City of Seattle
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections
Nathan Torgelson, Director

CITY OF SEATTLE
ANALYSIS AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR
OF THE SEATTLE DEPARTMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND INSPECTIONS

Application Number: 3018926

Applicant Name: Jodi Patterson-O'Hare

Address of Proposal: 1232 Harrison Street

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

Land Use Application to allow a 7-story, 109 unit apartment building with below grade parking for 15 vehicles. Existing structure to be demolished.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review with Departures (Seattle Municipal Code 23.41)*

** Departures are listed near the end of the Design Review Analysis in this document*

BACKGROUND

The project is located adjacent to another project proposal, 1212 Harrison Street, Seattle DCI Project #3018928. The sites are separated by a City of Seattle platted and improved alley. Each project is required to meet zoning development standards independent of the adjacent project proposal. To provide a comprehensive analysis of each project proposal the projects were presented to the West Design Review Board together for consideration.

An arborist report was provided (Urban Forestry Services, Inc., November 21, 2014), which indicated that there is one tree located on the site that would qualify as an Exceptional tree, per Director's Rule 16-2008. The report and proposed tree protection area have been reviewed by Seattle DCI's arborist for compliance with 25.11.

SITE AND VICINITY

Site Zone: Seattle Mixed Residential South Lake Union (SM-SLU/R 55/85)

Nearby Zones:

	North:	SM-SLU/R 55/85
	South:	SM-SLU/R 55/85
	West:	SM-SLU/R 55/85
	East:	SM-SLU/R 55/85

ECAs: None

Site Size: 11,400 square feet

PUBLIC COMMENT:

The public comment period ended on May 24, 2015. In addition to the comment(s) received through the Design Review process, other comments were received and carefully considered, to the extent that they raised issues within the scope of this review. These areas of public comment related to parking, construction impacts, and support for street improvements.

I. ANALYSIS – DESIGN REVIEW

CURRENT AND SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT; NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

The subject sites are located on the south portion of a block bounded by Minor Avenue N to the west, Pontius Avenue N to the east and Harrison Street to the south. The site consists of two developments, one fronting on Minor Avenue N and the other fronting on Pontius Avenue. Both developments face Harrison Street. The two developments are separated by a platted alley that runs north-south. Project Number 3018926 is located along Pontius Avenue N. Project Number 3018928 is located on Minor Avenue N. The subject lots are zoned Seattle Mixed Residential (SM/R 55/85). Surrounding properties are also zoned SM/R 55/85.

The neighborhood is largely defined by Cascade Park located directly south of the subject lot across Harrison Street. Harrison Street is a designated Green Street. Both Minor and Avenue N and Pontius Avenue N are developed with residential structures. The neighborhood includes a variety of older developments and newer mixed use developments, including the Stack House, which is located across Pontius Avenue N. Sites to the north contain an existing residential structure, a surface parking lot, and a commercial building. The subject lot on Minor Avenue N contains two exceptional trees. The lot on Pontius includes one Exceptional Tree.

FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE January 28, 2015
The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project numbers (**Error! Reference source not found.** and 3018928) at this website: http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp.

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

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

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

At the Early Design Guidance Meeting, the applicant presented three design alternatives. Each option included two buildings, one building on Minor Avenue N and another on Pontius Avenue E. Both buildings include frontage on Harrison Street. The design intent first massing option is designed to activate the alley with upper level setbacks and terrace amenity space facing the alley. The second massing option maintained the exceptional trees located on the sites.

In the presentation, the applicant expressed the preferred massing option's strong relationship to the Cascade Playfield. The design intent was to use a playful use of material and color to create a backdrop to the Park. The preferred massing alterative located the primary entries and a 2nd level podium deck on the south façade facing the park. The basic architectural concept includes a base, middle and top. The design intent of the base was to have a pedestrian focus with a solid, substantial, durable, heavy structure with 3' deep modulation to create a regular bay rhythm. The middle section includes a gasket with a recess created by the podium deck. The top of the structure was divided into two basic languages. The applicant noted that the intent is to design the façades facing Minor and Pontius will be designed with an urban residential character and a regular fenestration rhythm. The Harrison facade was intended to include 'screens' that provide a mural artwork feature as a back drop to the park.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was one member of the public were in attendance at the Early Design Guidance meeting held on January 28, 2015. No public comments were offered.

SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE March 18, 2015

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project numbers (**Error! Reference source not found.** and 3018928) at this website: http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp.

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

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

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

At the Second Early Design Guidance Meeting, the applicant presented the Board's preferred massing option, developed in response to the First Early Design Guidance, and described the massing and pedestrian experience along each street façade.

The preferred massing alternative was revised to include street level setbacks along Minor Avenue, Pontius Avenue, Harrison Street and the alley. The revised site design includes 3 foot setbacks along Minor and Pontius Street to provide a transition space between the ground level residential units and the adjacent sidewalk. Direct access was provided from the sidewalk to the units. In total, the double unit stoop was approximately 13 feet wide with 3 foot landscaping space between the doors. All subterranean units along the street were removed. Only two units, located a maximum of 1.5 feet below sidewalk elevation, were maintained along Minor Avenue. Units on Pontius Avenue are located above grade.

Along Harrison Street, the ground level programming was revised to include all the common residential amenity spaces. The lobby has been set back approximately 15 feet from the sidewalk and raised to relate directly to the elevation of the adjacent park. To complete the grade change from the sidewalk to the entry, a direct stair with integrated ADA ramp are located within a series of landscaped terraces. The applicant expressed a design intent to maintain a ramp less than 5% slope to avoid guardrail, to include seating elements and pedestrian lighting on Harrison Street.

The revised design included ground level units along the alley. The alley improvement will include a unique paving treatment and planters between the residential units and the right-of-way to provide defensible space.

The upper level massing along Harrison Street has been modified to include two defined massing elements at the alley, reducing the size of the mural element. The massing along Pontius and Minor have been broken into 2 unit modules with a vertical character.

The design has been modified to respond to the Stack House pedestrian crossing by creating a raised landscaping visual terminus.

In response to the courtyard in the northwest corner, the building is terraced at 3 levels with a stoop at grade and a private terrace above. Brick will wrap the corner and return 42 feet to the edge of the courtyard area. Corner windows are provided at street level and the upper level massing.

The revised right-of-way design will include 3 inch caliper trees along each street and wider curb bulbs at each corner.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was one member of the public were in attendance at the Early Design Guidance meeting held on March 18, 2015. No public comments were offered.

INITIAL RECOMMENDATION November 4, 2015

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project numbers (**Error! Reference source not found.** and 3018928) at this website: http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp.

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

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

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

At the Initial Recommendation meeting, the applicant described the design in response to the Early Design Guidance. The applicant noted that Exceptional Trees are located on both sites. The proposal is to remove the Exceptional trees and include additional landscaping on Harrison Street, which is a designated Green Street. 3” caliper trees are proposed as street trees. Both buildings include roof decks with green roofs.

The intent of the design was described as using color on the upper levels to relate to nearby development. The upper level colors are intended to relate to the City scale as viewed from adjacent Cascade Park to the south. The overall pattern of vibrant color was described as a plaid pattern with most of the color on the south facades and some areas of color that weave through the east and west facades. Upper level materials included metal colored panels, translucent glass balcony panels, and white cementitious siding. The applicant clarified that 1” recesses are proposed between metal panels, with approximately 30” recesses between bays.

The lower levels included brick framed bays and a scale to historic South Lake Union development. The brick patterning was shown to tie in to the plaid pattern at the upper levels. Metal mesh panels were shown at the street level patios, to further tie in to the plaid pattern. The base also includes larger than required setbacks in some areas, to create pedestrian 'eddy' areas with seating, landscaping, and art pieces. The applicant noted that the south setbacks had been increased to 7' compared with the 4' setback shown at EDG. The landscaped area at the southwest corner of the west site was designed with boulders and layered landscaping to compliment the design at Cascade Park across the street.

The packet included two options for the east building residential lobby (the applicant preferred more glazed interior space vs. more outdoor space), two options for the street level residential units (the applicant preferred raised patios with no direct access vs. stoops), and two options for bike room access (the applicant preferred garage and lobby access only vs. direct street access with stairs and a runnel). The applicant explained that the east building has been raised 21" since EDG, which results in taller stoops than shown at that stage of review. The applicant also explained that the team is working with Cornish College of the Arts to develop art panels for the street walls of the raised patios at Harrison St and Pontius Ave N.

The alley façades were shown with residential units at grade and facing each other across the alley. The floor lines of each building were off-set and the windows of each building were off-set to minimize privacy impacts between units. The south half of the alley is to function as a quieter residential area, with the solid waste staging and garage entry at the northern half of the alley.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at the Initial Recommendation meeting:

- Concerned that the option with direct bike access creates an unsafe condition at the entrance without clear sight lines;
- Asserted that the applicant team should coordinate with Seattle City Light on the streetscape improvements at Minor Ave N.;
- Appreciated the overall design;
- Concerned about safety at the alley, and requested that the south edge of both buildings be designed for clear sight lines at the alley;
- Concerned about the design option of stoops and creation of unsafe areas lacking clear sight lines;
- Would like to see that the proposed colors will not fade with time;
- Would like to see family sized units, given the adjacency to Cascade Park; and
- Asserted that the roofscape should be carefully designed, given the visibility from nearby existing and future taller buildings.

FINAL RECOMMENDATION January 20, 2016

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project numbers (**Error! Reference source not found.** and 3018928) at this website: http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp.

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

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

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

At the Final Recommendation meeting, the applicant described the design in response to the Initial Recommendation Meeting.

The intent of the design was described as using color metal panels on the on the upper levels to relate to nearby development and provide a vibrant color backdrop to Cascade Park. Large windows and 22 gauge metal panels in 18 custom colors, alternating size and direction, create a strengthened plaid pattern on the south facing façade. The façade also includes a 3' deep modulation creating a 'pleat.' The upper level facades on Pontius and Minor Street have been simplified to weave small amounts of color to support the plaid concept.

The lower levels included brick framed bays and a scale to reference historic South Lake Union development. The brick patterning was designed to tie in to the plaid pattern at the upper levels. Metal panels have replaced cement panel at the ground level units. Metal mesh panels were shown at the street level patios, to further tie in to the plaid pattern. The base also includes larger than required setbacks in some areas, to create pedestrian 'eddy' areas with seating, landscaping, and art pieces. The project will work with Cornish students to develop the patio art, as well as, the full height feature wall at the east building entry. The landscaped area at the southwest corner of the west site was designed with boulders and layered landscaping to compliment the design of Cascade Park across the street.

The alley façades were shown with residential units at grade and facing each other across the alley. The floor lines of each building were off-set and the windows of each building were also off-set to minimize privacy impacts between units. Additional windows have been added to provide increased opportunity for light into the units. The south half of the alley is to function as a quieter residential area, with the solid waste staging and garage entry at the northern half of the alley.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments were offered at the Final Recommendation Meeting.

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. The Board identified the Citywide Design Guidelines of highest priority for this project.

FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE January 28, 2015

1. **Massing and Site Design**. The Board unanimously supported the preferred massing study C that removes the Exceptional Trees. The Board noted the location across from the park, which will maintain an open southern exposure, requires a unique and thoughtful response.
   a) The Board agreed that the preferred massing alternative, which removes the Exceptional Trees, better meets the intent of City adopted design guidelines. The Board supported the removal of the Exceptional Trees in order to provide an exceptional south façade facing the park (CS2-I, CS2-B).
   b) The Board noted the preferred design, which included ground level units that do not engage the street, was not appropriate facing the park. The Board felt the design was fortress-like, insular and opaque. The Board felt strongly that the ground level should be redesigned to function as an active, porous, transparent front porch to the park (CS2-I, CS2-B, PL2-B3).
   c) The Board encouraged use of retail or other active residential accessory space to enliven the Harrison street level façade while providing a high degree of interaction with the pedestrian environment (CS2-B, CS2-I, PL2-B, PL3-C).
   d) The Board directed the applicant to design the base to be porous, active and engage the public realm with a combination of indoor/outdoor spaces to reinforce the character of the park (CS2-B, CS2-I, PL3-C, PL3-II, DC1-A).
   e) The Board noted that the required changes to the ground level façade on Harrison Street would likely require a loss of volume at the street. The Board expressed early support for a departure to the upper level setback along the alley in order to meet the direction for the design of the façade facing the street (CS2-B, CS2-I, PL3-C, PL3-II, DC1-A).

2. **Harrison Green Street**. The Board felt additional efforts were necessary to create a vibrant ground level façade and Green Street right-of-way design to develop a Heart Center across from the Cascade Park.
   a) The Board was supportive of the intent to create visible, meaningful entrances with a relationship to the park, but questioned the location of primary entries on the alley and aligned with the park path. The Board felt the entrances should relate to the context of the redesigned street façade facing the park (CS2-B, PL3-III-I, DC1-A).

b) The Board agreed that the treatment of the Green Street should include a more thoughtful landscaping composition which may include asymmetrical spacing, a centerpiece, or a specimen tree. The Board also encouraged the applicant to investigate using trees as multiple levels, including the 2nd floor amenity space. The Board noted that the landscaping should complement the architecture (DC4-D).
c) The Board gave guidance that the right-of-way design and ground level building façade should include pockets of landscaping to create eddies of activity (CS2-B, DC2-A2 DC3-A and C, DC4-D).
d) The Board noted that the removal of the Exceptional Trees the right-of-way should result in larger caliper street trees proposed in the landscape plan (DC4-D).

3. **Minor Avenue N and Pontius Avenue N.** The Board agreed that the context of Minor and Pontius are appropriate for ground level residential units.
   a) The Board directed the applicant to provide a buffer between the unit and the sidewalk. The buffer should provide a feeling of shelter and protection for units from the sidewalk. The buffer may include landscaping and/ or stoops (PL3-B, PL3-III).
   b) Design the scale and texture of the ground level to provide a positive pedestrian experience (DC2-D).
   c) The Board agreed below grade units facing the sidewalk are not appropriate for the urban neighborhood (PL3-B).

4. **Architectural Concept and Materials.** The Board discussed the upper level massing and architectural concept at length. The Board noted that the visibility of this site warranted variation in massing and roof lines.
   a) At the Second Early Design Guidance Meeting the Board would like to see greater variability in massing, which may include modulation, varied roof line and/or parapet heights (CS2-C, CS3-A, CS3-I).
   b) The Board supported the concept of a base, middle and top and the 2nd level amenity space gasket. However, the Board agreed that the design of the ground level was of primary importance and the revised façade may require changes or removal to the gasket/amenity level (CS2-B).
   c) The Board directed the applicant to investigate a higher degree of variability in composition of each of the two building facades, which may include two unique architectural compositions (CS2-C3).
   d) The Board noted that fiber cement is not appropriate for a uniform massing concept or the context at this site (DC4-A).

5. **Finer Grain Analysis.** The Board requested additional analysis of the massing and site design, and demonstration of how the design includes a relationship to the adjacent context.
   a) At the second Early Design Guidance Meeting, the Board would like to see more information on the treatment of the north façade in relationship to existing building and courtyard (CS2-D5).
   b) The Board required additional detail showing how the building responds to the Stack House entry at the street (PL1-A).

SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE March 18, 2015

1. **Massing and Architectural Concept**. The Board was supportive of the changes to the upper level massing and the architectural concept. However, the Board maintained concerns related to the mural element facing the park.
   a) The Board applauded the second massing element introduced along Harrison Street adjacent to alley to reduce the scale of the structure along the park (CS2-C3, CS3).
   b) The Board expressed reservations about the mural pieces facing the park. The Board was supportive of the inspirational images provided on page 18 of the 2nd EDG packet, but felt that to be successful, the mural must be developed as an art piece developed with high quality materials, human scale elements and reflectivity (CS2-I, CS3).
   c) At the Recommendation Meeting, the Board requested further development of the mural piece. The Board was adamant the mural must include a finer grain scale. The Board noted there are many ways to reduce the scale but offered suggestions such as modulation, fins at the windows or Juliette balconies that allow people to populate the artwork on the south façade (CS2-I, CS3).

2. **West Building along Harrison Green Street**. The Board was pleased with the active residential uses facing the park, the raised entry at a similar elevation to the park, and lowered transparent gasket. The revised design creates a more active, transparent facade facing the park consistent with Early Design Guidance. The Board agreed that additional efforts could further enhance the relationship the park.
   a) While the Board was supportive of the raised entry, the Board agreed the street setback space still felt armored. The Board directed that the setback space be developed with places for people to sit and gather. The Board suggested the entry ramp may include seating spaces as one possible solution (CS2-B, CS2-I, PL1, PL3-A, PL3-II, DC1-A, DC3).
   b) The Board felt the corner of Minor and Harrison Street would be enhanced by providing direct access to the bike storage room. The Board encouraged the applicant to explore a direct connection in order to activate the street corner (CS2-B2, PL3-II).
   c) The Board encouraged the applicant to work with SDOT to provide a grove of trees within the larger the Harrison/Minor curb bulb (DC4-D4).

3. **East Building along Harrison Green Street**. The Board felt the East Building's response to Harrison Street was less successful than the West Building. The Board agreed that the façade must be elevated to the same level of design to create a unified response to the park.
   a) The Board was supportive of the primary lobby relationship to the fitness center across the alley. The Board recommended that the entrance incorporate a setback and open space to create a front porch (DC1, DC3).
   b) The Board expressed concern regarding the ground level units facing the park. The Board encouraged other active transparent uses along the façade. However, if residential use was maintained along the façade, a wider setback incorporating stoops must be provided (CS2, PL3-B, PL3-C, PL3-II, PL3-III).

c) The Board directed additional public seating should be included along the entire Harrison Street right-of-way and setback space. The space should be designed as eddies of activity, niche seating areas and pockets along the right-of-way (CS2, CS2-I, PL1).

4. **Minor Avenue N and Pontius Avenue N.** The Board was pleased with the revised ground level design for the units along Minor Avenue N and Pontius Avenue N. The Board supported the two story brick expression with the 3 foot street setback incorporated into raised landscape planter buffers. The Board agreed that the 13 foot stoops with 3 foot planters in the middle responded well to the Early Design Guidance.

5. **Alley.** The Board was supportive of the residential units along the alley. The Board noted the design evolution appeared to be invested in creating an enhanced alley space.
   a) The Board agreed that the East Building primary entry and the West Building fitness center should be developed with an entry sequence to the alley to help further activate the residential uses along the alley (PL1-B, PL3-A, PL3-B).
   b) The Board encouraged the applicant to include additional features, such as overhead lights to further activate the space (PL1-B, PL3-A).
   c) At the Recommendation Meeting, the Board requested a detailed plan and perspectives of the alley demonstrating the treatment of the space. The Board also requested additional details on the location of solid waste staging within the alley (PL1-B).

6. **Edge Response.** The Board analyzed the response to the Stack House pedestrian connection and the courtyard in the northwest corner.
   a) At the Recommendation Meeting, the Board requested massing graphics including the adjacent context (CS2-C).
   b) The Board agreed the raised landscape planter was not an adequate response to the terminus of the Stack House walkway. The Board suggested a seating area would be a better response. The seating area should redirect the visual attention back to the axis of the walkway (CS3-A).
   c) The Board was supportive of the site and architectural response to the northwest courtyard. The Board felt the terraced open space, the return of the brick materials and corner windows responds well to the existing condition (CS3-A).

INITIAL RECOMMENDATION November 4, 2015

1. **Architectural Concept and Materials**. The Board strongly supported the intent for an artistically expressed vibrant upper façade on both building, but observed that the current design does not sufficiently express the artistic concept and presents a flat expanse of façade across both buildings. (CS2-A, CS2-I, CS3-I, DC2-B, DC2-D, DC4-A).
   a) The Board stressed that the design should be modified to strongly express the artistic concept and fine grain scale shown in the precedent images on page 20 of the Initial Recommendation packet. The Board observed that the concept is an artful composition, not a backdrop. The façade will be very visible due to the location of Cascade Park across the street to the south. (CS3-I, DC2-B)

b) The Board observed that the currently shown south elevation upper level façades lack sufficient articulation or modulation, do not express a fine grain scale, and window locations/sizes do not emphasize the design concept. The plaid concept is also not evident in the layering of color, depth, and façade texture.
   i. The design should be modified for visual interest through both form and fenestration. (CS3-I, DC2-B, DC2-D)
   ii. The Board noted that possible strategies to add depth and texture could include adding true balconies, adding modulation and articulation to emphasize the plaid concept, using fins around windows, and grouping and varying window sizes/proportions. (CS3-I, DC2-B, DC2-D, DC4-A)

c) The Board strongly advised the applicant to work with a professional artist to achieve an artful solution in conjunction with the architectural changes. (CS2-A, CS2-I, CS3-I, DC2-B)

d) The Board directed the applicant to design the east, west, and north facades to emphasize the artful concept on the south facades. (CS2-A, CS2-I)
   i. The Board noted that one strategy may involve using color only on the south façade and wrapping the corners, with white/gray/black used on the east, west, and north facades.
   ii. Another possible strategy is to weave the color through the east, west, and north facades.

e) The Board clearly specified that the changes should include architectural moves at the upper facades, not only modifications to color or siding. (CS3-I, DC2-D)

f) The Board noted that any areas adjacent to unit or building entries and any areas with bright colors should be composed of metal panel rather than cementitious panels. (DC4-A)

g) The Board noted that additional green roof areas would be welcome at the roofscape, and any roof coatings should be non-reflective. The Board noted that the roofscape is less critical than the other building facades. (DC4-D)

h) The Board approved of the proposed building identification signage. (DC2-B)

2. Street Level Design. The Board supported the design of the landscaping in response to the removal of Exceptional trees, the seating areas at sidewalk level, the low ramps at the West building entry, and the overall design of the Harrison Street level. (CS2-B, CS2-I, PL1, PL3-A, PL3-II, DC1-A, DC3, DC4-D).

a. East Building:
   i. The Board supported the applicant's preferred option for raised terraces at Harrison Street at Pontius Ave N, as opposed to stoops. The terraces may result in more activity adjacent to the sidewalk, as opposed to tall stoops. (CS2-B, PL1-A, PL3-III)
      1. The Board directed the applicant to modify the depth of the terrace at the east building to 6' minimum depth to provide usable area. The Board noted that the depth of the landscaped setback could be reduced to achieve this depth. (PL1-A, PL3-III)

2. The walls of the terraces that are visible to the street should be designed with architectural interest, while also providing opportunity for art pieces as intended in the proposed design. (DC2-B, DC2-D)

ii. The Board supported the applicant's preferred option to include more glazed lobby area at the east building, rather than more outdoor area near the lobby. (DC1, DC3)

1. The Board noted that the proposed feature wall (visible from the street frontage, through the glazed lobby) is a critical aspect of the lobby relationship to the sidewalk and should be carefully designed.

b. West Building:

i. The Board directed the applicant to design the stairs at the entry to avoid handrails, thereby maintaining the proposed low appearance of ramps and stairs. (CS2-B, PL3-A)

ii. The Board also directed the applicant to modify the planter walls at the perimeter of the southwest landscaped area adjacent to the sidewalk, to reduce the appearance of an armored wall and allow plant materials to connect with the pedestrian sidewalk areas. The Board suggested making a couple of breaks in the planter walls near the corner would be sufficient. (CS2-B, CS2-I, PL1, PL3-A, PL3-II, DC1-A, DC3).

iii. The Board supported the applicant's preferred option to have lobby and garage access only for the bike room in the West building, to avoid creating unsafe areas below sidewalk level and away from clear lines of sight. The Board noted that the same strategy is proposed for the East building. (CS2-B, PL2-B).

3. Alley. The Board was supportive of the overall design of residential units at the alley, the consideration of staggering unit windows and floor lines at upper facades, overall level of lighting, and proposed solid waste storage design. (PL1-B, PL3-A, PL3-B).

a. The Board gave direction to include individual signage for ground level units at the alley and add lighting at these units. (PL2-B, PL3-B, PL3-III)

b. The Board observed that the ground level alley units in the West Building are further below grade, and recommended that transom windows be added to increase natural lighting and visual height of these units. (PL3-III)

FINAL RECOMMENDATION January 20, 2016

1. Architectural Concept and Materials. The Board was pleased with the modifications to the artistically expressed south facades. The Board agreed the changes created layers of texture, color and depth (CS2-A, CS2-I, CS3-I, DC2-B, DC2-D, DC4-A).

a) The Board felt the revised multidirectional metal panels of varying sizes, coupled with the increased fenestration and 'pleated' building modulation, significantly strengthened the artistic plaid composition while adding dimension to the façade (CS2-A, CS2-I, CS3-I, DC2-B, DC2-D, DC4-A).

b) The Board appreciated the time lapse presentation provided at the meeting showing how the façade colors and shadow lines will change throughout the day, creating a dynamic and unique façade at all times of day and year (CS2-A, CS2-I, CS3-I, DC2-B, DC2-D, DC4-A).

c) The Board was pleased with the restrained use of color on the east and west facades. The Board noted integrating color on the vertical panels between the windows provided a sophisticated and elegant resolution to the east and west facades, while strengthening the artful concept on the south facades (CS2-A, CS2-I, CS3-I, DC2-B, DC2-D, DC4-A).
d) The Board agreed the dark panel material application at the gasket and within the building recesses was integral to the overall composition. The panels provide a backdrop to make both the modulation and the south facing façade pop. The Board expressed concern regarding the longevity of the dark color and felt the applicant should investigate pre-finished material (DC4-A).
e) The Board conditioned that the south facing façade soffit include a wrapped metal panel provided in the same color as the bay directly above (CS2-A, CS2-I, CS3-I, DC2-B, DC2-D, DC4-A).

2. Street Level Design. The Board supported the design of the landscaping in response to the removal of Exceptional Trees, the seating areas at sidewalk level, the low ramps at the West building entry, and the overall design of the Harrison Street level. (CS2-B, CS2-I, PL1, PL3-A, PL3-II, DC1-A, DC3, DC4-D).

a. The Board expressed support for the more refined west building entry design. They applauded the removal of the ADA ramp handrail and the minimized planting wall height. The Board noted the lush landscaping and seating boulders provided a thoughtful response to Cascade Park entrance opposite the site (CS2-A, CS2-I, PL1, CS3-II, PL3, DC4-D).
b. The Board expressed support for the plaid detailing within the ground level brick, the solid header at the top of the window and opening, and gray grout to be used with the brick. The Board noted the monochromatic color application and detailing provided a clean, beautiful base which reinforces the plaid concept expressed in the upper levels. The Board felt the team should consider a monochromatic cap on the brick walls similar to how the building is rendered within the Recommendation Packet, page 29 (CS2-I, DC4-A).
c. The Board strongly supported the six foot terrace facing the park in Building B, and the typical use of a double stanchion guardrail system with metal basket weave details, to reinforce the plaid concept at the pedestrian level (CS2-I, DC4-A).
d. The Board applauded the collaborative efforts with Cornish students to create the ground level art pieces. The Board noted that the collaborative efforts are consistent with the Cascade Design Guidelines (CS2-A, CS2-I, CS3-I, DC2-B).
e. The Board supported the East Building's primary entry feature wall (visible from the street frontage, through the glazed lobby), noting it is a critical aspect of the lobby relationship to the sidewalk and should be carefully designed (CS2-A, CS2-I, CS3-I, DC2-B).
f. The Board applauded the use of colored metal panel next to the individual building entries. The Board noted the use of metal panel, coupled with lighting and signage, created a quality residential entry sequence on the street and alleys (PL3-A, DC-4).

3. Alley. The Board was supportive of the residential units at the alley.

a. The Board applauded the additional fenestration for each alley unit. The glazing will provide opportunities for natural light and increase the visual height of the unit (PL1-B, PL3-A, PL3-B).
b. The Board appreciated the metal panel provided at grade, the entry lights and signage. The Board noted the quality material application and residential detailing makes the alley units feel like private residences (PL2-B, PL3-B, PL3-III).
c. The Board felt the alley units could benefit by being located at grade. The Board encouraged the team to investigate the feasibility of locating the primary entry at grade and any required ramping internal to the structure (PL2-B, PL3-B, PL3-III).

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The priority Citywide and Neighborhood guidelines 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-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.

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-B Adjacent Sites, Streets, and Open Spaces

CS2-B-2. Connection to the Street: Identify opportunities for the project to make a strong connection to the street and 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-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-5. Respect for Adjacent Sites: Respect adjacent properties with design and site planning to minimize disrupting the privacy of residents in adjacent buildings.

South Lake Union Supplemental Guidance:

CS2-I Responding to Site Characteristics

CS2-I-iv. Heart Locations: Several areas have been identified as "heart locations." Heart locations serve as the perceived center of commercial and social activity within the neighborhood. These locations provide anchors for the community as they have identity and give form to the neighborhood. Development at heart locations should enhance their central character through appropriate site planning and architecture. These sites have a high priority for improvements to the public realm. A new building's primary entry and facade should respond to the heart location. Special street treatments are likely to occur and buildings will need to respond to these centers of commercial and social activity. Amenities to consider are: pedestrian lighting, public art, special paving, landscaping, additional public open space provided by curb bulbs and entry plazas. See full guidelines for Heart Locations

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.

South Lake Union Supplemental Guidance:

CS3-I Height, Bulk, and Scale Compatibility

CS3-I-i. Facade Articulation: Articulate the building facades vertically or horizontally in intervals that relate to the existing structures or existing pattern of development in the vicinity.

CS3-II-vi. Cascade Character: Respond to the unique, grass roots, sustainable character of the Cascade neighborhood. Examples of elements to consider include:

a. community artwork;
b. edible gardens;
c. water filtration systems that serve as pedestrian amenities;
d. gutters that support greenery.

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-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.

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

PL2-B Safety and Security

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

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.

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-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-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.

South Lake Union Supplemental Guidance:

PL3-II Human Activity

PL3-II-ii. Active Facades: Design facades to encourage activity to spill out from business onto the sidewalk, and vice-versa.

PL3-II-iii. Coordinate Retail/Pedestrian Activity: Reinforce retail concentrations with compatible spaces that encourage pedestrian activity.

PL3-II-iv. Activity Clusters: Create businesses and community activity clusters through colocation of retail and pedestrian uses as well as other high pedestrian traffic opportunities.

PL3-III Transition Between Residence and Street

PL3-III-i. Residential Entries: Consider designing the entries of residential buildings to enhance the character of the streetscape through the use of small gardens, stoops and other elements to create a transition between the public and private areas. Consider design options to accommodate various residential uses, i.e., townhouse, live-work, apartment and senior-assisted housing.

DESIGN CONCEPT

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

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

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-AMassing

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-BArchitectural and Facade Composition

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-DScale and Texture

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

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

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

South Lake Union Supplemental Guidance:

DC3-ABuilding-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-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-CDesign

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.

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

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

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board's recommendation on the requested departures were 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 departures.

At the time of the **FINAL** Recommendation, the following departures were requested:

1. **Minimum Façade Height (SMC 23.48.014.A.2):** The Code requires a minimum façade height of 25 feet facing Harrison Street and wrapping the corners for 25' depth into Minor Ave and Pontius Ave. This departure was referred to as Departure 1A in the Initial Recommendation packet.

   At the west site, the applicant proposes a façade height that averages 15' in height for 41' of the width of the façade on Harrison St, remaining parts of the façade are set back more than 25' from Harrison St, and a 14'11" wide landscaped open space is located at the corner of Minor Ave N and Harrison St, instead of building façade.

   At the east site, the applicant proposes a façade that averages 20' in height for 40' of the width of the façade on Harrison St.

   The Board unanimously approved the setback departure, since this departure would provide an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Review Guideline CS2-I Responding to Site Characteristics by reducing the scale of the façade facing Cascade Park.

2. **Maximum Street Level Setback (SMC 23.48.014.A.3.b):** The Code requires a maximum set back of 12' from the street lot line, with additional setbacks permitted for portions of the façade located away from the street corners. This departure was referred to as Departure 1B in the Initial Recommendation packet.

   At the west site, the applicant proposes a 14'11" setback for 76' of the façade width at Harrison St and the street corner.

   At the east site, the applicant proposes a 16'7" setback for 42'3" of the façade width at Harrison St and the street corner.

   The Board unanimously approved the setback departure, since the overall design better meets the intent of Design Review Guideline DC1-A.2 and DC1-A.4 Arrangement of Interior Uses and CS2-I Responding to Site Characteristics by reducing the scale of the façade facing Cascade Park.

3. **Alley Setback (SMC 23.48.012):** The Code requires portions of a structure greater than 25 feet be setback 1' for every 2' up to a maximum of 15 feet. The applicant proposes 0' setback for all upper level facades at the alley. This departure was referred to as Departure 2 in the Initial Recommendation packet.

   The Board unanimously approved the alley setback departure, as the overall design would better meet the intent of Design Review Guideline CS2-I Responding to Site Characteristics by allowing for increased setbacks facing Cascade Park, and CS2-D5 Respect for Adjacent Sites by arranging the windows and floor lines of alley facing units to minimize privacy impacts between residences.

4. **Upper Level Setback (SMC 23.48.012):** The Code portions of a structure taller than 45' to be setback 1' for every 2' of additional height, up to a limit of 15'. The applicant proposes a 3'-8" projection into the required 15 foot setback for the upper floor of the structure. This departure was referred to as Departure 2a and 2b in the Initial Recommendation packet.

   The Board unanimously approved the upper level setback departure, as the overall design would better meet the intent of Design Review Guideline DC1-A.2 and DC1-A.4 Responding to Site Characteristics by creating a vibrant, color, modulated artistic wall facing Cascade Park.

RECOMMENDATIONS

At the conclusion of the FINAL RECOMMENDATION meeting, the Board recommended approval of the project with conditions.

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated Wednesday, January 20, 2016, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the Wednesday, January 20, 2016 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the four Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design and departures with the following conditions:

1. The south facing façade soffit should include a wrapped metal panel in the same color as the bay directly above.

ANALYSIS & DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

Director's Analysis

The design review process prescribed in Section 23.41.014.F of the Seattle Municipal Code describing the content of the Seattle DCI Director's decision reads in part as follows:

The Director's decision shall consider the recommendation of the Design Review Board, provided that, if four (4) members of the Design Review Board are in agreement in their recommendation to the Director, the Director shall issue a decision which incorporates the full substance of the recommendation of the Design Review Board, unless the Director concludes the Design Review Board:

a. Reflects inconsistent application of the design review guidelines; or
b. Exceeds the authority of the Design Review Board; or
c. Conflicts with SEPA conditions or other regulatory requirements applicable to the site; or
d. Conflicts with the requirements of state or federal law.

Subject to the recommended conditions, the design of the proposed project was found by the Design Review Board to adequately conform to the applicable Design Guidelines.

At the conclusion of the Recommendation meeting held on January 20, 2016, the Board recommended approval of the project with the condition described in the summary of the Recommendation meeting above.

Four members of the West Design Review Board were in attendance and provided recommendations (listed above) to the Director and identified elements of the Design Guidelines which are critical to the project's overall success. The Director must provide additional analysis of the Board's recommendations and then accept, deny or revise the Board's recommendations (SMC 23.41.014.F3).

The Director agrees with the Design Review Board's conclusion that the proposed project and conditions imposed result in a design that best meets the intent of the Design Review Guidelines and accepts the recommendations noted by the Board.

Following the Recommendation meeting, Seattle DCI staff worked with the applicant to update the submitted plans to include the recommendations of the Design Review Board.

Applicant response to Recommended Design Review Condition:

1. The Master Use Permit plan set has been updated to include a note on Sheet A3.01A noting, "Composite Metal Panels (Soffits) to match adjacent metal panels." The response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision. This item shall be shown on the construction plans, and the installation of this item will be confirmed by the Land Use Planner prior to the final Certificate of Occupancy.

The applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that all construction documents, details, and specifications are shown and constructed consistent with the approved MUP drawings.

The Director of Seattle DCI has reviewed the decision and recommendations of the Design Review Board made by the four members present at the decision meeting and finds that they are

consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines. The Director is satisfied that all of the recommendations imposed by the Design Review Board have been met.

DIRECTOR'S DECISION

The Director accepts the Design Review Board's recommendations and **CONDITIONALLY APPROVES** the proposed design and the requested departure with the conditions summarized at the end of this Decision.

CONDITIONS – DESIGN REVIEW

For the Life of the Project

1. The building and landscape design shall be substantially consistent with the materials represented at the Recommendation meeting and in the materials submitted after the Recommendation meeting, before the MUP issuance. Any change to the proposed design, including materials or colors, shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Lindsay King, 206-684-9218, Lindsay.king@seattle.gov).

Lindsay King, Senior Land Use Planner Date: April 28, 2016
Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

LK:bg

King/3018926.docx

IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR ISSUANCE OF YOUR MASTER USE PERMIT

Master Use Permit Expiration and Issuance

The appealable land use decision on your Master Use Permit (MUP) application has now been published. At the conclusion of the appeal period, your permit will be considered "approved for issuance". (If your decision is appealed, your permit will be considered "approved for issuance" on the fourth day following the City Hearing Examiner's decision.) Projects requiring a Council land use action shall be considered "approved for issuance" following the Council's decision.

The "approved for issuance" date marks the beginning of the **three year life** of the MUP approval, whether or not there are outstanding corrections to be made or pre-issuance conditions to be met. The permit must be issued by Seattle DCI within that three years or it will expire and be cancelled. (SMC 23-76-028) (Projects with a shoreline component have a **two year life**. Additional information regarding the effective date of shoreline permits may be found at 23.60.074.)

All outstanding corrections must be made, any pre-issuance conditions met and all outstanding fees paid before the permit is issued. You will be notified when your permit has issued.

Questions regarding the issuance and expiration of your permit may be addressed to the Public Resource Center at prc@seattle.gov or to our message line at 206-684-8467.