Seattle Department of Construction & Inspections

DESIGN REVIEW

FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE OF THE WEST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Record Number:	3034348-EG
Address:	2550 32nd Ave W.
Applicant:	Bumgardner Architects
Date of Meeting:	Wednesday, January 08, 2020
Board Members Present:	Brian Walters, Alternate Chair Patreese Martin John Morefield Jen Montressor Gloria Mah
Board Members Absent:	Stephen Porter, Chair
SDCI Staff Present:	David Landry, AICP

SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: Neighborhood Commercial 2-55 (M) (NC2-55 (M))

Nearby Zoning: North - Single Family 5000 (SF 5000)
South - NC2-55 (M)/NC2P 55 (M)
East - SF 5000
West SF 5000

Lot Area: 41,125 square feet (sq. ft.)

Overlays: Airport Height District

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 project site is currently developed with an Albertsons grocery store constructed in 1955 and a surface parking lot. The site has a descending slope of approximately 10' from east to west.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:

The subject site is located midblock on 32nd Ave W between W Raye St and W Smith St in the Magnolia neighborhood. A portion of the block was upzoned from Neighborhood Commercial 2-40 to Neighborhood Commercial 2-55 (M) on 4/19/19. Adjacent to the site are multifamily residential structures to the north and south, single-family homes across the alley to the east, and Lowery C. "Pop" Mounger Pool to the west. 32nd Ave W, a collector arterial, is lined with commercial uses leading south to the Magnolia Village commercial area.

The neighborhood is anchored by the recreational and educational institutions of Magnolia Playfield, Magnolia Community Center, Blaine Jr High School, and Catharine Blaine K-8 school, which fall immediately north of Magnolia Village. Surrounding uses are largely single-family residential homes. 32nd Ave W is characterized by sidewalks and neat rows of mature street trees, interjected by the occasional surface parking lot. Traveling south of W Raye St, the character transitions to small businesses clustering together to form a strong street edge. Buildings are lowrise, ranging from one to three stories in height. No one architectural style dominates amongst the mixed-use and multifamily residential structures in the vicinity, although boxy forms, flat roofs, and masonry materials are found throughout. North of W Raye St are single-family homes characterized by gabled roofs and vegetated setbacks. Multiple projects in the vicinity are currently in review or under construction for proposed development, including 2412 32nd Ave W.

Access:

Vehicular access is proposed from 32nd Ave W. Pedestrian access is proposed from 32nd Ave W and the alley.

Environmentally Critical Areas:

There are no mapped environmentally critical areas located on the subject site.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Design Review Early Design Guidance for a 7-story,138-unit apartment building with retail (Safeway Store). Parking for 224 vehicles proposed. Existing building to be demolished.

This proposal intends to participate in the Living Building Challenge.

The design packet includes information presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the record number at this website:
http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/aboutus/news/events/DesignReview/SearchPastReviews/default.aspx
Any recording of the Board meeting is available in the project file. This meeting report summarizes the meeting and is not a meeting transcript.

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

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

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE January 8, 2020

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

- Disappointed in the lack of diversity in the schemes in that the three schemes seem to be an evolution of just one scheme when there should have been more of difference between the three schemes.
- Didn't support the proposal because it provides parking access off 32nd Ave W while proposing a midblock crossing due to the potential for conflicts between automobiles and children walking in the area.
- Suggested that the design needs to address the large number of bicyclists in the area.
- Supported the sunken plaza area.
- Supported access off 32nd Ave W as it supports the public plaza and would allow the alley to be maintained for residential use.
- Supported a midblock pedestrian crossing because the block is very long which forces people to jaywalk.
- Supported the project as it will revitalize buildings that owners do not reside in and revitalize the general area.
- Supported the project as it will bring more density to the area which will be a first step in revitalizing the community.
- Suggested that the project will afford opportunities for homeowners to downsize and stay in the community without having to move downtown.
- Suggested that the Living Pilot Program building is important as it will provide major health benefits for residents in the building and the Magnolia neighborhood that surrounds it.
- Stated that the project does not provide enough parking.
- Suggested that the alley will not be able to accommodate semi-trucks.

- Stated that the proposed 70-foot-tall building will block the sun to the residences to east.
- Excited to see the quality of exterior finishes, size of windows and final fenestration because the project will be the best type of architecture to be seen in the City.
- Asked if there will be any retail interaction with the proposed plaza and suggested that the design team should develop ways of activating it.
- Suggested that if the building is allowed to take advantage of the additional height afforded by the living building pilot program then it should be introduced in a neighborhood that already has buildings of a similar height rather than placing it immediately adjacent to a lower single family zone.
- Suggested that the single-family residences located to the east will have stadium seating to a blank façade.
- Urged the design team to design a project that is for how individuals will get around in the future opposed to 'right now', including electric cars and bikes and electric cargo bikes, especially if there are concerns about automobile exhaust.
- Suggested that the scale and the massing of the proposed building compared to structures located around it is drastically different and the proposal site is not the civic center of Magnolia where this kind of scale exists.
- Requested that the design team think further about the solar impacts of the project on the adjacent swimming pool and so that it does not block the massive amounts of sunlight to residences.
- Said that they would like to see the building come down by one story because they do not think the building needs to be seven stories.
- Asked if the upper story terrace will be only for use by residents of the building.
- Stated that they are not opposed to the building but rather opposed to the height of the building.
- Asked why not make the proposal a living building at a maximum height of 54 feet.
- Stated that other large developments are separated from residential uses by large streets while this project will be separated from residences by a 24-foot-wide alley.
- Encouraged the Board to look further at the design guidelines for height, bulk and scale even though the project has done a good job providing substantial setbacks which are not required.
- Supported the curb cut along 32nd Ave W. as the local neighbors are used to this existing condition.
- Supported the surface parking lot because it is so convenient.
- Supported the plaza and suggested that if it were moved to the north it would be in shadow.
- Urged the design team to use more natural building materials that will last for a long time.
- Supported the preferred option and access off 32nd Ave W. for its convenience.
- Supported the amount of collaboration between the community and the development team.

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

- Several comments supported the project.
- Several comments favored option 3.

- Several comments supported revitalizing Magnolia Village.
- Most comments supported locating residential and grocery parking access on 32nd Ave W instead of the alley to minimize impacts to adjacent properties.
- Most comments supported a sitting and gathering area to encourage social and retail interactions. Noted the proposed area would be smaller if the parking entrance is located on the alley.
- Stressed the importance of an attractive design for pedestrians with a pleasant plaza and connection to the park and pool.
- Most comments were concerned about pedestrian safety if parking is accessed from the alley.
- Suggested moving the proposed bike lane from 32nd Ave W to 34th Ave W.
- Noted the project will set a precedent for future development.
- Most comments supported Green Built or Living Building design.
- Unsupportive of the 6' setback requested by SDOT intending to widen 32nd Ave. Suggested variation in the overall massing and elevations to improve the relationship to adjacent structures.
- Requested screening and covering the loading dock along the alley for aesthetic reasons and soundproofing.
- Requested keeping two curb cuts instead of just one.
- Noted this is the first structure built under the new NC2-55 zoning in Magnolia.
- Multiple comments concerned the proposed structure appearing out of place in the neighborhood due to height and size.
- A couple comments felt the impact of the proposed height on neighboring structures was underrepresented in the design proposal.
- Discouraged adding another coffee shop in the neighborhood.

The Seattle Department of Transportation offered the following comments:

- Supported the code-compliant options which consolidate vehicle access and truck loading functions to the alley.
- Conditionally supported reducing the 6' Right-Of-Way setback requirement on 32nd Ave W to 0'.
- Stated SDOT won't approve a new mid-block crossing on 32nd Ave W unless the project can verify that pedestrian and vehicle volumes warrant a marked crosswalk.
- Encouraged developing a concept that allows solid waste containers to be staged on private property on collection day.

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 siting and design guidance.

1. **Massing:**
    a. The Board stated that Options 1 and 2, did not receive the same amount of study as the preferred option, Option 3 which shouldn't automatically become the defacto preferred option as a result. The Board continued by stating that Options 1 and 2 are simply not viable options as they appeared to be duplications of Option 3 with less detail, including no detail about the public plaza, no discussion about the secondary retail space, no detailed discussion about the residential entries, . **(CS2-A-2, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-1)**
    b. In reviewing the preferred option, the Board observed a third massing element depicted in a vignette sketch shown on page 76 of the EDG packet not included in the preferred option depicted in earlier pages of the packet and ask if the move should be inferred as an element of the preferred massing option. The Board stated that the design team shall depict massing moves or volume changes into the massing diagram at 2nd EDG. **(CS2-A-2, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-1)**
    c. Discussing the northern building volume in the preferred option, the Board noted it was set 4 feet below the southern volume and asked for details on how it will meet the street.
    d. The Board requested additional views of the building mass from the northwest corner and demonstration of how the proposed height will be experienced from a pedestrian viewpoint. **(CS1-B-2, CS2-B-2, CS2-C-2, CS2-D-5)**
    e. The Board stated that there was not enough information about the how the scale of the building will be broken down and that if the design team is considering elements like sloped roofs, indentations or other elements, then this information needs to be presented in an EDG massing option. **(CS2-D-4, CS2-D-5, PL3-A-1, DC2-A-2, DC2-B)**
    f. The Board stated because there was not enough information in the preferred option, the design team should return for a second EDG to provide more options and further studies depicting how the height, bulk and scale will be broken down. The massing options should clarify whether the shifts in the volumes are in the center of the mass, at the corner or are the corners carved in subtle manner, or another approach. **(CS2-C-2, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-5, DC1-A-4, DC2-A-2)**
    g. While acknowledging that setback relief had been given to the adjacent building to the south, the Board was concerned that not much relief had been given to the building to the north. **(CS1-B, CS2-D-1, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-5)**
    h. The Board stated that Design Guideline CS2-D3 discusses zone transitions but could not see how the guideline had been used to inform the three massing option. As such the Board asked for additional study that clearly shows the transitions with adjacent buildings in a neighborhood context. **(CS2-D-3, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-5)**

i. The Board stated that the massing moves depicted in the thumbnail sketch imagery depicted on page 76 of the EDG packet should be reflected in the massing options. **(CS2-B-1, CS2-B-2, CS2-B-3, PL2-A-2, PL2-B-3)**

j. For the next EDG meeting, the Board asked to see three updated massing options with access off 32nd Ave W. The massing options could include one option characterized as a partial block shift, and an option with a lantern or tower element as seen in the concept sketch on page 76 of the EDG packet. **(CS2-D-3, CS2-D-4, CS2-D-5, DC2-A-2)**

2. Design Concept:

a. The Board stated that they did not understand how the massing options presented at EDG were indicative of a recognizable design concept. **(CS2-A-2, CS2-D-1)**

b. The Board directed the team to demonstrate responses to the following issues in the Second EDG packet, to clarify proposed access into the site and the pedestrian realm.

i. What is the design rationale for providing parking access off 32nd Ave W. to the surface parking lot? **(PL1-B-1, PL1-B-3, PL1-C-2)**

ii. Why is the public plaza so highly integrated with the greatest amount of traffic into the project site? **(DC3-A-1, DC3-B, DC3-C-2)**

iii. Why is there parking outside of the garage and adjacent to pedestrian plaza?

iv. Why not place all the parking within the garage? **(DC3-A-1, DC3-B, DC3-C-2)**

c. The Board observed that the location of the surface parking lot significantly detracts from the public plaza area. Study alternate parking/plaza locations in the second EDG packet. **(PL1-B-1, PL1-B-3, PL1-C-2)**

d. In the Second EDG packet, demonstrate how the grades work in relationship to the plaza area as depicted on page 74 of the EDG packet dated January 8, 2020. **(CS1-C-2, DC2-D)**

e. The Board stated that the design guidelines talk about using topography to inform design concepts. In response to these guidelines, the Second EDG packet should demonstrate how the design will take advantage of the sloping conditions by stepping with the grade, especially as it relates to an east-west direction. **(CS1-C-1, CS1-C-2, DC2-A-1)**

f. The proposed massing is larger than nearby existing context. In the Second EDG packet, demonstrate how the design will further the urban experience of the nearby context. **(DC2-B, DC2-D-1, DC2-E-1, DC4-D-4)**

g. The Board stated that there is no architectural design concept reflected in any of the massing options presented in the EDG packet. As such the Board requested that the design team devote further study in developing a design concept and rationale for an updated EDG 2 presentation. **(CS2-D-5, CS3-B-1, DC2-B)**

3. Articulation:

a. The Board observed that proposed design consists of three very similar massing approaches which includes two shifting volumes, a southern volume set back from 32nd Ave W and a northern volume shifting west away from the alley which the Board felt was not yet fully resolved. Additional massing options should be provided in the Second EDG packet. **(CS1-B-2, DC2-B-1, CS2-A-2)**

b. The Board stated that comparative massing imagery page 53 of EDG packet depicts three massing options with facades that emulate sheer walls that go all the down to grade with some windows. The Board continued by saying that the massing options should be further developed with reveals or other elements designed to break down the scale, like the thumbnail sketch on page 76 of the EDG packet. **(CS1-B-2, DC2-B-1, CS2-A-2, DC2-C-1)**
c. The Board stated that the massing volumes should be further articulated. The Board agreed with the conceptual idea of incorporating elements like biophilia and lantern forms into the design were positive. Provide clear information on how all these things would be incorporated into a cohesive design approach, with the information at the 2nd EDG meeting. **(CS2-D-4, CS2-D-5 DC2-C-1)**
d. The Board requested additional studies showing how the design will transition to lower existing heights north side the building, and provide a north façade that, relates to a design concept.,. **(CS1-B-2, CS2-D-5)**
e. The Board stated that it will be important to see how the building will look from both west and east sides and requested additional studies depicting how the building will be perceived from those vantage points. **(CS2-D-5, DC2-A-2, DC2-B-1)**
f. The Board requested additional information depicting how the scale of the massing volumes will be further broken down and how Living Building Pilot elements will be incorporated into the design. **(DC2-C-1, PL3-A-1)**
g. The Board requested an elevated perspective view of the project from surrounding neighborhoods which would aid in showing the building in a broader context. **(CS3-B-1, CS1-B-2, DC2-B-1, CS2-A-2)**

4. Circulation and Parking Access:

a. While this is a Type I Decision with the final determination made by the SDCI Director, the Board expressed skepticism about the proposed parking access being taken from the street instead of from the alley. The Board stated that there are several other supermarkets throughout Seattle that take parking access off the alley. **(PL2-A-1, PL2-A-2, DC1-B-1, DC1-C)**
b. The Board stated that they did not believe that the 'SeaTac Ramp' depicted in Option 2 in the EDG packet is the only way to bring parking off the alley. **(DC1-B-1, DC1-C)**
c. The Board noted the applicant's statement that taking parking access off 32nd Ave W would reduce the impacts to the single-family residences located to the east of the project. **(PL2-A-1, PL2-A-2, DC1-B-1)**
d. In discussing the auto circulation patterns presented at EDG, the Board stated that the design scheme depicting access of 32nd Ave W seemed to be most developed, but not completely resolved. **(PL2-A-1, DC1-B-1)**
e. The Board stated that the preferred option with automobile access off 32nd Ave W needed more analysis in order to demonstrate that this is approach will be a successful response to Design Guidelines and the context. **(PL2-A-1, DC1-C)**
f. The Board requested additional information related to automobile access off 32nd Ave W and demonstration of how the design function without a midblock pedestrian crossing. SDOT comments noted they do not support a midblock pedestrian crossing at this time. **(CS2-B-2, PL2-A-2, PL2-B-3)**

g. The Board asked for more detailed information at the podium level including section views of the plaza and its relationship with the access point off 32nd Ave W. **(CS2-B-2, PL4-A, DC1-B-1)**

5. **Public Life**:
   a. The Board was concerned that the public plaza is located immediately adjacent to the surface parking area. **(CS2-A-1, CS2-C-2, PL2-B-3)**
   b. The Board stated that in similar situations, other sites have benefited from intervening sidewalks or a change in elevation separating pedestrian activities from automobile traffic. Seeing how other sites approached the use of a public plaza, the Board stated that this proposal needs more study in way of separating the plaza from the surface parking area and automobile movement. **(CS2-B-2, CS2-B-3, CS2-C-2, PL2-A-2, PL2-B-3)**
   c. The Board supported the concept for the public plaza designed to support the programming needs of the supermarket but stated that design of the space was not yet clear. Demonstrate how the plaza design will enhance this concept. **(CS2-B-1, CS2-B-2, CS2-B-3, PL2-A-2, PL2-B-3)**
   d. The Board requested section studies taken through the plaza and the sidewalk to demonstrate the pedestrian experience along the sidewalk and the building frontage. **(CS2-B-1, CS2-B-2, CS2-B-3, PL2-A-2, PL2-B-3)**
   e. The Board asked for more detail depicting/describing the indoor-outdoor relationship of the public plaza, the store entry, and the pedestrian experience. **(PL2-A-2, PL2-B-3, DC3-A-1, DC3-B-1)**
   f. The Board requested additional information detailing the location and amount of transparency along the store frontage and the type of textures, rhythms or places of pause along the very long storefront facade. **(CS2-B-1, CS2-B-2, CS2-B-3, PL2-A-2, PL2-B-3)**

6. **Living Building Pilot**:
   a. Discussing the three massing options, the Board suggested that the option with the least amount of concrete is the best for the environment. As such the preferred option seemed to be the most carbon sensitive opposed to a large parking ramp seen in other options. **(DC2-B-1, DC3-C-2)**
   b. The Board supported the Living Building Pilot approach, suggested that the living building design approach needs to be embodied in the massing and that sustainability goals should be legible in the building design, potentially achieved through building articulation and other design moves. **(CS3-B-1D, C2-C-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-E DC4-D-4)**
   c. The Board stated that a large 7-story building will be very visible within the lower height Magnolia neighborhood. The design should clearly read as a Living Building as seen from the top of the hill and surrounding areas. **(DC2-C-3, DC2-D, DC2-E)**
   d. The Board asked the team to demonstrate how integrating the parking and the pedestrian biophilia will be consistent with the values of the Living Building Challenge, given that pedestrians will be subjected to automobile exhaust with the driveway next to the pedestrian realm. **(DC3-B-1, DC3-C-2, DC4-D-4)**

e. The Board requested additional information depicting how the living building challenge is reflected in the massing through further study of the fifth/roof elevation. **(CS3-B-1, DC2-D-2, DC2-E, DC4-D-4)**

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

At the time of the **FIRST** Early Design Guidance meeting no departures were requested.

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The Seattle Design Guidelines and Neighborhood Design Guidelines recognized by the Board as Priority Guidelines are identified above. All guidelines remain applicable and are summarized below. For the full text please visit the Design Review website.

CONTEXT & SITE

CS1 Natural Systems and Site Features: Use natural systems/features of the site and its surroundings as a starting point for project design.

CS1-A Energy Use

CS1-A-1. Energy Choices: At the earliest phase of project development, examine how energy choices may influence building form, siting, and orientation, and factor in the findings when making siting and design decisions.

CS1-B Sunlight and Natural Ventilation

CS1-B-1. Sun and Wind: Take advantage of solar exposure and natural ventilation. Use local wind patterns and solar gain to reduce the need for mechanical ventilation and heating where possible.

CS1-B-2. Daylight and Shading: Maximize daylight for interior and exterior spaces and minimize shading on adjacent sites through the placement and/or design of structures on site.

CS1-B-3. Managing Solar Gain: Manage direct sunlight falling on south and west facing facades through shading devices and existing or newly planted trees.

CS1-C Topography

CS1-C-1. Land Form: Use natural topography and desirable landforms to inform project design.

CS1-C-2. Elevation Changes: Use the existing site topography when locating structures and open spaces on the site.

CS1-D Plants and Habitat

CS1-D-1. On-Site Features: Incorporate on-site natural habitats and landscape elements into project design and connect those features to existing networks of open spaces and natural habitats wherever possible. Consider relocating significant trees and vegetation if retention is not feasible.

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

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

CS2-A Location in the City and Neighborhood

CS2-A-1. Sense of Place: Emphasize attributes that give a distinctive sense of place. Design the building and open spaces to enhance areas where a strong identity already exists and create a sense of place where the physical context is less established.

CS2-A-2. Architectural Presence: Evaluate the degree of visibility or architectural presence that is appropriate or desired given the context, and design accordingly.

CS2-B Adjacent Sites, Streets, and Open Spaces

CS2-B-1. Site Characteristics: Allow characteristics of sites to inform the design, especially where the street grid and topography create unusually shaped lots that can add distinction to the building massing.

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

CS2-B-3. Character of Open Space: Contribute to the character and proportion of surrounding open spaces.

CS2-C Relationship to the Block

CS2-C-1. Corner Sites: Corner sites can serve as gateways or focal points; both require careful detailing at the first three floors due to their high visibility from two or more streets and long distances.

CS2-C-2. Mid-Block Sites: Look to the uses and scales of adjacent buildings for clues about how to design a mid-block building. Continue a strong street-edge and respond to datum lines of adjacent buildings at the first three floors.

CS2-C-3. Full Block Sites: Break up long facades of full-block buildings to avoid a monolithic presence. Provide detail and human scale at street-level and include repeating elements to add variety and rhythm to the façade and overall building design.

CS2-D Height, Bulk, and Scale

CS2-D-1. Existing Development and Zoning: Review the height, bulk, and scale of neighboring buildings as well as the scale of development anticipated by zoning for the area to determine an appropriate complement and/or transition.

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

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

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

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

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

CS3-A Emphasizing Positive Neighborhood Attributes

CS3-A-1. Fitting Old and New Together: Create compatibility between new projects, and existing architectural context, including historic and modern designs, through building articulation, scale and proportion, roof forms, detailing, fenestration, and/or the use of complementary materials.

CS3-A-2. Contemporary Design: Explore how contemporary designs can contribute to the development of attractive new forms and architectural styles as expressed through use of new materials or other means.

CS3-A-3. Established Neighborhoods: In existing neighborhoods with a well-defined architectural character, site and design new structures to complement or be compatible with the architectural style and siting patterns of neighborhood buildings.

CS3-A-4. Evolving Neighborhoods: In neighborhoods where architectural character is evolving or otherwise in transition, explore ways for new development to establish a positive and desirable context for others to build upon in the future.

CS3-B Local History and Culture

CS3-B-1. Placemaking: Explore the history of the site and neighborhood as a potential placemaking opportunity. Look for historical and cultural significance, using neighborhood groups and archives as resources.

CS3-B-2. Historical/Cultural References: Reuse existing structures on the site where feasible as a means of incorporating historical or cultural elements into the new project.

PUBLIC LIFE

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

PL1-A Network of Open Spaces

PL1-A-1. Enhancing Open Space: Design the building and open spaces to positively contribute to a broader network of open spaces throughout the neighborhood.

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

PL1-B Walkways and Connections

PL1-B-1. Pedestrian Infrastructure: Connect on-site pedestrian walkways with existing public and private pedestrian infrastructure, thereby supporting pedestrian connections within and outside the project.

PL1-B-2. Pedestrian Volumes: Provide ample space for pedestrian flow and circulation, particularly in areas where there is already heavy pedestrian traffic or where the project is expected to add or attract pedestrians to the area.

PL1-B-3. Pedestrian Amenities: Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian oriented open spaces to enliven the area and attract interest and interaction with the site and building should be considered.

PL1-C Outdoor Uses and Activities

PL1-C-1. Selecting Activity Areas: Concentrate activity areas in places with sunny exposure, views across spaces, and in direct line with pedestrian routes.

PL1-C-2. Informal Community Uses: In addition to places for walking and sitting, consider including space for informal community use such as performances, farmer's markets, kiosks and community bulletin boards, cafes, or street vending.

PL1-C-3. Year-Round Activity: Where possible, include features in open spaces for activities beyond daylight hours and throughout the seasons of the year, especially in neighborhood centers where active open space will contribute vibrancy, economic health, and public safety.

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

PL2-A Accessibility

PL2-A-1. Access for All: Provide access for people of all abilities in a manner that is fully integrated into the project design. Design entries and other primary access points such that all visitors can be greeted and welcomed through the front door.

PL2-A-2. Access Challenges: Add features to assist pedestrians in navigating sloped sites, long blocks, or other challenges.

PL2-B Safety and Security

PL2-B-1. Eyes on the Street: Create a safe environment by providing lines of sight and encouraging natural surveillance.

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

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

PL2-C Weather Protection

PL2-C-1. Locations and Coverage: Overhead weather protection is encouraged and should be located at or near uses that generate pedestrian activity such as entries, retail uses, and transit stops.

PL2-C-2. Design Integration: Integrate weather protection, gutters and downspouts into the design of the structure as a whole and ensure that it also relates well to neighboring buildings in design, coverage, or other features.

PL2-C-3. People-Friendly Spaces: Create an artful and people-friendly space beneath building.

PL2-D Wayfinding

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

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

PL3-A Entries

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

PL3-A-2. Common Entries: Multi-story residential buildings need to provide privacy and security for residents but also be welcoming and identifiable to visitors.

PL3-A-3. Individual Entries: Ground-related housing should be scaled and detailed appropriately to provide for a more intimate type of entry.

PL3-A-4. Ensemble of Elements: Design the entry as a collection of coordinated elements including the door(s), overhead features, ground surface, landscaping, lighting, and other features.

PL3-B Residential Edges

PL3-B-1. Security and Privacy: Provide security and privacy for residential buildings through the use of a buffer or semi-private space between the development and the street or neighboring buildings.

PL3-B-2. Ground-level Residential: Privacy and security issues are particularly important in buildings with ground-level housing, both at entries and where windows are located overlooking the street.

PL3-B-3. Buildings with Live/Work Uses: Maintain active and transparent facades in the design of live/work residences. Design the first floor so it can be adapted to other commercial use as needed in the future.

PL3-B-4. Interaction: Provide opportunities for interaction among residents and neighbors.

PL3-C Retail Edges

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

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

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

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

PL4-A Entry Locations and Relationships

PL4-A-1. Serving all Modes of Travel: Provide safe and convenient access points for all modes of travel.

PL4-A-2. Connections to All Modes: Site the primary entry in a location that logically relates to building uses and clearly connects all major points of access.

PL4-B Planning Ahead for Bicyclists

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

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

PL4-B-3. Bike Connections: Facilitate connections to bicycle trails and infrastructure around and beyond the project.

PL4-C Planning Ahead for Transit

PL4-C-1. Influence on Project Design: Identify how a transit stop (planned or built) adjacent to or near the site may influence project design, provide opportunities for placemaking.

PL4-C-2. On-site Transit Stops: If a transit stop is located onsite, design project-related pedestrian improvements and amenities so that they complement any amenities provided for transit riders.

PL4-C-3. Transit Connections: Where no transit stops are on or adjacent to the site, identify where the nearest transit stops, and pedestrian routes are and include design features and connections within the project design as appropriate.

DESIGN CONCEPT

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

DC1-A Arrangement of Interior Uses

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

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

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

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

DC1-B Vehicular Access and Circulation

DC1-B-1. Access Location and Design: Choose locations for vehicular access, service uses, and delivery areas that minimize conflict between vehicles and non-motorists wherever possible. Emphasize use of the sidewalk for pedestrians, and create safe and attractive conditions for pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers.

DC1-B-2. Facilities for Alternative Transportation: Locate facilities for alternative transportation in prominent locations that are convenient and readily accessible to expected users.

DC1-C Parking and Service Uses

DC1-C-1. Below-Grade Parking: Locate parking below grade wherever possible. Where a surface parking lot is the only alternative, locate the parking in rear or side yards, or on lower or less visible portions of the site.

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

DC1-C-3. Multiple Uses: Design parking areas to serve multiple uses such as children's play space, outdoor gathering areas, sports courts, woonerf, or common space in multifamily projects.

DC1-C-4. Service Uses: Locate and design service entries, loading docks, and trash receptacles away from pedestrian areas or to a less visible portion of the site to reduce possible impacts of these facilities on building aesthetics and pedestrian circulation.

DC2 Architectural Concept: Develop an architectural concept that will result in a unified and functional design that fits well on the site and within its surroundings.

DC2-A Massing

DC2-A-1. Site Characteristics and Uses: Arrange the mass of the building taking into consideration the characteristics of the site and the proposed uses of the building and its open space.

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

DC2-B Architectural and Facade Composition

DC2-B-1. Façade Composition: Design all building facades—including alleys and visible roofs— considering the composition and architectural expression of the building as a whole. Ensure that all facades are attractive and well-proportioned.

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

DC2-C Secondary Architectural Features

DC2-C-1. Visual Depth and Interest: Add depth to facades where appropriate by incorporating balconies, canopies, awnings, decks, or other secondary elements into the façade design. Add detailing at the street level in order to create interest for the pedestrian and encourage active street life and window shopping (in retail areas).

DC2-C-2. Dual Purpose Elements: Consider architectural features that can be dual purpose— adding depth, texture, and scale as well as serving other project functions.

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

DC2-D Scale and Texture

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

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

DC2-E Form and Function

DC2-E-1. Legibility and Flexibility: Strive for a balance between building use legibility and flexibility. Design buildings such that their primary functions and uses can be readily determined from the exterior, making the building easy to access and understand. At the same time, design flexibility into the building so that it may remain useful over time even as specific programmatic needs evolve.

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

DC3-A Building-Open Space Relationship

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

DC3-B Open Space Uses and Activities

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

DC3-B-2. Matching Uses to Conditions: Respond to changing environmental conditions such as seasonal and daily light and weather shifts through open space design and/or programming of open space activities.

DC3-B-3. Connections to Other Open Space: Site and design project-related open spaces to connect with, or enhance, the uses and activities of other nearby public open space where appropriate.

DC3-B-4. Multifamily Open Space: Design common and private open spaces in multifamily projects for use by all residents to encourage physical activity and social interaction.

DC3-C Design

DC3-C-1. Reinforce Existing Open Space: Where a strong open space concept exists in the neighborhood, reinforce existing character and patterns of street tree planting, buffers or treatment of topographic changes. Where no strong patterns exist, initiate a strong open space concept that other projects can build upon in the future.

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

DC3-C-3. Support Natural Areas: Create an open space design that retains and enhances onsite natural areas and connects to natural areas that may exist off-site and may provide habitat for wildlife.

DC4 Exterior Elements and Finishes: Use appropriate and high-quality elements and finishes for the building and its open spaces.

DC4-A Exterior Elements and Finishes

DC4-A-1. Exterior Finish Materials: Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.

DC4-A-2. Climate Appropriateness: Select durable and attractive materials that will age well in Seattle's climate, taking special care to detail corners, edges, and transitions.

DC4-B Signage

DC4-B-1. Scale and Character: Add interest to the streetscape with exterior signs and attachments that are appropriate in scale and character to the project and its environs.

DC4-B-2. Coordination with Project Design: Develop a signage plan within the context of architectural and open space concepts, and coordinate the details with façade design,

lighting, and other project features to complement the project as a whole, in addition to the surrounding context.

DC4-C Lighting

DC4-C-1. Functions: Use lighting both to increase site safety in all locations used by pedestrians and to highlight architectural or landscape details and features such as entries, signs, canopies, plantings, and art.

DC4-C-2. Avoiding Glare: Design project lighting based upon the uses on and off site, taking care to provide illumination to serve building needs while avoiding off-site night glare and light pollution.

DC4-D Trees, Landscape, and Hardscape Materials

DC4-D-1. Choice of Plant Materials: Reinforce the overall architectural and open space design concepts through the selection of landscape materials.

DC4-D-2. Hardscape Materials: Use exterior courtyards, plazas, and other hard surfaced areas as an opportunity to add color, texture, and/or pattern and enliven public areas through the use of distinctive and durable paving materials. Use permeable materials wherever possible.

DC4-D-3. Long Range Planning: Select plants that upon maturity will be of appropriate size, scale, and shape to contribute to the site as intended.

DC4-D-4. Place Making: Create a landscape design that helps define spaces with significant elements such as trees.

DC4-E Project Assembly and Lifespan

DC4-E-1. Deconstruction: When possible, design the project so that it may be deconstructed at the end of its useful lifetime, with connections and assembly techniques that will allow reuse of materials.

BOARD DIRECTION

At the conclusion of the FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE meeting, the Board recommended the project return for another meeting in response to the guidance provided.