



**INITIAL RECOMMENDATION OF THE
EAST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

Record Number: 3034679-LU

Address: 2517 Eastlake Avenue E.

Applicant: Scott Shaw, Hewitt Architects

Date of Meeting: Wednesday, December 18, 2019

Board Members Present: Melissa Alexander (Chair)
Elizabeth (Betsy) Anderson
Justin Panganiban
Alastair Townsend
Lauren Powers

Board Members Absent: Andrew Haas

SDCI Staff Present: Joseph Hurley, Senior Planner, SDCI

SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: The development site encompasses three parcels with three zoning designations:
NC2-65 (M1): Neighborhood Commercial Two with a 65' height limit
NC2P-65 (M1) Neighborhood Commercial Two – Pedestrian Overlay with a 65' height limit (
LR3 (M1) Low-rise Three

Nearby Zones: (North) NC2-65 (M2)
(South) NC2P-65 (M1)
(East) LR3(M1)
(West) MR (M1)

Lot Area: 33,442 sq.ft.



Current Development:

One- and two-story commercial with surface parking.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:

The immediate context includes a variety of zoning designations and uses. Nearby sites are zoned Low-rise Two, Low-rise Three, Midrise, Neighborhood Commercial One and Two, some with a Pedestrian Overlay (NC3P-160+65), Midrise and Single-family. The neighborhood consists of an eclectic mix, including pre-war masonry structures, mid-century multi-family buildings and more recent mixed-use projects. Uses along Eastlake Avenue are varied and include single family homes, multifamily apartment buildings, multi-story mixed-use buildings and commercial structures. Within walking distance from the site, services include restaurants, grocery stores, shopping, and parks. Natural amenities in the area include Lake Union and Rogers Playground.

Access:

Vehicle and pedestrian access are from Eastlake Avenue and East Louisa Street.

Environmentally Critical Areas:

The site contains a mapped steep slope Environmentally Critical Area

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Design Review Early Design Guidance for a 6-story, 200-unit apartment building with retail space. 100 parking spaces proposed. Existing buildings to be demolished.

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 SDCl:

Mailing Public Resource Center

Address: 700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000

P.O. Box 34019

Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Concern that the project is much larger than anything else in the neighborhood
- From a representative of nearby homeowners to the west:
 - Support for the provision of parking and its location and access point.
 - Support for the preservation of the existing rockery on the west slope.
 - Support for the development of the landscape design.
 - Concern regarding the scale of the project, by their estimate 76' tall on the downhill edge
 - a suggestion that the design team request departures from the Land Use Code in order to develop a scheme that mitigates scale at this edge by terracing up the hill.
- Concern regarding the impact on E. Louisa Street and a request that loading zones be developed on Eastlake for commercial and ride hailing services.
- Concerned about the residential uses at street-level, would like to see them well-designed
- Concern for safety of pedestrians with deliveries, ride-hailing, cars, etc.

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

- Concern regarding the possible misrepresentation of existing conditions (houses) to the west.
- Concern regarding the future of Arbor Way and a request to preserve it.
- Concern regarding the scale of the proposed project relative to existing residences and potential impacts on privacy and congestion.
- A request to reduce the scale of the project with particular reference to the Design Guideline CS2 Urban Pattern and Form.
- Concern regarding the scale of the proposed project relative to downhill neighbors.
- A request that space be made for small retailers in the new commercial areas.
- Concern regarding the scale of the proposed project and its impact on Rogers playground.

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 siting and design guidance.

1. Massing Schemes

- a. The Board supported Option C and agreed that the idea of smaller forms combined in a larger whole could be an effective strategy for breaking down the scale of this large project. (CS2-D)
- b. The Board expressed concern regarding the how this scheme responds to context, particularly where it abuts zone changes and along E. Louisa Street. (CS2, DC2)

2. Downhill (west) Edge

- a. Echoing public comment, the Board identified this edge and zone transition as a critical project element and agreed that the combination of topography and less-intensive zoning presented a unique challenge that would require careful composition. (CS2-D, CS2-D)
- b. The Board supported the modulation of the project where it abuts Parcel C and agreed that further modulation and development would be required along Parcel B to provide the scale mitigation required at this zone transition. (CS2, CS3)
- c. The Board noted that a solution for this edge (Parcel B) could potentially inform the development of the related scale-mitigation strategy at East Louisa. (CS2, CS3)

3. Architectural Concept

- a. The Board expressed general support for the design concept of smaller identifiable forms coming together as an integrated whole, but agreed that they did not yet see a clear relationship between the pieces. (DC2-B)
- b. The Board supported the two-part articulation of the massing along Eastlake Avenue and gave guidance to strengthen this move by further recessing the residential entry, ideally as a fully glazed element with light and views to the courtyard beyond. (DC2, CS3)
- c. The Board noted a number of unsuccessful nearby projects with similar compositional approaches and agreed that a simple composition of a few high-quality materials would likely be more effective. (DC2, CS3)
- d. The Board supported the variable heights of the pieces and the development of residential entrances on both Eastlake Avenue and East Louisa. (CS2, PL2)

4. Eastlake Avenue E.

- a. The Board supported the development of double-height direct entry units along Eastlake avenue and gave guidance to further develop this edge architecturally and with landscape to create safe occupiable spaces that foster human interaction. (PL3)

- b. The Board agreed that this edge would be one of the most important to neighbors and pedestrians and offered preliminary support for a departure from development standards in support of the best solution possible.
- c. The Board agreed that they did not see a connection between the ground floor base and the massing above and identified the resolution of this issue as of primary importance. (DC2, PL3)
- d. The Board noted the unique condition at the north east corner of the project and requested that complete details of a context-appropriate solution be provided for the next meeting. (DC1, CS2)
- e. The Board expressed concern regarding the representation of a single commercial space and agreed that the street edges should be developed to support demising into multiple smaller spaces. (PL3-C)
- f. The Board agreed that the changing grade along Eastlake Avenue presented a challenge to maintaining this as an active and connected edge and provided guidance to make the resolution of these issues a priority. (CS1, PL2, PL3)
- g. The Board supported the schematic thinking behind Park View Frame concept, making particular reference to the precedents provided in the packet. The Board agreed that the success of this scheme would depend on making a meaningful connection between the residential units and Rogers Park and encouraged the design team to develop this edge with a high percentage of glazing and occupiable exterior space in deep recesses. (DC2, PL1)

5. East Louisa Street

- a. The Board did not support the massing proposed for this edge, agreeing that the large cantilevered mass of the upper levels did not seem to be an appropriate response to context. (CS2, DC2)
- b. The Board took particular note of the unique smaller-scaled and vernacular character of this section of E. Louisa Street and agreed that a more nuanced approach to the massing and modulation would be required and that high quality materials and careful detailing would be critically important in relating to the pedestrian scale of this street. (CS2-A.1, CS-3)

6. The Corner

- a. The Board noted that the very different conditions on Eastlake Avenue and East Louisa presented a unique problem at this corner and gave guidance to explore further options to resolve this issue and create the corner anchor described in the packet. (CS2, CS3)

INITIAL RECOMMENDATION December 18, 2019

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Supported the rocky treatment and set back at west edge.

- Appreciated the addition of bays and large trees on East Louisa Street as scale mitigating elements.
- Supported the set back of the amenity area at the rooftop terrace.
- Requested that the landscape between the project and downhill neighbors be well designed and completely documented.

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

- Concerned regarding the loss of light to existing neighbors and Rogers Park caused by the height and bulk of the project.
- Concerned that the height and bulk of the project is out of scale with the existing neighborhood.
- Concerned about the pedestrian experience on Eastlake Avenue. Noted that the main business street needs to be pedestrian friendly.
- Concerned that the project will appear enormous to residents of the dwellings to the west (downhill) from the project.
- Concerned about the effect this project will have on the character of East Louisa Street and the Arbor Way pedestrian route.
- Concerned that the project will appear large and cheap.
- Concerned that the large scale of this project will set a poor precedent for the neighborhood.

SDCI received non-design related comments regarding traffic congestion, SEPA-related documents, site geology, quantity of parking, construction impacts and transit planning.

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 siting and design guidance.

- 1. Response to Guidance.** The Board expressed appreciation for the materials produced for this meeting and the evolution of the design but agreed unanimously that it should return for a second meeting with the recommendations that follow.
- 2. Corner Anchor Block.**

- a. The Board supported the development of this principal corner element, noting the high-quality materials, well composed fenestration pattern, and fully glazed street front as contextually appropriate and well connected to the public realm. (CS2-B.2, CS3-A, DC2-B.1,)
- b. Noting the size and prominence of this element, the Board provided guidance to explore an upgrade in the quality of the infill panels to either brick or a similarly high-quality texture-creating material. (DC2-D.2, CS2-C.1, CS2-A.2)
- c. The Board noted that the proportion of the glazed corner entry area seemed compressed relative to its location and importance, and noted the awning as potentially exacerbating this appearance. (PL3-A, CS2-C.1)
- d. The Board supported shifting the cantilevered upper level away from the corner but noted that moving this one bay further back could better fit the design concept, strengthen the legibility of the corner and respond to context. (CS2-D, CS3-A.1, CS2-C)
- e. The Board supported the proposed curb bulb and associated landscaping at this corner and asked for a resolution and explanation of the potential conflict with utility poles identified by SDOT. (DC4-D)

3. Signage.

- a. The Board expressed support for the idea of re-using the iconic EASTLAKE sign but agreed that as currently proposed it could increase the perceived height bulk and scale of this project, an issue of concern for both the public and the Board. (CS2-D, DC4-B)
- b. The Board noted that their guidance on similar projects has been for signage to be directed towards the pedestrian realm and asked for an exploration of this issue (including alternative locations or solutions) for the next meeting. (CS2-D, DC4-B)

4. Park Frame.

- a. The Board expressed general support for both the design concept and bold choice of materials proposed for this element but struggled to understand the logic or see the continuity in how this scheme was executed. (DC2, DC2-B)
- b. The Board noted in particular the expression of the frame, where the use of an identical cladding material on the inboard face and the use of material identical to the adjacent field material on the outboard face appeared to diminish the legibility of this strong idea. (DC2, CS2-B)
- c. The Board agreed that it was hard to understand how this element would appear from other viewpoints and asked that additional views be provided for the next meeting.
- d. The Board noted that the area within the ‘frame’ of this facade did not have the depth they expected to see given their guidance at EDG, and repeated their guidance to explore creating depth in the facade and a connection to the adjacent public park, ideally with occupiable exterior spaces. (CS2-B.2, CS2-D, DC2-B, DC2-C)

5. Eastlake Avenue Base.

- a. The Board supported the two-story entry expression at the street edge and agreed that the shift in materials and modulation of form was an appropriate response to the pedestrian realm. (PL3-A, CS2-B)
- b. The Board supported the development of the 'treehouse' bays and entry stoops at this edge but expressed concern that the positive qualities they supported may be diminishing with the changing grade. The Board asked that complete drawings be provided for the next meeting showing finish floor elevations and exterior grades along this edge. (PL3-A, CS2-B.2)
- c. The Board expressed appreciation for the inspirational precedent images provided at EDG and on page 39, noting the simplicity of composition and significant glazing of the bays. The Board encouraged the applicant to revisit these images as the design of these elements evolves. (CS2-B, PL3-A)
- d. The Board encouraged the design team to explore the possibility of using materials to make a connection between the street level 'treehouse' area and that of the Park Frame above. (DC2-B, DC2-C, DC4)
- e. The Board had questions about the choice of tree species for both the right of way and at the residential entries and asked for complete details and their design rationale for the next meeting. (DC4-D, PL3-A)

6. Eastlake Gasket.

- a. The Board noted their earlier support for this element in visually connecting the street to the courtyard and in the legibility of the two-part massing scheme along Eastlake, and their guidance to further strengthen those qualities. (DC2, CS2-D, CS2-B)
- b. The Board did not support the current expression of the gasket, finding it too much like the rest of the Eastlake facade. The Board provided guidance to create a distinct appearance for this element, ideally employing a high percentage of uniquely expressed glazing and a distinguishing exterior cladding material. (CS2-B.2, DC2-A.2)
- c. The Board supported the complete transparency of the ground floor entry area and the continuity of the wood soffit from interior to exterior, agreeing that it was an appropriate response to their earlier guidance. (DC2, CS3)

7. East Louisa and Arbor Way.

- a. The Board did not support the treatment of the residential bays along this frontage, expressing concern regarding the angled geometry, the choice and deployment of materials, the lack of depth and articulation of the bays, and the multiplicity of window types. (CS2, CS3, DC2-B, DC2-C)
- b. Despite their concerns about the expression of these elements, the Board agreed that having scale-mitigating bays wrap the corner from East Louisa to the west facade of Parcel C would be a good response to their previous guidance. (CS2, CS3)

- c. The Board supported the intent of the material change at Level 6 but agreed that it was not conceptually consistent with the corner block. The Board provided guidance to explore options that would provide scale mitigation while maintaining conceptual consistency with the corner block. (DC2, DC2-A.2, CS2-D)

8. Garage Entrance and Services.

- a. The Board supported the configuration of elements around the garage entrance but questioned the logic of employing a new cladding material in an area that appeared to be part of the corner block. (DC2-B, DC4-A)
- b. The Board provided guidance to maximize the amount of landscaping where possible in this area (possibly with storm-water planters) and provide screening for waste staging areas. (DC1-C, DC4-D, PL4)
- c. The Board asked the design team to explore paving changes and other strategies to enhance pedestrian safety at this confluence of an established pedestrian route and the single access point for both residential and service vehicle traffic. (PL2, DC1-B, DC1-C)

9. West Façade.

- a. Echoing public comment, the Board expressed concern about the height bulk and scale of the project where it is adjacent to and topographically higher than a less intensive zone. (CS2-D.2, CS2-D.3)
- b. Some Board members expressed surprise that the response to their guidance at EDG had been to erode the base of this facade rather than the top but agreed that the required scale mitigation could be achieved in a number of ways. (CS2-D.3, CS2-D.4)
- c. The Board agreed that the development of each residential bay with an identical character had diminished the hierarchical order and scale-mitigating effect of the fewer and simpler bays they had supported at EDG. (DC2-A.2, CS2-D.3)
- d. The Board noted the prominence of this facade and provided guidance to explore the introduction of materials of a similarly high quality to those on the Eastlake facade. (DC2-B.1)

10. Landscaping.

- a. The Board noted that while the landscape plan identified many of the proposed plantings, it was difficult to understand their specific location, and asked that this be completely specified for the next meeting.

11. Materials.

- a. The Board noted that many of the exterior materials shown in the aspirational images had texture and a patina that were the result of age and encouraged the design team to revisit these as the design evolves. (DC2-D, DC4-A)

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).

At the time of the INITIAL RECOMMENDATION review, the following departures were requested:

1. **Parking Space and Access Standards (SMC 23.54.030):** The Code requires that when more than 5 spaces are provided that a minimum of 60% of the stalls be striped for medium vehicles.

The Board expressed preliminary openness to this departure provided it will help the project better meet the guidance provided and supported by the adopted Design Guidelines.

2. **Facade Length (SMC 23.45.518):** The Code requires a 7-foot average and 5-foot minimum setback on facades longer than 40 feet in length. The applicant proposes an average of 6.42-feet and a minimum of 5-feet at the south property line.

The Board expressed preliminary openness to this departure provided it will help the project better meet the guidance provided and supported by the adopted Design Guidelines.

3. **Street -level Uses (SMC 23.47A.005):** The Code limits residential uses to 20% of street facing facades on designate Principal Pedestrian streets. The applicant proposes residential uses for 42% of the facade.

The Board expressed preliminary openness to this departure provided it will help the project better meet the guidance provided and supported by the adopted Design Guidelines. The Board noted that the proposed provision of unrequired retail use on E. Louisa St. that would help to activate the street level could be a strong rationale for such a departure request.

4. **Overhead Weather Protection (SMC 23.47A.008.C.4):** Where overhead weather protection is required, the Code requires the covered area width to be a minimum of 6 feet. The applicant proposes areas of non-compliance where conflicts with proposed street trees exist.

The Board expressed preliminary openness to this departure provided it will help the project better meet the guidance provided and supported by the adopted Design Guidelines.

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.

CS1-E Water

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

CS1-E-2. Adding Interest with Project Drainage: Use project drainage systems as opportunities to add interest to the site through water-related design elements.

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