



City of Seattle

Department of Construction and Inspections

Nathan Torgelson, Director



RECOMMENDATION OF THE SOUTHEAST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Project Number: 3024724

Address: 1253 S. Jackson St.

Applicant: Michelle Wang, Runber Architecture Group

Date of Meeting: Tuesday, December 12, 2017

Board Members Present: Julian Weber (Chair)
Charles Romero
Carey Dagliano-Holms
David Sauvion
Sharon Khosla

Board Members Absent: None

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

SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: Downtown Mixed Residential/Commercial (DMR/C 65/65-85)

Nearby Zones: North – DMR/C 65/65-85
South – DMR/C 65/65-85
East – DMR/C 65/65-85
West - DMR/C 65/65-85

Overlay Districts: Chinatown-International District
Urban Center Village
Frequent Transit Service Area

Project Area: 12704 square feet (sq. ft.)



Current Development:

The proposal site is located on the south side of S. Jackson Street, one block west of Rainier Ave south in the Chinatown International. The site is currently occupied by a single-story masonry office building with a small parking lot built in 1983 and currently used as an emergency shelter operated by YouthCare, a not for profit outreach program for homeless youth and adults.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:

The proposal site is located within the Chinatown-International District and is within the Downtown Urban Center Village. The neighborhood includes Chinatown, Little Saigon located to the east of Interstate 5 and remnants of the historic Japantown located predominantly around 6th Avenue and Main Street. The area is culturally diverse with a large concentration of businesses owned by people of Chinese, Japanese, and Vietnamese descent. The boundaries of the district are roughly from 4th Avenue South, on the west to Rainier Avenue to the east and Yesler Way to the north to Charles Street/Dearborn to the south. The project site is located between 12 Ave S. and Rainier Ave S. Along this stretch of 12 Ave S. is a vast array of retail shops and offices located in both one and two –story buildings. Located at the southwest corner of S. Jackson and Rainier Ave S is a confluence of four major streets; Boren Ave S., S. Jackson, 14th Ave S. and Rainier Ave S, resulting in a distinctive 5-way intersection referred to as a gateway to the Yesler Terrace neighborhood to the northwest, First Hill to the north, North Beacon hill to the south, little Saigon to the southwest and the rest the International District and Pioneer to west. This area experiences high pedestrian traffic while this stretch of S. Jackson St. is the location of a light rail transit stop, various bus routes entering and leaving the downtown business corridor and designated bike lanes.

Access:

Primary access to the site is south off of S. Jackson from a west bound or east bound direction. Secondary access would be west off of Rainier Ave. S. onto S. King St. and then north along the improved section of an alley which then angles to west reaching the rear or south side of the site. The unimproved portion of the alley continues northward and is directly adjacent to the projects sites eastern property boundary.

Environmentally Critical Areas:

The site is not located in an Environmentally Critical Area.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This is a proposal to construct a seven-story, Apartment building containing 70 units, 1,800 sq. ft. of retail and 8,000 sq. ft. of office space at ground level with parking for 17 vehicles provided within the structure. The existing structures to be demolished.

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3024724) 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 SDCl:

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

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

PUBLIC COMMENT

At the EDG meeting, the following comments were provided:

- Suggested that the unimproved portion of the alley could be made to be more hospitable designed to accommodate a night time market which is suitable for the character of the neighborhood.
- Asked why there was not more of an effort to set back the building further away from the existing neighboring buildings, possibly making the building taller so that it could accommodate the same number of units.
- Suggested that Little Saigon has experienced the loss of Right-of-way (R-O-W) over the years and that this neighborhood could benefit from reinforcing R-O-W.'s and through connections and whatever happens along the (alley) edge should be public.
- Verbalized support of the use of screens as seen in the images presented in the EDG packet and suggested that the screens are a nice way of expressing the character of the neighborhood.
- Suggested that the use of screens would help to unify the building façade, but found their suggested use to be in direct contrast to the applicant's stated desire of wanting to create different facades as seen in images presented in the EDG packet. The suggestion was for the applicant to one or other approach but not both.
- Asked if the office space could be located on the second floor in order to create deeper and or more retail spaces which would be great for the neighborhood.
- Questioned if the departure request was driven by the desire to avoid burying the power lines.
- Suggested bringing the vertical façade modulation down to the retail and eliminating the horizontal retail expression in order to make the retail look more individual.
- Advised that the design avoid contrived busy-ness and pastiche as the challenge is to try to create something that looks like it has been developed over time.
- Suggested that this type of development needs to create smaller retail spaces to offset the higher rents as small businesses cannot afford to pay the high cost of rents.

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 EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE May 23, 2017

1. **Massing:** The Board supported the preferred massing of Option C and the arrangement of uses as being appropriate. The Board did verbalize that the site has a big job in being sensitive to many things coming together as the gateway to Little Saigon, the corner to a very sensitive place with a high degree of homelessness which are real issues. As a result, this project will become a large beacon due to its large mass and height at the east end of a major street at the gateway to many things coming together. Board members suggested that the design needs to be more responsive as a corner site to the gateway of Rainier, (Jackson, 14th). The Board found it interesting that the east facing units of the project were family oriented while the ones facing west are smaller units which feels disconnected. Still other Board members felt that the horizontal band separating the residential from the commercial façade should be used and the vertical articulation of the building façade should be brought down through the commercial/ground floor façade as well. **(CS2-A-2, DC2-B-1, DC2-B-1)**
 - a. The Board wanted to see more of an enhanced residential entry and pedestrian interaction at the lobby. **(CS2-B-2, PL3-A-1, DC2-B-1)**
 - b. Board members suggested that there needs to be more retail space and less office on the ground floor level which would aid in activate the street. **(CS2-B-2, PL3-A-1)**
 - c. Board members suggested that some modulation along the other façade is important and attention should be given to them in the final design. **(CS2-A-2, DC2-B-1)**

2. **Cultural Relevance:**

The Board appreciated the amount of effort that went into the cultural research of the neighborhood and how that was translated into the building massing with the residential units being placed above the commercial space that will be divided into narrow bays, reflecting the small-scale character of the existing retail along S. Jackson St. The Board also agreed with public comment and felt that the precedent images were relevant and exciting to see but cautioned that they would like to see more cohesion in the massing as a whole. **(CS2-A-1, CS2-A-2, CS3-B-1, CS3-B-2)**

3. **Ground Level Activity:** The Board agreed with public comment that there should be more retail space, with smaller spaces (and less office uses) to help activate and reinforce the commercial street character and pedestrian activity. The Board indicated support for moving the housing office to the second floor as a way of creating more commercial floor space and as a means of further activating the street right-of-ways. The Board acknowledged that this could create challenges and asked if the office could somehow be further broken down into more micro type of retail which better fits the character of the

neighborhood. The Board supported the placement of retail at the southwest corner as depicted in Massing Option C connecting to the strong commercial corridor of the neighborhood. The Board also supported placing the retail at the on the east corner as depicted in in Option A to reinforce this as a leading and more visible corner. **(DC2-C, PL3-C-3, DC3-A-1)**

- 4. Right-of-way:** The Board supported the public comment that would explore the use of the public right-of-way and create more public open space. The Board acknowledged that the alleys in terms of access, cleanliness, and safety will be challenging but feel that the applicant is ‘punting’ the issue rather than dealing with it directly. The Board encouraged the applicant to open up the alley and (internal spaces) toward the eastern alley as a catalyst for future opportunities for development along the r-o-w. The uses and the type of architecture will dictate how the alley will be used over time. **(CS2-A-2, CS2-B-2, CS2-B-3, PL3-A-2, PL3-C-3, DC3-A-1)**

RECOMMENDATION December 12, 2017

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3024724) 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 Recommendation meeting:

- Appreciated the work that the applicant had done to investigate smaller levels of detail and how they applied some of the more traditional façade elements that are indicative of the neighborhood.
- Felt that some of the pedestrian elements along Jackson were well thought-out and integrated into the project.
- Asked that safety and security be made a priority where the east alley dead ends.

- Agreed with the public sentiment that the east façade should be prioritized as a prominent façade as seen from Rainier and Jackson Street and that more thought should be given to how to make it more cohesive with the rest of the building.
- Verbalized that it appeared that the other facades have much more variation and modulation that happens along the other façades.
- Suggested that there will be opportunities for views toward Mt. Rainier.

One purpose of the design review process is for the Board and City to receive comments from the public that help to identify feedback and concerns about the site and design concept, identify applicable citywide and neighborhood design guidelines of highest priority to the site and explore conceptual design, siting alternatives and eventual architectural design. Concerns with off-street parking, traffic and construction impacts are reviewed as part of the environmental review conducted by SDCI and are not part of this review.

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/>

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 recommendations.

1. **Response to EDG Guidance:**

- a. The Board appreciated how the applicant introduced small scale retail spaces along Jackson Street and how they relocated the ground floor level office space to the southeast corner, creating an opportunity for activity the east facing façade **(CS2-B-2, PL3-A-1)**
- b. The Board appreciated how the applicant took measures toward activating the east facing façade and south alley. **(CS2-B-2, PL3-A-1)**

2. **Design Concept Related to Cultural Relevance:** The Board approved of the level of analysis that went into quantifying how cultural elements can be translated into architectural expression. The Board was concerned however by the loss of the vertical elements on the second level of the Jackson Street façade. Members suggested that because the “Urban Vietnamese Architecture ‘Tube House’” concept from EDG had been lost, then the proposal didn’t exhibit the same cultural relevancy as the EDG design concept. The Board stated that the evocative images presented in the Recommendation packet (pg. 24) were not realized in the actual building design. The Board recommended that better articulation of the bays could sufficiently express the ‘Tube House’ concept from EDG and therefore emphasize the project’s cultural relevancy.

- a. To better express the “Tube House” concept, the Board recommended a condition of approval to bring the vertical lines of the bays down to the second level and widen the balconies to match the bays. The Board agreed that the vertical elements need not be enclosed. **(CS2-A-1, CS2-A-2, CS3-B-1, CS3-B-2)**

- 3. **Color and Material Palette and Artwork:** While the Board appreciated the use of wood at building’s north-east corner they indicated that the material palette had no sense of identity or place. The Board suggested that there are more opportunities for adding color and art work to better express the cultural context of the area, consistent with the nearby context and architectural inspirations shown in the Recommendation packet. The Board was in agreement that the greys used around the building could be ‘swapped out’ for more vibrant colors.
 - a. The Board recommended a condition to provide more vibrant and bolder accent colors in more locations, especially along the blank walls on the south and west building facades. **(DC2-C-3.a, DC4-D-2)**
 - b. The Board recommended a condition to identify specific locations around the project for infusion of art. The Board welcomed opportunities for the applicant to reach out to local artist to create art around the exterior of the building. **(PL1-A-2, PL1-C-3, DC2-B-2.e, DC4-C-1)**

- 4. **Alley Activation:** The Board supported future night market and other neighborhood uses in the south alley by encouraging:
 - a. adding electrical receptacles (locked, so not to be abused)
 - b. adding hooks to support future catenary lighting, lanterns, flags, etc.
 The Board declined to make this a condition of final approval. **(DC4-C-1)**

- 5. **Departures:** The Board unanimously supported departure request number 1 as it resulted in a well-proportioned and integrated street frontage along Jackson St. The Board also unanimously supported departure request number 3 as it aided in locating parking access off of the alley, and the placement of the garage entry points despite sloping site conditions. Four of the five Board members supported departure request number 2 as the departure request resulted in a well-articulated building façade along S. Jackson Street. The one dissenting Board member believed that the building did not go far enough in demonstrating cultural relevancy.

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](#).

CONTEXT & 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 Seattle, the neighborhood, and/or the site its 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. Examples of neighborhood and/or site features that contributed to a sense of place include patterns of streets or blocks, slopes, sites with prominent visibility, relationships to bodies of water or significant trees, natural areas, open spaces, iconic buildings or transportation junctions, and land seen as a gateway to the community.

CS2-A-2. Architectural Presence: Evaluate the degree of visibility or architectural presence that is appropriate or desired given the context, and design accordingly. A site may lend itself to a “high-profile” design with significant presence and individual identity, or may be better suited to a simpler but quality design that contributes to the block as a whole. Buildings that contribute to a strong street edge, especially at the first three floors, are particularly important to the creation of a quality public realm that invites social interaction and economic activity. Encourage all building facades to incorporate design detail, articulation and quality materials.

CS2-B. ADJACENT SITES, STREETS, AND OPEN SPACES

CS2-B-2. Connection to the Street: Identify opportunities for the project to make a strong connection to the street and carefully consider how the building will interact with the public realm. Consider the qualities and character of the streetscape— its physical features (sidewalk, parking, landscape strip, street trees, travel lanes, and other amenities) and its function (major retail street or quieter residential street)—in siting and designing the building.

CS2-B-3. Character of Open Space: Contribute to the character and proportion of surrounding open spaces. Evaluate adjacent sites, streetscapes, trees and vegetation, and open spaces for how they function as the walls and floor of outdoor spaces or “rooms” for public use. Determine how best to support those spaces through project siting and design (e.g. using mature trees to frame views of architecture or other prominent features).

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

CS3-B. LOCAL HISTORY AND CULTURE

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

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

PUBLIC LIFE

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;

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.

PL4 Active Transportation: Incorporate design features that facilitate active forms of transportation such as walking, bicycling, and use of transit.

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-B. ARCHITECTURAL AND FAÇADE COMPOSITION

DC2-B-1. Façade Composition: Design all building facades—including alleys and visible roofs—considering the composition and architectural expression of the building as a whole. Ensure that all facades are attractive and well-proportioned through the placement and detailing of all elements, including bays, fenestration, and materials, and any patterns created by their arrangement. On sites that abut an alley, design the alley façade and its connection to the street carefully. At a minimum, consider wrapping the treatment of the street-facing façade around the alley corner of the building

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. These may include:

- 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 terraces and landscaping where retaining walls above eye level are avoidable.

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). Detailing may include features such as distinctive door and window hardware, projecting window sills, ornamental tile or metal, and other high-quality surface materials and finishes.

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

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board's recommendation on the requested departures 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 departures. At the time of the Recommendation meeting the applicant requested the following departures:

1. **Street-level-Use Requirements SMC 23.49.009.B.1.a.:** The Code states that the amount of street frontage required to be occupied by street-level uses is as follows:
 - a) Except as provided in subsection 23.49.009.B.1.b, a minimum of 75% of each street frontage at street level where street-level uses are required must be occupied by uses listed in subsection 23.49.009.A.

The applicant is requesting to reduce the required 75 percent of street frontage occupied by required uses listed in subsection 23.49.009.A to 71 percent as a result of the placement of the proposed egress corridor.

As designed, the proposed building is divided into an east and west building mass with commercial uses and residential lobby occupying the street frontage along S. Jackson Street and residential units on levels 2-6. The base of the east mass constitutes 23% of the street frontage and is occupied by the residential and office lobby. The base of the west mass constitutes 77 percent of the street frontage and is occupied by retail space, and an egress corridor serving both the residential and office uses.

The egress door is designed to be incorporated into the retail facade so it has the appearance of being a part of the west mass. The applicant believes this is a better design approach due to the challenges associated with the steep grade at the south alley and building code requirements for exit access points.

The Board supported this departure as the reduced façade resulted in an attractive, well-proportioned and integrated street frontage. **(CS2-A-2. Architectural Presence, CS2-B-2. Connection to the Street, PL3-A-1. Design Objectives, DC2-B-1. Façade Composition)**

The five Board members voted unanimously in support of approving the departure as currently shown.

2. **Facade Setback Limits SMC 23.49.162.B.1.b(2):** The Code requires that Setback Limits for Property Line Facades for the following setback limits shall apply to all streets designated on (S. Jackson St. per Map 1H as requiring property line facades: Structures greater than fifteen (15) feet in height shall be governed by the following standards:

Between the elevations of fifteen (15) and thirty-five (35) feet above sidewalk grade, the facade shall be located within two (2) feet of the street property line, except that:

- The maximum setback shall be ten (10) feet.
- The total area of a facade that is set back more than two (2) feet from the street property line shall not exceed forty (40) percent of the total facade area between the elevations of fifteen (15) and thirty-five (35) feet.
- No setback deeper than two (2) feet shall be wider than twenty (20) feet, measured parallel to the street property line.

- The facade of the structure shall return to within two (2) feet of the street property line between each setback area for a minimum of ten (10) feet. Balcony railings and other nonstructural features or walls shall not be considered the facade of the structure.

The applicant is asking for a departure to allow for a building façade setback ranging from 4 to 6 feet between the elevations of 15 and 35 feet above the sidewalk along the S. Jackson St. elevation.

The building massing is divided into two parts: the west massing which responds to the existing, small-scale retail uses along S Jackson Street, and the east massing which uses larger architectural gestures oriented toward the neighborhood gateway at the corner of Rainier Ave S. The west massing is set back from the east massing and is modulated with narrow bays aligned with the residential units reflecting the small-scale character of the existing retail core.

Per Seattle City Light, existing overhead high voltage power lines on S Jackson Street require a 14' minimum setback from the nearest conductor. This is approximately the equivalent to the proposed 4' setback from the property line the residential massing uses along some of the building facade. While the departure is needed to avoid the overhead high voltage utility lines located along S. Jackson Street, the departure is also aids in the use of larger setbacks along the west massing for the building of generous residential decks at level 2, which increases human activity along South Jackson Street. The maximum proposed setback at the west massing of 6' is less than the maximum allowed setback of 10'.

Four Board members recommended approval of this departure request as it aided in emphasizing greater building articulation and visual interest (**DC2-B-1. Façade Composition, DC2-B-1. Façade Composition, DC2-C-1. Visual Depth and Interest, PL3-C-3. Ancillary Activities, PL3-C-3. Ancillary Activities**)

The Board voted four in support and one against supporting approval of the departure as currently shown.

- 3. Parking Space Requirements SMC 23.54.030.B: the Code requires the following:**
 1. Residential uses
 - a. When five or fewer parking spaces are provided, the minimum required size of a parking space shall be for a medium car, as described in subsection 23.54.030.A.2, except as provided in subsection 23.54.030.B.1.d.
 2. Non-residential uses
 - b. When between 11 and 19 parking spaces are provided, a minimum of 25 percent of the parking spaces shall be striped for small vehicles. The minimum required size for these small parking spaces shall also be the maximum size. A maximum of 65 percent

of the parking spaces may be striped for small vehicles. A minimum of 35 percent of the spaces shall be striped for large vehicles.

The applicant is requesting that all parking spaces (5 residential, 11 commercial) be allowed to be striped for small vehicle use. The applicant is basing their request on Code section 23.49.019 which states that no parking, either long-term or short-term, is required for uses on lots in Downtown zones, except under specific circumstance which they feel they meet. The applicant has stated that the proposed office spaces will be occupied by the nonprofit developer, Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI), and all of the commercial parking spaces will be used by LIHI staff. The residential parking spaces will be used by residential staff or tenants.

Due to space programming on Level P1 and the placement of structural elements, space for parking is constrained. Space for parking is further constrained by the sloping grade at the alley which has affected the location of the parking garage entry.

The Board was generally in support of this departure as they supported the design for parking access off of the alley and the placement of the garage entry points, despite the difficulties of the sloping grade. The Board also appreciated that there were still some opportunities for the parking larger vehicles as well. **(CSD2-B-1 Connection to the Street, DC1-C-1 Below Grade Parking, DC1-C-4 Service Uses)**

The five Board members voted unanimously in support of approving the departure as currently shown.

BOARD RECOMMENATION

The recommendations summarized below were based on the design review packet dated December 12, 2017 and materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the December 12, 2017 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, four of the five Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design and departures, with conditions:

1. Bring the vertical expression of the bays down to level 2 by widening the balconies to match the bay and adding vertical elements. **(CS2-A-1, CS2-A-2, CS3-B-1, CS3-B-2)**
2. Incorporate brighter more vibrant accent colors. **(DC2-C-3.a, DC4-D-2)**
3. Designate locations around the project for the infusion of art that could possibly be installed by local and other artists. **(PL1-A-2, PL1-C-3, DC2-B-2.e, DC4-C-1)**