City of Seattle

Department of Construction & Inspections

DESIGN REVIEW

SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE OF THE EAST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Record Number:	3032059-EG
Address:	3138 Fairview Ave E.
Applicant:	Scot Carr, Public 47
Date of Meeting:	Wednesday, November 28, 2018
Board Members Present:	Andrew Haas (Chair) Betsy Anderson Alastair Townsend AJ Taaca
Board Members Absent:	Melissa Alexander Carson Hartman
SDCI Staff Present:	David Landry, AICP, Land Use Planner

SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: Commercial 1 Maximum Height Limit 40' (C1-40)

Nearby Zones: North: C1-40/C2-40
South: C1-40/Neighborhood Commercial Pedestrian Overlay, Maximum Height Limit-40 (NC3P-40)
East: NC3P-40
West: C2-40

Project Area: 24,931 Square Feet (sq. ft.)

Overlay Districts:
Eastlake Residential Urban Village
Frequent Transit Service Corridor
(No Parking Requirement)

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.

Environmentally Critical Area (ECA): Steep Slope
Liquefaction Prone Area

Current Development:
The proposal site is located on the east side of Fairview Ave E., just north of E. Allison St., and south of a three leg oblique intersection with Fairview Ave. E., E. Martin St., and Harvard Ave E. The proposal site is located within the Eastlake neighborhood located in the Eastlake Residential Urban Village Overlay. The site is currently occupied by a single-story office building connected on its south side by a two-story light manufacturing structure, both of masonry construction originally built in 1964.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:
The proposal site is located near the shoreline along the eastern portion of Lake Union and is characterized as an upland lot within an Urban Commercial Shoreline district. The site is located on the east side of Fairview Ave E., southeast of Good Turn Park and just west of the Interstate 5 (I-5) overpass. Fairview Ave. separates the waterfront lots from the upland lots along this stretch of the road. Historically the surrounding area was known for its dry docks, marinas, machine shops, and old squatter houseboats. In more recent years the area is known as popular recreation area with several rowing and yacht clubs and marinas along the water's edge in addition to a number of floating homes.

Located to the west of the proposal site, on the west side of Fairview Ave. E., between E. Martin St. right-of-way and E. Allison St. are a small number of single and multi-story commercial buildings and a smaller number of single-story single-family residences. Located to the south of the site, at the corner Fairview Ave. E. and E. Allison St. is a five-story, 30 unit condominium complex built which was built in 1991. Situated along the rear project site, east of the alley, at a much higher elevation are a small number of mixed-use structures of varying heights accessed from Eastlake Ave E., with views to Lake Union.

Access:
Access to the site is currently south off of Fairview Ave E., which is curbless in this area. There is also partial access to the rear or east side of the site via an unimproved alley right-of-way, mid-block and north off of E. Allison St.

Environmentally Critical Areas:
The site is identified as being partially located within steep slope and liquefaction Environmentally Critical Areas.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Design proposal to construct a 5-story, 103-unit apartment building. Parking for 40 vehicles proposed. Existing 1-story building to be demolished, and 2-story building to remain.

FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE September 12, 2018

The design packet includes information presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3032059-EG) 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
The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Questioned why the applicant did not make an effort to preserve any of the trees on site and in the E. Martin St. right-of-way.
- Stated that the design team should have provided a viable alternative that featured two or more buildings that could provide views corridors, adding light and air.
- Suggested that the design packet has only provided one viable alternative that is extremely massive.
- Suggested that the project will set architectural precedent along the furthest northern reaches of Fairview Ave. E.
- Applauded the applicant for providing parking in a frequent transit area which does not required off street parking.
- Supported the new stairway within the E. Martin St. right-of-way. Encouraged the applicant to provide a barrier free route.
- Suggested that the depth of the units on the upper floors of Alternatives 1 and 2 are extremely insufficient which basically gives the appearance of a very large wall.
- Asked if the existing two story building will remain at its current height or will it be increased in height at a later date.
- Concerned that the stair tower height may obstruct neighboring views.
- Criticized the project for not having additional guest parking.
- Stated that views to the lake will be obstructed.
- Suggested that the requested shoreline variance will be legally challenged.
- Believed that the proposed massing will be an existential threat to the way of life and values of the people in the neighborhood.
- Suggested that neighboring building which has a high degree of historical significance will be extremely impacted in terms of views to the lake.
- Suggested that the alley is not suitable for automobile access to the site.
- Stated that the loss of the significant tree (magnolia) should have mitigation significant enough to mitigate its loss.
- Stated that all three design alternatives are challenging to the adjacent neighbors and the first two seem unrealistic.

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. **Massing Options:** The Board discussed the massing options and concluded that additional massing studies are required. The Board acknowledged that the work so far is a good foundation that needs further exploration. The Board listed benefits and challenges of each of the massing options, to help inform the development of the additional massing options:
    - **a.** The Board questioned whether Alternatives 1 and 2 were actual viable alternatives as the upper living units appear to be extremely small or oddly configured.
    - **b.** Alternatives 1 and 2 have solid wall massing heights with very narrow upper stories that climb to a height of up to 70 feet. **(CS2-D, DC2-A)**
    - **c.** In agreement with the public comment, the Board was concerned about the tree in Alternative 2 being unnecessarily encumbered and doomed to failure.
    - **d.** The Board appreciated the architectural exercise that the design team went through in developing Alternatives 1 and 2 given the constraints of the site, and how the exercise informed one real alternative based on lowering the building height.
    - **e.** The Board was concerned that the preferred option requires a Shoreline variance, which is outside the Board's purview.
    - **f.** The Board supported the design approach of Alternative 2 with two massing elements, which helps to break down the scale of the building on a very long site.
    - **g.** The preferred alternative would feature a long walkway with a long expanse of residential units without the benefit of commercial space, coffee shops, or gathering spaces, and a missed opportunity for contributing elements for any possible future green street.
    - **h.** The notch in Alternative 2 helps to break up the mass and make the structure fit in better with the scale of the rest of the neighborhood.
    - **i.** The granularity of the surrounding neighborhood should inform the massing. Explore the juxtapositionof different forms, sizes, and scales of building masses. This could be used to further develop massing Alternative 2.
    - **j.** Additional massing alternatives could also use Alternative three as a starting point.
    - **k.** The Board appreciated the retention of the building, but it should be better integrated into the overall project.

    The Board directed the design team to develop alternative massing options that would be possible without a shoreline variance approval. The Board stated that they would like to see an alternative(s) in response to the context and Design Guidelines:

a. They requested to see more variety in the terracing that responds to context of other buildings Eastlake, which should inform massing of the project. **(CS2-D, DC2-A)**

b. Develop at one viable massing alternative that features a broken massing approach instead the one continuous building façade. **(CS2-D, DC2-A)**

c. Design the proposal with a more cohesive architectural concept. **(CS2-A-2, DC2-A-2, DC2-C-3)**

d. Include at least one massing option that provides sufficient area for the exceptional tree to continue to thrive. **(CS1-D, CS2-B-3)**

e. The Board requested additional illustrations and perspectives on the building, featuring views of the proposal site from across the lake, (looking toward the building), from above as might be seen from Eastlake Ave E and other important views such as the stairway. **(DC2-C-3, DC2-D, DC3-A)**

f. Design the massing options with a more innovative design solution to the site constraints. Possible options include a terracing or shifting approach that is more "avant-garde," possibly similar to some of the precedent images or past works in the EDG packet. This approach could possibly support different departures.

g. The Board also suggested that a terracing approach from the second or third floor upward and back could fit in better with the context of the existing site constraints, resulting in a more whimsical and inspirational approach to the massing. **(CS1-C-1, CS1-C-2, CS2-A-1, CS2-D-2, CS2-D-5, DC1-A-2, DC2-A-2, DC2-C-3)**

2. **Materiality:** The Board supported the design team's choice of materials and over parti which includes brick, real wood, interesting textures, inset balconies, and other elements found in the surrounding neighborhood. The Board verbalized that they venting should be carefully integrated with the exterior of the building façade. The Board acknowledged the public comment about the stair tower over run and vents, and recommended shifting these rooftop masses to the north so that it is more sensitive to adjacent views. **DC2-B-1, DC2-D-2, DC4-A-1, DC4-D-2**

    a. The Board recommended shifting the southernmost stair tower to the north so that it is more sensitive to adjacent views. If it's not possible to move the stair tower and rooftop masses to the north, explain why it is infeasible. **(PL3-A-4)**

3. **Streetscape:** The Board discussed the streetscape along Fairview Ave E., and stated that residential stoops help to activate a streetscape. The Board suggested that the depth of the proposed stoops was a positive but questioned the parallel orientation of the stair to the street, which seems to be potentially less engaging to the street than a perpendicular orientation. The Board also discussed briefly concerns with other amenities such as bike parking and storage and trash room location.

    a. The Board requested a study of both parallel and perpendicular stoop orientations and a clear distinction as to why one orientation is superior to the other, in terms of reinforcing the architectural concept and activation of the street. **(PL2-B-1, PL2-B-3, PL3-B-1, PL3-B-2)**

    b. The Board requested more information about the location of the trash, where it will be stored, how it will be staged, and where it will be picked up. **(DC1-C)**

    c. The Board requested additional information pertaining to the proposed amount of bicycle storage and recommended more than the Code required minimum at this

location. The design should also incorporate storage area for small boats, stand up paddle boards, or other recreational equipment to support the active engagement to the street. **(PL4-B, DC1-C)**

4. **Fairview and Alley Access:**
   - **a.** The Board was concerned about the applicant stating that SDOT supported garage access from the street, and noted the SDOT memo did not specifically support street access at this time. *(staff note: vehicular access location is required by the Land Use Code and is subject to approval by the SDCI Director)*
   - **b.** The Board suggested that the success of the pedestrian pathway would be predicated on the introduction of the stairway leading between Eastlake Ave. E and Fairview Ave E. This stair would place more focus on the rear of the building rather than the front, but the Board supported the concept of the pedestrian way and the pedestrian oriented design at the rear of the building. The Board suggested that the pedestrian pathway would act as a quiet park like pedestrian route. **(PL2-B-3, PL3-A-2, PL3-B, PL4 CS2-B-2, DC2-B-1, DC2-B-2, DC4-A-1)**
   - **c.** The Board commended the design in knitting the urban fabric together with their design of the stairway and pedestrian walkway, but wanted the design team to further hone in on how the details of these spaces and the transition to the residential units at grade. **(PL2-B-3, PL3-A-2, PL3-B, PL4 CS2-B-2, DC2-B-1, DC2-B-2, DC4-A-1)**
   - **d.** The Board potentially supported idea of parking access off of Fairview Ave. E. contingent upon the design and activation of the pedestrian alley, minimizing the appearance of the vehicle entry with an eye to texture, detail and transparency. The vehicle access should not be a large blank wall with little visual interest. **(PL2-B-3, PL3-A-2, PL3-B, PL4 CS2-B-2, DC2-B-1, DC2-B-2, DC4-A-1)**
   - **e.** The Board also suggested that they would be receptive of seeing the streetscape designed more as woonerf with elements designed to support pedestrian and bicycle activity. The Board recognizing that this would be out of their purview gave no further details as to what they would like to see. **(PL2-B-3, PL3-A-2, PL3-B, PL4 CS2-B-2, DC2-B-1, DC2-B-2, DC4-A-1)**
   - **f.** The Board directed the design team to provide additional details demonstrating how the pedestrian walkway and stairs will function. The Board also agreed with the public comment that the route should be designed as a barrier free route if at all possible. **(PL2-B-3, PL3-A-2, PL3-B, PL4 CS2-B-2, DC2-B-1, DC2-B-2, DC4-A-1)**
   - **g.** The Board also noted that the applicant could seek further input from SDOT, which can be considered by the Board as they review the departure request. **(CS2-B-2, PL2, PL3-B-4, PL4)**
   - **h.** The Board encouraged the applicant team to design the parking access off of Fairview as small as possible with a potential nod toward approving a departure for access of the street. **(DC1-C)**

5. **Commercial Use:** The Board questioned the decision to place the commercial space in one location, as opposed to spreading it out in multiple locations to encourage transparency and eyes on the street. The Board stated that if the commercial space is retained in its current location, it might become a unique use that engages more with the lake. They acknowledged

concerns about the long term viability of any commercial space in that location, as it appeared there were limited other pedestrian oriented commercial opportunities' along this stretch of the street. **(PL3-A, PL3-C, DC1-A-3)**

6. **Storm Water Issues:** The Board verbalized concerned about recent storm water issues and asked the design team to demonstrate how they have addressed these concerns. The Board suggested that this location would benefit from green stormwater infrastructure.
    a. The Board requested that the design team provide reference or integration of green street work that has been done for this area to date. **(CS1-E-1, CS1-E-2, DC3-C-2)**

7. **Departure:** The Board agreed in principle with all three requested departures. However, the Board requested additional information in support of the design rationale.
    a. Provide additional view studies and design details in support of parking access of Fairview Ave. E., the pedestrian path within the alley right-of-way, and the reduction of in the floor level for a residential use located along a street-level street-facing façade per the following detailed description below. **(CS2-B-2**, **PL2-B-1, PL2-B-3, DC2-B-1**, **DC2-B-2, DC2-D-2, DC3-C-2DC4-A-1)**

SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE NOVEMBER 28, 2018

The design packet includes information presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3032059-EG) 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
The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Stated that based on past experience the Shoreline Variance is unlikely to be achieved.
- Appreciated how the applicant has met and discussed some of the neighbors' concerns.
- Not convinced that the neighbor's concerns have been fully addressed.
- Suggested that the neighboring "Whaac All All" building located above the proposal, has both cultural and historical significance for the whole city due to its unique native history and cultural iconography along the exterior of the building.
- Suggested that the Ship Canal Bridge is a large generator of noise affecting surrounding properties, which will have a greater impact as a result of noise bouncing between the bridge and the building mass created by the proposed project.

- Suggested that the narrow channel view will be ineffective to the lower floors of the "Whaac All All" as the view impacts will remain.
- Suggested the proposed building should provide an appropriate zone transition by creating massing that is stepped away from neighboring properties.
- Observed that the proposed community room and stair tower despite moving further south still occupies the southern portion of the building continuing to create a view obstruction.
- Suggested that the proposed structure should be designed as a stepped mass toward the far north end of the building so that the properties located to east are less impacted.
- Stated that the garage structure could be thought of as a plinth with smaller individual residential towers located on top.
- Suggested that the design proposal should create gaps between residential towers sitting on a one-story parking garage designed as a plinth, which could have less of an impact to structures on the uphill side.
- Verbalized that creating gaps between the buildings would allow opportunities for landscape and pedestrian connections to alley which would be more in keeping with many of the existing buildings especially along the lakeshore.
- Observed that many of the businesses located in the area are smaller buildings with a strong east-west orientation, with distinct roof forms and building materials.
- Supported the modulation of the building's west façade, some of the buildings indentations and the interesting color combinations, but suggested that more should be done to break up the monolithic form of the building.
- Suggested that the stair and elevator towers, machinery spaces, heat pumps, parapets and safety rails, look differently than when presented and end up being much taller than presented. Suggested that the Board hold the development height to a specific number which would give neighbors a greater sense of comfort.
- Requested that the stoops be designed as individualized private spaces with access to water for watering plants as communal stoops do not work.
- Disappointed that the project does not provide upstairs and downstairs units within the structure as it makes it child compatible housing which the City desperately needs.
- Suggested that a portion of the roof should be designed as a wedge shape to combat the effects of noise reverberating between buildings.
- Verbalized disappointment by all of the design alternatives because they are not responsive to the comments that the Board provided.
- Suggested that the project is a huge monolithic building when the design team should have at least developed one alternative that showed separate buildings.
- Suggested that the one of the alternatives might have been a series of 4-plexes or other design approach which provide yards.
- Disappointed that most of the alternatives do not try to preserve the existing Magnolia or other trees in the area.
- Suggested that this design and the City as a whole should do a better job respecting the "Whaac All All" building as a historical landmark.
- Suggested that the Board should send this project back for another EDG meeting for development of serious alternatives which the applicant still has not provided.
- Asked what will happen if the shoreline variance request is not approved.

- Suggested that the design is interesting as it has a number of breaks, interesting colors and interesting rooftop deck edifice that is probably nice to look at and just concrete square blocks.

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, noise and construction impacts are reviewed as part of the environmental review conducted by SDCI and are not part of this review. SDCI, nor the Design Review Boards, have the authority to protect views from private property.

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:**
   - **a.** In respond to EDG 1 the Board stated that the design scheme has made significant progress in accommodating the Board's feedback. **(CS2-D, DC2-A)**
   - **b.** The project now uses a much more sophisticated set of moves to create a clearer hierarchy of design elements, with portions of the building being recessed while other portions are flush with the street. **(CS2-A-2, DC2-A-2, DC2-C-3)**
   - **c.** The Board supported the proportionality of the second story of the building which references the height of the commercial building to the south, yet remains slim and somewhat elegant but a nice counterpoint to the design elements on the upper floor. The Board also asked if the existing building's second floor datum line could be used to better integrated with the second floor of the proposed building as the current configuration gives the impression that the appears to the two lines are skewed. **(CS2-A-2, DC2-A-2, DC2-C-3)**
   - **d.** The Board noted that proportions of the second floor could be further emphasized with an added setback or reveal along the north facing façade creating a more prominent for floating feature that is more proud of the rest of the facade. **(DC2-B, DC2-C)**
   - **e.** The Board supported the direction of the modulation and felt that forms were clean and simple. **(PL3-B-2)**
   - **f.** The Board questioned the concept of leaving a tunnel as a view corridor at the south end of the roof, (as a means of providing relief to the upland properties in term of view impact) and suggested that it could be completely removed in favor or adding height to the opposite side of the roof structure similar to comments made by the general public. **(DC1-A-4)**

g. The Board stated that the rooftop amenity area with the view corridor and amenity space seems unresolved as an integrated concept. **(DC1-A-4)**

h. While the Board supported the concept of stacking blocks in the current preferred design scheme, they also felt that the project could be terraced upward to the north without destroying the concept of the stacked modulated squares similar to comments made by the general public. **(CS2-D, DC2-A)**

i. The Board did acknowledge however that the shoreline variance is factor in whether any additional height can be gained in the shoreline which could affect a terracing design move. **(CS2-D-1)**

h. The Board expressed a willingness to move the project forward to the next round of reviews providing that a revised version of the preferred option featuring the stepped stacked box concept located on the north side of the building is explored which the public also supported. The Board clearly verbalized that they wanted to see how this design approach would not work if it was determined to be infeasible or conceptually undesirable. **(CS1-C-1, CS1-C-2, CS2-A-1, CS2-D-2, CS2-D-5, DC1-A-2, DC2-A-2, DC2-C-3)**

2. Alternatives:

a. The Board acknowledged that the project would need to come back in front of the Board if the Shoreline Variance was not approved.

b. While not a viable alternative, the Board appreciated the design team's efforts in researching a massing option that could preserve the Exceptional Magnolia tree. The Board also appreciated that the team spoke with Big Trees on the possibility of transplanting the tree which turned out not to be a viable solution. The Board further discussed the need to replace tree canopy and suggested that the applicant should err on the side of caution and provide the maximum number of trees rather than the minimum as well as the maximum soil volume. **(PL3-A-2, DC4-D)**

3. Storm Water Features:

a. Per Board guidance, the project proposal has now been designed to include green storm water infrastructure which offers both a prominent storm water features as well as a visual bioretention features designed to treat both on-site stormwater and to filter and clean approximately one acre of Interstate 5 bridge runoff to a Salmon Safe water standard, which the Board wholeheartedly supported. **(CS1-E-1, CS1-E-2, DC3-C-2)**

b. The Board asked if there could be more integration of the two stormwater features that the flank the hill-climb stairs with the stairs and trees as an integrated design element. The Board also welcomed more ideas to create public engagement with the bioretention features. **(CS1-E-1, CS1-E-2, DC3-C-2)**

c. The Board requested that for the next Recommendation phase, they would like to see where the water is being generated from, where it's flowing to, how it's coming of the buildings as well as other detailed factors. **(CS1-E-1, CS1-E-2, DC3-C-2)**

4. **Streetscape and Landscape Design:**
    a. The Board supported the proposed hill-climb stair to the north of the building, along the unimproved E Martin St right-of-way as a public connector from Eastlake down to Good Turn Park.
    b. The Board also supported how the stairs provide access to the alley pedestrian path and the new plaza at the proposed building entrance at the bottom of the stair. **(PL2-B-3, PL3-A-2, PL3-B, PL4 CS2-B-2, DC2-B-1, DC2-B-2, DC4-A-1)**
    c. The Board supported the integration of bioretention planters with the hill-climb stairs and the new replacement magnolia tree as a means of knitting back together the urban fabric and streetscape with pedestrian access points. **(CS1-E-1, CS1-E-2)**
    d. The Board asked the design team to further investigate and provide details of infiltration opportunities into the tree wells along Fairview Avenue E. **(CS1-E-1, CS1-E-2, DC3-C-2)**
    e. The Board liked the re-oriented front stoops along Fairview as creating a very positive pedestrian experience and each is destined to create its own unique character as life fills in. **(PL2-B-1, PL2-B-3, PL3-B-1, PL3-B-2)**

5. **Bicycle and Kayak Storage:**
    a. The Board supported increased bike parking capacity including the additional bike parking provided at the alley level which now in total exceeds the code minimum of 87 spaces in addition to the new kayak storage for use by residents. **(PL4-B, DC1-C)**

6. **Trash:**
    a. For the recommendation phase, the Board asked for a better understanding of how the trash will be picked up and staged. They suggested that it appears that the trash room seems to be close enough to the street to be picked up from the street by waste management and not staged on the Green Street while asking for additional details. **(DC1-C)**

7. **Alley Access:**
    a. While the Board suggested that the pedestrian pathway along the alley right-of-way would act as a quiet park like pedestrian route, they requested additional detailed illustrations for the condition of the walkway and the building façade as seen from a pedestrian experience as the walkway feels narrows and a bit oppressive. The Board suggested that a wider well-lit path should be introduced as a means of enhancing the pedestrian experience. **(PL2-B-3, PL3-A-2, PL3-B, PL4 CS2-B-2, DC2-B-1, DC2-B-2, DC4-A-1)**

8. **Materiality:**
    a. The Board noted the use of high quality metal, real wood and concrete as the preferred material finishes. The Board approved of several of the precedent images gathered from around the neighborhood that had interesting textures and demonstrated their applicability. **DC2-B-1, DC2-D-2, DC4-A-1, DC4-D-2**

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. **Parking Location Access (SMC 23.47A.032.A):** The Code requires parking access from the alley, with exceptions that may be permitted by the SDCI Director. The applicant is proposing vehicle access to the site from Fairview Ave. via a single curb cut.

   The applicant's rationale for the request states that the departure would make efficient use of the building's ground floor as it would minimize internal ramping to the garage, it would allow uses to provide 'eyes on the street' at the alley, and provide an opportunity for improving a pedestrian network between the new Martin St. stair, Good Turn Park, proposed ground level residential units, and Fairview Ave E.

   The Board continued their preliminary support of this departure request to allow parking access off of Fairview Ave. E. contingent upon being aware of and remedying potential automobile-pedestrians conflicts. Members suggested that vehicular access from Fairview should be minimized and designed with an eye to adding texture along the ground plain and other details as well as an eye toward transparency. Finally the Board reiterated their request for additional design details that support the request for the pedestrian path within the alley right-of-way and justification for allowing parking access of Fairview Ave. E.,

   (CS2-B-2. Connection to the Street, PL2-B-3. Street-Level Transparency, DC2-B-1. Façade Composition, DC2-B-2. Blank Walls, DC2-D-2 Texture, DC4-A-1. Exterior Finish Materials, DC4-A-1. Exterior Finish Materials)

2. **Dwelling Unit Location (SMC23.47A.008.D.2):** The Code requires that where residential uses are located along a street-level street-facing façade, the floor of a dwelling unit located along the street-level street-facing facade shall be at least 4 feet above or 4 feet below sidewalk grade or set back at least 10 feet from the sidewalk.

   The applicant is proposing that a residential use located along a street-level street-facing façade has a first-floor level of two feet above sidewalk grade.

   The applicant's justification suggests that the proposal creates stronger interaction between street level residential units to the street and pedestrian realm by reducing the vertical distance between residential and stoop floor level and the sidewalk (per **PL-3 Street Level Interaction**). The applicant indicates that two-foot stoop above the sidewalk does not require a guardrail, which is felt to further increase street level interaction potential. As a result, the departure would improve the first floor residential units by providing taller

ceilings. **(PL2-B-1 Eyes on the Street, PL3-B-2. Ground-level Residential, PL3 Street Level Interaction, DC3-A-1 Interior/Exterior Fit)**

The Board indicated continued preliminary support of the departure request.

3. **Alley Improvements (SMC 23.53.030.F and G).** *Staff Note:* The applicant presented a departure request to modify the requirements for alley improvements and required alley setback. However, the requirements of this code section cannot be modified through a design review departure.

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 the natural topography and/or other desirable land forms or features to inform the project design.

CS1-C-2. Elevation Changes: Use the existing site topography when locating structures and open spaces on the site. Consider "stepping up or down" hillsides to accommodate significant changes in elevation.

CS1-D PLANTS AND HABITAT

CS1-D-2. Off-Site Features: Provide opportunities through design to connect to off-site habitats such as riparian corridors or existing urban forest corridors. Promote continuous habitat, where possible, and increase interconnected corridors of urban forest and habitat where possible.

CS1-E WATER

CS1-E-1. Natural Water Features: If the site includes any natural water features, consider ways to incorporate them into project design, where feasible.

CS1-E-2. Adding Interest with Project Drainage: Use project drainage systems as opportunities to add interest to the site through water-related design elements. Features such as trees, rain gardens, bioswales, green roofs, fountains of recycled water, and/or water art installations can create movement and sound, air cooling, focal points for pedestrians, and habitats which may already be required to manage on-site stormwater and allow reuse of potable water for irrigation.

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 unusual shaped lots that can add distinction to the building massing.

CS2-B-2. Connection to the Street: Identify opportunities for the project to make a strong connection to the street and public realm. 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.

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

CS2-D-3. Zone Transitions: For projects located at the edge of different zones, provide an appropriate transition or complement to the adjacent zone(s). Projects should create a step in perceived height, bulk and scale between the anticipated development potential of the adjacent zone and the proposed development.

CS2-D-4. Massing Choices: Strive for a successful transition between zones where a project abuts a less intense zone.

CS2-D-5. Respect for Adjacent Sites: Respect adjacent properties with design and site planning to minimize disrupting the privacy of residents in adjacent buildings.

PUBLIC LIFE

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

PL2-B. SAFETY AND SECURITY

PL2-B-1. Eyes on the Street: Create a safe environment by providing lines of sight and encouraging natural surveillance through strategic placement of doors, windows, balconies and street-level uses.

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

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

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

PL3-A ENTRIES

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

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;

d. building surface/interface: privacy screens, upward-operating shades on windows, signage, lighting.

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. Consider design approaches such as elevating the main floor, providing a setback from the sidewalk, and/or landscaping to indicate the transition from one type of space to another.

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 and sidewalk. Consider providing a greater number of transition elements and spaces, and choose materials carefully to clearly identify the transition from public sidewalk to private residence. In addition to the ideas in PL3-B-1, design strategies include:

a. vertical modulation and a range of exterior finishes on the facade to articulate the location of residential entries;
b. pedestrian-scaled building addressing and signage, and entry elements such as mail slots/boxes, doorbells, entry lights, planter boxes or pots; and
c. a combination of window treatments at street level, to provide solutions to varying needs for light, ventilation, noise control, and privacy.

PL3-B-3. Buildings with Live/Work Uses: Maintain active and transparent facades in the design of live/work residences that are required to orient the nonresidential portions of the unit toward the street. 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. Consider locating commonly used features or services such as mailboxes, outdoor seating, seasonal displays, children's play equipment, and space for informal events in the area between buildings as a means of encouraging interaction.

PL4 Active Transportation: Incorporate design features that facilitate active forms of transportation such as walking, bicycling, and use of transit.

PL4-B PLANNING AHEAD FOR BICYCLISTS

PL4-B-1. Early Planning: Consider existing and future bicycle traffic to and through the site early in the process so that access and connections are integrated into the project along with other modes of travel.

PL4-B-2. Bike Facilities: Facilities such as bike racks and storage, bike share stations, shower facilities and lockers for bicyclists should be located to maximize convenience, security, and safety.

PL4-B-3. Bike Connections: Facilitate connections to bicycle trails and infrastructure around and beyond the project. Design bicycling access points so that they relate to the street grid and include information about connections to existing trails and infrastructure where possible. Also consider signage, kiosks, building lobbies, and bicycle parking areas, where provided, as opportunities to share bicycling information.

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-C Parking and Service Uses

DC1-C-2. Visual Impacts: Reduce the visual impacts of parking lots, parking structures, entrances, and related signs and equipment as much as possible.

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, 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

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. Examples include shading devices and windows that add rhythm and depth as well as contribute toward energy efficiency and/or savings or canopies that provide street-level scale and detail while also offering weather protection. Where these elements are prominent design features, the quality of the materials is critical.

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

DC2-D Scale and Texture

DC2-D-1. Human Scale: Incorporate architectural features, elements, and details that are of human scale into the building facades, entries, retaining walls, courtyards, and exterior spaces in a manner that is consistent with the overall architectural concept

DC2-D-2. Texture: Design the character of the building, as expressed in the form, scale, and materials, to strive for a fine-grained scale, or "texture," particularly at the street level and other areas where pedestrians predominate.

DC3 Open Space Concept: Integrate open space design with the building design so that they complement each other.

DC3-A Building-Open Space Relationship

DC3-A-1. Interior/Exterior Fit: Develop an open space concept in conjunction with the architectural concept to ensure that interior and exterior spaces relate well to each other and support the functions of the development.

DC3-B Open Space Uses and Activities

DC3-B-1. Meeting User Needs: Plan the size, uses, activities, and features of each open space to meet the needs of expected users, ensuring each space has a purpose and function.

DC3-B-2. Open Space Uses and Activities: 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.

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.

DC3-C Design

DC3-C-2. Amenities/Features: Create attractive outdoor spaces suited to the uses envisioned for the project.

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-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.

BOARD DIRECTION

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