City of Seattle

Department of Construction and Inspections
Nathan Torgelson, Director

DESIGN REVIEW

THIRD RECOMMENDATION MEETING OF THE DOWNTOWN DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Record Number:	3034280-LU
Address:	2301 7th Ave
Applicant:	Michael Medina, Graphite Design Group
Date of Meeting:	February 11, 2020
Board Members Present:	Belinda Bail (Chair) Aaron Luoma Han Beh Grace Leong (substitute)
Board Members Absent:	Aaron Argyle
Board Members Recused:	Ed Palushock
DPD Staff Present:	Joseph Hurley, Senior Land Use Planner

SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: (former) DMC 240/290-400 / (current) DMC 240/290-440

Nearby Zones: (North) SM 240/125-400 / SM 240/125-440
(South) DMC 340/290-400 / DMC 340/290-440
(East) DMC 340/290-400 / DMC 340/290-440
(West) DMR-C 240/125 / DMR-C 280/125

Lot Area: 38,880 Sq. Ft.

Current Development: On the north portion of the site is a single story commercial building constructed in 1936.

Access: The site has access from 7th Ave, Bell St, Battery St, and an improved alley.

Environmentally Critical Areas: None mapped

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character: The nearby blocks and neighborhood are experiencing rapid transition from a low density under-used area of surface parking and smaller scale retail structures and former hotels. Newer nearby development includes high rise condo and apartment towers, high rise office development, and a data center.

North of the site, across Battery St is the Pink Elephant car wash. To the south across Bell St is a single story retail structure and a 5-story parking garage. Near the northeast corner of the site, Dexter Ave splays off of 7th Ave and heads true north.

The site is served by multiple bus lines and the South Lake Union streetcar runs down Westlake Ave a few blocks to the east. 7th Avenue is a primary bike corridor, with a planned cycle track connecting to Dexter Ave N. Bike traffic crisscrosses the neighborhood on multiple streets, including Bell and Blanchard St.

Recreational opportunities and green space are available with Denny Park to the north and the proposed park at Westlake and 8th Ave.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Land Use application to allow 2, 30-story towers over an 11-story podium building with 622 apartment units, office and retail. Parking for 543 vehicles proposed. Existing buildings to be demolished.

Early Design Guidance Review and First Recommendation meetings were conducted under 3019371-LU.

Following issuance of MUP 3019371-LU, the applicant proposed changes to the design that required additional SDCI analysis and Design Review Board recommendations. The applicant submitted a major MUP revision for review (3034280-LU).

The packets include materials presented at the meeting, and are available online by entering the record numbers (3019371 or 3034280-LU) at this website:
http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/aboutus/news/events/DesignReview/SearchPastReviews/default.aspx

The packets are 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

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE April 7, 2015

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

Three massing design options were presented.
Option 1, called 'The Cubist', proposed a two tower composition comprised of three nearly identical cubes forms stacking vertically over a podium of approx. 125'. At grade there were no setbacks along Bell St. and Battery St. and a minimal setback along 7th Ave was shown. The north tower was not set back from Battery St, but the south tower was set back from Bell St.

There would be two residential entries from 7th Ave and an office entry near the south tower residential entry. Retail space would be located midblock along 7th Ave and along both Bell and Battery Streets. Parking and loading functions would be accessed from the mid-section of the alley. Residential units would flank the above grade parking along Bell St. and Battery St.

Option 2, called 'The Angle', proposed a two tower composition comprised of two nearly identical building footprints that are angled 45 degrees to 7th Ave. At grade there were no setbacks along Bell St. and Battery St. or 7th Ave. Both towers were set back from Bell and Battery Streets.

There would be two residential entries from 7th Ave and an office entry near the south tower residential entry. Retail space would be located midblock along 7th Ave and along both Bell and Battery Streets. Parking and loading functions would be accessed from the mid-section of the alley. Residential units would flank the above grade parking along Bell St. and Battery St.

Option 3, called 'The Grid', proposed a two tower non-symmetrical composition with the intent to let the two towers look past each more than the two other options. At grade there was a skewed setback along Bell St. and no setback along Battery St. or 7th Ave. Both towers were setback from Bell and Battery Streets.

There would be two residential entries from 7th Ave and an office entry near the south tower residential entry. Retail space would be located midblock along 7th Ave and along both Bell and Battery Streets. Parking and loading functions would be accessed from the mid-section of the alley. Residential units would flank the above grade parking along Bell St. and Battery St.

PUBLIC COMMENT
The following public comments were offered at the meeting:

- Encouraged the Board to consider how development on the site could impact or restrict future development on the site across the alley.
- Concerned about shadow impacts to Denny Park by the development.
- Concerned that the design did not show sufficient pedestrian interaction along Bell St, which is a designated Green Street.

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.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE: April 7, 2015

1. **Towers and Massing: The Board agreed they preferred the tower design as shown in Option 1. They also liked the asymmetry of Option 2 in the way the towers met the podium in different manners. The Board also noted that the towers in Option 1 were the skinniest and the towers in Option 2 appear as the largest massing due to the angles. The Board did not think it was important the towers needed to relate to the shifts in the street grid. (A2, B2, B4.1)**
    a. Provide a design with one of the towers eroding the podium and reaching the base. (A2.1, B4.1)
    b. Encouraged a design with the panelized modules, as it would allow for a very interesting design with differing materials. Use the reveals between the modules to bring the tower down to the base. (A2.1, B4.3, C2.1)
    c. Consider the capping of the towers as shown in Option 1. (A2, C2.1)

2. **Podium Design: The Board preferred the layers and stepping down of the levels of open space on the podium facing 7th Ave as shown on Option 3. The Board was concerned about how the four levels of above grade parking will appear along 7th Ave. (B4.1, D1.3, E2.1)**
    a. Provide a design with one of the towers eroding the podium to break up its massing as shown on Option 2. (A2.1, B4.1)
    b. Provide a design with the stepping down of the open space on the podium top of shown in Option 3. (B4.1, D1.3)
    c. Study the façade treatment of the retail space and above grade parking levels. Consider using the retail facade treatment at the parking levels. (C3.1, E2.1)

3. **Streetscape: The Board remarked that the amount of retail being proposed is positive for activating the street. The Board liked the proposed Battery St treatment with the extended curb bulb. Work with SDOT to get their approval and make sure the proposal addresses pedestrian safety concerns. (D1.2, D3.1, D6.1)**
    a. Along Bell St, push back or cant the podium façade at grade and above to be similar in spirit to what was proposed in Option 3. (B3.3, C1.3, D1.1)
    b. Activate the retail space along Battery St with the design of the street. (C1, D1.2, D6.1)

FIRST RECOMMENDATION MEETING January 19, 2016

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

The applicant presented their design in response to the Board guidance.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at the meeting:

- Concerned that the design did not show the relationship of this project to the proposed project west of the site across the alley.
- Stated that the project was using its full massing potential while the proposed project across the alley had reduced the height of its podium and wanted the project conditioned to set back from the alley 7'-6" at the north tower.

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.

RECOMMENDATION MEETING: JANUARY 19, 2016

1. **Tower Design: The Board appreciated the design that is different than other nearby residential towers. The Board noted the rotating stacking cubes read as volumes creating interest without being overly complicated. They did express that the top cube of the north tower was too short and fragmented and doesn't read successfully as a cube. (A2.1, B4.1.b&c)**
    a. Design both towers with the strength of the south tower. (A2.1)
    b. At the north tower, design the vertical proportions of the cubes to be visually pleasing. A variety of heights of the 'cubes' is acceptable. (A2.1, B4.1.b&c)

2. **Podium Design: The Board was supportive of the deep modulations at the street facing office levels of the podium, the variety of the sizes of the modulations and the asymmetrical locations. The Board was supportive of the residential 'bookends' at the four levels of above grade parking. However, they remarked that the design language of the residential component was too different from the rest of the design. They also noted that the facade screening the parking needed further design effort and should give the illusion of activity. (B4, C3.1, E2.1.e) The Board gave the following guidance and recommended conditions:**

    <u>Parking Area</u>

    a. Design a facade with the 'solid' sections mimicking the modulation recesses of the office levels above. (B4)
    b. Consider back-lighting spandrel glass to create a subtle glow. (C3.1.g)
    c. Remove the white vertical panels which mimic the tower residential facade. (B4)

Residential Area

d. Design the terra cotta facade to be more modern and in the spirit of the office levels above, at a residential scale. (B4)
e. Remove the metal frame that wraps the residential units. (B4)
f. Push out the elevations to create a separate volume. (B4)

3. **Street-level floor: The Board was impressed with the layout and design of the ground floor. They appreciated the open space and cycle track along 7th Ave. (D1.1&2, D2.1.l) The Board recommended the following condition:**
    a. Design the project to be compliant with code requirements for canopies. (C5.1)

SECOND RECOMMENDATION September 24, 2019

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Noted that the approved MUP for the project across the alley will include two large podiums and two large towers on the sitesand that it is important to consider that design as part of the context and requested careful consideration of that project in the review of this proposal.

SDCI staff also summarized design related comments received in writing prior to the meeting:

- Requested careful consideration of the proposed taller podium, especially the relationship to the permitted project at 2300 6th (across the alley). Requested the inclusion of that project in the Board's consideration of context, and cited Downtown Design Guidelines A-1, B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4, C-2, D-3.

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 Seattle Design Guidelines 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.

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. **The Revised Design:** The Board noted that there were many aspects of the design that continued to meet criteria in the Design Guidelines identified at the previous meeting when

the Board first recommended approval of the design. The Board agreed that there were additional elements that required further development and directed the applicant to return for a second recommendation meeting.

2. **Ground Plane and Pedestrian Experience**:
    a. The Board agreed that the minor revisions to the ground floor were consistent with the previously approved design and that the elimination of the above grade parking was a positive improvement. (C-1, D-1, E-1)
    b. The Board directed the applicant to demonstrate the alignment of paving patterns with ground floor programming and entries. (C-4)

3. **Podium Massing and Expression**:
    a. The Board agreed that the increase in the height and mass of the podium in combination with the loss of the differently expressed programmatic elements resulted in a composition that was less successful in breaking down the scale of the podium and had negatively impacted its relationship to the tower in terms of proportion and coherence and overall composition. (B-2, B-4)
    b. The Board noted that one of the successful aspects of the previously approved design was the relationship between the 'block' towers and the podium, and the scale-mitigating effect of the towers 'stepping' into the podium. They noted that the larger base block and changed proportions had weakened this effect and that further development and articulation of the composition would be needed. (B-4, C-2)
    c. On the alley side, the Board agreed that the reduction in the number of distinct expressions had similarly diminished the degree of recognizable modulation and coherence of the larger composition. The Board noted in particular the strength of the distinctive floor-to-ceiling glazing (p.7), now replaced with a continuous field of horizontal glass and spandrel. The Board recognized the underlying programmatic changes and agreed that their identification of this issue isn't a request to restore the previous articulation, but rather to recompose the elements in a manner that would create a coherent and well-proportioned composition, comparable in quality to the previous design.(B-4, C-2, C-6)
    d. The Board stated that support for the departure request on modulation would be contingent on the successful resolution of the issues identified above, noting that the number, scale and composition of notches should be carefully considered. (B-1, B-2)

4. **Tower Articulation**:
    a. The Board had a wide-ranging discussion of the changes to the towers but agreed that the revised design continued to be well proportioned and unified and noted that the change in roof form was a well resolved response to the change in tower expression. (A-2, B-4)
    b. The Board agreed that the additional texture and detail provided by the change in cladding system and additional balconies was a positive improvement. (C-2, B-4)

5. **Context**:

a. The Board agreed that they require design related information about the neighboring project in order to fully evaluate the revised design. The Board directed the applicant to include that information for the next meeting. (A-1, B-2, B-3, C-6)

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board's recommendation on the requested departure(s) will be based on the departure's potential to help the project better meet these design guidelines priorities and achieve a better overall project design than could be achieved without the departure(s). The Board's recommendation will be reserved until the final Board meeting.

At the time of the Recommendation meeting the following departures were requested:

1. **Upper Level Façade Modulation (SMC23.49.058.B):** The Code requires in certain downtown zones with certain uses, modulation above 85' in height. The applicant requested departures from modulation standards that would result in an equal amount of required modulation dispersed across the 7th avenue facade.

   The Board indicated preliminary support for the proposed departure, depending on resolution of recommendation items described in 3.a-3.c, as this could help the project better meet the criteria in Design Guidelines B-2 Create a Transition in Bulk & Scale, B-4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building and C-2 Design Facades of Many Scales.

2. **Facade Setback Limits** (**SMC23.049.056.B.2.b):** On streets not requiring property line facades, the Code states that a maximum area of all setbacks between the street lot line and facade along each street frontage of a lot shall not exceed the area derived by multiplying the averaging factor by the width of the street frontage of the structure along that street. The averaging factor is ten on designated green streets. Along Bell St. the applicant is proposing a setback that varies from 10' to 23'-1" for a distance of 34'.

   The Board indicated preliminary support for the proposed departure as this could help the project better meet the criteria in Design Guidelines B3.3 Pedestrian Amenities at the Ground Level, C1.1. Street Level Uses, and C1.2 Retail Orientation.

3. **Minimum Facade Heights** (**SMC23.49.056.A.1):** The Code requires a minimum facade height of 25' on designated green streets**.** Along Bell St. the applicant is proposing a facade that is below the minimum 25' height.

   The Board indicated support for the proposed departure as this could help the project better meet the criteria in Design Guidelines B3.3 Pedestrian Amenities at the Ground Level, C1.1. Street Level Uses, B4.3. Architectural Details, and B-4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building.

4. **Facade Setback Limits (SMC23.49.056.B.2.d):** On streets not requiring property line facades, the Code states that the maximum setback of the facade from the street lot lines at intersections is 10 feet. The minimum distance the facade must conform to this limit is 20 feet along each street. The applicant proposes a setback that exceeds 10' at the corner of 7th Ave and Bell St., with a setback of 20'-2" from Bell St. and 20' from 7th Ave.

   The Board indicated support for the proposed departure as this could help the project better meet the criteria in Design Guidelines B3.3 Pedestrian Amenities at the Ground Level, C1.1. Street Level Uses, and C1.2 Retail Orientation.

THIRD RECOMMENDATION February 11, 2020

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- No comments were offered

SDCI staff summarized design related comments received in writing prior to the meeting:

- Supported the massing and design of the project.
- Requested careful consideration of the proposed taller podium, especially the relationship to the permitted project at 2300 6th (across the alley). Requested the inclusion of that project in the Board's consideration of context, and cited Downtown Design Guidelines A-1, B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4, C-2, D-3.

SDCI received non-design related comments concerning review delays and housing shortages.

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 Seattle Design Guidelines 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. **Ground Plane and Pedestrian Experience**:
   a. The Board agreed that the revised drawings had responded to previous guidance by aligning paving patterns with the entry locations and recommended approval of the design as shown. (C-1, C-4)

2. **Podium Massing and Expression**:
    a. The Board agreed that the strengthening of the scoring detail on 7th Avenue was effective in adding scale to this facade and harmonious proportions to this facade and recommended their approval. (C-2, D-3)
    b. The Board agreed that the additional detail and relief provided by the terracotta panels is well integrated with the tower and helps unify the design, particularly as it turns the corner into the alley. (C-6, C-2, B-4)
    a. The Board agreed that the revised design had effectively responded to their previous guidance by further breaking down the scale of the podium, revising the alley composition to re-establish the harmonious hierarchy of elements they had approved in the previous design, and re-connecting the organization of the podium with the tower blocks expression above and the larger design concept. The Board recommended approval of this element as designed. (B-1, B-2, B-4, C-2, C-6)
    b. The Board recommended approval of the proposed materials as shown in the Recommendation packet and the materials board. The Board recommended a condition that the textured terracotta material be retained as shown and detailed in the packet and on the materials board, notably deployed 3" proud of the surrounding cladding materials. (C-6, C-2, B-4)

3. **Tower Articulation**:
    a. The Board reiterated their previous support for the largely unchanged tower massing and for the additional texture and detail provided by the change in cladding system and additional balconies, and recommended approval of this design. (C-2, B-4)
    b. The Board recommended approval of the proposed materials as shown in the Recommendation packet and the materials board, particularly the new more transparent glass materials and those used in the shadowbox assembly. As noted previously, the Board recommended a condition that the textured terracotta material be retained as shown and detailed in the packet and on the materials board, notably deployed 3" proud of the surrounding cladding materials. (C-6, C-2, B-4)

4. **Context**:
    a. The Board agreed that the additional context provided at this meeting was extremely helpful in understanding the project and how its form and expression had been integrated into this rapidly changing area. (A1, B1, B4)

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board's recommendation on the requested departure(s) will be based on the departure's potential to help the project better meet these design guidelines priorities and achieve a better overall project design than could be achieved without the departure(s). The Board's recommendation will be reserved until the final Board meeting.

At the time of the Recommendation meeting the following departures were requested:

1. **Upper Level Façade Modulation (SMC23.49.058.B):** The Code requires in certain downtown zones with certain uses, modulation above 85’ in height. The applicant requested departures from modulation standards that would result in an equal amount of required modulation dispersed across the 7th avenue facade.

   The Board unanimously agreed that this element was integral to the design concept and effectively deployed to break down the massing and noted that the code required a similar amount of modulation. The Board recommended approval of this departure as it could help the project better meet criteria in Design Guidelines B1 Respond to the neighborhood context, B-2 Create a Transition in Bulk & Scale, and B-4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building

2. **Facade Setback Limits** (**SMC23.049.056.B.2.b):** On streets not requiring property line facades, the Code states that a maximum area of all setbacks between the street lot line and facade along each street frontage of a lot shall not exceed the area derived by multiplying the averaging factor by the width of the street frontage of the structure along that street. The averaging factor is ten on designated Green Streets. Along Bell St. the applicant is proposing a setback that varies from 10’ to 23’-1” for a distance of 34’.

   The Board unanimously agreed that the additional relief provided at the base of this large project helps better meet Design Guidelines B3.3 Pedestrian Amenities at the Ground Level, C1.1 Street Level Uses, and C1.2 Retail Orientation.

3. **Minimum Facade Heights** (**SMC23.49.056.A.1):** The Code requires a minimum facade height of 25’ on designated Green Streets**.** Along Bell St. the applicant is proposing a facade that is below the minimum 25’ height.

   The Board unanimously recommended approval of the proposed departure, noting that if allowed to be averaged it would generally meet the Code intent and that its composition was well integrated with the design concept and could help the project better meets Design Guidelines B3.3 Pedestrian Amenities at the Ground Level, C1.1. Street Level Uses and B-4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building.

4. **Facade Setback Limits (SMC23.49.056.B.2.d)**: The Code requires that the maximum setback of the facade from the street lot lines at intersections is 10 feet. The minimum distance the facade must conform to this limit is 20 feet along each street. The applicant proposes a setback that exceeds 10’ at the corner of 7th Ave and Bell St., with a setback of 20’-2” from Bell St. and 20’ from 7th Ave.

   The Board unanimously agreed that the design provided sufficient relief to meet the spirit of the Code and recommended approval of the proposed departure as better meeting Design Guidelines B3.3 Pedestrian Amenities at the Ground Level and C1.1. Street Level Uses.

5. **Overhead Canopies (SMC 23.49.018):** The Code requires continuous overhead weather protection along the entire street frontage. The applicant proposes five-foot gaps in coverage on either side of the principal entries.

   The Board voted 3 to 1 in favor of this request given that the gaps in overhead coverage would have little impact on the total amount of protection required and that the gaps would serve to highlight the entry locations and better meet Design Guideline C4 Reinforce Building Entries.

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The priority Downtown 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.

SITE PLANNING AND MASSING

A1 Respond to the Physical Environment: Develop an architectural concept and compose the building's massing in response to geographic conditions and patterns of urban form found nearby or beyond the immediate context of the building site.

A1.1. Response to Context: Each building site lies within a larger physical context having various and distinct features and characteristics to which the building design should respond. Develop an architectural concept and arrange the building mass in response to one or more of the following, if present:

a. a change in street grid alignment that yields a site having nonstandard shape;
b. a site having dramatic topography or contrasting edge conditions;
c. patterns of urban form, such as nearby buildings that have employed distinctive and effective massing compositions;
d. access to direct sunlight—seasonally or at particular times of day;
e. views from the site of noteworthy structures or natural features, (i.e.: the Space Needle, Smith Tower, port facilities, Puget Sound, Mount Rainier, the Olympic Mountains);
f. views of the site from other parts of the city or region; and
g. proximity to a regional transportation corridor (the monorail, light rail, freight rail, major arterial, state highway, ferry routes, bicycle trail, etc.).

A1.2. Response to Planning Efforts: Some areas downtown are transitional environments, where existing development patterns are likely to change. In these areas, respond to the urban form goals of current planning efforts, being cognizant that new development will establish the context to which future development will respond.

A2 Enhance the Skyline: Design the upper portion of the building to promote visual interest and variety in the downtown skyline. Respect existing landmarks while responding to the skyline's present and planned profile.

A2.1. Desired Architectural Treatments: Use one or more of the following architectural treatments to accomplish this goal:

a. sculpt or profile the facades;
b. specify and compose a palette of materials with distinctive texture, pattern, or color;

c. provide or enhance a specific architectural rooftop element.

A2.2. Rooftop Mechanical Equipment: In doing so, enclose and integrate any rooftop mechanical equipment into the design of the building as a whole.

ARCHITECTURAL EXPRESSION

B1 Respond to the neighborhood context: Develop an architectural concept and compose the major building elements to reinforce desirable urban features existing in the surrounding neighborhood.

B1.1. Adjacent Features and Networks: Each building site lies within an urban neighborhood context having distinct features and characteristics to which the building design should respond. Arrange the building mass in response to one or more of the following, if present:

a. a surrounding district of distinct and noteworthy character;

b. an adjacent landmark or noteworthy building;

c. a major public amenity or institution nearby;

d. neighboring buildings that have employed distinctive and effective massing compositions;

e. elements of the pedestrian network nearby, (i.e.: green street, hillclimb, mid-block crossing, through-block passageway); and

f. direct access to one or more components of the regional transportation system.

B1.2. Land Uses: Also, consider the design implications of the predominant land uses in the area surrounding the site.

B2 Create a Transition in Bulk and Scale: Compose the massing of the building to create a transition to the height, bulk, and scale of development in nearby less-intensive zones.

B2.1. Analyzing Height, Bulk, and Scale: Factors to consider in analyzing potential height, bulk, and scale impacts include:

a. topographic relationships;

b. distance from a less intensive zone edge;

c. differences in development standards between abutting zones (allowable building height, width, lot coverage, etc.);

d. effect of site size and shape;

e. height, bulk, and scale relationships resulting from lot orientation (e.g., back lot line to back lot line vs back lot line to side lot line); and

f. type and amount of separation between lots in the different zones (e.g. , separation by only a property line, by an alley or street, or by other physical features such as grade changes); g. street grid or platting orientations.

B2.2. Compatibility with Nearby Buildings: In some cases, careful siting and design treatment may be sufficient to achieve reasonable transition and mitigation of height, bulk, and scale impacts. Some techniques for achieving compatibility are as follows:

h. use of architectural style, details (such as roof lines, beltcourses, cornices, or fenestration), color, or materials that derive from the less intensive zone.

i. architectural massing of building components; and

j. responding to topographic conditions in ways that minimize impacts on neighboring development, such as by stepping a project down the hillside.

B2.3. Reduction of Bulk: In some cases, reductions in the actual bulk and scale of the proposed structure may be necessary in order to mitigate adverse impacts and achieve an acceptable level of compatibility. Some techniques which can be used in these cases include:

k. articulating the building's facades vertically or horizontally in intervals that reflect to existing structures or platting pattern;
l. increasing building setbacks from the zone edge at ground level;
m. reducing the bulk of the building's upper floors; and
n. limiting the length of, or otherwise modifying, facades.

B3 Reinforce the Positive Urban Form & Architectural Attributes of the Immediate Area.: Consider the predominant attributes of the immediate neighborhood and reinforce desirable siting patterns, massing arrangements, and streetscape characteristics of nearby development.

B3.1. Building Orientation: In general, orient the building entries and open space toward street intersections and toward street fronts with the highest pedestrian activity. Locate parking and vehicle access away from entries, open space, and street intersections considerations.

B3.2. Features to Complement: Reinforce the desirable patterns of massing and facade composition found in the surrounding area. Pay particular attention to designated landmarks and other noteworthy buildings. Consider complementing the existing:

a. massing and setbacks,
b. scale and proportions,
c. expressed structural bays and modulations,
d. fenestration patterns and detailing,
e. exterior finish materials and detailing,
f. architectural styles, and
g. roof forms.

B3.3. Pedestrian Amenities at the Ground Level: Consider setting the building back slightly to create space adjacent to the sidewalk conducive to pedestrian-oriented activities such as vending, sitting, or dining. Reinforce the desirable streetscape elements found on adjacent blocks. Consider complementing existing:

h. public art installations,
i. street furniture and signage systems,
j. lighting and landscaping, and
k. overhead weather protection.

B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building: Compose the massing and organize the interior and exterior spaces to create a well-proportioned building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept. Design the architectural elements and finish details to create a unified building, so that all components appear integral to the whole.

B4.1. Massing: When composing the massing, consider how the following can contribute to create a building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept:

a. setbacks, projections, and open space;
b. relative sizes and shapes of distinct building volumes; and
c. roof heights and forms.

B4.2. Coherent Interior/Exterior Design: When organizing the interior and exterior spaces and developing the architectural elements, consider how the following can contribute to create a building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept:

d. facade modulation and articulation;
e. windows and fenestration patterns;
f. corner features;
g. streetscape and open space fixtures;
h. building and garage entries; and
i. building base and top.

B4.3. Architectural Details: When designing the architectural details, consider how the following can contribute to create a building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept:

j. exterior finish materials;
k. architectural lighting and signage;
l. grilles, railings, and downspouts;
m. window and entry trim and moldings;
n. shadow patterns; and
o. exterior lighting.

THE STREETSCAPE

C1 Promote Pedestrian Interaction: Spaces for street level uses should be designed to engage pedestrians with the activities occurring within them. Sidewalk-related spaces should appear safe, welcoming, and open to the general public.

C1.1. Street Level Uses: Provide spaces for street level uses that:

a. reinforce existing retail concentrations;
b. vary in size, width, and depth;
c. enhance main pedestrian links between areas; and
d. establish new pedestrian activity where appropriate to meet area objectives. Design for uses that are accessible to the general public, open during established shopping hours, generate walk-in pedestrian clientele, and contribute to a high level of pedestrian activity.

C1.2. Retail Orientation: Where appropriate, consider configuring retail space to attract tenants with products or services that will "spill-out" onto the sidewalk (up to six feet where sidewalk is sufficiently wide).

C1.3. Street-Level Articulation for Pedestrian Activity: Consider setting portions of the building back slightly to create spaces conducive to pedestrian-oriented activities such as vending, resting, sitting, or dining. Further articulate the street level facade to provide an engaging pedestrian experience via:

e. open facades (i.e., arcades and shop fronts);
f. multiple building entries;
g. windows that encourage pedestrians to look into the building interior;
h. merchandising display windows;
i. street front open space that features art work, street furniture, and landscaping;

j. exterior finish materials having texture, pattern, lending themselves to high quality detailing.

C2 Design Facades of Many Scales: Design architectural features, fenestration patterns, and material compositions that refer to the scale of human activities contained within. Building facades should be composed of elements scaled to promote pedestrian comfort, safety, and orientation.

C2.1. Modulation of Facades: Consider modulating the building facades and reinforcing this modulation with the composition of:

a. the fenestration pattern;
b. exterior finish materials;
c. other architectural elements;
d. light fixtures and landscaping elements; and
e. the roofline.

C3 Provide Active — Not Blank — Facades: Buildings should not have large blank walls facing the street, especially near sidewalks.

C3.1. Desirable Facade Elements: Facades which for unavoidable programmatic reasons may have few entries or windows should receive special design treatment to increase pedestrian safety, comfort, and interest. Enliven these facades by providing:

a. small retail spaces (as small as 50 square feet) for food bars, newstands, and other specialized retail tenants;
b. visibility into building interiors;
c. limited lengths of blank walls;
d. a landscaped or raised bed planted with vegetation that will grow up a vertical trellis or frame installed to obscure or screen the wall's blank surface;
e. high quality public art in the form of a mosaic, mural, decorative masonry pattern, sculpture, relief, etc., installed over a substantial portion of the blank wall surface;
f. small setbacks, indentations, or other architectural means of breaking up the wall surface;
g. different textures, colors, or materials that break up the wall's surface.
h. special lighting, a canopy, awning, horizontal trellis, or other pedestrian-oriented feature to reduce the expanse of the blank surface and add visual interest;
i. seating ledges or perches (especially on sunny facades and near bus stops);
j. merchandising display windows or regularly changing public information display cases.

C4 Reinforce Building Entries: To promote pedestrian comfort, safety, and orientation, reinforce building entries.

C4.1. Entry Treatments: Reinforce the building's entry with one or more of the following architectural treatments:

a. extra-height lobby space;
b. distinctive doorways;
c. decorative lighting;
d. distinctive entry canopy;
e. projected or recessed entry bay;

f. building name and address integrated into the facade or sidewalk;
g. artwork integrated into the facade or sidewalk;
h. a change in paving material, texture, or color;
i. distinctive landscaping, including plants, water features and seating
j. ornamental glazing, railings, and balustrades.

C4.2. Residential Entries: To make a residential building more approachable and to create a sense of association among neighbors, entries should be clearly identifiable and visible from the street and easily accessible and inviting to pedestrians. The space between the building and the sidewalk should provide security and privacy for residents and encourage social interaction among residents and neighbors. Provide convenient and attractive access to the building's entry. To ensure comfort and security, entry areas and adjacent open space should be sufficiently lighted and protected from the weather. Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.

C5 Encourage Overhead Weather Protection: Project applicants are encouraged to provide continuous, well-lit, overhead weather protection to improve pedestrian comfort and safety along major pedestrian routes.

C5.1. Overhead Weather Protection Design Elements: Overhead weather protection should be designed with consideration given to:

a. the overall architectural concept of the building
b. uses occurring within the building (such as entries and retail spaces) or in the adjacent streetscape environment (such as bus stops and intersections);
c. minimizing gaps in coverage;
d. a drainage strategy that keeps rain water off the street-level facade and sidewalk;
e. continuity with weather protection provided on nearby buildings;
f. relationship to architectural features and elements on adjacent development, especially if abutting a building of historic or noteworthy character;
g. the scale of the space defined by the height and depth of the weather protection;
h. use of translucent or transparent covering material to maintain a pleasant sidewalk environment with plenty of natural light; and
i. when opaque material is used, the illumination of light-colored undersides to increase security after dark.

C6 Develop the Alley Façade: To increase pedestrian safety, comfort, and interest, develop portions of the alley facade in response to the unique conditions of the site or project.

C6.1. Alley Activation: Consider enlivening and enhancing the alley entrance by:

a. extending retail space fenestration into the alley one bay;
b. providing a niche for recycling and waste receptacles to be shared with nearby, older buildings lacking such facilities; and
c. adding effective lighting to enhance visibility and safety.

C6.2. Alley Parking Access: Enhance the facades and surfaces in and adjacent to the alley to create parking access that is visible, safe, and welcoming for drivers and pedestrians. Consider

d. locating the alley parking garage entry and/ or exit near the entrance to the alley;
e. installing highly visible signage indicating parking rates and availability on the building facade adjacent to the alley; and

f. chamfering the building corners to enhance pedestrian visibility and safety where alley is regularly used by vehicles accessing parking and loading.

PUBLIC AMENITIES

D1 Provide Inviting & Usable Open Space: Design public open spaces to promote a visually pleasing, safe, and active environment for workers, residents, and visitors. Views and solar access from the principal area of the open space should be especially emphasized.

D1.1. Pedestrian Enhancements: Where a commercial or mixed-use building is set back from the sidewalk, pedestrian enhancements should be considered in the resulting street frontage. Downtown the primary function of any open space between commercial buildings and the sidewalk is to provide access into the building and opportunities for outdoor activities such as vending, resting, sitting, or dining.

a. All open space elements should enhance a pedestrian oriented, urban environment that has the appearance of stability, quality, and safety.

b. Preferable open space locations are to the south and west of tower development, or where the siting of the open space would improve solar access to the sidewalk.

c. Orient public open space to receive the maximum direct sunlight possible, using trees, overhangs, and umbrellas to provide shade in the warmest months. Design such spaces to take advantage of views and solar access when available from the site.

d. The design of planters, landscaping, walls, and other street elements should allow visibility into and out of the open space.

D1.2. Open Space Features: Open spaces can feature art work, street furniture, and landscaping that invite customers or enhance the building's setting. Examples of desirable features to include are:

a. visual and pedestrian access (including barrier- free access) into the site from the public sidewalk;

b. walking surfaces of attractive pavers;

c. pedestrian-scaled site lighting;

d. retail spaces designed for uses that will comfortably "spill out" and enliven the open space;

e. areas for vendors in commercial areas;

f. landscaping that enhances the space and architecture;

g. pedestrian-scaled signage that identifies uses and shops; and

h. site furniture, art work, or amenities such as fountains, seating, and kiosks. residential open space

D2 Enhance the Building with Landscaping: Enhance the building and site with generous landscaping— which includes special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, and site furniture, as well as living plant material.

D2.1. Landscape Enhancements: Landscape enhancement of the site may include some of the approaches or features listed below:

a. emphasize entries with special planting in conjunction with decorative paving and/or lighting;

b. include a special feature such as a courtyard, fountain, or pool;

c. incorporate a planter guard or low planter wall as part of the architecture;
d. distinctively landscape open areas created by building modulation;
e. soften the building by screening blank walls, terracing retaining walls, etc;
f. increase privacy and security through screening and/or shading;
g. provide a framework such as a trellis or arbor for plants to grow on;
h. incorporate upper story planter boxes or roof planters;
i. provide identity and reinforce a desired feeling of intimacy and quiet;
j. provide brackets for hanging planters;
k. consider how the space will be viewed from the upper floors of nearby buildings as well as from the sidewalk; and
l. if on a designated Green Street, coordinate improvements with the local Green Street plan.

D2.2. Consider Nearby Landscaping: Reinforce the desirable pattern of landscaping found on adjacent block faces.

m. plant street trees that match the existing planting pattern or species;
n. use similar landscape materials; and
o. extend a low wall, use paving similar to that found nearby, or employ similar stairway construction methods.

D3 Provide Elements That Define the Place: Provide special elements on the facades, within public open spaces, or on the sidewalk to create a distinct, attractive, and memorable "sense of place" associated with the building.

D3.1. Public Space Features and Amenities: Incorporate one or more of the following a appropriate:

a. public art;
b. street furniture, such as seating, newspaper boxes, and information kiosks;
c. distinctive landscaping, such as specimen trees and water features;
d. retail kiosks;
e. public restroom facilities with directional signs in a location easily accessible to all; and
f. public seating areas in the form of ledges, broad stairs, planters and the like, especially near public open spaces, bus stops, vending areas, on sunny facades, and other places where people are likely to want to pause or wait.

D3.2. Intersection Focus: Enliven intersections by treating the corner of the building or sidewalk with public art and other elements that promote interaction (entry, tree, seating, etc.) and reinforce the distinctive character of the surrounding area.

D5 Provide Adequate Lighting: To promote a sense of security for people downtown during nighttime hours, provide appropriate levels of lighting on the building facade, on the underside of overhead weather protection, on and around street furniture, in merchandising display windows, in landscaped areas, and on signage.

D5.1. Lighting Strategies: Consider employing one or more of the following lighting strategies as appropriate.

a. Illuminate distinctive features of the building, including entries, signage, canopies, and areas of architectural detail and interest.
b. Install lighting in display windows that spills onto and illuminates the sidewalk.

c. Orient outside lighting to minimize glare within the public right-of-way.

D6 Design for Personal Safety & Security: Design the building and site to promote the feeling of personal safety and security in the immediate area.

D6.1. Safety in Design Features: To help promote safety for the residents, workers, shoppers, and visitors who enter the area:

a. provide adequate lighting;
b. retain clear lines of sight into and out of entries and open spaces;
c. use semi-transparent security screening, rather than opaque walls, where appropriate;
d. avoid blank and windowless walls that attract graffiti and that do not permit residents or workers to observe the street;
e. use landscaping that maintains visibility, such as short shrubs and/or trees pruned so that all branches are above head height;
f. use ornamental grille as fencing or over ground-floor windows in some locations;
g. avoid architectural features that provide hiding places for criminal activity;
h. design parking areas to allow natural surveillance by maintaining clear lines of sight for those who park there, for pedestrians passing by, and for occupants of nearby buildings;
i. install clear directional signage;
j. encourage "eyes on the street" through the placement of windows, balconies, and street-level uses; and
k. ensure natural surveillance of children's play areas.

VEHICULAR ACCESS AND PARKING

E2 Integrate Parking Facilities: Minimize the visual impact of parking by integrating parking facilities with surrounding development. Incorporate architectural treatments or suitable landscaping to provide for the safety and comfort of people using the facility as well as those walking by.

E2.1. Parking Structures: Minimize the visibility of at-grade parking structures or accessory parking garages. The parking portion of a structure should be architecturally compatible with the rest of the building and streetscape. Where appropriate consider incorporating one or more of the following treatments:

a. Incorporate pedestrian-oriented uses at street level to reduce the visual impact of parking structures. A depth of only 10 feet along the front of the building is sufficient to provide space for newsstands, ticket booths, flower shops, and other viable uses.
b. Use the site topography to help reduce the visibility of the parking facility.
c. Set the parking facility back from the sidewalk and install dense landscaping.
d. Incorporate any of the blank wall treatments listed in Guideline C-3.
e. Visually integrate the parking structure with building volumes above, below, and adjacent.
f. Incorporate artwork into the facades.
g. Provide a frieze, cornice, canopy, overhang, trellis or other device at the top of the parking level.
h. Use a portion of the top of the parking level as an outdoor deck, patio, or garden with a rail, bench, or other guard device around the perimeter.

E2.2. Parking Structure Entrances: Design vehicular entries to parking structure so that they do not dominate the street frontage of a building. Subordinate the garage entrance to the pedestrian entrance in terms of size, prominence on the street-scape, location, and design emphasis. Consider one or more of the following design strategies:

i. Enhance the pedestrian entry to reduce the relative importance of the garage entry.

j. Recess the garage entry portion of the facade or extend portions of the structure over the garage entry to help conceal it.

k. Emphasize other facade elements to reduce the visual prominence of the garage entry.

l. Use landscaping or artwork to soften the appearance of the garage entry from the street.

m. Locate the garage entry where the topography of the site can help conceal it.

E3 Minimize the Presence of Service Areas: Locate service areas for trash dumpsters, loading docks, mechanical equipment, and the like away from the street front where possible. Screen from view those elements which for programmatic reasons cannot be located away from the street front.

E3.1. Methods of Integrating Service Areas: Consider incorporating one or more of the following to help minimize these impacts:

a. Plan service areas for less visible locations on the site, such as off the alley.

b. Screen service areas to be less visible.

c. Use durable screening materials that complement the building.

d. Incorporate landscaping to make the screen more effective.

e. Locate the opening to the service area away from the sidewalk.

RECOMMENDATIONS

At the conclusion of the Final Recommendation meeting, the Board unanimously recommended approval of the project with conditions.

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated February 11, 2020 and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the February 11, 2020 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the four Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design and departures with the following conditions:

1. Retain the textured terracotta material as shown and detailed in the packet and on the materials board, notably as deployed 3” proud of the surrounding cladding materials. (C-6, C-2, B-4)