



RECOMMENDATION OF THE NORTHEAST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Project Number: 3033823-LU

Address: 420 NE 72nd St.

Applicant: Talia Olson, Collins Woerman

Date of Meeting: Monday, July 08, 2019

Board Members Present: Katy Haima, (Substitute Chair)
Dan Rusler
Anita Jeerage (Substitute)

Board Members Absent: James Marria
Brian Bishop

SDCI Staff Present: David Landry, AICP, Land Use Planner

SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: Neighborhood Commercial 2, Pedestrian Designation 75' height limit (M1)
(NC2P-75 (M1))

Nearby Zones: (North) Low Rise 3 (M) (LR3 (M1))
(South) NC2P-75 (M)
(East) LR3 (M)
(West) NC2-75 (M1)

Project Area: Approximately 24,758 sq. ft.

Overlay Districts:

- Green Lake Residential Urban Village
- Frequent Transit Corridor
(No Minimum 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.

Current Development:

The proposal site is located along NE 72nd St. from 5th Ave. NE east to approximately mid-block traveling west between 5th Ave. NE and Woodlawn Ave. NE. The alley (a designated east-west public right-of-way) is located along the northern property line, with NE 72nd St. along the southern boundary. The site consists of five distinct parcels with five distinct parcel numbers. The site is located at the northeast corner of a designated "Pedestrian Zone Boundary" with primary pedestrian traffic oriented toward the commercial activities located to the south and southwest. A small number of one and two story wooden and masonry structures and surface lot parking are located on site.

Located at the corner of NE 72nd and 5th Ave. NE is a two-story wooden office/Retail building built in 1955 with tandem surface parking located along the north. Located immediately to the west of the office building is a 20-foot wide vehicle curb cut and the single-story Billings Middle School portable classroom structures. Located further to west is an existing surface parking lot which is accessed off the alley. Located the west of the parking lot is the two-story masonry Vitamilk Dairy building, built in 1946 and currently used for commercial retail on the lower level and office space on the upper. Occupying the rest of the block is a two-story masonry structure at the corner of Woodlawn and NE 72nd, built in 1912, with a two one-story masonry structures building in the early 1920's.

There are a three street trees with a diameter of +/- 4" that front the middle school buildings that will be retained. Two street trees with diameters of +/- 12" that front the masonry structure are targeted to be relocated.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:

The proposal site is located within the Green Lake Neighborhood, which is in a designated Urban Village overlay district, situated just north east of a Pedestrian Designated Zone and east of Green Lake. The area surrounding the proposal site is made up of a variety of commercial mixed uses and building types. Located on the eastside of NE 5th Ave are several single-family residences built mostly in the 1920's. A single multi-family residence located at the south-east corner of 5th Ave NE and NE 72nd St. Other structures in the area include the Green Lake Village mixed use apartment building built in 2014, which currently houses the PCC grocery store and an underground parking garage. The development is located on the south side of NE 71st St and occupies the full block between Woodlawn Ave NE and 5th Ave NE, and NE 72nd St and NE 71st St. Development located on the north side of the alley consists of a number of structures currently used as multi-family residences or multi-family residential structures.

Access:

As the project site is currently occupied by several different commercial and institutional entities, access can be gained by traveling west off of 5th Ave NE, north off of 72nd St, east off of Woodlawn Ave NE or via the alley that runs along the northern property line.

Environmentally Critical Areas:

The site is not located in an Environmentally Critical Area.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Design Review Early Design Guidance application proposing a six-story, building with 133 residential units and 19,000 square feet of retail at street level. Parking for 180 vehicles to be provided. Existing structures to be demolished. The proposal current proposal includes a contract rezone request to change the current height and zoning designation from NC2P-40 to NC2P-65.

The site is part of a larger (3) parcel Property Use and Development contract rezone approval that occurred in 2005. That rezone allowed for a 40' building height limit, a ground level commercial area limited to 15,000 square feet of gross floor area (gsf), and a 64% lot coverage for residential uses located above the commercial base.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE October 30, 2017

The design packet includes information presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3028323) 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 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:

- Asked about the timeline for construction of the project.
- Agreed with having auto access off of the alley per SDOT guidance.
- Noted that there is very little automobile traffic moving up and down the alley.
- Agreed that some kind of warning device in the way of mirrors or other method would be appropriate at the parking garage entry.
- Questioned if the development proposal would be taking up the whole block.
- Asked if there were any plans for developing the other side (north side of the alley) of the block.
- Stated that consideration for a better transition with the buildings on the other side (north side) of the alley needs to be taken into account.

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 was generally supportive of the preferred massing option (Option 1) in that it had better articulation and more interesting features than the other options. The Board specifically liked the use of the recessed, double height podium and mezzanine. The Board felt strongly that Option 3 was not a viable massing solution.
- 2. Plaza and Entryway:** The Board supported the proposed location of the front entry and the plaza open space but were concerned that it could become a dead space if it is not properly activated. The Board noticed that there wasn't a physical connection between the plaza and the residential entry. As such, Board members agreed that the space needs to be thoughtfully designed so that it does not become a depository of waste or other unwanted items. The Board agreed that the residential entry aligned well with the Green Lake Village pedestrian cut-through located on the opposite side of the block, as it helps in create a visual connection and pedestrian scale between the two developments. **(PL2-I, PL2-D)**
 - a. The Board requested more detailed information on how the plaza space is intended to be used when the project returns for the recommendation phase. **(PL2-I, PL2-D, PL2-I-ii)**
 - b. The Board gave guidance to design the wayfinding to demonstrate the location of the different uses, entries, and public realm versus the private realm in relationship to the elevator lobby. **(PL2-I, PL2-D)**
 - c. Design a stronger visual and possibly physical connection between the residential entry and the entry plaza. **(PL2-I, PL2-D, PL2-I-ii)**
- 3. Adjacent Sites:** The Board supported the notched plaza, residential entry and mezzanine aligned with the Green Lake Village Pedestrian cut through which adds visual interest and connection with the proposal site. The Board requested a better demonstration of the relationship with building structures on the opposite side of the 5th Ave NE.
 - a. Board members requested more sections and/or elevations depicting the relationship of other building structures in terms of sight lines, horizontal distances, decks and deck railings, and views downward. **(CS2-D-5, PL2-I-ii)**
- 4. 5th Avenue NE Streetscape:** The Board requested more information about how the street would be treated along 5th Ave NE in terms of the amount of transparency and other elements. While the 5th Ave NE side of the building was characterized as a 'back of house',

the Board verbalized that it should not be forgotten. The Board appreciated the addition of the curb bulb for pedestrian safety as cars move quickly along this road.

- a. Design the proposal to minimize blank wall areas, using windows and window wells. **(DC2-C-1, DC2-C-2, DC2-B-2, DC2-I-I, DC4-A-1, DC4-II-i)**
- b. Where windows are not appropriate due to privacy concerns, use other design elements to avoid the appearance of blank walls and to make the façade more interesting. **(DC2-C-2, DC2-I-I, DC4-A-1, DC4-II-i)**

- 5. Parking:** The Board felt that it is important to identify which parking areas will be designated for different uses, and asked for floor plans demonstrating parking circulation, related to the proposed driveway slope departure.” **(CS2-D-5, PL2-D)**

RECOMMENDATION July 8, 2019

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the record number (3033823-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

PUBLIC COMMENT

At the Recommendation meeting the following public comments were provided:

- Commented that the project fits in well with the character of the rest of the neighborhood.
- Supported the use of different materials to the exterior of the building.
- Suggested that the departure requests are not that significant.
- Questioned how the building design gained extra height over the original EDG target height.
- Commented that they do like the design concept.
- Verbalized that they were concerned with the increased density in the surrounding neighborhood.
- Asked for clarification about the double story commercial storefront height.
- Supported the look of the double story commercial storefront height but was concerned with the massing along the north side of building as being too high next to the lower character of the adjacent buildings.

- Suggested that there needs to be more gradation on the north side to help blend in more with the surrounding area.
- Concerned with the massing to the east as there is a lack of gradation (transition) with the adjacent structures.
- Stated that this project fits in well with the other two projects.
- Generally, supported the massing and modulation of the project.
- Suggested that there should be a departure request for a 10 foot ceiling height for the retail space to the north so that it would have a better opportunity to engage with the sidewalk instead of a huge cavernous space that can only engage the sidewalk on half of the development site.
- Suggested that the 90 degree turning radius off of the alley into the parking garage is too tight and that the adjacent properties that are currently set back 15 feet from the alley will become the a defacto drive area if motorist and delivery vehicles to make such a sharp turn into the project site.
- Concerned about the height transition from the project site to the lower buildings on the north side of the alley.
- Supported the design, the modulation and colors but wished that portions of the building were brick.
- Suggested that the north side of the building should be reduced in height, designed with some balconies which would reduce the canyon effect to the neighbors on the north side of the alley.
- Asked for a mid-block through way passage as mitigation for the increased height of the project as a result of the recent HALA rezone and noted a mid-block passage would benefit the surrounding neighborhood.
- Concerned with the massing on the east side of the building and how it transitions to the adjacent zone on the north side of the alley.
- Concerned that if the departure request is specifically for the purposes of making the top floor wider, they would be against it because it would result in blocking out more light and increasing the canyon effect.

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 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 recommendations.

1. **Massing Options:** The Board was concerned about the current building mass with increased building height as a result of recent city-wide MHA HALA zoning changes.
 - a. The Board expressed their further apprehension about how the increased height now exerts greater influence over the resulting building design and increases potential impacts to adjacent buildings to the north. **(CS2-D-1, CS2-D-5, CS2-II)**
 - b. The Board recommended that the project needs better structural scaling and architectural language that involves more street activation at the base of the building, reminiscent of the smaller scale structures in the neighborhood. **(CS2-D-5, CS2-B-2, DC2-A-2, DC2-I-i)**
 - c. The Board suggested that the current form of the building edge does little to contribute to the existing fabric of the neighborhood. **(CS2-D-1, CS2-D-5)**
 - d. The Board recommended that if the building is taking advantage of the added allowable height, then the top-level should be set back from the edge and designed to reduce the perceived height and impacts to adjacent buildings. **(CS2-D-1, CS2-D-5, CS2-II)**
 - e. The Board suggested that this project could potentially affect future development around it by striking a new datum line of 70 feet that will not match that of other projects designed to a 65- or 75-foot height. **(CS2-D-1, CS2-D-5, CS2-II, DC2-A-2, DC2-I-i)**
 - f. The Board noted that this project should set a positive precedent for the neighborhood as it is one of the first building of this height. The Board therefore requested a description of the specific qualities that will enhance the future buildings in terms of the design concept, the scaling and attention to detailing, especially along the building's north side. **(CS2-D-1, CS2-D-5, CS2-II, DC2-A-2, DC2-I-I, DC2-I-i)**
 - g. The Board suggested that the building could be a 65-foot height expression with an attic kind of "attic" top story as one possible approach.
 - i. The attic approach could possibly give the structure a less bulky and monolithic feeling. **(CS2-D-5, CS2-II)**
 - ii. The attic feature could have a slightly different scale or possibly even slightly set back from the face of the building, taking on a kind of roof form, over a four-level building mass. **(CS2-D, CS2-II, DC2-A-2)**
 - h. The Board, in understanding that additional height had been added to the project since EDG, requested the project return for a second Recommendation meeting.
 - i. The Board specifically requested additional refinement of the massing, in terms of the base relationship to the upper portions and how the building fits into the neighborhood, especially to the north. **(CS2-D, CS2-II, DC2-I-i)**
 - ii. The Board especially requested additional scaling strategies that assist in breaking down the building mass, possibly using materials, architectural features, fenestration. Detail joints and panels to break down scale and provide a clear transition to different materials. **(CS2-D, CS2-II, DC2-A-2, DC4-A-1)**

- iii. The Board requested further clarity on the material expression as a system, including how the system reads and how many components make up the system. **(DC4-A-1, DC4-II)**
- iv. The Board requested that they would like to see a greater weaving and stitching of the base elements into the top portion of the building to help those two pieces relate, as the base currently feels disconnected. **(DC4-A-1, DC4-II)**

2. Façade Treatments:

- a. The Board expressed confusion about why the north face of the building changed from a kind of stacking form at EDG to the building face that uses the same language that is occurring on the other side of the building. Return to the stacking forms on this façade or demonstrate the design rationale for the change. **(DC4-A-1, DC4-II)**
- b. The Board also expressed concern that the different building materials and forms, including the prominent concrete at the southeast corner, and did not necessarily read well together. **(DC4-A-1, DC4-II)**
- c. The Board did not agree with the effectiveness of the canted windows on the upper floor of the building designed to give increased view of the lake. **(DC2-C-1, DC4-A-1, DC4-II)**
- d. The Board suggested that the brick does not always need to be a hard base but could begin to weave and stitch the top and bottom building elements, which they felt is a missed opportunity around the entry plaza. **(DC2-C-1, DC4-A-1, DC4-II)**
- e. In discussing the overall building façade treatment and architectural moves, the Board referred to the sketches on page 25:
 - i. The Board asked why the deployment of the finish element did not follow a similar approach as those depicted in the sketches. **(DC2-C-1, DC4-A-1, DC2-I-I, DC4-A-1, DC4-II-i)**
 - ii. The Board's noted that the finish material in the final design relies too heavily on several disjointed elements that need to be tied together. **(DC2-C-1, DC4-A-1, DC2-I-I, DC4-A-1, DC4-II-i)**
 - iii. The Board suggested the deployment of finish language in the sketch artistry was much more deliberate and cohesive. **(DC2-C-1, DC4-A-1, DC2-I-I, DC4-A-1, DC4-II-i)**
 - iv. In addition, the sketch artistry appears to have a stronger rhythmic pattern in terms of its window placement and the two-bay spacing which has been lost in the final design, possibly as the result of the use of using so many material changes. The Board verbalized that the deliberate residential entry base and the secondary commercial base reflected in the sketch artistry has been lost in the final building design. The Board suggested that the two elements do not necessarily need different colors, several different types of siding, or changes in openings to be successful. **(DC2-C-1, DC4-A-1, DC2-I-I, DC4-A-1, DC4-II-i)**

- v. The Board verbalized a preference toward the more simplified repetitive forms which emphasize the horizontal datums of the canopies, and give the sketch artistry example a stronger pedestrian feel. **(CS2-B-2, DC2-C-1, DC4-A-1, DC2-I-I, DC4-A-1, DC4-II-i)**
- vi. The Board specifically requested that the design team strengthen the rhythm of the façade in more of an intentional fashion to foster a higher degree of whimsy rather than be evenly applied everywhere. **(DC2-C-1, DC4-A-1, DC2-I-I, DC4-A-1, DC4-II-i)**

3. Plaza and Entryway:

- a. The Board recommended the plaza area be used to shape the residential entry. The Board suggested that the current residential entry seems more like a backdoor or side door of a street instead of a celebrated residential entryway. **(PL2-I, PL2-D, PL2-I-ii)**
- b. While the Board maintained their support of the residential entry being visually connected with the Green Lake Village pedestrian cut-through across the street, they recommended more intentional programming of the plaza space that reinforces the plaza a pedestrian friendly and usable space, especially with the residential entry being placed so close to the parking garage entry. **(PL2-I, PL2-D)**
- c. The Board was concerned with the design of the entry plaza and recommended that the space should have a greater connection with either the residential or commercial space, by removing the planter, reconfiguring the doors or other method that would make it more of a connected space. The Board recommended that the identity of the project could be increased by developing a stronger street edge and making the space feel more public instead of being a portal for a garage elevator. **(CS2-B-2, DC2-C-1, DC4-A-1, DC2-I-I)**
- d. The Board stated that the southeast corner seems a bit disjointed due to the heaviness of the concrete element which could use more airiness. **(CS2-B-2, DC4-A-1, DC4-II)**
- e. The Board indicated that they would like to see more direct activation of the corner, possibly tying the brick and concrete base elements more closely together. The Board also suggested that they would also welcome a larger number of commercial entryways that could bring more visual interest to the street frontage. **(DC4-A-1, PL2-D-1, PL2-I-ii)**
- f. The Board restated their EDG guidance that the building design should be used to a greater extent as wayfinding, especially at the entries, instead of relying solely on signage. The Board also stated that the current approach to signage does not elicit the sense of whimsy which they suggested during EDG. **(PL2-D-1, PL2-I-ii)**
- g. The Board gave the follow specific guidance in further defining the entry plaza:
 - i. The design team shall take steps to further connect the entryway with the lobby. **(CS2-B-2, PL2-D-1, PL2-I-ii, DC4-II-i)**
 - ii. The Board also requested additional information to help clarify if the entry space is geared toward commercial or residential and what programming

and design elements will be used to define the specified use. **(CS2-B-2, PL2-I, PL2-D, PL2-I-ii)**

4. 5th Avenue NE Streetscape:

- a. The Board continued to have concerns that the 5th Ave NE side of the building lacked activation and was still forgotten, per the characterization at EDG. The Board verbalized their concern about the space along the sidewalk and the blank walls as 5th Ave experiences a lot of foot and vehicular traffic and it feel like that street edge is still being forgotten. **(CS2-B-2, PL2-D-1, PL2-I-ii, DC2-C-1)**
- b. The Board recommended reducing the extreme distance between the finish floor height of the northern commercial space and the sidewalk, which they felt was driven by a desire to add more residential units. **(CS2-B-2, PL2-I-ii, DC2-C-1)**
- c. The Board suggested that the number of units at the northeast corner could potentially be reduced as a method for more direct activation of the retail space. **(CS2-B, PL2-D-1, PL2-I, PL2-I-ii)**
- d. The Board recommended that the north facing wall should be designed at an appropriate pedestrian scale, be attractively designed, and the vegetation should not just be an add-on. **(CS2-B, PL2-D-1, PL2-I, PL2-I-ii, DC4-II-i)**
- e. The Board indicated that if the wall was designed with a different type of architectural feature or art, they would be more inclined to support the design of this area. **(PL2-D-1, DC2-B-2, DC2-C-2, DC4-A-1, DC4-II-i)**
- f. The Board recommended that the entry at the northeast corner be better activated with possibly a material change or other method to make it feel less 'back door'. **(CS2-B, PL2-D-1, PL2-I, PL2-I-ii)**

- 5. Parking Entry:** Related to the Type I code requirements and driveway slope and request to deviate from standards, the Board suggested that due to the tight turning radius off the alley, the garage door may need to be set back away from the property line or the corners be recessed, which could have design impacts on this portion of the building. The Board gave no further direction in terms of this aspect of the design. **(CS2-D-5, PL2-D)**

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 Development Standards – Basic street level development standards(SMC 23.47A.008.A.3):** The Code requires street-level facing facades shall be located within 10 feet of the street lot line, unless wider sidewalks, plazas, or other approved landscaped or open spaces are provided.

The applicant is proposing a 42'-0" wide x 16'-0" deep open space "entry plaza" at the street level along NE 72nd Street. The plaza will result in a widened sidewalk area designed to accommodate street furniture and landscaping elements designed to create a public amenity and active the street. The plaza also reinforces the vertical notch along the building façade aiding in creating greater articulation along the building front.

The Board generally supported the departure request with the caveat that there needs to be a stronger pathway connection through the lobby and residential entryway and the entry plaza. The Board also asked for a better understanding and greater design detail as to how the plaza space will be activated; whether commercial storefront activation or residential use. At the final Recommendation phase, the design should clearly demonstrate how plaza functions, and whether it's intended for private commercial use, or public use. **CS2-B-2 Connection to the Street, DC2-C-1 Visual Depth and Interest Dual Purpose Elements, DC2-I-i Neighborhood commercial structures, DC4-A-1 Exterior Finish Materials.**

2. **Street Level Development Standards – Non-Residential Street-Level Requirements (SMC 23.47A.008.B.2):** The Code requires 60% transparency between 2-8 feet above the sidewalk. The applicant is proposing to provide sidewalk level planters with vertical wall plantings in lieu of transparent glass at non-residential street-level façade.

The applicant's rationale is that the sidewalk at the NE and SE corners will be 6.4-9.5 feet above the finished floor inside the building, resulting in the required transparency located in an area that is well above the activity inside the building. The applicant also suggests that the differences in elevation results privacy issues for the non-residential tenants, when interior spaces are located below the sidewalk level. Therefore, transparency is proposed to be concentrated towards the SE corner of the structure where the elevation difference is less. At the NE corner where the elevation difference is much greater, a sidewalk level planter with vertical plantings on the wall is proposed to provide pedestrian interest, in lieu of transparency.

The Board indicated that they could potentially support the departure, provided that the solution is not a green wall, it is integral to the overall building design, and that more effort is put into making the corner more active and transparent. **DC2-B-2 Blank Walls, DC2-C-1 Visual Depth and Interest, DC4-A-1 Exterior Finish Materials, DC2-I-i Neighborhood commercial structures, DC4-II Exterior Finish Materials.**

3. **Street Facing Façade Upper Setback Requirements - (SMC 23.47A.014.C.3):** Where a portion of the façade is required to be setback more than 15', the Code allows that up to 20% of the setback area can be set back less than 5 feet. The applicant is proposing that the 50'6" wide portion of facade above residential lobby have no setback.

The applicant's rationale for the departure request is that this portion of facade serves as a "primary" element for identifying the residential lobby entrance located and is aligned with the pedestrian cut-thru located at Green Lake Village immediately to the south across NE 72nd St. In addition, this portion of facade is immediately adjacent to an entry plaza that is setback from the property line by 16'-0" and serves as a means of creating facade modulation, scale, rhythm, and visual interest. The applicant also suggests that increasing this portion of facade will improve the dwelling unit layout and the west-facing, blank lot-line wall is able to be decreased in width.

The Board indicated that if the rationale behind the request is to add a more visually interesting architectural feature, in the form of the angular structural overhangs, then they could be in support of the departure request. The Board added however that the angular features would need to relate better to the language of the entry plaza, potentially the lightening of the corner and the rest of the building massing. **DC2-B-2 Blank Walls, DC2-C-1 Visual Depth and Interest, DC4-A-1 Exterior Finish Materials, DC2-I-i Neighborhood commercial structures, DC4-II Exterior Finish Materials.**

Staff Note: Clarify the amount of departure request in the next recommendation packet (Dimension of the proposed setback in the requested departure, the length of the façade that is required to be setback, and the percentage of the setback façade that is proposed to not meet the required setback.)

The following request was included in the Recommendation packet:

Type I Decision Code Requirement SMC Chapter 23.47A - COMMERCIAL 23.54.030 Parking space and access standards (SMC 23.54.030.D.3)

Staff Note: This is currently not a design review departure request per SMC 23.41.014.

Parking Space Standards (SMC 23.54.030.D.3): The Code requires that driveway slopes shall not exceed a slope of 15 percent. The applicant has indicated they intend to request a Type I approval to modify the driveway slope.

The criteria for this request are found in SMC 23.54.030.D.3. The applicant should submit their response and any graphics or information needed to demonstrate compliance with these criteria when they submit the rest of the MUP application materials. The response will be analyzed by the SDCl zoning reviewer during MUP review.

If the proposal doesn't meet the criteria in SMC 23.54.030.D.3, a departure may be requested if allowed by SMC 23.41.014. The applicant has not yet submitted information to demonstrate how the proposal may better meet the intent of specific design guidelines.

The Board did suggest that because of the tight turning radius off the alley, the garage door may need to be set back or the corners recessed which could have design impacts on this portion of the building.

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

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

CONTEXT & SITE

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

CS2-B Adjacent Sites, Streets, and Open Spaces

CS2-B-2. Connection to the Street: Identify opportunities for the project to make a strong connection to the street and carefully consider how the building will interact with the public realm. Consider the qualities and character of the streetscape its physical features (sidewalk, parking, landscape strip, street trees, travel lanes, and other amenities) and its function (major retail street or quieter residential street) in siting and designing the building.

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

Green Lake Supplemental Guidance:

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-II. HEIGHT, BULK, AND SCALE COMPATIBILITY

Building setbacks similar to those specified in the Land Use Code for zone edges where a proposed development project within a more intensive zone abuts a lower intensive zone.

CS2-II-ii Techniques specified in the Seattle Design Guidelines regarding height, bulk, and scale; and relationship to adjacent sites.

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-D Wayfinding

PL2-D-1. Design as Wayfinding: Use design features as a means of wayfinding wherever possible.

Green Lake Supplemental Guidance:

PL2 Walkability

PL2-I Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances.

PL2-I-ii Street Amenities: New developments are encouraged to work through the Design Review process and with interested citizens to provide features that enhance the public realm. Code departures, as set forth at SMC 23.41.012, will be considered for projects that propose enhancements to the public realm. The project proponent should provide an acceptable plan for, but not limited to, features such as:

- a. Curb bulbs adjacent to active retail spaces
- b. Pedestrian-oriented street 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-A Massing

DC2-A-2. Reducing Perceived Mass: Use secondary architectural elements to reduce the perceived mass of larger projects.

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.

Green Lake Supplemental Guidance:

DC2-I Architectural Context

DC2-I-i. Neighborhood commercial structures: Modulation in the street fronting façade of a mixed-use structure is less important when an appropriate level of details is present to break up the facade. Many existing structures are simple boxes that are well-fenestrated and possess several details that add interest and lend buildings a human scale. However, particularly large buildings, usually resulting from the aggregation of many properties, may need more modulation to mitigate the impacts of bulk and scale. Substantial modulation of neighborhood commercial structures at the street level is discouraged unless the space or spaces created by the modulation are large enough for pedestrians to use.

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.

Green Lake Supplemental Guidance:

DC4-II Exterior Finish Materials: New buildings should feature durable, attractive, and well-detailed finish materials in responding to the vernacular of the surrounding area, where desirable. Innovative use of materials is encouraged, provided they meet this criterion.

DC4-II-i. Building Materials in Green Lake's Individual Districts: Encourage the use of common building materials found in Green Lake's commercial areas:

- a. Green Lake Residential Urban Village: Surface treatments are primarily brick (painted or unpainted) or stucco. Some additional variations exist south of Ravenna Boulevard.
- b. Tangletown (55th/56th Corridor and Meridian): A consistent treatment of brick at the ground level and wood siding on the upper residential levels.
- c. 65th at Latona: A consistent treatment of brick at the ground level and wood siding on the upper (residential) levels.

BOARD DIRECTION

At the conclusion of the RECOMMENDATION meeting, the Board recommended the project return for another meeting in response to the guidance provided.