



---

## SECOND RECOMMENDATION OF THE EAST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

---

Record Number: 3028662-LU

Address: 104 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue

Applicant: Michael Hatcher, Clark Barnes

Date of Meeting: Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Board Members Present: Melissa Alexander (Chair)  
Betsy Anderson  
Andrew Haas  
Carson Hartmann  
Alastair Townsend

Board Members Absent: None

SDCI Staff Present: Lindsay King

---

### SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: Neighborhood Commercial and Commercial Two  
(NC3P-65, C2-65)

Nearby Zones: (North) NC3P-65  
(South) NC3-65  
(East) NC3-65/C2-65  
(West) NC3P-65

Lot Area: Approximately 47,447 sq. ft.

**Current Development:**

The lot proposed for development includes four parcels containing existing commercial buildings and a surface parking lot.

**Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:**

The subject site is located east side of 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue between E Fir Street to the north and E Yesler Way to the south. The subject lot is split zoned Neighborhood Commercial with a Pedestrian Overlay (NC3P-65) and Commercial (C2-65). Lots to the north are zoned NC3P-65, to the south NC3-65, to the west NC3P-65 and C2-65. The subject site is bound by 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue along the west property line. 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue is a major commercial corridor running north south and is a designated pedestrian street containing a bike lane. A new mixed-use building, Anthem, and a variety of single family homes converted to multifamily uses are located across the street. E Yesler Way is a major arterial street running east west and is the south boundary of the site. E Yesler contains designated biking facilities and includes the First Hill Street Car. Bailey Gatzert Elementary School is located directly south of the subject site across E Yesler Way. E Fir Street, a quieter street, is located to the north of the subject site. The immediate context includes a variety of commercial and residential uses. Directly east of the subject lot is the existing King County Archives Building, which is anticipated to be redeveloped with future Seattle Housing Authority housing. The site contains approximately 20 feet of grade change from the southeast corner, the low point of the site, to the northwest corner, the high point of the site.

**Access:**

The corner site has street frontage on 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue, E Yesler Way and E Fir Street. Existing vehicular access is from E. Fir St.

**Environmentally Critical Areas:**

None.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Land Use Application to allow a 6-story, 280-unit apartment building with 10,356 sq. ft. of general retail sales and service and 16 live-work units. Parking for 134 vehicles proposed. Existing buildings to be demolished.

The design packet includes information presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the record 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](mailto:PRC@seattle.gov)

## EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE April 25, 2018

### PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

#### Site Context

- Noted the corner of 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue and E Yesler Way is very important. The corner is a gateway for the Central District, Capitol Hill beyond, the International District, and the introduction to the residential neighborhood.
- Would like to see the existing building context inform the future site development. Noted the scale of existing buildings is smaller than the proposed development. The new building is on the leading edge of a new context.
- Noted the site has a very important relationship to the King County Site. Would like to see the design consider a variety of outcomes for the future site development.
- Expressed concern for the lack of light and air to the interior units. Would like to see a larger setback provided between the proposed structure and the interior property line.
- Noted family-size units and children are needed for the future neighborhood residents.

#### Massing

- Concerned about the lack defined massing and variety in building scale within the proposed options.
- Noted floor plans do not express a setback at the location of the reveal. Would like to see meaningful building modulation so buildings read as three separate structures and not just a change in material.
- Noted the power lines along 12th Avenue inform the massing choices. Concerned that the upper level setback may create a clunky appearance but felt the preferred massing was the most successful option.

#### Street Level

- Would like to see commercial uses step up grade. Concerned regarding the sunken plaza. Support a departure for retail height if building was located at grade.
- Expressed concern for the proposed live work uses. Would like to see an entire second floor living space and not just a mezzanine. Would prefer to see family size residential units on E Yesler Way.
- Would like a wider sidewalk provided.
- Would like to see future discussion about location of setbacks at ground level.
- Noted E Yesler Way has the best sun exposure, would like to see retail along the street.

The Design Review Chair also summarized design related comments received in writing prior to the meeting:

- Would like to see a massing alternative with multiple buildings.
- Suggested using lasting, timeless materials, like brick and wood, instead of cheap siding or aluminum.

- Recommended including retail incubation for independent retailers.
- Encouraged including tall trees.
- SDOT supports access from Fir, not Yelser by way of woonerf. SDOT would like to see the building designed to activate any future woonerf.

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 SDCl 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. **Massing.** The Board discussed the massing options at length and was concerned with the subtle variation between the options. The Board also noted that the Early Design Guidance packet lacked a meaningful analysis of the existing architectural and building context. Ultimately the Board agreed that the preferred Massing Option 4 provided the better design solution for the site. Option 4 included a step along 12th Avenue to follow grade. The alternative also included two reveals along 12th Avenue and one reveal along E Yelser Way to further break up the massing.
  - a) The Board noted the importance of the corner at 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue and E Yelser Way and provided guidance that the corner be developed as a gateway. The ground level commercial space should feel substantial and not compressed. **(CS2-C1, CS3-A, PL3-A, DC4-A)**
  - b) The Board provided guidance that the massing should include a more substantive setback at the reveal to physically define the break in the massing. **(CS2-C3, DC2-A)**
  - c) The Board was concerned regarding the back of the building, facing the future King County site development. The Board would like to see how the building will relate to a future SHA development and how it would relate to development without a woonerf. The Board was particularly concerned that both the ground level and the upper levels be developed in anticipation of the future adjacent development. Additional setbacks for the units should be explored. **(PL3-B)**
2. **Architectural Concept.** The Board expressed concern that the preferred massing option lacked a clear design concept. The Board noted that Option 2, the Distinctive Frontage, was more successful because the architecture acknowledged the movement along 12th Avenue. The Board provided guidance that the preferred massing option be developed with a clear

architectural concept and a distinctive character informed by the existing neighborhood urban design context. The concept the Board provided the following guidance regarding the façade composition:

- a) Develop the architectural concept to define a sense of place that bridges multiple adjacent neighborhoods. Design massing gestures, setbacks, and materiality to respond to the existing urban design context. **(CS3-A2, DC2, DC4-A, DC4-D)**
  - b) Consider how the architecture translates across the principle building massing, divided by the reveals. Consider more subtle variations in architecture, material application, use of fenestration and/or architectural detailing. The overall composition should be cohesive. Avoid too distinctive a treatment that will be glaring and unauthentic. **(CS2-C3, CS3-A2, DC2, DC4-A)**
  - c) The Board supported the precedent impacts provided on page 24 of the EDG packet. Specifically, the Board noted the use of wood, the variation in balcony depth, screening elements, and the solid vs. transparent façade treatment as particularly successful. **(CS3-A2, DC2, DC4-A)**
- 3. Streetscape.** The Board expressed support for the vehicle access off of E Fir Street but observed that the ground level design lacked a specific response to the character of each abutting street. The Board noted that the ground level design required additional changes in order to provide a successful relationship between the structure and the street.
- a) The Board did not support the sunken retail courtyard along 12th Avenue. The Board felt strongly that the retail spaces should be located at sidewalk grade and step with the sloping site topography. **(CS1-C, PL1-A2, PL3-C, DC1-A)**
  - b) The Board expressed early support for retail uses along E Yesler given the prominent sun exposure. **(PL1-A2, PL3-C, DC1-A)**
  - c) The Board noted it was very important to anchor both corners with retail uses (12th Avenue/Fir Street and 12th Avenue and E Yesler Way). **(CS2-C1, PL3-A, PL3-C, DC1-A)**
  - d) The Board expressed supported the early landscape design including a regular street tree species rhythm and planting beds with moments of reprieve. **(CS2-C3, DC4-D)**
  - e) The Board noted that the success of live work unit depends upon the interior design, including a ground level work space with a dedicated live loft space. The Board gave guidance that the design should include either a true live work design, or ground level residential units. The Board requested further details for the ground level landscape design to respond to either a live work or residential use. **(PL3-A, PL3-B, DC1-A)**

#### **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 Early Design Guidance Meeting no departures were requested.

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](mailto:PRC@seattle.gov)

**FIRST RECOMMENDATION January 23, 2019**

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

Process

- Would like to see greater diversity within the Design Review Board and Design Review process. Felt the Design Review Meeting should occur in an easily accessible location proximate to the building location.

Massing/Materials/Architectural Concept

- Would like to see the building design informed by community engagement and reflect the diversity and unique culture of the neighborhood.
- Felt massing does not invite community connections.
- Expressed concern the building does not respond to Bailey Gatzert.
- Would like to see higher quality materials provided.
- Would like to see a more developed gateway corner at 12th and Yesler that is responsive to the Central Area Guidelines.
- Would like the design team to review other buildings in the Central District for precedent.
- Noted the proposal is an improvement over the EDG design. Expressed support for the transparent gaskets.
- Supported the use of brick material application.

Ground Level Design

- Expressed support for the new restaurant/retail spaces proposed.
- Felt ground level design demonstrates a commitment to creating successful retail spaces.
- Felt revised massing was more inviting at ground level. The additional setbacks and outdoor spaces provide a place for movement and interaction at street level.
- Noted the corner will be active if a successful retail space is provided.
- Would like to see wider sidewalks provided, with additional landscaping next to the street vs. against the building.
- Felt the live work design was not resolved and would prefer to see commercial space provided on Yesler Way.
- Expressed support for the potential woonerf on SHA property.

## Other

- Questioned the livability of units along the shared property line.
- Expressed sadness for the loss of the existing restaurant on site.
- Would like to see larger units provided for families.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the record 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.** The Board discussed the changes in massing and architectural concept from EDG to Recommendation. Along 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue the entire building is setback from the street, which removed the upper level setback at the power line location. The change to the height calculation removed the vertical modulation at the most northern mass.
  - a. The Board agreed the four building masses were appropriately scaled and the clarity of building parts was maintained by the use of the highly transparent gaskets. **(CS1-C, CS2-C, PL3-B, DC2-A)**
  - b. The Board agreed the increased setback on the shared property line was an adequate response to the future building context. **(CS1-C, CS2-C, PL3-B, DC2-A)**
- 2. Architectural Concept.** The Board noted the architectural concept had transitioned from a dynamic form to a more traditional project with a simple material palette. The Board agreed the material palette, with variation in each mass, successfully unified the four building parts. The Board supported the expression and materiality along E Fir Street and the north portion of 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The Board felt strongly the increased glazing, lighter material application and modern detailing at the corner of 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue and E Fir Street were more successful than at the southern corner. The Board agreed the corner of 12<sup>th</sup> and Yesler required further development given the prominent gateway location.
  - a) Develop the gateway corner, at 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue and E Yesler Street, to create a unique building identity. The Board encouraged the design resolution be informed by the Central Area Guidelines and community engagement. At the 2<sup>nd</sup> Recommendation Meeting:
    - i. Demonstrate how the corner design reflects the character of the Central District, while also stitching together four Seattle neighborhoods. **(CS3-A, DC2, DC4-A)**
    - ii. Consider changes to building massing, increased fenestration, fenestration patterns, materiality, architectural details, and use of color in the corner resolution. **(CS3-A, DC2, DC4-A)**
    - iii. Consider contemporary design detailing with increased transparency and less heavy framing. Remove the cornice at the top of the structure. **(CS3-A, DC2, DC4-A)**

- iv. Look to prominent local institutions, including Washington Hall and the Langston Hughes Center for inspiration. **(CS3-A, DC2, DC4-A)**
  - b) Maintain the substantial corner at-grade retail space. **(PL1-A2, PL3-A, PL3)**
  - c) Demonstrate a revised design that is more open, inviting, welcoming and supportive of community interactions. The Board suggested the revised design could include a smaller structural column, additional setbacks, and introduction of benches. **(PL1-A2, PL3-A, PL3)**
  - d) Provide higher quality materials on all street facing facades. The Board was supportive of a modern brick material application but agreed the cement panel and faux wood should be more authentic to the neighborhood character. **(DC4-A)**
  - e) Provide seamless, flush-venting, color-matched venting, or alternatively, incorporate venting into the architectural detailing so that it is not visible on the façade. **(DC2)**
  - f) Develop the building gaskets to have a uniform expression and maintain the increased transparency. **(DC2)**
- 3. Streetscape.** The Board agreed the revised streetscape design with at-grade retail space and the additional ground level setback was a significant improvement since EDG. The Board noted that the site programming, including vehicular access, solid waste and recycling, residential entry, retail spaces was resolved. The Board also expressed support for a future woonerf space once the SHA property is developed.
- a) The Board did not support the live work spaces as shown. The Board expressed support for a live work loft, or alternatively, commercial space. **(PL3-B3, PL3-C)**
  - b) The Board expressed support for the divisible retail spaces along 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The Board noted smaller spaces could be used by local neighborhood businesses. **(DC1-A)**
  - c) At the 2<sup>nd</sup> Recommendation Meeting, the Board requested enlarged street level elevations, sections, and vignettes demonstrating the commercial storefront material application, material detailing, and massing/material transitions to the upper levels of the structure. **(DC2, DC4)**
  - d) The Board expressed support for operable windows and true wood material application at ground level. **(PL3-C, DC4)**
  - e) The Board expressed support for street level details that provide a vibrancy to the pedestrian experience, such as the use of quality hardscape, landscape, pedestrian amenities, and the use of color. **(PL3-B4, PL3-C, DC4)**
  - f) The Board requested a study of 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue retail canopy height. **(PL3-C3)**
- 4. Lighting and Signage.** The Board provided the following guidance on the conceptual lighting and signage plan.
- a) The Board expressed support for the catenary lighting in the gasket setback, noting that this special design feature should be maintained. **(DC2, DC4)**
  - b) The Board encouraged the building signage at street level. The Board did not support the large vertical building signage at the corner of 12<sup>th</sup>/Yesler but noted the space could be used for art or another unique feature in response to the guidance provided. **(DC2, DC4)**
  - c) The Board supported the proposed signage for the retail spaces which will activate the space and provide a unique identity to each space. **(PL3-C)**



## 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.

1. **Street Level Uses (SMC 23.47A.008 B4):** The Code requires a minimum of 13-foot floor to floor height for street level nonresidential uses. The applicant proposes a 10-foot floor to floor height for the live work uses along E Yesler Way.

The Board did not support the departure request as shown at the first Recommendation meeting. The Board stated that the live work uses, as proposed, lack a defined living area separate from the work space. The Board agreed that live work should be designed to accommodate both a living space and work space that is separate in order to be successful. The Board indicated potential support for this departure with a revised live work design that includes a loft for living. Alternatively, the Board indicated support for the departure with true commercial space at the E Yesler Way location. With these changes, the project has the potential to better meet the intent of adopted PL3-B3 Buildings with Live/Work Uses and PL3-C Retail Edges.

2. **Overhead Weather Protection (SMC 23.47A.008 C4):** The Code requires continuous overhead weather protection along 60% of the principal pedestrian street. The applicant proposed overhead weather projection on 62% of the pedestrian street but not continuous protection.

The Board indicated early support for the requested departure request. The building setback at the street makes continuous protection at the sidewalk very difficult. The Board did request additional detail demonstrating that the height of the provided canopy was optimized for pedestrians, retail transparency, and that the design is integrated into the building massing/material application. With the provided guidance, the project has the potential to better meet the intent of adopted PL3-B4 InteractionDC2-C Secondary Architectural Features.

## SECOND RECOMMENDATION May 15, 2019

### PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Expressed support for the revised project design including the resolution of the Yesler commercial storefronts. Felt the design successfully breaks down the scale of the façade.
- Would like to see further articulation of the small commercial storefronts, including tile at the kick plate, wood storefront, and small fenestration patterns consistent with the neighborhood context.

- Felt the presentation should including specific information about the most eastern commercial space along Yesler Way.
- Central Area Land Use Review Committee questioned how the art plan would be implemented through the City.
- Expressed support for the lantern feature at the corner.
- Noted the design team has responded well to the community input. Would like to see the project approved as presented.
- Felt the revised corner design will provide a great entry to the Central District.
- Do not support the departure requested for the floor to floor height on Yesler. Felt the code-required height is necessary to provide quality small commercial spaces
- Excited to be a part of the project.
- Felt the small commercial spaces are reflective of the entrepreneurial spirit, a core part of the Central District values.
- Felt the art program will reflect history of the community in the design providing a fitting to gateway to community
- Noted the material quality and application reflect the history of Central District.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the record 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 and Architectural Concept.** The Board discussed the resolution to the building in response to the guidance provided at the 1<sup>st</sup> Recommendation Meeting. The Board noted the corner massing remains mostly unchanged but has been expressed as a transparent “lantern” with a revised material and 17 operable art screens. The Board expressed support for the lantern concept but agreed additional effort was necessary to express a prominent gateway.
  - a) The Board recommended a condition to further develop the lantern feature to create a more substantial expression. The Board offered the following options or combination of options for resolution:
    - Increase the size of the lantern, horizontally and vertically, to provide a more pleasing proportion with the overall building scale. (CS2-C1, DC2, DC4)
    - Quiet the adjacent material application to draw attention to the fenestration and material screens located at the corner. (CS2-C1, DC2, DC4)
    - Make the art application more visually prominent. (CS2-C1, DC2, DC4)
    - Resolve the height of the lantern in response to the adjacent parapet. (CS2-C1, DC2, DC4)
    - Maintain an architecturally integrated art application from ground level to the top of the structure. (CS2-C1, DC2, DC4)

- b) The Board agreed the increased transparency and consistent material application in the three gaskets (page 23 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Recommendation Packet) create a successful uniform expression consistent with the provided guidance. (CS2-C3, DC2, DC4)
- c) The Board recommended a condition that the project maintain an integrated vent design as shown on page 13, 17, 24 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Recommendation Packet. (DC2, DC4)
- d) The Board recommended a condition to modify that the grey cement panel material application to on the street facing facades to a brick masonry material. The final material should be in the same color palette presented on page 65 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Recommendation Packet. (CS3-A, DC2, DC4)

**2. Streetscape.** The Board agreed the building setback, landscape design and revised commercial storefronts along 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue E and Yesler Street created a rich pedestrian environment.

- a) The Board agreed with public comment and supported for the variation in commercial storefront expression along Yesler Way, the corner of Yesler and 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue E and along 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue E. The Board agreed that the variation provided a more interesting and diverse pedestrian experience for this large development. (PL3-A, PL3-C)
- b) The Board echoes public comment and offered support for the small commercial storefronts, with bay window projection, along Yesler Way as represented on page 15, 18-19 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Recommendation Packet. The Board noted the opportunity for individual storefront expression. (PL3-A, PL3-C)
- c) The Board recommended a condition to maintain operable storefront windows along 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue E as represented on page 9 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Recommendation Packet. (PL3-A, PL3-C)
- d) The Board supported the blade and pin signage concept plan as represented on page 21 and lighting plan represented on page 69 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Recommendation Packet. The Board noted that building signage should be located at ground level as represented. (PL3-A)

**3. Art.** The Board expressed support for the art plan represented on page 26-41 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Recommendation Packet. The Board noted the art located at ground level provides an immersive experience that will facilitate community interaction. The Board felt strongly that the art plan, process, location, and material quality be executed as presented.

- 1) The Board recommended a condition to include the art plan represented on page 26-41 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Recommendation Packet in all permit drawings. Execute the artist selection, public outreach, art location, materiality and quality as presented. (CS3-A, DC2, DC4)
  - a) The Board recommended a condition to maintain an art curator until final art installation is complete. The art curator shall facilitate artist selection, public outreach, and integration of the art into the building architecture. (CS3-A, DC2, DC4)
  - b) The Board recommended a condition that the art can change over time, but the new art installation shall require the same artist selection and public engagement process described in the Art plan provided on page 26-41 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Recommendation Packet. (CS3-A, DC2, DC4)
  - c) The Board recommended a condition that no artwork shall be branding for the building. (CS3-A, DC2, DC4)

## 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).

1. **Street Level Uses (SMC 23.47A.008 B4):** The Code requires a minimum of 13-foot floor to floor height for street level nonresidential uses. The applicant proposes a 11-foot floor to floor height for the commercial uses along E Yesler Way as represented on page 20 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Recommendation Packet.

The Board unanimously recommended approval of the departure request. The Board observed the departure request allows at grade retail space in lieu of a finished floor located below the sidewalk elevation. At grade retail space provides the opportunity for more commercial entries and smaller commercial space. The Board also noted that individual store front expression, with bay windows, better meets the intent of adopted design guidelines PL3-C Retail Edges and DC2-C Secondary Architectural Features and DC2-D Scale and Texture.

2. **Overhead Weather Protection (SMC 23.47A.008 C4):** The Code requires continuous overhead weather protection along 60% of the principal pedestrian street. The applicant proposed overhead weather projection on 62% of the pedestrian street but not continuous protection.

The Board unanimously recommended approval of the departure request. The building setback at the street makes continuous protection at the sidewalk very difficult. The Board was satisfied that the canopy height has been optimized for 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue E commercial corridor as demonstrated on page 12 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Recommendation Packet. The proposed canopy design better meets the intent of DC2-C Secondary Architectural Features.

## 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-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-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.

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

**CS3-A Emphasizing Positive Neighborhood Attributes**

**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.

**PUBLIC LIFE**

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

**PL1-A-2. Adding to Public Life:** Seek opportunities to foster human interaction through an increase in the size and quality of project-related open space available for public life.

**PL3 Street-Level Interaction: Encourage human interaction and activity at the street-level with clear connections to building entries and edges.**

**PL3-A Entries**

**PL3-A-1. Design Objectives:** Design primary entries to be obvious, identifiable, and distinctive with clear lines of sight and lobbies visually connected to the street.

**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.

### **PL3-C Retail Edges**

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

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

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

## **DESIGN CONCEPT**

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

#### **DC1-A Arrangement of Interior Uses**

**DC1-A-1. Visibility:** Locate uses and services frequently used by the public in visible or prominent areas, such as at entries or along the street front.

**DC1-A-2. Gathering Places:** Maximize the use of any interior or exterior gathering spaces.

**DC1-A-3. Flexibility:** Build in flexibility so the building can adapt over time to evolving needs, such as the ability to change residential space to commercial space as needed.

**DC1-A-4. Views and Connections:** Locate interior uses and activities to take advantage of views and physical connections to exterior spaces and uses.

#### **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.

### **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.

**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-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 Recommendation meeting, the Board recommended approval of the project.

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated Wednesday, May 15, 2019, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the Wednesday, May 15, 2019 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 and departures with the following conditions.

- 1) Further develop the lantern to create a more substantial expression. The Board offered the following options or combination or option for resolution:
  - Increase the size of the lantern, horizontally and vertically, to provide a more pleasing proportion with the overall building scale. (CS2-C1, DC2, DC4)
  - Quiet the adjacent material application to draw attention to the fenestration and material screens located at the corner. (CS2-C1, DC2, DC4)
  - Make the art application more visually prominent. (CS2-C1, DC2, DC4)
  - Resolve the height of the lantern in response to the adjacent parapet. (CS2-C1, DC2, DC4)
  - Maintain an architecturally integrated art application from ground level to the top of the structure. (CS2-C1, DC2, DC4)
- 2) Maintain an integrated vent design as shown on page 13, 17, 24 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Recommendation Packet. (DC2, DC4)
- 3) Modify that the grey cement panel material application to on the street facing facades to a brick masonry material. The final material should be in the same color palette presented on page 65 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Recommendation Packet. (CS3-A, DC2, DC4)
- 4) Maintain operable storefront windows along 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue E as represented on page 9 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Recommendation Packet. (PL3-A, PL3-C)
- 5) Include the art plan represented on pages 26-41 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Recommendation Packet in all permit drawings. Execute the artist selection, public outreach, art location, materiality and quality as presented. (CS3-A, DC2, DC4)
- 6) Maintain an art curator until final art installation is complete. The art curator shall facilitate artist selection, public outreach, and integration of the art into the building architecture. (CS3-A, DC2, DC4)



- 7) The art can change over time, but the new art installation shall require the same artist selection and public engagement process described in the Art plan provided on page 26-41 of the 2nd Recommendation Packet. (CS3-A, DC2, DC4)
- 8) No artwork shall be branding for the building. (CS3-A, DC2, DC4)