City of Seattle

Department of Construction & Inspections

DESIGN REVIEW

INITIAL RECOMMENDATION OF THE EAST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Project Number:	3028322-LU
Address:	1103 Summit Ave.
Applicant:	Jay Janette, Skidmore - Janette
Date of Meeting:	Wednesday, June 27, 2018
Board Members Present:	Andrew Haas (Chair) Melissa Alexander Betsy Anderson Alastair Townsend AJ Taaca
Board Members Absent:	None
SDCI Staff Present:	David Landry, AICP, Senior Land Use Planner

SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: High Rise (HR)

Nearby Zones:

(North)	HR/MIO-160-HR
(South)	HR/NC3P-160NC2P-65
(East)	HR
(West)	HR

Project Area: 7,200 Square Feet (sq. ft.)

Overlay Districts:

- First Hill Urban Center Village
- Frequent Transit Corridor (No Minimum Parking Requirement)

Current Development:
The proposal site is located at the northwest corner of Spring Street and Summit Avenue in the First Hill neighborhood district. The site is currently used as a surface parking lot for Virginia Mason Medical Center.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:
The proposal site is located within the First Hill neighborhood district which is in the First Hill Urban Center a designated Urban Village overlay district. Historically First Hill rose in popularity for wealthier residences in the late 1890s due to its close proximity to downtown Seattle. First Hill also became the location of several important churches, clubs, hotels, schools, entrepreneurs, and residences for civic leaders from the 1890s until around 1914. Many of these early buildings were demolished as the area transitioned to denser, larger-scale apartment houses, commercial buildings and institutional uses; including Harborview Medical Center, Swedish Medical Center, and Virginia Mason Medical Center. One such building, located to the south of the project is the 22-story, Spring Street Condominiums, a masonry brick structure built in 1929. Another building located to the north is the five-story Tuscany apartment building, built of reinforced concrete in 1926 and expanded in 1928, which featured colored plaster, brick and tile, with cast stone window sills. Other historical buildings in the area include a two-story medical office building at the northeast corner of Seneca and Summit Avenue, built in 1948 and a single-story medical/dental office located on the southeast corner of Spring St. and Summit Avenue, built in 1956. More recent development includes the 33-story First Hill Plaza Condominium tower, located on Spring Street between Summit Avenue and Boylston Avenue and built in 1986.

The densely developed First Hill neighborhood is also characterized by an abundance of tree coverage and lush vegetation along the streets, which adds to the area's unique character.

Access:
Access to the site which is currently a surface parking lot is either west off of Summit Avenue or via a north-south running alley located to the west of the development site.

Environmentally Critical Areas:
The site is not located in an Environmentally Critical Area.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Design Review Early Design Guidance application proposing a 7-story apartment building with 91 small efficiency dwelling units. No parking proposed.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE October 26, 2017

The design packet includes information presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3028322-LU) 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 SDCI:

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:

- At the EDG meeting, the following comments were provided:
- Supported Option A, but felt it needed modifications so that it fits better within the existing neighborhood fabric.
- Requested that the building be designed using light colored brick or stone and cornice elements.
- Balconies should be eliminated or placed flat against the building.
- Building should have a wider street facing setback.
- Live-work spaces should not be transparent as there should not be views into cluttered living areas.
- Project does not respect the historic character of one of the oldest neighborhoods in the city.
- Design does not meet the level of design excellence the design guidelines requires.
- Stated that some photographs represented in the packet were not actually of buildings in the vicinity but rather of the Pike-Pine corridor which has a very different visual aesthetic.
- Suggested that building examples such as The Marlborough building and other historic building should have been included in the EDG packet.
- Current design is an uninspired proposal that needs several improvements.
- Proposed design is not compatible with the precedent images presented in the EDG packet.
- Lighting on the roof deck should be restrained and mindful of surrounding buildings.
- Landscaping should be abundant, well designed and maintained, reflecting neighboring design.
- Building signage should be in scale with the neighborhood.
- Loading area off the alley appears to be inadequate in size.
- Recommended enforcing all setback requirements on all four sides of the building to allow for an appropriate loading zone, room for landscaping, which is compatible with the neighborhood.
- Commented that the landscaping makes this neighborhood a special place in the City.

- Asked that the Board hold the applicant accountable for to reinforce the design response to adjacent properties and to take cues from the best examples on First Hill.
- Requested that the Design Review Board require that the applicant provide a robust tree canopy on both Spring Street and Summit Avenue.
- Proposal is not respectful to its historical neighbors and it fails to preserve what is unique about this Seattle neighborhood.
- Project should enhance the tree canopy on the Spring Street side of the proposal site.
- Suggested that the metal siding and fiber cement are an insult to the area's historic neighbors.
- Suggested that the applicant look at the Cobb and Wells building that uses brick to fit into the context of the neighborhood as well as the mixed use Broadway building apartments that uses tiles to match the terra cotta façade of the Blick Art building.
- Suggested that the building should use a midblock entry location.
- Worried that there will be a change in the character and nature of the sidewalk from the rest of the neighborhood.
- Not in favor of the setback departures as the building would enter the public domain with a setback pattern which is several feet different from other buildings in the area resulting in a mismatched sidewalk.
- Suggested that any colors used for this new project needs to compliment the colors that are already present in the neighborhood.

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 siting and design guidance.

1. **Height, Bulk, Scale:** The Board appreciated the diagrams which depicted the maximum capacity of the site and the applicant's preferred option. The Board also agreed that the proposed bulk of the building is proportional to the size of the site and its neighboring buildings. However, the Board felt that the unit sizes are driving the exterior design of the project. The Board gave guidance to develop a design concept by starting with massing proportions, and then taking cues from the neighborhood. **(CS2-A-1, CS2-A-2, CS3-A-1)**

2. **Options:** The Board stated that any of the proposed building options would be compatible with the neighborhood. However, the Board was least supportive of Option C, as it was the

least interesting in terms of its overall design elements. The Board noted that the materials chosen for all three options did not demonstrate how these options are the best design approach or response to neighborhood context. The Board advised developing a contemporary design approach with a nod to the materials and proportions of the historical buildings in the neighborhood. The proposed articulation should also be modified to respond to the neighborhood context. **(CS2-A-1, CS2-A-2)**

a. The Board gave guidance to develop the design with additional building fenestration, detailing and a different choice in materials. **(CS3-A-1, CS2-A-2, DC4-A)**
b. In agreement with public comment about using a midblock entry, the Board requested a study of entry options and nearby context. **(CS2-C-2)**
c. The Board requested further review and consideration of landscaping and sidewalk treatments that response to existing neighborhood patterns. **(CS2-B-3, DC4-A, DC4-D)**

3. **Streetscape:** The Board requested additional information about the Live-Work units. The applicant should demonstrate whether these units will be designed to function as primarily residential apartments, or live-work. **(CS2-B-2, CS3-A-3)**

4. **Landscaping:** The Board agreed with the public sentiment that landscaping should be abundant, well designed and maintained, and reflecting neighborhood character. The Board strongly encouraged the development of a landscaping plan in response to these items.
   a. The Board requested clear and specific information about the type and location of landscaping elements, along with a maintenance and irrigation plan designed to make it a functioning landscape. **(PL1-B-3, DC4-A, DC4-D)**
   b. The Board strongly encouraged the applicant to provide larger caliper trees than the minimum required. **(DC4-D)**

5. **Materials:** The Board agreed that the use of fiber cement is not an appropriate response to the context at this location, or for scale of this building. The Board noted that the use of high quality materials compatible with the neighborhood is reflected in the priority Design Guidelines. The Board also agreed that the use of metal siding as a primary material is out of character with the neighborhood, unless it is used in small areas. **(CS3-A-1, CS3-A-3)**
   a. The Board asked the applicant to continue their investigation of their fenestration patterns and demonstrate how the proposed relates to the neighborhood context. **(CS3-A-3, DC2-B-1, DC4-A)**
   b. The Board requested that the applicant provide a couple of diagrams of different buildings within a couple block radius, as suggested by the community during public comment. The proposed fenestration design for this building should be responsive to context, not driven by unit sizes. **(CS2-A-2, CS3-A-1, DC4-A, DC2-B-1)**
   c. At the Recommendation meeting, the applicant should demonstrate how the fenestration detailing takes into account the location of vents, and incorporates high quality materials that reflect the neighborhood character. **(CS2-A-2, DC4-A-1)**

6. **Balconies**: The Board agreed with the public comment that the balconies are too small to be usable and may only be used for storage. The Board gave guidance to redesign the balconies to either be Juliet balconies or larger balconies that can be used for a table and two chairs. **(DC2 A-2, DC2-C-1)**

7. **Departure:** The Board expressed initial support of the proposed alley setback departure, which they noted would allow for better landscaping at the street. However, the Board wanted to see a lush planting scheme that matches the landscaping of the existing neighborhood. The Board also supported the front setback along Summit Avenue which they stated would allow the project to better relate to the neighboring building.
   a. The Board specifically requested clear diagrams of all departure requests at the Recommendation meeting. **(PL1-B-3)**

RECOMMENDATION June 27, 2018

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3028322-LU) at this website: http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp.

The packet is also available to view in the file, by contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

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

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following comments, issues and concerns were raised at the Recommendation Meeting:

- Supported the applicant's direction in enhancing the tree canopy.
- Encouraged the developer to select tree species will large canopies given the lack of overhead wires.
- Supported the greater use of brick on the latest building design which better reflects the neighborhood context.
- Favored the installation of 3 minute drop-off and a 30 minute load zone adjacent to entrance along Summit Avenue.
- Encouraged the greatest number of bicycle parking stalls as possible rather than the minimum currently proposed.
- Suggested that the outdoor bicycle storage along the north side of the building needs to be well secured, preferably with individual access for each bike owner.
- Was in favor of a color palette with warmer tones to fit more closely with the surrounding neighborhood context of red and yellow brick, rather than proposed materials used in the composition of the current architectural façade.

- Discouraged the use of fiber cement on the top floor of the east elevation and instead encouraged the continuation of the use of brick.
- Encouraged low level pedestrian scale lighting that adequately illuminates the sidewalk for safe walking conditions.
- Encouraged lighting on the upper levels be kept to a minimum so that it does not encroach into the neighboring residences.
- Streetscape and landscape materials should be commensurate with the best examples of the surrounding neighborhood.
- Vegetative landscaping should be drought tolerant.
- Concerned that the new structure will be too close to existing residence located to the north.
- Suggested that the current design is an improvement over the previous design presented at EDG.
- Did not agree with the use of black and grey brick.
- Suggested that the scale of the windows are too large especially at ground level.
- Suggested that there should not be a roof deck, as the activity and uses will be an impact to neighboring residences.
- Asked that the amount of metal siding be reduced.
- Suggested that precedent imagery depicted in the packet are not representative of the immediate neighborhood.
- Suggested that the precedent imagery depicting a lush and verdant landscape should not be of planting material that currently does not existing in the surrounding neighborhood.
- Suggested that the use of fiber cement materials proposed for up 70 percent of the north side and up to 25 percent of the east and west sides of the building and should not be used.
- Asked that the Board hold the applicant responsible (to earlier Board guidance) by having them exclude fiber cement panels, minimizing metal siding and using a predominance of warm toned brick masonry to compliment adjacent building and neighborhood character.
- Suggested that the landscaping should use hedges, raised beds, strategies to keep animals and humans out of the gardens.
- Suggested that the understory plants are not appropriate to the neighborhood and encouraged the applicant to use fewer variety of plants, concentrating on species that are more prevalent to the neighborhood.
- Suggested that the applicant did not meet the Boards EDG guidance of providing an irrigation and landscape maintenance plan.
- Asked the Board to deny the requested alley setback departure as its approval would cause restricted access and increased congestion along the alley.
- Suggested that the applicant pursue a temporary loading zone at the front entry to better serve the building and create a safer drop-off, delivery and pick-up scenario.
- Suggested that the heavy use of lighting on the rooftop deck should be avoided.
- Suggested that the sidewalk lighting would not efficient and it would not be enough.

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 or 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. **EDG Guidance response:** The Board agreed that the project responded well to guidance given at EDG. The Board also acknowledged the design team's effort in putting together an design effort that fully embraced both Early Design Guidance and the design review process as a whole. **(CS2-A-1, CS2-B, CS2-C-2, CS3-A-1, CS2-A-2, PL3-C DC4-A)**

2. **Design Concept:** The Board verbalized their continued support of Option A, the preferred massing option, designed as a shifting bar concept. However, the Board questioned the material change using cement fiber panel finish to step down at the upper levels of the northern massing element. The Board generally supported the material change to indicate the stepping down in height at the upper floors but recommended a different color and material, possibly brick in place of the cement panel. The Board also was not enthusiastic about the continued line of fiber cement panel going down the back or northern building mass. The Board suggested that the brick framing continue across the entire face of the north facing façade as way of making the parti more cohesive but declined to recommend further direction.
    a. The Board recommended that the northern building mass have a similar materiality and finish as the southern building mass, and to do away with the cascading cementitious board treatment going down the back of the or north facing facade. **(DC2-B-1, DC4-A)**

3. **Materiality:** The Board supported how the faceted metal used on the southern building façade gave the appearance of a secondary or tertiary material. The Board also supported the rationale for the changes in material and the resulting depth along the south facing elevation.

   In discussing the northern building mass, the Board suggested that there needs to be more consistency with the southern building mass in terms of its overall material treatment. The

Board was not in favor of cement board and how it stepped down to an imaginary datum line at the upper reaches of the northern building mass. The Board agreed that greater material consistency with the southern building mass would reinforce the overall proposed design concept of two sliding bars that the building. In order to achieve greater consistency, the Board was not opposed to using two different colors of the same brick material on both of the sliding bars.

a. The Board recommended that a consistent material treatment be used to reinforce the concept of two building volumes sliding past each other, possibly consisting of two different shades of brick, with a lighter tone brick on the upper reaches of the northern bar. **(DC2-B-1, DC4-A)**
b. The Board stated that the east and west elevations need to be developed further to achieve a similar architectural quality with the increased use of brick and the reduced use of metal, as presented on the Spring St. side of the building. **(CS3-A-1, CS2-A-2, DC2-B-1, DC4-A)**
c. The Board requested that the design team provide actual materials samples at the next Recommendation public meeting. **(DC2-B-1, DC4-A)**

4. **Lantern Element**: The Board did not agree with the applicant's characterization of the vertical slot on the northern building mass, perpendicular to the front entry, as a lantern element because the windows are all the same format. The Board also suggested that the concept of the lantern windows was much stronger at EDG because the size and shape of the windows created more areas of continuous glazing.
    a. The Board request the lantern be further developed so that it reads as a lantern concept with recessed windows or other techniques, or eliminate entirely. **(DC2-B-1, DC4-A-1)**

5. **Color Palette**: Board members agreed with the public comment that the color of the brick presented in the recommendation packet appeared to be very dark in relationship to the neighborhood context.
    a. The Board requested that the applicant explore alternative color palettes for the brick and other finishes as the proposed brick was too dark and did not respond to the context of nearby colors and materials. **(DC4-A-1)**

6. **Streetscape:** The Board suggested that the courtyard outside of the entryway lacked materiality in the hardscaping and thought the seating wall resembled a concrete wall rather than a place to sit.
    a. The Board recommended that the courtyard be integrated with warmer materials such as a wooden seat or other materials that bring a human presence to the area. The Board also suggested that the overhead protection could be made to look more prominent as a way of creating a better sense of entry. The Board stated that the base of the pilasters along Spring St., the hardscaping, and the raised planters consist of large amounts of poured concrete and therefore recommended that these should be treated with a higher quality material,

texture and finish using tile or by extending the brick finishes to these areas. (**CS2-B-2, CS2-B-3, PL1-B-3, PL3-A)**

7. **Lighting:** The Board recommended that the lighting located at the front entrance be subtle and not so bright that it will be introducing a large amount of glare. **(DC4-C)**

8. **Landscaping:** Echoing public sentiment, the Board voiced their concern about the color palette and different foliage choices. The Board suggested that the foliage associated with the surrounding neighborhood be characterized by different textures and shades of greens. The Board briefly discussed how they would like to see better hardscaping with a gate that helps better activate the entry, more vegetative screening designed to soften the facades at the service entrance in the alley, and high degree of transparency for eyes on the street.
    a. The Board recommended that the foliage colors and tones are more verdant with more colors of green, and more indicative of neighborhood plant palette, rather than red foliage tone as presented in the Recommendation packet. **(CS2-B-3, DC4-A, DC4-D)**
    b. The Board recommended that the applicant provide more vegetative screening that is designed to be more pedestrian friendly and soften the facades at the service entrance in the alley. **(CS2-B-3, PL1-B-3, DC4-A, DC4-D)**
    c. The Board recommended that the applicant include hardscape elements that are designed to be more inviting, that highlights the secondary entry, and add a door with glazing to add eyes on the street. **(DC4-D-2)**

9. **Departures:** The Board was inclined to support departures 1 a, c, and d but not b as they felt that "c" would add to increased traffic impacts. The Board was amenable to a departure that encroached less into the rear setback but needed additional information that would aid in forming a final decision. The Board wished to gain a better understanding of how a vehicle moving through the alley might navigate past a temporarily parked vehicle and what impacts might be encountered if the 4' encroachment into the rear setback were allowed.
    a. The Board requested dimensioned sectioned vignettes and profiles comparing the requirements of the code verses the departure request. **(PL1-B-3)**

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board's initial recommendation on the requested departure(s) were 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 final recommendations will be reserved until the final recommendation meeting.

At the time of the Initial Recommendation meeting, the following departures were identified:

1. **Setbacks & Separation (SMC 23.45.518):** The Code requires that portions of a structure located in an HR zone that are less than 85 feet in height shall have a minimum Side &

Front (Street) setback of 5’-0”, with an average setback of 7’-0,” and an alley setback of 10’-0”.

a. The applicant is requesting a departure to allow a 4’-0” encroachment into the required 5’-0” minimum setback along Summit Ave., for a total width of 22 feet or approximately (44%) of street facing façade. This is an average setback of 7’-5”, greater than the 7’-0” minimum requirement.

   The applicant states that the departure would lend itself to a design that better meets the intent of several design guidelines including; CS2.B.2 connection to the street, CS2.B.3 character of open space, CS2.C. 1 corner sites, PL3.A.2 common entries, DC2.B.1 façade composition, DC2.C.3 fit with neighboring buildings by creating an entry plaza / courtyard adjacent to the building’s entry and the prominent corner of Summit Ave and Spring St. The courtyard is created by dividing the structure into two shifting bar or masses, forcing the northern mass to sit closer to the property line along Summit Ave. As a result, the projecting northern mass better relates to the zero lot line setback of the adjacent building to the north, while the south mass sits further back away from the property line to help create an entry lobby and courtyard area. The courtyard space will be enhanced with landscaping, seating, and overhead weather protection.

   The Board indicated support for the departure which would result in a larger setback along Summit Avenue at the entry. The Board also stated that the 4’ encroachment into the 5’ front setback would result in better alignment of the northern mass of the building with the neighboring building to the north. **(CS2-B Adjacent Sites, Streets, and Open Spaces, CS2.B.2 connection to the street, CS2.B.3 character of open space, PL1-B-3. Design Objectives, PL3-B Residential Edges, DC2-B-1. Façade Composition)**

b. The applicant is requesting a departure to allow a 4’-0” encroachment into the required 5’-0” minimum setback along the western property, located immediately adjacent to alley, for a total width 29’-6” or approximately (59%) of the alley facing façade. This is an average setback of 4’-3”, a 40% reduction from the requirement.

   The applicant states that the departure would lend itself to a design that better meets the intent of several design guidelines including CS2.D.5 respect for adjacent sites, CS3.A.1 fitting old and new together, DC2.A.2 reducing perceived mass, and DC2.B.1 façade composition by creating a recessed courtyard off the alley which mirrors the courtyard located at Summit & Spring, and adding life and vibrancy along the alley. The departure would also allow access to service functions as well as provide additional opportunities for landscaping and green space along the alley edge. The shifting mass along the alley façade would also block the service access points from views along Spring Street.

The Board was not in support of the full depth of the departure request for the alley as they felt that it would add to increased traffic impacts. The Board was amenable to a reduced amount of encroachment but requested further information as to how the design with the revised encroachment would better meet the intent of design guidelines. **(CS2-B Adjacent Sites, Streets, and Open Spaces, CS2.D.5 Respect for Adjacent Sites, PL3-B Residential Edges, DC4-D-1 Choice of Plant Materials)**

c. The applicant is requesting a departure to allow a 1'-0" encroachment of the pilasters into the 5'-0" minimum setback along Spring St.

The applicant states that this departure would provide an overall design that would better meet the intent of several design guidelines including CS1.D.1 On-Site Feature, CS2.B.2 Connection to the Street, CS2.B.3 Character of Open Space, CS2.C.1 Corner Sites, CS3.A.1 Fitting Old and New Together, PL3.A.2 Common Entries, PL3.A.4 Ensemble of Elements, DC2.B.1, DC2.C.1 Visual Depth and Interest, DC4.A.1 Exterior Finish Materials. The pilasters provide depth and establish a clear compositional hierarchy. The result is an added layer of materials that creates visual interest, shade, shadow, and relief. The proposed south façade would otherwise be in compliance with the minimum required 5'-0" setback.

The Board supported the proposed departure for the encroachment of the pilasters along Spring Street which act to provide additional depth along a building façade, which they stated needed additional fenestration at EDG. The result is an added layer of materials that creates visual interest, shade, shadow, and relief. **(CS3-A-1 Fitting Old and New Together, CS2-A-2 Architectural Presence, DC4-A Exterior Elements and Finishes)**

d. The applicant is requesting a departure to allow for an average setback of 7'-6", with a minimum setback of 6'-0" for the north side upper level setback, a 27% reduction from requirement.

This departure would provide an overall design that would better meet the intent of several design guidelines CS2.D.5 Respect For Adjacent Sites, CS3.A.1 Fitting Old and New Together, CS3.A.4 Evolving Neighborhoods, DC2.A2 Reducing Perceived Mass, and DC2.B.1 Façade Composition by allowing the massing of the project to be uninterrupted with a setback that would normally not be required for a taller, high-rise building. In lieu of the setback, the design provides a distinct material break that allows the north building façade to have a degree of similarity with the south façade. Additionally, the project proposes a "stepping down" expression sat the upper reaches of the northern building mass which gives the building further visual uniqueness.

The Board supported the departure as they believed the north facing building façade would have a stronger visual appearance, similar to the south facing façade if it were not subject to the setback requirements of a taller, high-rise building. **(CS2.D.5 Respect for Adjacent Sites, DC2.A2 Reducing Perceived Mass, DC2-B-1 Façade Composition, DC4-A Exterior Elements and Finishes)**

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

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 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-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 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).

CS2-C. RELATIONSHIP TO THE BLOCK SPACES

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. Consider using a corner to provide extra space for pedestrians and a generous entry, or build out to the corner to provide a strong urban edge to the block.

CS2-C-2. Mid-Block Sites: Look to the uses and scales of adjacent buildings for clues about how to design a mid-block building. Continue a strong street-edge where it is already present, and respond to datum lines created by adjacent buildings at the first three floors. Where adjacent properties are undeveloped or underdeveloped, design the party walls to provide visual interest through materials, color, texture, or other means.

CS2-C-3. Full Block Sites: Break up long facades of full-block buildings to avoid a monolithic presence. Provide detail and human scale at street-level, and include repeating elements to add variety and rhythm to the façade and overall building design. Consider providing through-block access and/or designing the project as an assemblage of buildings and spaces within the block.

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

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-3. Design Objectives: 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. Visible access to the building's entry should be provided. Examples of pedestrian amenities include seating, other street furniture, lighting, year-round landscaping, seasonal plantings, pedestrian scale signage, site furniture, art work, awnings, large storefront windows, and engaging retail displays and/or kiosks.

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 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.

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 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.

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.

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.

RECOMMENDATIONS

At the conclusion of the INITIAL RECOMMENDATION meeting, the Board recommended the project return for a second Recommendation meeting to response to the guidance and initial recommendations provided.