



City of Seattle

Department of Construction and Inspections

Nathan Torgelson, Director



SECOND RECOMMENDATION OF THE EAST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Project Number: 3020301

Address: 1300 E. Pike

Applicant: Aaron Swain, Weber Thompson

Date of Meeting: Wednesday, November 30, 2016

Board Members Present: Natalie Gualy (Chair)
Curtis Bigelow
Sarah Saviskas

Board Members Absent: Christina Orr-Cahall
Dan Foltz
Barbara Busetti

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

SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: Neighborhood Commercial 3, Pedestrian Designation 65' height limit (NC3P-65)

Nearby Zones: (North) NC3P-65
(South) NC3P-65
(East) NC3P-65
(West) NC3P-65

Lot Area: 10,160 square feet (sq. ft.)

Overlay: Urban Center Village
Pike Pine Conservation
Frequent Transit
Pedestrian Zone



Current Development:

The proposal site is located in the Broadway neighborhood of Capitol Hill within the Pike-Pine Conservation Overlay which encourages the retention of character structures; building structures in existence prior to 1940, just outside of the districts "Conservation Core". The site is currently occupied by what has been referred to in recent years as the Fran's Chocolate Company building, a 6,560 square foot, single story, brick clad building built in 1926.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:

The proposal site is located at the northwest corner of 13th Avenue East and East Pike Street on a flag shaped parcel. The site is located within the Pike/Pine Urban Center Village within a Frequent Transit Corridor where the provision of off street parking is not a requirement. This area is characterized as one of the most densely populated neighborhoods in the city, with large numbers of restaurants, stores and services reachable within a several block radius. Historically this area especially along Broadway Avenue and Pike Street was known as Seattle's first "Auto Row". Over past 35 years however a diverse group of arts and cultural organizations have also been re-occupying many former light industrial buildings in the area.

Located immediately to the east of the site is a single story brick clad commercial building built in 1905. Located to the north is a refurbished historic three story mixed use commercial/residential structure built in 1906. Located immediately to the west is the single-story Public Storage building, while located to on the southwest corner of East Pike and 13th Ave. is the three story Elysian Brewing Company building, formerly the Packard automobile storage building built sometime in 1919. Located just to the north of there is a single-story Bank of America building and parking lot.

Access:

Primary vehicular access to the proposal site would be north off of E. Pike St. and then east off of 13th Ave. via a ramp leading to below grade parking spaces. Primary residential access would be east off of 13th Ave. into a lobby entryway leading up to an open stairway system designed as large 'balcony landings' designed to act as gathering/amenity spaces. Access to the commercial retail spaces will either be north off of E. Pike Ave through an outdoor space created by a porous metal screen structure or north off of 13th Ave. E. into a smaller office/retail space.

Environmentally Critical Areas:

There are no mapped Environmentally Critical Areas onsite.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A 6-story mixed-use residential/commercial retail development at the corner of 13th Ave. East and East Pike Street. The project designed as a first of its kind sustainable apartment building that includes Passive House design elements that aid in reducing building energy needs to as close to zero as possible. The development includes 45 residential units above 2,900 square feet of ground level commercial space, and 13 below grade parking spaces.

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

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

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

Mailing Public Resource Center

Address: 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:

- Concerned that yet another character structure will be demolished in the heart of the Pike/Pine neighborhood and questions PPUNC support of the project when they do not represent the 'communities public opinion'.
- Concerned that the visual character of the proposed option does not fit the typical commercial character of the area.
- General concern that the live-work units will not activate the street and therefore will not be successful. This opinion was echoed by both the general public as well as the Board.
- Suggested that the proposed design should reflect the historic character of the neighborhood or compliment it with 'smart modern architecture'.
- Supported the project proposal and the fact that it will be using sustainable building elements and operational techniques. The Board also strongly supported the sustainable building approach and suggested that this project might be a model for other projects to follow in the future.
- Supported the preferred option with the belief that the design should be further fleshed out. The Board was in agreement with this position in that members of the Board stated that they did not understand the projects overall design theme as the graphic material did not match many of the inspirational images presented in the EDG packet. The Board

wanted the applicant to further develop an overall design concept that further matched some of the imagery they identified as being inspirational to their design concept.

- Supported the preferred option while voicing concern that the base of the building does not go far enough in matching the upper portion of the building.
- Supported the general design approach for the project and supported the demolition of the existing character structure. The Board agreed with the approach of removing the character structure as it has so drastically been altered and to use it would only amount to pasting the shell of a former façade that once had character but has since lost that character due to so many drastic alterations.

RECOMMENDATION September 21, 2016

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3020301) 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

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following comments were offered at the Initial Recommendation meeting:

- Excited about the passive house approach to the design proposal.
- Commented that the stairs located behind the screen were an interesting feature.
- Commented that the 'feature stairs' are active.
- Were in agreement with the departure requests.
- Agreed with the activation of the corner retail along with retail elements continuing up the hill.
- A member of PPUNC read a letter in support of the mural as well as the overall project design and how the design team has engaged with the community to create a unique design for the neighborhood.

RECOMMENDATION November 30, 2016

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3020301) 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

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following comments were offered at the Final Recommendation meeting:

- Liked the passive house concept.
- Commented that the screening detail is an interesting feature.
- Liked the incorporation of the wood beams.
- Did not like that the preservation incentives are not being utilized.
- Felt that buildings connected to the Pike Pine neighborhood should be linked to the historical buildings associated with auto row which are being lost.
- Street level should be hand set brick as well as the application of terracotta details from the existing building as part of the design approach.
- Believes the use of hardie board is inconsistent with design criteria which targets the use of brick masonry, concrete, true stucco, wood and metal.
- Preferred the building massing from the earlier design guidance as it maintains the roof line of the existing building which makes the proposed building out of line with the existing buildings as the design guidelines say to reference the existing buildings.
- Would like to see a commitment to the introduction of three small business spaces as the Pike Pine area has lost small retail spaces due to recent development.
- PPNC and Environmental District are in support of the project overall as well as the approach to installing the mural that tells the story of the Passive House and the historic district.
- Supported the project as it helps to create a lively and attractive environment at the pedestrian scale.
- Commended the project for striving for environmental sustainability.
- Supported Passive House concepts for this neighborhood as it is new and has never been done in this area.
- Supported the project as being an improvement to the area and feels that it is well detailed.

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.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE March 26, 2016

1. **Natural Systems and Site Features:** The Board was supportive of the project's deep green sustainability goals, possibly acting as a "prototype" for other future projects. **(CS1-A)**
2. **Massing & Relationship to Context:** At the first EDG, the Board noted that they did not completely understand the overall design approach the applicant was trying to execute. The Board also expressed concerns that the massing of the three options did not relate to the inspirational imagery presented in the applicant's development photographs. As such the Board was confused as to what overall design character the applicant is striving for.

In discussing the southwest corner of the building façade of the preferred option, the Board was divided on the erosion of the massing at that corner with one Board member opposed to the whole concept of erosion at that locale. Overall, the Board members did not oppose the massing of the preferred design scheme. Board members generally agreed that they would like to see a stronger relationship between the base and the upper reaches of the building.

- a. The Board directed the applicant to explore additional approaches to the massing alternatives. **(CS2-C, CS2-D, CS3-A, CS3-B, DC2-A, DC2-B)**
 - b. For the next meeting, the Board suggested that the design of the entry court be developed further to show more connectedness with stair landings and courtyard area and more thoughtfulness to public safety at along 13th Avenue. **(CS2-D, PL2-A, PL2-B, PL3)**
3. **Entries/Access & Security**
 - a. The Board expressed general support for an internal courtyard/entryway concept that connected the joint residential/retail entry presented but wanted to make sure that the space is safe and secure by possibly making it more transparent. **(PL3-B-1, PL3-B-2, PL3-B-3)**
 - b. The Board suggested that the stair and entryway should be more inviting allowing visitors to see into the courtyard space. **(DC1-A-1, DC1-A-4, PL3-B-1)**
 - c. The Board generally supported the exterior stair as a major visual element on the west facing facade. Some Board members liked the concept of the viewing "porch"/integrated as open space at each level. The Board wanted to see a stronger connection between the stair/porch elements and the courtyard and joint retail-residential entryway and suggested that the concept be further enhanced for the next EDG meeting. **(DC1-A-1, DC1-A-4, DC3-A-1, DC4-C-1, PL3-B-1)**

4. Pedestrian Realm, Streetscape & Uses

- a. The Board generally supported the commercial retail floor space presented at the EDG although they felt that the shared retail lobby entry needed to be actively connected to the open stairway 'view balconies' by bringing more landscaping, lighting and other elements down from the stairs into the lobby. The Board was also concerned that the ground level retail/entry lobby might not have enough visual transparency especially from 13th Avenue. The Board suggested that the entry/lobby as viewed from 13th Avenue direction needs to be a safe environment with lines of sight and sufficient lighting to make the space feel safer. As such, the Board requested that the design of the stair be further developed. **(PL2-B-2, PL2-B-3, PL3-A-1-a, PL3-A-1-c)**
- b. The Board had reservations about the viability of the proposed live/work units and expressed the need to maintain a high degree of transparency in order to activate the street along 13th Ave. **(PL2-B-2, PL2-B-3)**
- c. The Board reinforced the challenge of creating live/work units to activate the street, citing the common occurrence of primarily residential-use live/work units resulting in large windows with blinds/shades perpetually drawn. Board members requested that the design of the live/work units particularly the street frontage be further developed for presentation at the next meeting.

5. Architectural Character

- a. The Board was generally split on the architectural character shown for the preferred option and how it related to the inspirational imagery depicted in the packet. Board members wanted more of the elements depicted in the inspirational images such as entry treatments, window patterning, and exterior stair treatment integrated into the design of the preferred options. The Board also wanted to see further depth along the building facades where appropriate by incorporating balconies, canopies, awnings, decks, or other secondary elements into the façade design. **(DC2-A-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-B-2, DC2-C-1, DC2-C-2, DC2-C-3, DC2-D-2)**
- b. The Board agreed that materials and façade treatments will be of critical importance to the success of the project and directed the applicant to explore the use of brick at the base of the structure to immortalizing a more historical feel for the façade. **(DC4-A-1, DC4-A-2)**

6. Open Space Concept

- a. The Board generally supported the use of the rooftop as a green amenity space and requested the design of the rooftop amenity be developed further for presentation at the next meeting. **(DC3-C-1)**
- b. The Board agreed that the exterior stairway facing 13th Avenue would be a major design element and generally supported the viewing gather porch area as an open space amenity. The Board suggested incorporating landscaping and other elements into the stair feature as a means of connecting the stair, courtyard and entryway into a unified experience. The Board requested the design of the stair be developed further for presentation at the next meeting and emphasized that it must be well

executed in order to be part of a successful design concept. (DC3-A1, DC3-C-1, DC3-I, DC3-II).

INITIAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING (September 21, 2016)

- 1. Natural Systems and Site Features:** At the recommendation meeting, the Board echoed public sentiment and continued to support the passive house approach to the development. but felt that the revised building design had evolved into three different non-integrated design elements consisting of the feature stair, the screened outdoor courtyard space and the south and east facing building facades, See #2 below for further guidance. (CS1-A, CS1-B-2)
- 2. Architectural Character:** The Board while encouraging the design team to abandon the design option that favored the preservation of the character structure, felt that the overall parti of the revised design had been compromised. The Board was not in agreement with the revised design approach that emphasized the strong vertical color elements along the south and west facing building facades. They felt that the vertical articulation of the facade was now in direct competition with the stair, and because of the high contrast of the facade treatment, the stair felt diminished. Board also felt that the impact of the feature stair element discussed in detail at the EDG in addition to the screened outdoor spaces located along the stairwell had become visually separated from the overall building form and the without integrating into the rest of the building or feature stair. Members verbalized that they thought that the project had become three different building types without a unifying design approach. The Board agreed that the revised design elements were no longer representative of the precedent images included in the design packet. (DC2-A-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-B-2, DC2-C-1, DC2-C-2, DC2-C-3, DC2-D-2)
- 3. Commercial/Retail:** The Board agreed with public comment and was very pleased to see the introduction of commercial use with retail space along 13th Ave E. instead of live/work units. Members felt that the commercial space would work better in activating the street. (CS2-A-2, CS2-C-1)
- 4. Entries/Access:** The Board felt that the 'feature stair' described as a major visual element located on the west facing façade during EDG was greatly diminished as a result of the introduction of other more prominent building elements and colors. The Board felt that the programming and the aesthetic treatment expressed in the original concept of the viewing "porch" as an integrated open space at each level had become less significant. The Board reminded the applicant that they wanted to see how the porches would be used as gathering spaces per guidance from the last meeting. The Board discussed that there was a conflict between the use of wood elements in the interior of the stair system that reached up in the guise of a tree to the green spaces of the rooftop deck and the lighter appearance of the filigree screened outdoor courtyard space. There was also some concern with the capping or roof covering of feature stair. (DC1-A-1, DC1-A-4, PL3-B-1)

5. **Courtyard:** The Board agreed that the courtyard had been successfully redesigned using operable gates which improved security and safety. The Board noted a concern that the courtyard was redesigned for commercial retail users and no longer for residential users. Members were more comfortable with the idea of the space being used in conjunction with an active retail or restaurant use as opposed to the possibility that the space might be used in associated with a drug store reducing the effectiveness of the space activating the street. **(CS2-A-2, CS2-C-1, PL3-A, PL3-B)**
6. **Lighting:** The Board members wanted to see better lighting that creates a better glow of the stair and courtyard. The Board in reviewing the different night images of the project presented by the applicant suggested that they would like to see more light in relationship to the screened exterior courtyard space. **(DC4-C-2) (DC4-C-2)**
7. **Wood Elements:** Board members supported the forest meadow concept associated with the use of wood elements within the interior of the feature stair
8. **Materials:** Board members verbalized disappointed that Hardie Board would be used along E. Pike St., characterized as a prominent street. Members felt that the use of Hardie would not be in keeping with the history and character of many of the surrounding building structures and were concerned it would set a negative precedence contrary to sustainable design practices in addition to having concerns regarding the quality of the facade composition and texture along Pike Street which are addressed by the neighborhood design guidelines for Pike Pine. Finally the Board stated that they would like to see a more attractive treatment applied to the garage door located to the west of the residential entry. **(DC4-A, DC4-I)**
9. **Mural:** Members of the Board were concerned that the mural might be subject to graffiti or become obscured if new development were to take place on the abutting lot. A suggestion was offered that the mural might be more of an abstraction rather than an actual image. The Board did continue to agree that treatment of this blank wall with artistic elements would be supported
10. **Landscape Plans:** Board members mention that they would have liked to have seen landscaping elements brought up from the lower level through the feature stair and up to the roof area. The concept of the meadow at ground level and meadow at the top with greenery connecting the two.

FINAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING (November 30, 2016)

1. **Natural Systems and Site Features:** The Board appreciated the applicant's explanation of how major issues identified at the previous recommendation meeting were addressed. The

Board verbalized their continued support for the Passive House approach and how the project continued pushing sustainable energy goals forward. **(CS1-A, CS1-B-2)**

2. **Architectural Character:** The Board was split in terms of their support of the design concepts presented at the Second Recommendation meeting.
 - a. The Board was in agreement that the overall building design had significantly improved since the previous recommendation meeting. **State those elements they felt had improved.... DC2-A-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-B-2, DC2-C-1, DC2-C-2, DC2-C-3, DC2-D-2)**
 - b. Concerns were raised by some Board members about the following issues:
 - i. The design was still not based on one unifying design but rather 4 or 5 different design ideas plus one new one with the exterior window shades contrary to the Boards directive at the previous recommendation meeting. **(CS3, DC2-B-1, DC2-B-2, DC2-C-1, DC2-C-2, DC2-C-3, DC2-D-2)**
 - ii. Wished the design team had focused on one unifying design idea so that they could integrate better, higher end materials. Specifically, the lack of one unifying design theme has impacted the choice to use lesser quality materials and reinforced the concern from the previous meeting that the Board would not support the use of cementitious panels. **(CS3, DC2-A-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-B-2, DC2-C-1, DC4)**
3. **Commercial/Retail:** The Board continued to praise the design and development team for pursuing commercial use along 13th Ave.
 - a. The Board, in lieu of conditioning the space to have three separate commercial spaces which they acknowledged would be difficult, liked the flexibility of the space with the use of the movable planters that could define how the spaces including the outdoor area might be used. **(CS2-A-2, CS2-C-1)**
 - b. The Board was also supportive of a possible office use along 13th **(CS2-A-2, CS2-C-1)**
4. **Garage Door:** At the previous recommendation meeting, the Board stated that they wanted to see a more attractive treatment applied to the garage door located to the west of the residential entry. The Board was concerned that the garage door had not changed per the direction provided at the first recommendation meeting. The Board noted that the garage door had increased in size and was concerned that the garage door is being sized for a future project. The Board acknowledged that the color or the garage had changed but not the design of the door itself. The Board was non-committal as to whether the change in color had met the Boards guidelines. **(DC4-A, DC4-I)**
5. **Entries/Access:** The Board continued to support the 'feature stair' as a major design element. The Board appreciated the reconfiguration and the direction change of the stairs.

Some concern was raised that the interstitial space underneath the stairs had not been resolved. **(DC1-A-1, DC1-A-4, PL3-B-1)**

6. Landscape Plans and Stair Feature:

- a. Board members mentioned that they would have liked to have seen landscaping elements brought up from the lower level through the feature stair and up to the roof area. The concept being of the meadow at ground level and meadow at the top with greenery connecting the two levels. At the previous recommendation, this connection was lacking, so Board members requested that the connection be addressed. The Board felt that this did not happen as the landscape plan had not changed. **(CS2, DC4)**
 - b. The Board was concerned about the resolution of the stair and that the area underneath the landing had not been resolved. **(DC1-A-1, DC1-A-4, PL3-B-1)**
 - c. The Board stated that the stairway lighting had improved. **(CS2-A-2, CS2-C-1, PL3-A, PL3-B)**
- 7. Courtyard:** The reiterated how they fully supported the courtyard design as a concept.
- 8. Lighting:** The Board agreed that the stairway lighting and the glow as it is represented in the updated packet was greatly improved and will really celebrate the stairwell. **(DC4-C-2)**
- 9. Wood Elements:** The Board stated that they previously supported the wood elements and metal as focus pieces of the project and they agreed that bringing the wood into the window frames above has enhanced the project. Board members supported the forest meadow concept associated with the use of wood elements within the interior of the feature stair. The Board also stated that the overall design had improved by adding the wood elements into the windows which helped to enhance the project by eliminating one material and better unified the whole project. **(CS2-A-2, CS2-C-1, PL3-A, PL3-B)**
- 10. Materials:** An individual Board member reiterated strong concerns that the Board did not support cementitious product on this project because cementitious material would set a bad precedent for this key location. Other Board members recognized the sustainable nature of the project and that there was a need to balance the use of cheaper materials and the attainment of a more costly sustainable project. Members were not in agreement with the position that the design chose too many design elements and materials.. Conversely other Board members suggested that the project has done a better job in unifying all of the design elements into a better design and that the use of cementitious siding is no longer such an issue. It was stated that the design team had gone in a very strong direction to meet a lot of the Boards directives by removing the emphasis on the verticals so that the design has become more simplified and integrating the wood of the storefront detail into

the windows has neutralized the pallet and made the design stronger and more like the precedent images shown in the Recommendation Packet #2. **(DC4-A, DC4-I)**

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-A ENERGY USE:

CS1-A-1. Energy Choices: At the earliest phase of project development, examine how energy choices may influence building form, siting, and orientation, and factor in the findings when making siting and design decisions.

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.

Pike/Pine 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-II Corner Lots: Buildings on corner lots should reinforce the street corner. To help celebrate the corner, pedestrian entrances and other design features that lend to Pike/Pine's character may be incorporated. These features include architectural detailing, cornice work or frieze designs. The following corner sites are identified as Pike/Pine gateways (see map 1, page 2).

CS2-II-i. Pike/Boren: southeast corner

CS2-II-ii. Melrose/Pine: northeast corner

CS2-II-iii. 12th/Pike intersection

CS2-II-iv. 12th/Pine intersection

CS2-II-v. Madison: between 11th/12th

CS2-II-vi. Madison entries onto Pike and Pine

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

CS3-I Height, Bulk, and Scale Compatibility and Pike/Pine Scale and Proportion

Relate the scale and proportions of architectural features and elements to existing structures on the block face to maintain block face rhythm and continuity.

CS3-I-i. Align architectural features with patterns established by the vernacular architecture of neighborhood structures to create visual continuity.

CS3-I-ii. Use building components that are similar in size and shape to those found in structures along the street from the auto row period.

CS3-I-iii. Keep the proportions of window and door openings similar to those of existing character structures on the block or in the neighborhood.

CS3-I-iv. Use windows compatible in proportion, size, and orientation to those found in character structures in the surrounding area.

PUBLIC LIFE

PL1 Connectivity Complement and contribute to the network of open spaces around the site and the connection among

PL1-C. OUTDOOR USES AND ACTIVITIES

PL1-C-1. Selecting Activity Areas: Concentrate activity areas in places with sunny exposure, views across spaces, and in direct line with pedestrian routes.

PL1-C-2. Informal Community Uses: In addition to places for walking and sitting, consider including space for informal community use such as performances, farmer’s markets, kiosks and community bulletin boards, cafes, or street vending.

PL1-C-3. Year-Round Activity: Where possible, include features in open spaces for activities beyond daylight hours and throughout the seasons of the year, especially in neighborhood centers where active open space will contribute vibrancy, economic health, and public safety. These may include:

- a. seasonal plantings or displays and/or water features;
- b. outdoor heaters;
- c. overhead weather protection;
- d. ample, moveable seating and tables and opportunities for outdoor dining;
- e. an extra level of pedestrian lighting;
- f. trees for moderate weather protection and shade; and/or
- g. 24-hour Wi-Fi service.

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 through strategic placement of doors, windows, balconies and street-level uses.

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.

Pike/Pine Supplemental Guidance:

PL2. Walkability: Create a safe, comfortable, walking environment that is easy to navigate and well-connected to existing pedestrian walkways and features.

PL2-I. PERSONAL SAFETY AND SECURITY: Lighting installed for pedestrians should be hooded or directed to pathways leading towards buildings.

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. Scale and detail them to function well for their anticipated use and also to fit with the building of which they are a part, differentiating residential and commercial entries with design features and amenities specific to each.

- a. Office/commercial lobbies should be visually connected to the street through the primary entry and sized to accommodate the range and volume of foot traffic anticipated;
- b. Retail entries should include adequate space for several patrons to enter and exit simultaneously, preferably under cover from weather.
- c. Common entries to multi-story residential buildings need to provide privacy and security for residents but also be welcoming and identifiable to visitors. Design features emphasizing the entry as a semi-private space are recommended and may be accomplished through signage, low walls and/or landscaping, a recessed entry area, and other detailing that signals a break from the public sidewalk.
- d. Individual entries to ground-related housing should be scaled and detailed appropriately to provide for a more intimate type of entry. The design should contribute to a sense of identity, opportunity for personalization, offer privacy, and emphasize personal safety and security for building occupants.

PL3-A-2. 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. Consider a range of elements such as:

- a. overhead shelter: canopies, porches, building extensions;
- b. transitional spaces: stoops, courtyards, stairways, portals, arcades, pocket gardens, decks;
- c. ground surface: seating walls; special paving, landscaping, trees, lighting; Above-grade residential entries and extensive and
- d. building surface/interface: privacy screens, upward-operating shades on windows, signage, lighting.

PL3-B RESIDENTIAL EDGES

PL3-B-1. Security and Privacy: Provide security and privacy for residential buildings through the use of a buffer or semi-private space between the development and the street or neighboring buildings. Consider design approaches such as elevating the main floor, providing a setback from the sidewalk, and/or landscaping to indicate the transition from one type of space to another.

PL3-B-2. Ground-level Residential: Privacy and security issues are particularly important in buildings with ground-level housing, both at entries and where windows are located

overlooking the street and sidewalk. Consider providing a greater number of transition elements and spaces, and choose materials carefully to clearly identify the transition from public sidewalk to private residence. In addition to the ideas in PL3.B1, design strategies include:

- a. vertical modulation and a range of exterior finishes on the facade to articulate the location of residential entries;
- b. pedestrian-scaled building addressing and signage, and entry elements such as mail slots/boxes, doorbells, entry lights, planter boxes or pots; and
- c. a combination of window treatments at street level, to provide solutions to varying needs for light, ventilation, noise control, and privacy.

PL3-B-3. Buildings with Live/Work Uses: Maintain active and transparent facades in the design of live/work residences that are required to orient the nonresidential portions of the unit toward the street. Design the first floor so it can be adapted to other commercial use as needed in the future.

PL3-B-4. Interaction: Provide opportunities for interaction among residents and neighbors. Consider locating commonly used features or services such as mailboxes, outdoor seating, seasonal displays, children’s play equipment, and space for informal events in the area between buildings as a means of encouraging interaction.

PL3-C Retail Edges

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

PL3-C-2. Visibility: Maximize visibility into the building interior and merchandise displays. Consider fully operational glazed wall-sized doors that can be completely opened to the street, increased height in lobbies, and/or special lighting for displays.

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

DESIGN CONCEPT

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. In addition, special situations such as very large sites, unusually shaped sites, or sites with varied topography may require particular attention to where and how building massing is arranged as they can accentuate mass and height.

DC2-A-2. Reducing Perceived Mass: Use secondary architectural elements to reduce the perceived mass of larger projects. Consider creating recesses or indentations in the building envelope; adding balconies, bay windows, porches, canopies or other elements; and/or highlighting building entries.

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.

- a. newsstands, ticket booths and flower shops (even if small or narrow);
- b. green walls, landscaped areas or raised planters;
- c. wall setbacks or other indentations;
- d. display windows; trellises or other secondary elements;
- e. art as appropriate to area zoning and uses; and/or
- f. terraces and landscaping where retaining walls above eye level are unavoidable.

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-2. Dual Purpose Elements: Consider architectural features that can be dual purpose—adding depth, texture, and scale as well as serving other project functions. Examples include shading devices and windows that add rhythm and depth as well as contribute toward energy efficiency and/or savings or canopies that provide street-level scale and detail while also offering weather protection. Where these elements are prominent design features, the quality of the materials is critical.

DC2-D-3. Fit With Neighboring Buildings: Use design elements to achieve a successful fit between a building and its neighbors, such as: a. considering aspects of neighboring buildings through architectural style, roof line, datum line detailing, fenestration, color or materials, b. using trees and landscaping to enhance the building design and fit with the surrounding context, and/or c. creating a well-proportioned base, middle and top to the building in locations where this might be appropriate. Consider how surrounding buildings have addressed base, middle, and top, and whether those solutions—or similar ones—might be a good fit for the project and its context.

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. Pay special attention to the first three floors of the building in order to maximize opportunities to engage the pedestrian and enable an active and vibrant street front.

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.

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

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-2. Matching Uses to Conditions: Respond to changing environmental conditions such as seasonal and daily light and weather shifts through open space design and/or programming of open space activities. For example, place outdoor seating and gathering areas where there is sunny exposure and shelter from wind. Build flexibility into the design in order to accommodate changes as needed; e.g. a south-facing courtyard that is ideal in spring may become too hot in summer, necessitating a shift of outdoor furniture to a shadier location for the season.

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), barbecues, 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. BUILDING MATERIALS

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. Highly visible features, such as balconies, grilles and railings should be especially attractive, well-crafted and easy to maintain. Pay particular attention to environments that create harsh conditions that may require special materials and details, such as marine areas or open or exposed sites.

DC4-C. LIGHTING

DC4-C-1. Functions: Use lighting both to increase site safety in all locations used by pedestrians and to highlight architectural or landscape details and features such as entries, signs, canopies, plantings, and art.

DC4-C-2. Avoiding Glare: Design project lighting based upon the uses on and off site, taking care to provide illumination to serve building needs while avoiding off-site night glare and light pollution.

DC4-E. PROJECT ASSEMBLY AND LIFESPAN

DC4-C-1. Deconstruction: When possible, design the project so that it may be deconstructed at the end of its useful lifetime, with connections and assembly techniques that will allow reuse of materials.

Pike/Pine Supplemental Guidance:

DC4. Exterior Elements and Finishes: Use appropriate and high quality elements and finishes for the building and its open spaces.

DC4-I EXTERIOR FINISH MATERIALS: New development should complement the neighborhood's light-industrial vernacular through type and arrangement of exterior building materials. Preferred materials and approaches include:

DC4-I-i. Brick, masonry, textured or patterned concrete, true stucco (Dry-vit is discouraged), with wood and metal as secondary or accent materials;

DC4-I-ii. Other high quality materials that work well with the historic materials and style of neighboring buildings;

DC4-I-iii. Limited number of exterior finish materials per building; and

DC4-I-iv. High quality glazing and trim as a vital component of exterior finish.

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 City Wide and Pike/Pine design guidelines priorities and achieve a better overall project design than could be achieved without the departure(s). The Board's recommendation will be reserved until the final Board meeting.

At the time of the Early Design Guidance meeting, there were no requests for departures however the recommendation meeting the applicant requests three departures related to street level uses along 13th Avenue E. which is a designated principal pedestrian street.

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

- 1. Street-Level Uses along 13th Ave E. (SMC 23.47A.005.D.1.i):** The Code states that no more than 30 feet of the street-level, street-facing facade of a structure may contain an office use. The applicant is requesting an additional 6'-0" (for a total of 36') of office use frontage for this ground floor space to allow for flexibility in using the space as either a retail or office space.

As designed, Pike Street has 100% street level commercial use. Without the requested departure, a secondary egress would need to be introduced along Pike Street, reducing the amount of ground level commercial building frontage. With the departure, a secondary egress can be located added along 13th Ave., allowing for additional frontage along 13th will offset the need for a secondary egress use without the departure a secondary egress along Pike Street would be necessary thus reducing the amount of commercial use along the street. The departure would

The use of moveable planters will allow for privacy for an office use or flexibility in creating a small open outdoor space for retail use. (PL2-B.3, DC3-C.2, CS2-B.3)

I am confused by this - let's discuss further.

The Board unanimously recommended that SDCI grant the departure.

- 2. Street Level Development Standards along 13th Ave E. (SMC 23.47A.008.C.4.a):** The Code requires continuous overhead weather protection (i.e., canopies, awnings, marquees, and arcades) along at least 60 percent of the street frontage of a structure on a Principal Pedestrian Street. The applicant is requesting a reduction in overhead weather protection by 21.5%, (for a total of 38.5%) not locating canopies over the parking garage and other locales along 13th Ave.

This departure would allow relief from the provision of continuous overhead weather protection along 13th Avenue which would disrupt the verticality and height of the porous metal screen at the residential entry purposefully designed to be taller than the protection over the retail office space and residential entrees. The departure allows for more flexibility in the façade treatment along 13th Ave and allow the height of the porous screen to wrap around the corner to the north enclosing the retail courtyard making it a more formalized outdoor space. (PL-C.3.c, PL2-C.1)

The Board unanimously recommended that SDCI grant the departure.

Let's touch base on how to integrate the design guidelines justification into the departure analysis.

- 3. Transparency. (SMC 23.47A.008.B.2):** The Code requires that 60 percent of the street-facing facade between 2 feet and 8 feet above the sidewalk shall be transparent. The applicant is requesting to reduce the transparency requirement to 38% when measured along the 13th Ave. façade. The intent of the proposed design however the meets the intent of transparency by introducing the porous screen, which is transparent in nature and ultimately results in 74% transparency along the 13th avenue facade. The screen is designed to provide "views into and out of the structure", activating the façade with a protected outdoor space with operable large bi-fold doors that remain open during business hours and closed at night to create a lantern-like effect of the space.

This departure will allow for the installation of the custom laser cut metal screen which is porous as it meets the intent of transparency along this designated principal pedestrian street. (PL2-B.3, PL3-C.1)

The Board unanimously recommended that SDCI grant the departure. Let's touch base on how to integrate the design guidelines justification into the departure analysis.

BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation summarized below was based on the design review packet dated November 30, 2016, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the November 30, 2016 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the two of three Design Review Board members present recommended APPROVAL of the subject design and departures, with the following conditions:

I am unclear what the upshot of the meeting was in terms of Board recommendations or conditions...???