (DC3-A, DC3-C, DC3-I, DC4-A, DC4-D)

4. **East Façade and Parking**
    a. Consider how to use the conditions created by the topography and parking location as an opportunity for a successful transition. The Board encouraged the applicant to explore lidding the parking to provide a greater buffer or amenity space, or creating a podium at the ground level. (DC2-A, DC4-A, DC4-D)
    b. Demonstrate how the visual impacts of the open parking will be minimized. The Board was concerned about a potential blank wall condition along. (CS2-B, DC1-C, DC2-B)

**FIRST RECOMMENDATION: February 1, 2016**

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3019810) 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 DPD:

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

**Email:** PRC@seattle.gov

**PUBLIC COMMENT**
The following comments, issues and concerns were raised:

- Felt the proposal was out of scale with the existing streetscape.
- Concerned over the lack of parking.
- Thanked the project team for meeting with them.
- Appreciated changes that had been made to the landscaping, façade articulation, and composition.
- Preferred a three-story structure, as it would accommodate parking needs and be more in character with the residential neighborhood. Noted that there are no four-story structures in the vicinity.
- Parking is already difficult on 83rd, and the street can be hard to maneuver. Felt that more transit should be implemented before more density is added to the neighborhood.
- Concerned about the construction impacts.
- Felt that the design had greatly improved, but still concerned about the structure complementing the existing neighborhood form in scale and character and creating a step in the perceived height, bulk, and scale at the zone edge.
- Concerned about the combined traffic and parking impacts from this project and the nearby Bethany Church, and the impacts to safe and convenient pedestrian travel.

## PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

**FIRST RECOMMENDATION MEETING: FEBRUARY 1, 2016**
The Board supported the development of the design concept, but felt additional information and refinement was necessary to demonstrate a clear articulation of the design concept and resolution of the concerns raised at EDG.

1. **Gateway Corner.** The Board supported the concept of the large sculptural piece highlighting the massing at the corner but noted that the execution of this concept required additional refinement of the detailing and integration into the overall corner element. (CS2.A, CS2.B, CS2.C, CS2.I, PL1.A, PL1.B, DC1.A, DC2.A, DC2.B, DC3.A, DC3.C, DC4.A, DC4.D)
    a. The Board was concerned that the concept was too literal an interpretation of the concept, and noted that the final design should strive for a timeless expression.
    b. The relationship and hierarchy of the fenestration and metal sculptural screen should appear harmonious and integrated. As proposed, the windows break the structure of the screen and appear more dominant than the sculptural piece.
    c. The cap at the top of the massing which frames the sculptural piece, appears heavy and out of proportion with the thinner, more delicate lines of the trees. The Board suggested the sculptural piece fade as it ascends, without a hard cap at the top.
    d. As noted at EDG, the Board was concerned with how the massing meets the corner at grade. The grounding of the sculptural piece and massing needs additional refinement to create a cohesive gateway element. The concept for the sculptural piece should own the corner, and be a complete expression from top to

bottom. The integration of the corner landscape design and the upper massing and sculpture is crucial for relating the ground plane to the vertical massing.

1) The planter at the corner occupies a significant proportion of the space at grade, and does not have a clear rationale, nor appear to relate well to the pedestrian experience. Continue to explore landscaping options to further reinforce the expression of the gateway corner.
2) The single, small specimen tree appears out of scale with the strong massing, and creates an awkward relationship with the tree-themed sculptural element above. The height and type of landscaping provided should establish a clear relationship with the corner massing and material treatment.
3) The landscape design at the corner should relate to the streetscape design along 83rd Ave and Green Lake Drive N, and help to reinforce the overall streetscape concept.

e. The Board expressed concern about locating the amenity space at the ground-floor at the corner, as the lack of entries and inward-oriented use may have the net result of not providing adequate activation. Ideally, the gateway corner would be activated with a more public use such as retail use or have an entry into the interior space. The Board was also concerned that if programmed as an amenity space, it may not be used if adequate screening or privacy is not provided. The Board suggested using the metal sculpture to create a "fence" to give some perception of privacy at the ground-level, yet remain open and permeable.

2. **Streetscape at 83rd Ave.** The Board supported the concept of the streetscape design, including the tiered landscaping and planters along 83rd Ave as presented in the perspectives. However, more information is necessary to fully demonstrate the design response, including sections and elevations that explain the construction of the planters and how they meet grade. (CS2.B, PL1.B,PL3.B, DC1.C, DC2.B, DC2.C, DC2.D, DC3.A, DC4.D)
   a. The Board expressed some concern about the durability of the wood if taken down to grade.
   b. In addition, the Board would like to see weather protection added where possible.

3. **Massing and Zone Transition.** The Board felt not enough information was shown that demonstrated how the design has evolved since EDG regarding the strategies to minimize the height, bulk and scale, and provide a sensitive response to the abutting single family zone. (CS2.A, CS2.B, CS2.C, CS2.I, CS2.II, DC2.A, DC2.B, DC2.C, DC4.A)
   a. Include the studies that explored different massing strategies. Include pros and cons for each option, and demonstrate how the preferred response provides the most relief to the adjacent zone. Include sections and elevations with dimensions, as well as shadow studies.

b. The Board appreciated the strong horizontal datum line at the third story as it works to reduce the perceived height, and suggested exploring ways to strengthen this expression. The Board questioned if the tan vertical portions at the recessed areas were diminishing the datum line and working against this gesture.
**c.** The Board suggested pulling in the top floor at the northwest corner to further reduce the height, bulk and scale.

4. **Façade Composition and Materiality.** The Board generally supported the proposed materials and composition on the south and north façade, noting the use of wood appropriate scale of materials for these facades.

**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-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-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.

***Green Lake Supplemental Guidance:***

**CS2-I Responding to Site Characteristics**

**CS2-I-ii. Entry Locations:** Within the Green Lake Planning Area, certain locations serve as entry points into neighborhood and commercial areas. Development of properties at these "Entry Locations" should include elements suggesting an entry or gateway. Examples include a clock tower, turret or other architectural features, kiosks, benches, signage, landscaping, public art or other features that contribute to the demarcation of the area. For Entry Locations, see Map 1 on page 5 of Green Lake Guidelines.

**CS2-II Height, Bulk and Scale Compatibility**

**CS2-II-i. Zone Edges:** In such cases where a property with more-intensive zoning is adjacent to a property that contains such split zoning, the following design techniques are encouraged to improve the transition to the split-zoned lot:

a. Building setbacks similar to those specified in the Land Use Code for zone edges where a proposed development project within a more intensive zone abuts a lower intensive zone.

b. Techniques specified in the Seattle Design Guidelines regarding height, bulk, and scale; and relationship to adjacent sites.

c. Along a zone edge without an alley, consider additional methods that help reduce the potential 'looming' effect of a much larger structure in proximity to smaller, existing buildings.

d. One possibility is allowing the proposed structure's ground floor to be built to the property line and significantly stepping back the upper levels from the adjacent building (see sketch in the left column). The building wall at the property line should be designed in a manner sympathetic to the existing structure(s), particularly regarding privacy and aesthetic issues.

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

**CS3-A Emphasizing Positive Neighborhood Attributes**

**CS3-A-1. Fitting Old and New Together:** Create compatibility between new projects, and existing architectural context, including historic and modern designs, through building articulation, scale and proportion, roof forms, detailing, fenestration, and/or the use of complementary materials.

**CS3-A-3. Established Neighborhoods:** In existing neighborhoods with a well-defined architectural character, site and design new structures to complement or be compatible with the architectural style and siting patterns of neighborhood buildings.

**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.

***Green Lake Supplemental Guidance:***

**CS3-I Architectural Context**

**CS3-I-i. Aurora Avenue North Corridor:** Recognize Aurora's 1920-1950 commercial character while making the area more friendly to the pedestrian. Specific architectural cues include creative and playful signage, simple post-WW II and flamboyant architecture.

## 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.

**PL1-B Walkways and Connections**

**PL1-B-3. Pedestrian Amenities:** Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian oriented open spaces to enliven the area and attract interest and interaction with the site and building should be considered.

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

**PL3-B Residential Edges**

**PL3-B-3. Buildings with Live/Work Uses:** Maintain active and transparent facades in the design of live/work residences. Design the first floor so it can be adapted to other commercial use as needed in the future.

***Green Lake Supplemental Guidance:***

**PL3-II. Transition Between Residence and Street.**

**PL3-II-ii.** On Mixed Use Corridors, primary business and residential entrances should be oriented to the commercial street. Secondary and service entries should be located off the alley, side street or parking lots.

**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-A-2. Connections to All Modes:** Site the primary entry in a location that logically relates to building uses and clearly connects all major points of access.

**PL4-B Planning Ahead for Bicyclists**

**PL4-B-1. Early Planning:** Consider existing and future bicycle traffic to and through the site early in the process so that access and connections are integrated into the project along with other modes of travel.

## DESIGN CONCEPT

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

**DC1-A Arrangement of Interior Uses**

**DC1-A-3. Flexibility:** Build in flexibility so the building can adapt over time to evolving needs, such as the ability to change residential space to commercial space as needed.

**DC1-A-4. Views and Connections:** Locate interior uses and activities to take advantage of views and physical connections to exterior spaces and uses.

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

**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-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-B-2. Blank Walls:** Avoid large blank walls along visible façades wherever possible. Where expanses of blank walls, retaining walls, or garage facades are unavoidable, include uses or design treatments at the street level that have human scale and are designed for pedestrians.

**DC2-C Secondary Architectural Features**

**DC2-C-1. Visual Depth and Interest:** Add depth to facades where appropriate by incorporating balconies, canopies, awnings, decks, or other secondary elements into the façade design. Add detailing at the street level in order to create interest for the pedestrian and encourage active street life and window shopping (in retail areas).

**DC2-C-3. Fit With Neighboring Buildings:** Use design elements to achieve a successful fit between a building and its neighbors.

**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

**DC3 Open Space Concept: Integrate open space design with the building design so that they complement each 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-C Design**

**DC3-C-1. Reinforce Existing Open Space:** Where a strong open space concept exists in the neighborhood, reinforce existing character and patterns of street tree planting, buffers or treatment of topographic changes. Where no strong patterns exist, initiate a strong open space concept that other projects can build upon in the future.

**DC3-C-2. Amenities/Features:** Create attractive outdoor spaces suited to the uses envisioned for the project.

***Green Lake Supplemental Guidance:***

**DC3-I Landscape Design to Address Special Site Conditions**

**DC3-I-i. Celebrate the Olmsted heritage**. Green Lake Park, Ravenna Boulevard and Lower Woodland Park are visible and accessible examples of the Olmsted brothers' design. New

development should build on this character by employing informal groupings of large and small trees and shrubs. A mix of deciduous, evergreen, and ornamental plant materials is appropriate. Continuous rows of street trees contrasting with the informal, asymmetric landscaping of open spaces are also typical (see the following page for examples).

**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-D Trees, Landscape, and Hardscape Materials**

**DC4-D-1. Choice of Plant Materials:** Reinforce the overall architectural and open space design concepts through the selection of landscape materials.

**DC4-D-2. Hardscape Materials:** Use exterior courtyards, plazas, and other hard surfaced areas as an opportunity to add color, texture, and/or pattern and enliven public areas through the use of distinctive and durable paving materials. Use permeable materials wherever possible.

**DC4-D-3. Long Range Planning:** Select plants that upon maturity will be of appropriate size, scale, and shape to contribute to the site as intended.

**DC4-D-4. Place Making:** Create a landscape design that helps define spaces with significant elements such as trees.

***Green Lake Supplemental Guidance:***

**DC4-I Architectural Context**

**DC4-I-i. Signage:** The design and placement of signs plays an important role in the visual character and identity of the community. While regulatory sign review is not in the purview of Design Review, integration with the overall architectural expression of a building and appropriate scale and orientation are important design considerations. Franchises should not be given exceptions to these guidelines. Signs on Aurora Ave. North should acknowledge Aurora's 1920-1950 commercial character. Sign designs, including those for corporate franchises, are encouraged to be playful, interesting, and colorful in order to respond to desirable elements of the corridor's commercial strip heritage. See guidelines for full list of sign types.

## DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board's recommendation on the requested departure(s) will be based upon the departure's potential to help the project better meet these design guideline priorities and achieve a better overall design than could be achieved without the departure(s).

At the time of the Recommendation meeting, the following departure was requested:

1. **Sight Triangle. (SMC 23.54.030.G.1):** The Code requires that for two-way driveways of 22 feet wide of more, a sight triangle on the side of the driveways used as an exit is to be provided and to be kept clear of any obstruction for a distance of 10 feet from the intersection of the driveway and the sidewalk. The applicant proposes a reduction of the right sight triangle.

The Board indicated they would recommend the departure if the entries to the live-work units are shifted away from the garage entry, and if further explanation of the potential impacts to the adjacent unit are addressed at the next meeting. The Board noted that reducing the sight triangle would lessen the impact of the garage entry on the pedestrian realm, and may help to slow traffic and further minimized pedestrian conflicts. (DC1-C, DC2-B)

## RECOMMENDATIONS

**The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated February 1, 2016, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the February 1, 2016 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the five Design Review Board members unanimously recommended the project return for another Recommendation Meeting.**