City of Seattle

Department of Construction & Inspections
Nathan Torgelson, Director

DESIGN REVIEW

RECOMMENDATION OF THE
EAST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Project Number:	3025791
Address:	701 16th Ave
Applicant:	Tony Fan, Studio Meng Strazzara
Date of Meeting:	Wednesday, October 11, 2017
Board Members Present:	Curtis Bigelow, Chair Melissa Alexander Barbara Busetti Andrew Hass Kenny Pleasant
SDCI Staff Present:	Abby Weber

SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: Lowrise 3 (LR3) & Lowrise 1 (LR1)

Nearby Zones: (North) LR1
(South) LR3 with Major Institution Overlay-160 (MIO-160-LR3)
(East) LR3
(West) LR3

Lot Area: 24,000 SF

Current Development:
The development site is composed of 4 existing parcels. The site is split zoned, the 3 parcels to the south are zoned LR3 and the single parcel to the north is zoned LR1. The southern-most parcel on the corner is currently developed with a masonry office building. Due to site topography, along 16th Ave at the corner, the building is a single story accessed from the parking lot; along E Cherry St at the alley, the building is two stories accessed at the lower level. The 2 middle parcels contain a surface parking lot for the office building. The LR1 parcel is currently developed with a single-story, single family structure with a garage on the alley.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:
The site is located in the Cherry Hill neighborhood, directly across from the Swedish Medical Center Cherry Hill Campus. Seattle University and the 12th Ave commercial corridor is located approximately 4 blocks to the west. Existing development is largely commercial or institutional to the west and south, with large buildings set in a campus setting. Lowrise residential development, including townhomes and single family structures, is the predominant development pattern to the north of E Cherry St. The surrounding development transitions to predominantly single family neighborhood about 2 blocks east of the site.

Access:
Existing vehicular access to the surface parking lot is off 16th Ave. The existing single family home has a garage with vehicular access from the alley. Existing pedestrian access is off 16th Ave, the parking lot, and E Cherry St. Proposed vehicular access to an underground parking garage is off the alley.

Environmentally Critical Areas:
There is a small Steep Slope Environmentally Critical Area (ECA) onsite.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The proposal is to allow 2 structures, one 3-story with 47 apartment units and one 3-story with 3 townhouse units. Below grade parking for 41 vehicles to be provided. Existing structures are proposed to be demolished.

The design packets include information presented at the Early Design Guidance and Recommendation meetings, and are available online by entering the project number (#3025791) at this website:
http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/aboutus/news/events/DesignReview/SearchPastReviews/default.aspx

The packets are also available to view in the file, by contacting the Public Resource Center at SDCI:

Mailing Address:	**Public Resource Center** 700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000

P.O. Box 34019
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE February 22, 2017

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Preferred Option 3; happy to see residential housing with a mix of unit size as the community values family-sized housing.
- Concerned about poor sightlines when exiting alley onto Cherry Street, access is difficult and dangerous. The alley is too steep. The location of the garage openings needs to be reevaluated.
- Concerned about lack of ground floor entries which give the building an institutional feel and does not respond to the residential uses across the street.
- Concerned about the large concrete planters.
- Pleased to see an apartment building rather than all townhomes.
- Would like to see the appearance of stoops to better address the street.
- Concerned that the proposed gate will be closed off during the day which closes off the residence from community engagement, would like more transparency.
- The proposal ignores the needs of the people for affordable housing.
- Concerned about 16th Ave frontage and the inward orientation of the entries, feels like a private campus and not part of the community.
- Concerned about graffiti on the alley and the viability of alley landscaping.
- Concerned about trash pick-up on such a narrow alley.
- Identified Option 3 as the only acceptable massing option, but it looks too institutional with only one entry. More entry points will make it look more residential.
- Concerned about traffic on the alley – including visibility, safety, and access – and existing traffic on streets.
- Would like the applicant to look at the neighborhood context outside a 2-block radius, and better meld the old and the new visually. The trees block the building from the street and create a poor visual connection.
- Would like exterior lighting along the alley.
- Option 2 does not provide a good zone transition; would like to see stoops on 16th Ave or perhaps the last townhome could be oriented towards the street.

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

- Concerned about the lack of parking, would like to see a minimum of one space per unit. The lack of parking will worsen as the hospital grows.
- Preferred Option 3, the applicants preferred massing option, and supported the use of housing on site.
- Concerned about the capacity of the alley to handle increased traffic as there are existing safety concerns, would like to see an SDOT study and consideration of vehicular access off the street.

- Concerned that the proposed vehicular access will negatively impact neighbors across the alley, and their ability to access their garages.
- Concerned about staging area for garbage, recycling and yard waste pick-up, the placement of the receptacles may impact resident's ability to navigate the alley. Would like to see adequate space provided for trash pick-up and storage.
- Concerned that the inward facing townhomes and entry to apartment building gives the site a feeling of a private campus rather than an addition to the community, ignoring the rest of the neighborhood. The inward orientation makes the project less pedestrian friendly, and does not have a residential appearance. Would like to see the building oriented onto 16th Ave.
- Supported the proposed landscaping along all sides of the site. Identified landscaping along the alley as important, would like to see a deeper setback to allow for growth of mature trees while providing adequate clearance for service vehicles.
- Would like to see building entrances on 16th Ave, not folded into the interior, to allow a neighborhood-friendly appeal.
- Concerned about average grade and building height calculations, which do not include the alley level.
- The orientation of the entries in Option 3 results in a 16th Ave façade that is more institutional and less residential in nature, it is not pedestrian friendly as it turns its back on the street. Would like to see the building oriented onto and entrances off of 16th Ave.
- Concerned about the size and function of the proposed curb cut on 16th Ave, the function and appearance of the drive will be important as it contribute to the experience along the street.
- The Cherry Street facade is unfriendly to pedestrians because of the large concrete planters. Supported the use of landscaping, if feasible.
- Concerned there is not sufficient space within the alley setback for growth of trees.
- Concerned about increased traffic along the alley, and the alley connection to Cherry Street which is already dangerous due to the steep slope and restricted sight lines.
- Would like to see trash storage and pick-up to occur within the garage.
- Would like to see further review of move-in/move-out functionality.
- Would like to see more affordable housing for low and modest wage earners at the hospital and nearby businesses.
- Concerned that the proposed landscaping is not feasible, and the massive planters along Cherry St separate the building from the street have an institutional appearance. The inward facing entrances further contributes to the institutional feel, and sets it apart from the community.
- Concerned about safety along the alley; the alley is quite steep and there are poor sight lines where it meets the street. Would like to see vehicular access located on a different street.
- Concerned about the proposed height as it blocks views of the Seattle skyline from the neighborhood.
- Concerned about the perceived height, such a large building is not in keeping with the existing residential character.
- Options 1 and 2 are disproportionate to anything else in the neighborhood, and does not consider them to be viable alternatives.

- Concerned that the added density and minimal parking will have a negative impact on the existing parking problem.
- The entry should be located off the street in order to better balance site use and neighborhood integration, it is not appropriate for the building to have a closed-off private entrance away from the street, it is not pedestrian friendly, and creates a feeling of exclusivity which is contrary to the character of the neighborhood.
- Would like developers to consider a smaller complex with a more appealing neighborhood friendly street entrance off of 16th Ave.

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. **Massing Options & Neighborhood Context:** The Board discussed each of the three massing options and related public comments. While the Board found merit in Option 1 with the prominent street-facing entry, they ultimately supported Option 3 – the applicant's preferred massing option.
    a. The Board unanimously supported Option 3 as it provides an appropriate massing transition from the large institutional campus to the south to the finer-grained residential neighborhood to the north. The Board noted that the proposed townhomes are a clever way to breakdown the massing and respond to the zone transition onsite. The separate townhome structure should be maintained in the final design at the Recommendation phase. (CS2-D-1, CS2-D-3, CS2-D-4)
    b. In agreement with public comment, the Board expressed concern about the scale and institutional character of the larger apartment structure. The scale should be broken down to achieve an appropriate fit with the neighboring residential buildings. (CS2-D, CS3-A-1)
    c. In response to public comment, the Board identified CS3-A – emphasizing positive neighborhood attributes – as a priority design guideline. The design should create compatibility between the institutional campus, newer development projects, and single family residential character, through scale and proportion. (CS3-A, DC2-C-3)
    d. The Board expressed concern regarding the proposed height and locations of the rooftop penthouses, and the butterfly roofs on the townhome structure. The final design should be mindful of height, bulk and scale as it is perceived from the pedestrian realm. At the Recommendation phase, the Board would like to see a sight line diagram to better understand what is visible on the roof from a pedestrian on the street. (CS2-D, CS3-A-1)

2. **Entries & Connection to the Street:** The Board discussed the architectural concept and site plan as the relate to the existing context and pedestrian realm.

a. The Board discussed the inward orientation of the residential entries, as proposed in Option 3. In agreement with public comment, the Board encouraged the applicant to explore means to achieve a sense of openness along the street edge, a better fit with the existing residential neighborhood, and a stronger connection to the street. (CS2-A, PL2-B-3, DC2-C-3, DC2-D-1, DC4-D-1)
b. Echoing public comment, the Board did not support the proposed gated entry as it does not foster a sense of openness or community inclusivity. However, the Board noted that these concerns may be resolved as the design develops in response to their guidance. The Board encouraged the applicant to be mindful of the buildings institutional appearance and consider whether a gated entry would be appropriate for a residential use in this location. (CS2-D-1, PL3-A-2, PL3-B, DC2-C-3)
c. The Board directed the applicant to better articulate the 16th Ave façade as a residential use, and encouraged study of individual ground floor entries, or stoops, as they would help establish a finer-grained scale, make a strong connection to the pedestrian realm, and promote eyes on the street. (CS2-D-1, CS3-A-1, PL2-B-1, PL3-A-3, PL3-B, DC2-D-1)
d. The Board did not support the proposed vertical signage on the east façade of the townhome. Signage should be appropriately sized, and located on the apartment building in a location that signifies and draws attention to the building entrance. (DC2-B-1, PL3-A-4)
e. In agreement with public comment, the Board expressed concern with the volume of proposed perimeter landscaping and the use of large concrete planters, particularly along E Cherry St, as it acts as a physical and visual barrier between the building and the street, preventing eyes on the street and impacting the pedestrian experience. The Board requested eye-level renderings to better understand how the building and landscaping is perceived from the street and pedestrian realm at the Recommendation phase. (CS1-C, PL2-B-1, DC2-D-1, DC4-D)

3. **Vehicular Access & Service Uses:** The Board discussed vehicular access and service uses, and related public concerns regarding existing alley access and trash storage.
    a. The Board appreciated that service uses were proposed to be located off the alley, however, the Board heard public comment and noted that trash storage and pick-up should be well thought through to reduce impacts of facilities. (DC1-B-1, DC1-C-4)
    b. The Board acknowledged public comments regarding vehicular access off the alley, however, the Board felt the design was beginning to respond to these concerns by eroding the southwest corner to improve sight lines, providing a 7-foot setback from the property line, and incorporating lighting along the alley. The encouraged continued study of these solutions. (DC1-B-1, DC1-C)
    c. In response to public comment, the Board identified DC1-B – vehicular access and circulation – as a priority design guideline. The location of the garage entry should be located in a manner that minimizes conflict between personal and service vehicles, and shows consideration of existing vehicular access points on adjacent sites. (DC1-B-1)

RECOMMENDATION October 11, 2017

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Concerned about the height and bulk of the proposed developed, the proximity to smaller scale structures, and impacts to access to natural light on adjacent sites. Would like the mass of the building to be pulled back from the alley, or the overhanging eaves eliminated to minimize shadow impacts.
- Concerned about the proposed height and mass, and blocked views from the east. Would like trees to be selected that will not greatly exceed the height of the building at maturity.
- Questioned building height calculations.
- Concerned about the ground-level concrete wall along the alley as it is a harsh condition, and noted that it there is too much exposed concrete with the potential for future graffiti. Encouraged minimizing the height of the wall and further development of the treatment of this surface.
- Would like to see the patios pulled back along the alley to improve the relationship with the neighboring residences and reduce impacts on the privacy of adjacent sites.
- Concerned about the proposed garage access location as it is directly across from an access gate to the residence across the alley.
- Concerned about the viability of landscaping along the alley, and encouraged the applicant to choose plants that will thrive in those conditions.
- Would like to see the existing trees onsite preserved for bird habitat.
- Would like to see a community garden incorporated onsite to enhance the neighborhood/community feel.
- Noted that the intersection of the alley and Cherry St is a dangerous condition due to traffic, slope and limited visibility; concerned about impacts on the pedestrian experience and safety.
- Appreciated the applicant's responsiveness to the Board's Early Design Guidance, and earlier public comments; particularly, the reduction of the mass, reduced height, and entry relocation.
- Supported the slightly recessed patios along the perimeter of the site as they help reduce the overall height and create privacy for the residents of those units.

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 are addressed under the City's zoning code and are not part of Design 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**
    a. In agreement with public comment, the Board appreciated the overall responsiveness to Early Design Guidance. Particularly, reducing the perceived height by varying the roof line and shifting the primary entry onto 16th Ave. (CS2-D, PL3-A)
    b. The Board supported the proposed access to the bike storage room along Cherry St as it is conveniently located to expected users. (DC1-B-2)
    c. The Board appreciated that the vertical signage was removed from the townhouse structure in response to EDG, and supported the modified proposed signage and lighting plan. (PL2-B-2, DC2-B-1, DC4-B-1)
    d. The Board supported the trash storage and service as proposed as it minimizes impacts on building aesthetics, the pedestrian experience, and adjacent sites. (DC1-C-4)

2. **Topography**
    a. The Board appreciated the mindful response to the grade change, and the sections provided on pages 24-25 of the Recommendation Packet. (CS1-C, CS2-D-2)
    b. The Board noted that the experience of stepping down from the sidewalk to the primary entry is not an ideal condition, but that it could potentially work due to the horizontal distance and depth of entry if well-designed. The Board encouraged further consideration of how the building entry could be designed to have an inviting appearance, sense of openness, and be mindful of the grade change, but declined to recommend this as a condition. (CS1-C, PL3-A-1, PL3-A-2)

3. **Alley**
    a. The Board acknowledged public comment regarding the ground-level of the alley façade, however, noted that the proposed use of textured architectural concrete and the landscape buffer was a thoughtful and attractive response to these concerns. (DC1-C-2, DC2-B, DC4-D-1)
    b. The Board heard public comment regarding the perceived bulk, overhanging eaves, and shadow impacts on adjacent sites across the alley, however, the Board noted that the large setback and modulation was a good response to these concerns. While the Board noted the design could be successful without the overhanging eaves along the alley, they supported the overall consistency of the architectural expression and form. (CS2-D, DC2-B-1)

4. **Landscaping**
    a. The Board strongly supported the generous 9-foot setback along the alley, which allowed for a robust landscape buffer. In response to public comment regarding exposed concrete at the ground level and landscape viability, the Board recommended a condition that the landscape plan include 4-6-foot tall evergreen

shrubs and columnar trees adjacent to the alley, and be well irrigated. The Board recommended columnar maple, and discouraged Arborvitae. (DC4-D-1, DC4-D-3)

b. The Board was concerned about the tall height of the Corten planters along Cherry St in the southwest corner of the site as it creates a severe sidewalk condition and poor connection to the street. The Board encouraged the incorporation of a ground-level use in this location to activate the streetscape and provide eyes on the street, such as a residential unit. However, if this could not be achieved, the Board encouraged reducing the height of the Corten planters or incorporating additional terracing to create a more appropriate pedestrian scale. The Board declined to recommend these items as conditions. (PL2-B, PL3-B, DC2-B-2, DC2-D-1)
c. The Board supported the proposed design and width of the courtyard as it is an attractive green space and well-designed transition between the two structures. (DC2-C-3, DC4-D)
d. The Board supported the proposed perimeter landscaping and, in response to public comment, noted that the proposed tree types appeared to be appropriately sized. (DC4-D-1, DC4-D-3)

5. Materials

a. The Board strongly supported the proposed use of high quality, durable materials. Particularly, the use of Longboard siding and Smooth HardiePanel vertical siding. The Board recommended a condition that these materials be maintained. (DC4-A)
b. The Board discussed the relationship between the apartment and townhome structures, and whether there should be a greater distinction between them. Ultimately, the Board supported the use of the same material palette, but appreciated the unique – albeit complimentary – application on each structure. (DC2-C-3, DC4-A-1)
c. The Board appreciated that the alley façade was treated and modulated similarly to the street-facing facades as it contributed to a consistent architectural expression. (DC2-C-3, DC4-A-1)
d. The Board recommended further study of wider, more functional balconies that may encourage outdoor use and contribute to the residential character. However, the Board declined to recommend this as a condition. (DC2-C-2)

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

At the time of Recommendation, no departures were requested.

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The priority Citywide and Neighborhood 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-C Topography

CS1-C-1. Land Form: Use natural topography and desirable landforms to inform project design.

CS1-C-2. Elevation Changes: Use the existing site topography when locating structures and open spaces on the site.

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

CS2-A Location in the City and Neighborhood

CS2-A-1. Sense of Place: Emphasize attributes that give a distinctive sense of place. Design the building and open spaces to enhance areas where a strong identity already exists, and create a sense of place where the physical context is less established.

CS2-A-2. Architectural Presence: Evaluate the degree of visibility or architectural presence that is appropriate or desired given the context, and design accordingly.

CS2-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-2. Existing Site Features: Use changes in topography, site shape, and vegetation or structures to help make a successful fit with adjacent properties.

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.

CS3-A-4. Evolving Neighborhoods: In neighborhoods where architectural character is evolving or otherwise in transition, explore ways for new development to establish a positive and desirable context for others to build upon in the future.

PUBLIC LIFE

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-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-B-2. Facilities for Alternative Transportation: Locate facilities for alternative transportation in prominent locations that are convenient and readily accessible to expected users.

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-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

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-D Trees, Landscape, and Hardscape Materials

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

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

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

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

BOARD DIRECTION

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated Wednesday, October 11, 2017, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the Wednesday, October 11, 2017 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the five Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design with the following conditions:

1. Incorporate 4-foot to 6-foot tall evergreen shrubs and columnar trees within the setback adjacent to the alley, and permanent irrigation. (DC4-D-1, DC4-D-3)
2. Maintain the use of high quality materials, including Longboard siding and Smooth HardiePanel vertical siding, as shown. (DC4-A)