



### RECOMMENDATION OF THE NORTHEAST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

---

Report Number:	3028940-LU
Address:	8829 Roosevelt Way NE
Applicant:	Jay Janette, Skidmore Janette, Architecture Planning & Design
Date of Meeting:	Monday, September 17, 2018
Board Members Present:	James Marria (Chair) Brian Bishop Anita Jeerage Dan Rusler Katy Haima
Board Members Absent:	None
SDCI Staff Present:	David L. Landry, AICP, Land Use Planner

---

#### SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: Neighborhood Commercial 2 Pedestrian Designation Zone (NC 2P-40)

Nearby Zones: North – NC2P-40  
South – NC2P-40  
East – NC2P-40/SF 5000  
West -- SF 5000

Overlay Districts: Northgate Overlay District

Project Area: 9,859 square feet (sq. ft.)



The top of this image is north.  
This map is for illustrative purposes only.  
In the event of omissions, errors or differences, the  
documents in SDCI's file will control.

**Current Development:**

The proposal site is located on the southwest corner of Roosevelt Way NE and NE 89<sup>th</sup> St. The site consists of two separate parcels located at 8815 and 8829 Roosevelt Way NE. The property at 8829 was currently occupied by a single-story commercial building built in 1946 and used until recently as an auto repair shop. The parcel located at 8815 is currently occupied by two-story mixed use building.

**Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:**

The proposal site is located in the south-central portion of the Maple Leaf neighborhood, a designated pedestrian zone within the Northgate Overlay District. The site located at the corner of NE 89<sup>th</sup> Street and Roosevelt Way NE a major arterial running in a north and south direction eventually turning into a one-way southbound arterial at Ne 75<sup>th</sup> St. to the south.

The unofficial boundaries of the Maple Leaf neighborhood are between Interstate 5 to the west and State Route 522 or Lake City Way to the east and as far north as Northgate Way and NE 75<sup>th</sup> Street to the south.

Located along Roosevelt Way NE stretching from NE 97<sup>th</sup> St. to NE 92<sup>nd</sup> are a number of 2 and 3 story multi-family residential structures, a limited number of single-family residential structures, and several artisan shops and other small businesses. The area around Roosevelt Avenue and 90<sup>th</sup> Street is the main business district in Maple Leaf.

Properties located either one block to the east or west of Roosevelt consists primarily of single-family residences from as far south to NE 86<sup>th</sup> to as north as NE 105<sup>th</sup> of varying styles and ages consisting heavily of split level smaller craftsman's mixed with a smaller number of Tudor style homes.

Other distinctive features of this neighborhood include the water tower and reservoir (Maple Leaf Reservoir Park) located at 85<sup>th</sup> and Roosevelt. The Park is a total of 16 acres and features a system of pathways weaving through plantings and trees, including two staircases connecting the upper and lower levels of the park. Finally, located two blocks to the east of Roosevelt NE on NE 92<sup>nd</sup> street is the Northwest Puppet Center which houses a museum, a stage for plays, and holds classes for puppet enthusiasts.

**Access:**

Access to the site located at the northwest corner of Roosevelt Way NE and NE 89<sup>th</sup> St., can be obtained by traveling north or south along Roosevelt Way NE and west onto NE 89<sup>th</sup> St.

**Environmentally Critical Areas:**

The site is not located in an Environmentally Critical Area.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This is a proposal to construct a five-story, 69-unit apartment building with commercial retail at grade. Parking for 63 vehicles to be provided. Existing structures to be demolished.

### EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE February 12, 2018

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3028940-LU) at the following website:

<http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/aboutus/news/events/DesignReview/SearchPastReviews/default.aspx>

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

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

**Email:**               [PRC@seattle.gov](mailto:PRC@seattle.gov)

## PUBLIC COMMENT

At the EDG meeting, the following comments were provided:

- Asked if the west facing building façade would have windows.
- Questioned if there would be underground rainwater catchments (cistern).
- Concerned that if an underground catchment system is introduced, that the root zone of trees would be cut.
- Questioned why this proposal is allowed five-stories in a corridor with existing buildings that have four stories. [Staff note: the existing building are underdeveloped within the zoning capacity of this corridor.]
- Appreciated the proposed building texture and brick work.
- Concerned about the height of the building on the west side and the amount of sun that will be blocked and its impact on the vegetation on that side of the building.
- Worried about the type of trees on the west side and their potential inability to survive due to lack of sun especially during the non-summer months.
- Suggested that the character of the building should relate more to the Maple Leaf neighborhood. Also suggested that the Maple Leaf neighborhood as a whole needs to have an overall design plan that new development should adhere to.
- Stated that the north side of the building feels bulky and that this side of the building would not receive any sun light.
- Questioned why the proposal needs 70 units as it is out of context for the neighborhood relative to other buildings in the neighborhood.

- Asked how HALA worked and how floor area ratios are determined, as the amount of building being by the structure is pretty significant.
- Asked what the strategy was for creating two separate buildings as depicted on page 42 of the EDG packet (dated 2/12/18).
- Verbalized that their yard looks into the back of the building and they would rather see units facing their property instead of the courtyard amenity space.
- Appreciated the diversity of mixture of unit types.
- Asked how one parking space per unit is not required for the development.
- Concerned that the morning light will be blocked.
- Appreciated the amount of parking being provided.
- Verbalized that it would be nice to slow traffic down for vehicle movement from Roosevelt onto 88<sup>th</sup> St. possibly introducing a crosswalk which would help make the area more of an urban center.
- Appreciated the wider sidewalks and the landscape plantings and the location of the garbage which is off the street.
- Verbalized a hope that the mixture of units will reflect the diversity of the community.
- Asked about the sizes of the units.
- Questioned what can be done to enforce parking as the onsite parking is sometimes cost prohibitive forcing residents to park on streets and 89<sup>th</sup> St is too narrow to accommodate any more on street parking as the travel lane is down to one lane.
- Asked what will be happening with all of the commercial parking along Roosevelt.
- Would like to see curb bulbs at the intersection of the project and possible flashing lights.
- Discussion about a number of non-design review related issues such a request to improvement to the park and the addition of play equipment.
- Suggested introducing electrically vehicle charging stations in the project.
- Suggested that there should be a designated car sharing parking space along Roosevelt between 88<sup>th</sup> and 89<sup>th</sup> Streets.

One purpose of the design review process is for the Board and City to receive comments from the public that help to identify feedback and concerns about the site and design concept, identify applicable citywide and neighborhood design guidelines of highest priority to the site and explore conceptual design, siting alternatives and eventual architectural design. Concerns with off-street parking, traffic and construction impacts are reviewed as part of the environmental review conducted by SDCI and are not part of this review. Concerns with building height calculations and bicycle storage standards are addressed under the City's zoning code and are not part of this review. Neither SDCI, nor the Design Review process have authority over zoning designations, unit size, density, or parking enforcement.

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:** The Board supported the preferred option (Option C), as they felt that this option did a better job responding to the adjacent residential structures to the west in pulling back the upper floors of the structures away from the property. The Board did acknowledge public concern about height and bulk impacts of Option C but gave support to the preferred option based on the use of setbacks at the upper two floors along Roosevelt Way which they suggested creates a sense of reduced mass as perceived from the pedestrian realm. The Board also supported how the building was modulated at the upper two floors of the building along NE 89<sup>th</sup> St. and levels 2-5 along the western façade.

Finally the Board verbalized that a two-story over three design scenario with the upper two floors setback will be more on display than a typical four and one design and therefore the exterior finish of the upper floors should be nicely detailed with durable, high quality materials and not be subordinate to the materials on the lower levels. **(CS2-D-3, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-5)**

2. **Materiality:** The Board suggested that when the project returns for the Recommendation phase of the project that there should be a strong color and material differentiation on both the east and west building facades. The Board also verbalized that with the upper levels being more prominent, that the façade should not take on a secondary or tertiary material treatment, but rather have greater parity between the upper and the lower masses. **(CS3-A-2, DC2-B-1)**
  - a. The Board agreed with public comment and was pleased with the proposed use of brick material and directed the applicant to demonstrate how they have taken care in creating careful detailing and design intent of the brick materials, inset panels, mullions on the upper and lower building façade along the eastern and how that has been carried around to the western building face. **(DC2-B-1, DC2-B-2)**
  - b. The Board requested rendered views of the building facades from eye level view as well as a full landscape plan for the Recommendation phase. **(PL3-A-2, DC2-B-1)**
3. **Waste Management:** The Board appreciated the proposed location and the method for garbage staging and removal. However, the Board suggested that the applicant consider providing pet relief stations on the roof in light of 70 new residential units being proposed and potential impacts to the right-of-way-planting strips along the curb due to pet use. **(CS2-D-5)**
4. **Ground Floor:**
  - a. The Board noted that there are a lot of activity nodes on the ground floor including the urban garden, the commercial spaces, a fitness center and artist

studios. The Board would like to better understand how all of these elements will come together and interact. ( PL3-A-1, DC-3-B-1, DC3-B-2)

- b. The Board also suggested that because of the limited right-of-way width, opportunities for placing chairs and table to enliven the streetscape might be limited. (CS2-B-2, PL3-A-1, D3B-B-2)
- c. The Board felt the artist studio presents a unique opportunity for creating additional vibrancy with the use of roll-up doors that would allow the activity to spill out onto the sidewalk. The Board also suggested that a roll up door could be used in the fitness room as well. (CS2-B-2, PL3-A-1)
- d. The Board admonished the applicant to design the building within stepped slabs so that the commercial and other spaces can easily be combined if future users needed to combine the spaces and maximize the functionality and viability of these commercial spaces. (CS2-D-5, CS3-A-2)
- e. The Board requested rough visualizations and plans depicting how the spaces will be used and how the spaces related to the lobby space, the art studio, grade relationships and the pedestrian experience. (CS2-B-2, PL3-A-1PL3-A-2)
- f. The Board requested further information demonstrating that the urban garden space remain available for public use. (PL3-A-2, DCB-B-3)

5. **Pedestrian Safety:** The Board acknowledged that it is challenge for pedestrians and vehicles to safely cross Roosevelt Way. The Board also agreed with the public sentiment that the applicant provide pedestrian friendly improvements along Roosevelt. (DG)

- a. The Board voiced that they would like to get a better understanding of the planning work that SDOT is doing along Roosevelt and how this project design might take advantage of these improvements in making the pedestrian crossing safer. (CS2-B-2, DCB-B-1)
- b. The Board stated that, if a curb bulb were allowed, they would like to know how it might affect the building frontage along Roosevelt, pedestrian traffic and its relationship to the project. (CS2-B-2, DCB-B-1)

6. **Vegetation:** The Board appreciated that planting was not being installed along the building edge which will most likely not survive but, rather, is located in the larger aggregated planting beds along the street edge. (CS2-D-3, DCB-B-3)

7. **Garage Entry:** The Board recommended that the garage entry be set back away of the sidewalk and utilize safety mechanisms. The Board verbalized that they would want to see how the garage entry is treated at the next recommendation meeting. (CS2-B-2)

## RECOMMENDATION September 17, 2018

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3028940-LU) at this website:

[http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design\\_Review\\_Program/Project\\_Reviews/Reports/default.asp](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**    **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)

### PUBLIC COMMENT

- Discussed the Early Masters Art program continuing within the context of the existing neighborhood.
- Supported the incorporation of a mural or other art work to the exterior of the proposed building façade.
- Looking forward to having a future for the Early Masters Art program in the context of the proposed development.
- Supported the design and proportionality and the treatment of the building at the corners.
- Supported the high quality brick as being a strong element.
- Stated that they wished the design was more forward thinking rather than relying on the 'brand' of the developer.
- Supported the departure request and thought that it is valid in its justification.
- Supported the proposal for the contract rezone, knowing that more housing options are needed for the neighborhood.
- Supported the commercial base but wanted to see what kinds of businesses might be targeted for those spaces.
- Suggested that commercial spaces could have the opportunity to spill out into the proposed urban garden area.

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. Response to EDG Guidance:** The Board generally agreed that the applicant responded well to the guidance given at the EDG meeting. The Board also agreed that the design met the early design guidance to clad the upper floors with high quality materials so that they would not appear to be subordinate to the lower levels. The Board supported the design approach and material application along the street facing façade along NE 89<sup>th</sup> Street as well. The Board appreciated the sidewalk vignette views of the project as represented on page 24 in the Recommendation packet, showcasing the building's materiality and the front entry transition. Finally, the Board recommended approval of the mural spaces targeted for the south facing wall. **(CS2-D-3, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-5)**
- 2. Materiality:** The Board supported the applicant's choice of materials as high quality and elegant and recommended that the brick soldier coursing was at an appropriate pedestrian scale. The Board approved of the detailing at the upper cornice as subtle way of accentuating the upper corner. The Board also recommended approval of the louver detailing above the windows along Roosevelt Way.

The Board was concerned about the middle portion of the structure facing Roosevelt Way NE which uses brick cladding on the first four floors with a darker cementitious material on the upper floors. Members suggested that this approach gives the building a wedding cake appearance that is not as successful as the rest of the building. The Board also suggested that the raising the parapet in addition to changing the material for this section results in too many design elements. The Board recommended that an alternative approach such as bringing the brick all the way to the top or bringing the higher quality horizontal panels at the corners across to the middle should be investigated as an alternative approach. **(CS3-A-2, DC2-B-1)**

- a.** The Board recommended a condition that the applicant bring the brick finish used on the center section of the east façade all the way to the top of the building. **(DC2-B-1, DC2-B-2)**
  - b.** The Board recommended a condition that applicant make the parapet all one plane. **(CS3-A-1, DC2-B, DC2-C)**
- 3. Ground Floor:** The Board re-visited their EDG discussion about the urban garden and suggested that the current design hasn't resulted in an urban garden but rather 5 foot setback or an entry plaza. The Board discussed the concept of what makes a good entry plaza and what is an appropriate scale for the street frontage. Members suggested that the current design lacks a specific character for an entry in terms of its massing form. In



continuing this discussion, the Board struggled with the specific requirements for an urban garden as required by Northgate Overlay guidelines where this project is located. The Board made a few suggestions as to how to augment the urban garden space starting with the inclusion of a pet relief area along the street. The Board also suggested that plant protectors be added to the planters on the property side or raise the planters to reduce the impact of pets relieving themselves along that edge. The Board recommended that the applicant further study how an alternative bench seating arrangement might be installed to better activate the street and make the urban garden space more usable. This could include reconfiguring the benches so that they are perpendicular to the property, made to be smaller or provide movable seating units.

- a. The Board recommended a condition that applicant further study an alternative bench seating arrangement including making the bench seating perpendicular to the property drawing increase attention to the front entry. **(CS2-B-2, PL3-A-2, PL3-A-1, DC2-B-1, DC3-B-2)**
- b. The Board suggested that the planters on the property side of the sidewalk be raised or otherwise protected from pets relieving themselves along that edge but did not make this a definitive condition of final approval. **(PL3-A-1, DC3-B-1, DC3-B-2, DC3-B-3)**

4. **Departures:** The Board recommended approval of the departure request as the smaller modulation of the upper level was in keeping with the spirit of the code requirements. The Board also felt that the elimination of the building notch that would result from a code compliant create a two building design which they felt would not be as successful. In addition, the Board felt that the granting of the departure would give the neighboring residences relief from view and noise impacts from potential users of the notched balcony space if the departure was not allowed. **CS2.D5, DC2.A1, DC2.A2, DC2.B1)**

## **DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES**

The Board's recommendation on the requested departures 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 departures.

At the time of the Recommendation meeting, the following departure was identified:

1. **Maximum Width and Depth of Structures (SMC 23.71.036):** The Code states that the maximum width and depth requirements for portions of structures located within an NC2-40 zone with a 40 feet or greater height limit shall not exceed 80% of the length of the abutting lot line, to a maximum of 60 feet, above a height of 30 feet.

The applicant is requesting a departure to allow for modulation at the upper levels of the building by dissolving the façade into wall segments of less than 60'-0" in length similar

to other recessed portions of the building structure that are within 50'-0" of the adjacent property line.

The Board supported the rationale presented by the applicant that the departure would provide an overall design that better meets the intent of the following design guidelines; **CS2.D5 – RESPECT FOR ADJACENT SITES, DC2.A1 – SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND USES, DC2.A2 - REDUCING PERCEIVED MASS, & DC2.B1 – FAÇADE COMPOSITION.** The rationale is that the proposed modulation meets the intent of the code section for maximum width and depth, but with a scale that is proportional to the long, narrow site, as opposed to the rigid length specified in the code. The design of the façade's secondary architectural features will further break up the perceived building mass. The added building modulation will provide for a more modest private amenity space at the upper level, as opposed to a larger, elevated courtyard that might be created by the prescriptive code, which would impact the privacy of the adjacent residential zone.

The Board unanimously recommended approval of this departure request as the smaller modulation of the upper level was in keeping with the spirit of the code requirements, and the elimination of the building notch that would result from the code compliant façade widths and the potential for a courtyard would give the neighboring residences relief from view and noise impacts from potential users.

The five Board members unanimously recommended approval of this departure.

## DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The priority guidelines identified by the Board as Priority Guidelines are summarized below, while all guidelines remain applicable. For the full text please visit the [Design Review website](#).

CONTEXT & SITE
<b>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.</b>
<b>CS2-B. ADJACENT SITES, STREETS, AND OPEN SPACES</b>
<b>CS2-B-1. Site Characteristics:</b> 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.
<b>CS2-B-2. Connection to the Street:</b> 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-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. Note that existing buildings may or may not reflect the density allowed by zoning or anticipated by applicable policies.

**CS2-D-2. Existing Street Features:** Use changes in topography, site shape, and vegetation or structures to help make a successful fit with adjacent properties; for example siting the greatest mass of the building on the lower part of the site or using an existing stand of trees to buffer building height from a smaller neighboring building.

**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.

Factors to consider:

- a. Distance to the edge of a less (or more) intensive zone;
- b. Differences in development standards between abutting zones;
- c. The type of separation from adjacent properties (e.g. separation by property line only, by an alley or street or open space, or by physical features such as grade change);
- d. Adjacencies to different neighborhoods or districts; adjacencies to parks, open spaces, significant buildings or view corridors; and
- e. Shading to or from neighboring properties.

**CS2-D-4. Massing Choices:** Strive for a successful transition between zones where a project abuts a less intense zone. In some areas, the best approach may be to lower the building height, break up the mass of the building, and/or match the scale of adjacent properties in building detailing. It may be appropriate in other areas to differ from the scale of adjacent buildings but preserve natural systems or existing features, enable better solar exposure or site orientation, and/or make for interesting urban form.

**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

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

### PL3-A ENTRIES

**PL3-A-1. Design Objectives:** Design primary entries to be obvious, identifiable, and distinctive with clear lines of sight and lobbies visually connected to the street. Scale and detail them to function well for their anticipated use and also to fit with the building of which they are a part, differentiating residential and commercial entries with design features and amenities specific to each.

- a. **Office/commercial lobbies** should be visually connected to the street through the primary entry and sized to accommodate the range and volume of foot traffic anticipated;
- b. **Retail entries** should include adequate space for several patrons to enter and exit simultaneously, preferably under cover from weather.
- c. **Common entries to multi-story residential buildings** need to provide privacy and security for residents but also be welcoming and identifiable to visitors. Design features emphasizing the entry as a semi-private space are recommended and may be accomplished through signage, low walls and/or landscaping, a recessed entry area, and other detailing that signals a break from the public sidewalk.
- d. **Individual entries to ground-related housing** should be scaled and detailed appropriately to provide for a more intimate type of entry. The design should contribute to a sense of identity, opportunity for personalization, offer privacy, and emphasize personal safety and security for building occupants.

**PL3-A-2. Ensemble of Elements:** Design the entry as a collection of coordinated elements including the door(s), overhead features, ground surface, landscaping, lighting, and other features. Consider a range of elements such as:

- a. overhead shelter: canopies, porches, building extensions;

- b. transitional spaces: stoops, courtyards, stairways, portals, arcades, pocket gardens, decks;
- c. ground surface: seating walls; special paving, landscaping, trees, lighting; and
- d. building surface/interface: privacy screens, upward-operating shades on windows, signage, lighting.

## 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 through the placement and detailing of all elements, including bays, fenestration, and materials, and any patterns created by their arrangement. On sites that abut an alley, design the alley façade and its connection to the street carefully. At a minimum, consider wrapping the treatment of the street-facing façade around the alley corner of the building.

**DC2-B-2. Blank Walls:** Avoid large blank walls along visible façades wherever possible. Where expanses of blank walls, retaining walls, or garage facades are unavoidable, include uses or design treatments at the street level that have human scale and are designed for pedestrians. These may include:

- a. newsstands, ticket booths and flower shops (even if small or narrow);
- b. green walls, landscaped areas or raised planters;
- c. wall setbacks or other indentations;
- d. display windows; trellises or other secondary elements;
- e. art as appropriate to area zoning and uses; and/or
- f. terraces and landscaping where retaining walls above eye level are unavoidable.

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

### DC3-B OPEN SPACE USES AND ACTIVITIES

**DCB-B-1. Meeting User Needs:** Plan the size, uses, activities, and features of each open space to meet the needs of expected users, ensuring each space has a purpose and function.

**DCB-B-2. Matching Uses to Conditions:** Respond to changing environmental conditions such as seasonal and daily light and weather shifts through open space design and/or programming of open space activities. For example, place outdoor seating and gathering areas where there is sunny exposure and shelter from wind. Build flexibility into the design in order to accommodate changes as needed; e.g. a south-facing courtyard that is ideal in spring may become too hot in summer, necessitating a shift of outdoor furniture to a shadier location for the season.

**DCB-B-3. Connections to Other Open Space:** Site and design project-related open spaces should connect with, or enhance, the uses and activities of other nearby public open space where appropriate. Look for opportunities to support uses and activities on adjacent properties and/or the sidewalk.

**DC3-B-4. Multifamily Open Space:** Design common and private open spaces in multifamily projects for use by all residents to encourage physical activity and social interaction. Some examples include areas for gardening, children's play (covered and uncovered), barbeques, resident meetings, and crafts or hobbies.

## **DC2-C SECONDARY ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES**

**DC2-C-3. Fit With Neighboring Buildings:** Use design elements to achieve a successful fit between a building and its neighbors.

- a. considering aspects of neighboring buildings through architectural style, roof line, datum line detailing, fenestration, color or materials,

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The recommendations summarized above were based on the design review packet dated September 17, 2018 and materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the September 17, 2018 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, five Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design, with the following conditions.

1. Bring the brick finish used on the center section of the east façade all the way to the top of the building. **(CS3-A-2, DC2-B-1)**
2. Make the parapet along the east facing building façade all one plane. **(CS3-A-1, DC2-B, DC2-C)**
3. Further study an alternative bench seating arrangement including making the seating perpendicular to the property designed to draw attention to the front entry. **(CS2-B-2, PL3-A-2, PL3-A-1, DC2-B-1, DC3-B-2)**