



SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE OF THE SOUTHWEST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Project Number: 3025192

Address: 4220 Southwest 100th Street

Applicant: Jonathan Lemons, Lemons Architecture

Date of Meeting: Thursday, April 20, 2017

Board Members Present: Matt Zinski (Chair)
Donald Caffrey
Alexandra Moravec
Robin Murphy (substitute)

Board Members Absent: Todd Bronk
T. Frick McNamara

SDCI Staff Present: Tami Garrett, Senior Land Use Planner
Allison Whitworth, Land Use Planner

SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: Neighborhood Commercial 1-30 (NC1-30)

Nearby Zones: (North) Single Family 7200 (SF 7200)
(South) Single Family 5000 (SF 5000)
(East) NC1-30
(West) SF 7200

Lot Area: 8,091 square feet (sq. ft.)



Current Development:

The project site contains a one-story with a minor upper-level addition religious facility structure.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:

Existing single family residences varying in architectural styles primarily surround the subject site to the west, east, north and south. A commercial one-story mixed-use retail/residential building ("Brace Point Pottery") is across the existing alley to the east. A nursing home (Florence of Seattle Assisted Living) is on the property north of the project site. A religious facility (Seattle Gospel Assembly Church) is located across Southwest 100th Street to the south.

This corner proposal site oriented at the northeast corner of the intersection of California Avenue Southwest and Southwest 100th Street, is one of the sole two commercially-zoned lots creating a small commercial node that has been established since the 1950s and once known as the "Downtown of Arbor Heights". The general character of this block along Southwest 100th Street is a mix of low-scaled non-residential development that immediately transitions to single family residential properties east and west of the subject site's block front. This residential character also extends north and south of the subject site along California Avenue Southwest. No standard sidewalk environment exists on that portion of project site that abuts Southwest 100th Street and California Avenue Southwest due to the presence of angled parking stalls and loading areas which straddles the subject site's property lines and the unimproved sidewalk/planting strip right-of-way area.

Access:

Vehicular access to the site is possible from both Southwest 100th Street and California Avenue Southwest, neither of which are improved with curbs or sidewalks. Access is also available from the unimproved alley along the east property line.

Environmentally Critical Areas:

The site is generally flat with no significant landscaping. There are no mapped environmentally critical areas (ECAs) located on the site.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is for the design and construction of two buildings consisting of a total of eight townhouse units and one live-work unit. Parking for eight vehicles is proposed to be provided at grade.

The design packet includes information presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number 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

FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE January 5, 2017

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this Early Design Guidance (EDG) meeting (with Board/applicant response in *italics*):

- Inquired about proposed street/alley improvements and if visitor/customer parking would be accommodated on site.
Applicant explained that the alley is intended to be improved (paved) for that portion that begins at Southwest 100th Street and continues to the north edge of the project site. Street improvements inclusive of sidewalks are planned for the portions of right-of-way that abut the project site on both streets (Southwest 100th Street and California Avenue Southwest). The improvement is planned to formalize on-street public parking areas (5-8 parking spaces) on both adjacent streets. Details concerning onsite parking allocation is still being discussed.
- Felt that the site's commercial zoning designation is no longer appropriate for this site and voiced concern that the future commercial uses considered for the live-work units won't be compatible with the predominately "quiet and family-oriented" residential neighborhood character.
- Stated that the height of the proposed structures is not compatible with the surrounding single family neighborhood and preferred the height of the smaller structure proposed along California Avenue Southwest.
- Asked if underground parking had been considered and encouraged a design that would accommodate more onsite parking for all occupants/users at the site (residents, employees, visitors and customers).
- Suggested that the proposed density is too excessive for the site and recommended a proposal with fewer units.
- Concerned that the development may exacerbate existing drainage and stormwater problems. Also, concerned that future development may intensive traffic on already busy streets.
The Board Chair confirmed that the proposal is subject to environmental review (SEPA) and questions related environmental concerns (i.e. drainage, traffic, parking, construction related noise, etc.) should be forwarded directly to the assigned SDCl land use planner.

- Appreciated the project design but felt that the modern design and materiality was not compatible with the character of the neighborhood.
- Concerned about the viability of commercial uses in this location.
- Concerned the proposed buildings will significantly shadow adjacent properties.
- Requested a physical barrier along the north property line to buffer the assisted living facility.
- Encouraged a design inclusive of commercial uses to strengthen and support the existing commercial presence in the neighborhood.
- Concerned with the additional height added by the stair penthouses and the privacy impacts of roof decks to adjacent residential uses.
- Concerned about the impacts of potential signage for businesses.

A Board member explained that signage and other exterior building elements (i.e. lighting) are typically presented at subsequent meeting(s) during the recommendation phase of development. It is expected that the applicant will present these design elements to the Board and members of the public at a future Recommendation meeting for comment/feedback/guidance.

The following design related comments were received in writing prior to and during the meeting:

- Concerned with height of the buildings and shadow impacts on adjacent properties.
- Stated need for screening along north property line for safety and security of adjacent assisted living facility.
- Felt that the design and materials are out of character with surrounding single family residential neighborhood.
- Scale of project is not appropriate for tiny footprint of site.
- Encouraged below-grade parking for the residents in addition to the above-grade exterior parking area being proposed for the project.
- Encouraged a design that would be comprised of larger and fewer units than being proposed.

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 siting and design guidance.

- 1. Design Concept, Massing and Architectural Context and Character:** The design and siting of the new commercial/residential development should provide an appropriate transition to the less intensive zone, be compatible with existing architectural context and character and be respectful to adjacent sites. (CS2.B, CS2.C.1, CS2.D, CS3.A)
 - a. The Board discussed each design scheme (Schemes 1, 2 and 3), considered public input and offered feedback. In reviewing the three schemes, the Board felt that Scheme 3 (preferred) best represented the preferred location of the massing.

However, the Board concluded that the proposed schemes (including Scheme 3) did not adequately address the site context; lacked consideration of the existing neighborhood scale and did not effectively transition to the surrounding lower-scaled residential properties to the north, west and south. Thus, the Board directed the applicant to return for a Second Early Design Guidance meeting to further explore development of Scheme 3 with the following guidance, noting that the response could include alternate designs that meet the intent of this guidance:

- i. The Board recognized that the subject site is one of two commercially-zoned properties surrounded by an abundance of single-family zoned residential properties. In reviewing Scheme 3, the Board stated that this scheme does not effectively address the zone transition from the neighborhood commercially-zoned project site to the surrounding single family-zoned properties and further study is needed to better articulate the relationship of the proposed structure to the urban pattern and form of the neighborhood. At the next EDG meeting, the Board would like to see additional developmental diagrams demonstrating how the massing responds to the rhythm and pattern of the existing context. (CS2.D.1, CS2.D.3)
- ii. The Board directed the applicant to perceptibly reduce the scale of the structures for compatibility with the adjacent residences. Agreeing with public comment, the Board appreciated the stepped massing reduction of the western building and noted this is a successful technique in responding to the zone transition and could be further explored. Though requesting a reduction of massing, the Board clarified that it is not necessarily requesting the removal of program elements. (CS2.D.3, CS2.D.4, DC2.A.2)
- iii. The Board supported the strategy of breaking the massing into two structures, as the scale is reduced and the smaller footprints relate better to the existing neighborhood pattern and form. (CS2.D.1)
- iv. The Board stated that it is imperative that design and site planning be respectful to adjacent properties. The Board appreciated that the siting of the massing and surface parking area illustrated in Scheme 3 pushes the building forms closer to the streets which creates a generous setback from the northern property line. However, the Board felt that more effort should be made to minimize disrupting the privacy of residents of the assisted living facility building north of the project site. Thus, the Board asked to see more demonstration on how the future development will address this adjacency concern. The Board also directed the applicant to supplement the buffer along the northern property line adjacent to the assisted living facility with screening, perhaps through a wall, fence or other screening methods. (CS2.D.3, CS2.D.5)
- v. The Board stated that the design should respond to the surrounding context and foster integration with the neighborhood. At the EDG phase, greater emphasis should be given to the relationship of the structure with the context. The Board recommended the applicant investigate how façade composition and patterning, secondary architectural elements, and scale and

texture of materials can relate to the single family neighborhood context.
(CS2.A.2, DC2.A.2, DC2.C.3)

- b. The Board emphasized the importance of providing clear and accurate diagrams depicting the shadow impact of the massing on adjacent properties at the next EDG meeting. (CS1.B.2, CS2.D.5)
- c. The Board noted that the fully rendered architectural images were premature for this Early Design Guidance phase and that more analysis should have been dedicated to the site and massing explorations.

2. Vehicular Access and Parking Location:

- a. The Board requested further study of how the design and location of vehicular access and circulation, parking and service uses best support the function and program of the site. (DC1.B.1, DC1.C.3, DC1.C.4)
- b. The Board supported the location of parking behind the structures where it is largely screened from view and allows the building to shift forward and engage the street. (CS2.B.2, DC1.C.2)

SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE April 20, 2017

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this Second Early Design Guidance (EDG) meeting (with applicant response in *italics*):

- Felt that the proposed design appeared too commercial, too tall and not complementary to the surrounding residential context.
- Concerned that the building massing would negatively impact (block) motorist views to oncoming traffic and pedestrians at the adjacent intersection.
- Appreciated that modifications had been made to the design to reduce the height of the proposed development. However, reiterated that the modern design, materiality (glazing), bulk and scale was not compatible with the character of the neighborhood.
- Encouraged a design that included less density and greater separation between structures.
- Voiced support for design Scheme 3 in its basic form and asked that the south building include an upper-level setback similar to the setback proposed for the west building. Felt the overreliance of materiality to introduce façade modulation is not appropriate.
- Commented that multifamily development is not compatible with the surrounding single family neighborhood and reiterated support for a design that is comprised of multiple single family residences.
- Voiced concern about future parking impacts associated with the proposed development.
- Repeated support for a design that would include below-grade parking onsite parking and voiced uncertainty that the angled parking design would be successful.
- Suggested the future design include pitched roof forms to be more compatible with the existing development in the neighborhood.

- Voiced concern that none of the presented design schemes consist of below-grade parking and inquired if the design team had explored below-grade parking.
Applicant stated that below-grade parking was initially considered. However, it was recognized that in forming the shoring and excavation design to accommodate below-grade parking, the density for the massing would need to be increased to make the project feasible for the owner to develop. The applicant explained that the presented design inclusive of onsite surface parking was considered the most viable solution in this instance and in response to the Board's guidance from the prior EDG meeting.
- Commented about the tall and lengthy appearance of the building frontage abutting Southwest 100th Street in the preferred design and asked about the design team's approach in building scale choices (upper-level setback, awning, etc.) for both street fronts.
Applicant explained that the decision to site the building mass from the residentially-zoned property north of the site to allow for increased light and air to the existing use (assisted living facility) and concentrate more building mass abutting the south property line was considered in determining building scale for the preferred design scheme.
- Inquired if sustainable features will be added to the future development and be apparent to the neighborhood.
Applicant confirmed that the future development will be a sustainable design inclusive of features meeting green building standards.

The following design related comments were received in writing prior to and during the meeting:

- Stated support for less density and an alternative use typology (single family residences, nursing home facility) to be developed on the subject property.
- Felt the applicant's design response to the Board's feedback/guidance delivered at the first EDG meeting was good. However, voiced concern that the Board's initial guidance was not correct and questioned if it could be "fixed".

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. Concerns with building height calculations and bicycle storage standards are addressed under the City's zoning code and are not part of this review. Neither SDCI nor the Board have jurisdiction over the number of bedrooms proposed for residential units.

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 siting and design guidance.

1. Design Concept, Massing and Architectural Context and Character: The design and siting of the new commercial/residential development should provide an appropriate transition to the less intensive zone, be compatible with existing architectural context and character and be respectful to adjacent sites. (CS2.B, CS2.C.1, CS2.D, CS3.A)

a. The Board reviewed the requested materials, considered public input and discussed the merits of the three presented design options. The Board reiterated that Scheme 3 (preferred) best represented the preferred location of the massing because the massing forms are pushed closer to the streets, creating a generous setback from the northern property line. However, the Board still felt that the Scheme 3 design did not adequately address the massing concerns voiced at the prior EDG meeting. Thus, the Board proposed a modified version of the preferred design scheme (Scheme 3) move forward to Master Use Permit (MUP) submittal with the following guidance:

i. The design concept should be further reduced from two masses to three distinct masses as contemplated in Scheme 2 that harken to the existing pattern and scale of the immediate context of single family-zoned properties. (CS2.D, CS3.A)

ii. It is imperative that each building mass be scaled down appropriately to better respond to the surrounding residential context. The Board looks forward to reviewing the next design iteration which should be comprised of secondary architectural elements, minor massing moves, materials, glazing, etc. that successfully achieve this design direction. Initial Board feedback concerning the conceptual perspective illustrated in the design packet (pg. 47) was that the amount of glazing applied to the buildings' exterior facades was an inappropriate response to this guidance. (CS3.A, DC2.A, DC2.B, DC2.C, DC2.D)

iii. The Board emphasized that special attention be applied to the entry sequencing of the townhouse units' entrances at grade. A design that creates a strong street wall, especially for the residential units abutting Southwest 100th Street, was strongly discouraged by the Board. (CS3.A, PL3.A, PL3.B, see departure #3)

iv. In response to public concerns pertaining to roof forms (pitched versus flat), the Board discussed roof forms. The Board stated that the presented height of the proposed flat-roofed massing forms is respectful to the allowable height limits of existing residential structures within the neighborhood and will be complementary to the surrounding varied architectural style of neighboring buildings. (CS3.A.1)

b. The Board acknowledged that, in response to public comments voiced at the first EDG meeting, the design proposal had evolved from a commercial use (nine live-work units) to now a mixed-use proposal with both commercial (one live-work unit) and residential uses (eight townhouse units). The Board voiced concern that differentiating the sole live-work unit from the surrounding townhouse units may be difficult. The Board voiced a willingness to support a design that includes additional

- live-work units that, if pursued by the design team, be arranged in the western building mass with corner frontage to accommodate live-work units with internal programming to allow viable commercial spaces. (CS2.C.1, PL3.B.3, DC1.A.3)
- c. The Board recognized that the removal of the “towering” stair penthouses was effective in reducing the perceived height of the massing and encouraged this design modification be carried through to the next design iteration. (CS2.D)
 - d. The Board requested that in addition to building materials, color palette, conceptual lighting and signage designs; specifics concerning waste storage, location, access, and feedback from SDCI and Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) should be presented to the Board at the next meeting. (PL3.B.1, DC1.C.4)

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board’s recommendation on the requested departure(s) will be based on the departure’s potential to help the project better meet these design guidelines priorities and achieve a better overall project design than could be achieved without the departure(s). The Board’s recommendation will be reserved until the final Board meeting.

At the time of the SECOND Early Design Guidance meeting the following departures were requested:

1. **Vehicular Access to Parking (SMC 23.47A.032.A.1):** The Code states that access to parking shall be from the alley if the lot abuts an alley improved to the standards of SMC 23.53.030.C, or if the Director determines that alley access is feasible and desirable to mitigate parking access impacts. If access is not provided from an alley and the lot abuts two or more streets, access is permitted across one of the side street lot lines pursuant to SMC 23.47A.032.C. The applicant proposes vehicular access to surface parking entering from the alley and exiting via a proposed curb cut on California Avenue Southwest.

The Board reiterated a willingness to entertain this requested departure. The Board commented that safety and security for the pedestrians is important and encouraged the applicant to provide measures/cueing devices (i.e. pavement patterning, mirrors, evidence of clear sightlines, etc.) at entry and exit points that will effectively address this concern at the Recommendation meeting. (CS2.B.2, PL3.B.3, DC1.B.1, DC1.C.3)

2. **Street-Level Residential Use Percentage (SMC 23.47A.005.C.1):** The Code states that in all NC and C (Commercial) zones, residential uses may occupy, in the aggregate, no more than 20% of the street-level street-facing façade. The applicant requests that both proposed structures will be allowed to not comply with this code requirement. The applicant explained that in respect to site’s surrounding context, the outcome of revising the project proposal to include more residential units creates a circumstance in which the project cannot comply with this code requirement.

The Board indicated a willingness to entertain this requested departure because the inclusion of residential use on the project site positively addresses the existing surrounding residential context and is in response to Board direction provided at the first EDG meeting. (CS3.A, PL3.B)

- 3. Street-Level Residential Use Provision (SMC 23.47A.008.D.2):** The Code states that when residential uses are located along a street-level street-facing façade, the floor of a dwelling unit located along the street-level street-facing facade shall be at least 4’ above or 4’ below sidewalk grade or be set back at least 10’ from the sidewalk. The applicant proposed townhouse units abutting both California Avenue Southwest and Southwest 100th Street that would not meet this code requirement because the floor of the proposed townhouse units would be less than 4’ above or below sidewalk grade and set back less than 10’ from the sidewalk. The applicant explained that this departure would allow the townhouse massing to be compatible with the residential character of the surrounding context.

The Board indicated a willingness to entertain this departure provided that refinement of the entry sequence design to the townhouse units is achieved by either setting back the entrances or raising/lowering the floor a portion of the 4’ code requirement. (PL3.A, PL3.B.2)

- 4. Street-Level Non-Residential Height Requirement (SMC 23.47A.008.B.4):** The Code states that for new structures containing a non-residential use, the non-residential use at street level shall have a floor-to-floor height of at least 13’. The applicant proposes the live-work unit floor-to-floor height be less than 13’ (10’). The applicant’s justification for this departure is that it allows for the live-work unit’s floor-to-floor height to match the townhouse units’ floor-to-floor heights and assists in a possible reduction of the structures’ overall building heights by 4’.

The Board indicated a willingness to entertain this departure provided that the reduced live-work unit’s street-level floor-to-floor height assists in mitigating the mass and scale of the building’s overall height effectively. (CS2.D, PL3.B.3)

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The priority Citywide guidelines identified 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-1. Sun and Wind: Take advantage of solar exposure and natural ventilation. Use local wind patterns and solar gain to reduce the need for mechanical ventilation and heating where possible.

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.

CS1-B-3. Managing Solar Gain: Manage direct sunlight falling on south and west facing facades through shading devices and existing or newly planted trees.

CS2 Urban Pattern and Form: Strengthen the most desirable forms, characteristics, and patterns of the streets, block faces, and open spaces in the surrounding area.

CS2-B Adjacent Sites, Streets, and Open Spaces

CS2-B-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-B-3. Character of Open Space: Contribute to the character and proportion of surrounding open spaces.

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.

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-2. Contemporary Design: Explore how contemporary designs can contribute to the development of attractive new forms and architectural styles; as expressed through use of new materials or other means.

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.

PUBLIC LIFE

PL1 Connectivity: Complement and contribute to the network of open spaces around the site and the connections among them.

PL1-B Walkways and Connections

PL1-B-1. Pedestrian Infrastructure: Connect on-site pedestrian walkways with existing public and private pedestrian infrastructure, thereby supporting pedestrian connections within and outside the project.

PL1-B-2. Pedestrian Volumes: Provide ample space for pedestrian flow and circulation, particularly in areas where there is already heavy pedestrian traffic or where the project is expected to add or attract pedestrians to the area.

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.

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

PL2-B Safety and Security

PL2-B-1. Eyes on the Street: Create a safe environment by providing lines of sight and encouraging natural surveillance.

PL2-B-2. Lighting for Safety: Provide lighting at sufficient lumen intensities and scales, including pathway illumination, pedestrian and entry lighting, and/or security lights.

PL2-B-3. Street-Level Transparency: Ensure transparency of street-level uses (for uses such as nonresidential uses or residential lobbies), where appropriate, by keeping views open into spaces behind walls or plantings, at corners, or along narrow passageways.

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-3. Individual Entries: Ground-related housing should be scaled and detailed appropriately to provide for a more intimate type of entry.

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-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.

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.

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.

PL3-B-4. Interaction: Provide opportunities for interaction among residents and neighbors.

DESIGN CONCEPT

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

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-1. Below-Grade Parking: Locate parking below grade wherever possible. Where a surface parking lot is the only alternative, locate the parking in rear or side yards, or on lower or less visible portions of the site.

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-3. Multiple Uses: Design parking areas to serve multiple uses such as children’s play space, outdoor gathering areas, sports courts, woonerf, or common space in multifamily projects.

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-2. Dual Purpose Elements: Consider architectural features that can be dual purpose—adding depth, texture, and scale as well as serving other project functions.

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

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 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-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.

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.

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

DC4-A Exterior Elements and Finishes

DC4-A-1. Exterior Finish Materials: Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.

DC4-A-2. Climate Appropriateness: Select durable and attractive materials that will age well in Seattle’s climate, taking special care to detail corners, edges, and transitions.

DC4-B Signage

DC4-B-1. Scale and Character: Add interest to the streetscape with exterior signs and attachments that are appropriate in scale and character to the project and its environs.

DC4-B-2. Coordination with Project Design: Develop a signage plan within the context of architectural and open space concepts, and coordinate the details with façade design, lighting, and other project features to complement the project as a whole, in addition to the surrounding context.

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-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.

RECOMMENDATIONS

BOARD DIRECTION

At the conclusion of the SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE meeting, the Board recommended the project moving forward to MUP application.