

# Capitol Hill Design Guidelines Update - Work Group meeting #10

## Meeting Summary

June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018

### Work Group Members present

<input type="checkbox"/> Leslie Bain	<input type="checkbox"/> Jess Blanch	<input type="checkbox"/> Lincoln Ferris	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Erik Rundell
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brian Baker	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lana Blinderman	<input type="checkbox"/> Whitney Fraser	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Saunatina Sanchez
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Matthew Benedict	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> McCaela Daffern	<input type="checkbox"/> Rob Ketcherside	<input type="checkbox"/> Alicia Daniels Uhlig
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Don Blakeney	<input type="checkbox"/> John Feit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mike Mariano	

### Staff present

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Christina Ghan (SDCI)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Patrice Carroll (OPCD)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aaron Hursey (OPCD)
---	--	---

### Additional Attendees

None

On June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018, the 10<sup>th</sup> work group session was held at 12<sup>th</sup> Ave Arts (1620 12<sup>th</sup> Ave) in the Capitol Hill Neighborhood of Seattle. This meeting was cohosted by the City of Seattle's Office of Planning and Community Development (OPCD) and Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) and the Capitol Hill EcoDistrict, a project of Capitol Hill Housing. The work group, which consists of over a dozen renters, homeowners, and business owners who live, work, and/or socialize in the Capitol Hill Neighborhood, will help with the update of the current Capitol Hill Neighborhood Design Guidelines. The goals of the meeting were to review feedback provided at the May 30<sup>th</sup> Community Open House, provide additional comments on the draft Capitol Hill Neighborhood Design Guidelines, and to discuss issues that cannot be addressed by design guidelines.

The meeting was attended by eight work group members and three city employees. The meeting was facilitated by Patrice Carroll, of OPCD, and Christina Ghan, of SDCI. The meeting began by discussing feedback from the community open house as well as additional comments from the work group.

We reviewed the following timeline. The work group asked, and City staff agreed, that they could see the guidelines one more time after City's internal review is completed and before the SEPA Draft is published.

June 12 5:30-7:30pm	Final Workgroup meeting 12 <sup>th</sup> Ave Arts	Final changes, Next Steps, Wrap up memo
June	City Internal Review	OPCD, SDCI, Law
July	Publish SEPA Draft	
August	Transmit Legislation to Council	
Nov/ Dec	PLUZ Committee	Discussion, hearing and recommendation
Dec	Council	Vote

The work group discussed the following Design Guideline topic areas:

- Youth and elderly – The work group discussed adding language in the priority issues section that addresses designing for intergenerational use. Several group members recommended adding language related to “age friendly design” to relevant guidelines. Group members also suggested editing guideline DC3 2b. to include” ...Multigenerational use regardless of ability, background, age, and socioeconomic class.”
- Materials – The work group had differing opinions on guidance related to materials. Several work groups members were concerned because there was no longer guidance addressing specific preferred materials like wood and masonry, while other group members thought guidance should not limit materials choice by including language that addressed preferred materials. The group acknowledged that broader community feedback on materials has also been mixed. The group agreed to edit guideline DC4 1 to include a reference to traditional material types without expressing a preference for specific materials: “Choose traditional materials such as brick, etc. or modern, durable, proven, high-quality materials that are compatible with and complement more traditional materials.” The work group then agreed guidance on materials should include language that will encourage developers using modern materials in a way that will better integrate with the existing neighborhood. Several group members then agreed that guideline DC 2.6 adequately addressed materials. A group member then suggested moving several guidelines from DC 2 to DC 4.
- Character Buildings – The work group had differing opinions on how to define character buildings. Several group members thought character buildings are buildings constructed in the early to mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, while other members thought the site, location, and scale, among other non-architectural features, should also define character buildings. Group members agreed that if non-architectural features should define character buildings, then the guidelines should include specific location and examples.
- Inclusivity – The work group was hesitant to include more detailed guidance addressing the LGBTQ community’s significance in the neighborhood for fear that design features to express the concept of “inclusivity” would be difficult to articulate, and not be successful. Work group members thought the introduction, priority issues, and existing guideline language adequately addressed this issue and that additional, more detailed guidance would not be necessary.
- Building Identification signage – The work group did not agree with including guidance on identification signage. Group members thought this would serve to brand the building and suggested guidance for pedestrian oriented signs only.
- Trash collection and service uses – The work group acknowledged the issue with trash collection as it relates to smaller multi-family developments. Group members agreed that the Design Review board is already sensitive to this issue.
- Balconies – The work group discussed the benefits of having interior space (with small or no balconies) vs. outdoor space in the form of larger balconies. Group members then discussed how flush balcony railings with large window/door openings can increase the functionality of the interior space. The work group then suggested removing the second part of DC2 5a.
- Photos – several workgroup members offered to send additional photos of buildings and other details that could be incorporated.

The work group then discussed how to address neighborhood issues that are not under the purview of the design review program. McCaela Daffern offered to reconvene working group members to discuss what next steps the community might take on these issues, e.g. send a memo to City departments.

Next Steps:

- Workgroup members should send any photos as soon as possible.
- Contact McCaela if interested in discussing issues that were outside the purview of design review.
- City staff will email the next Draft for your “final look” in July (be prepared for a quick turnaround).
- City staff will keep you updated as the document move through the legislative process – SEPA, transmission to Council, PLUZ committee review.
- City staff will let you know when the City Council PLUZ committee will hold its public hearing on the design guidelines, and hope that some of you will be able to attend.