



## SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE OF THE SOUTHWEST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Project Number: 3015817 & 3019746

Address: 4722 Fauntleroy Way SW & 4721 38<sup>th</sup> Ave SW

Applicant: Marty Jones

Date of Meeting: June 25, 2015

Board Members Present: Todd Bronk (Chair)  
Matt Zinski  
Alexandra Moravec

Board Members Absent: T. Frick McNamara  
Todd Bronk

DPD Staff Present: Katy Haima

### SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: Neighborhood Commercial 3 (NC3-85); the parcel across the alley to the east (4721 38<sup>th</sup> Ave SW) is zoned NC3-40.

Nearby Zones: (North) NC3P-85  
(South) NC3-85  
(East) LR2  
(West) NC3-85

Lot Area: 54,700 square feet



**Current Development:** The site contains a single-story commercial strip mall, small garage, and surface parking.

**Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:** The site is located within the West Seattle Junction Hub Urban Village, and the West Seattle Triangle planning area. A defining feature of the area is the diverse mix of residential and commercial uses.

Directly to the north of the site, fronting SW Alaska Street, is a Les Schwab tire center consisting of a single-story building and surface parking. To the South of the site is a single-story commercial building and surface parking. Across the alley to the east, in the LR2 zone, are primarily single-family dwellings. Across Fauntleroy Way SW, a mixed use structure with a Whole Foods is under development; the project site contains a pedestrian and vehicular mid-block passage between 40<sup>th</sup> Ave SW and Fauntleroy Way SW. Other new developments in the area include a mixed use structure with a QFC grocery store on SW Alaska, the Mural Apartments, and the Broadstone West Seattle.

The topography of the block ascends to the southeast, with steeper grades towards the south end of the block.

**Access:** A north/south alley runs between the parcels on the east and on the west sides of the project sites. An east/west alley is adjacent to the site on the north.

**Environmentally Critical Areas:** The site does not have mapped environmental critical areas.

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Project 3015817 consists of several interior parcels (building site) along Fauntleroy Way SW, which is proposed to contain a single-story commercial structure containing 12,200 square feet of retail and pharmacy space, surface parking, and drive-through. Project 3019746 is a single parcel (parking site) located across the alley to the east on 38<sup>th</sup> Ave SW, which is proposed to provide additional surface parking for the retail use for a total of 49 surface parking stalls. The site has a covenant that limits area of the building to 14,500 square feet and limits the height of building height to 35 feet.

#### **FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE March 19, 2015**

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3015817 & 3019746) at this website:

[http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design\\_Review\\_Program/Project\\_Reviews/Reports/default.asp](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 DPD:

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

**Email:** [PRC@seattle.gov](mailto:PRC@seattle.gov)

## DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

The applicant provided context for the project, noting that the site is restricted by a covenant which limits the height of any structures to 35 feet. The applicant also noted pedestrian connections to the site, including a transit stop on Fauntleroy Way SW, a Rapid Transit stop to the north of the site along Alaska St., and the mid-block crossing under development across Fauntleroy Way SW.

Neighborhood design cues were discussed in the urban analysis, including the midcentury architecture along California Ave. SW, modulated entry expressions, outdoor spaces within the Junction, and high-quality materiality.

Three options were shown at the EDG Meeting. All three schemes located two rows of surface parking at the north end of the building site and a drive-through along the south and east edges of the building site. All parking was accessed from the alley. The drive-through was accessed from the south end of the building site from Fauntleroy Way SW, and terminated in the north/south bound alley. Where the drive-through wrapped around the building to the east, it became a “channel,” separated from the grade at the alley. The structure was located in the center of the site, south of a mid-block pedestrian crossing, with the primary entry at the northwest corner of the building and a secondary entry at the northeast corner. None of the options proposed departures.

The code compliant scheme was configured to have an orthogonal relationship to Fauntleroy Way SW and to SW Alaska Street. The structure was unmodulated, other than a recessed primary entry. The mid-block crossing was at grade with the sidewalk.

Option 2 presented a scheme that broke the massing into two portions, by stepping down the height on the southern portion of the building. The storefront at the northwest corner was angled to establish a relationship with the retail across Fauntleroy and reference precedents in the neighborhood. The entries were marked by protruding canopies that extend along the Fauntleroy façade. The mid-block crossing was elevated from the sidewalk; ramping and stairs up to the crossing and entry plaza were integrated as design features.

Option 3, the preferred scheme, oriented the primary entry and pedestrian walkway at an angle to establish a relationship with the intersection of Fauntleroy Way and SW Alaska Street, as well as to the mid-block connection across the street. The façade included a storefront expression, and a masonry expression; these two design languages were alternated along the length of the north and west facades. An angled roof at the primary entry provided an architectural focal point. Conceptual options for the soffit were presented. The mid-block crossing was elevated from the sidewalk at Fauntleroy, ramping, stairs, and seat walls were integrated into the design of the entry plaza.

The applicant provided character renderings of the proposed pedestrian crossing and amenities, showing the conceptual landscaped areas and pedestrian circulation through the mid-block crossing. The applicant noted the intention to integrate the bus stop shelter into the layout of the pedestrian area.

In addition, the applicant noted the intention to voluntarily adhere to the Pedestrian Zone requirements regarding street-level transparency, and to use high-quality architectural elements and finishes including textured brick, punched windows, and overhead weather protection.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

### *Architectural Character & Design Concept*

- Noted that the site is located in a rapidly developing area with increased density, and the project should consider giving back to the environment that will make it successful.
- Expressed concern that the project is not appropriately responding to the urban context, and has a more suburban character to the development.
- Appreciated how the design reflects input from previous community stakeholder meetings.
- Noted that the project should be pedestrian-oriented as it is in an NC zone, but appears to be car-oriented.
- Cautioned that all 5 sides of the building will be highly visible and should be designed appropriately. Suggested that the blank wall on the south façade provide an opportunity for public art.
- Encouraged a more neighborhood-specific urban solution to the site constraints and desired programming of the site, similar to the approach used for the Queen Anne CVS.
- Supported the intention to keep the transparency and views into the store, as opposed to covering with advertisements.
- Advocated for the roof as a fifth façade as it will be visible from the surrounding buildings. Suggestions included a greenroof and solar panels.

### *Open Space Concept & Design*

- Pointed out that the amount of parking exceeds the minimum, and that the space could be better utilized for the plaza or a stronger pedestrian connection. In addition, the extra parking adds to the amount of impervious surfaces on site.
- Supported the intent to create an active space, and encouraged the design to provide space for additional active uses, such as a space for the food truck, or sidewalk vendors.
- Commended the concept of the pedestrian crossing/plaza, and suggested that a stronger identity for the plaza is needed.
- Encouraged continued efforts to integrate the transit stop into the project design. Noted that the bus stop on site is an AM line only, and that more attention should be paid to the C-Line stop on Alaska.
- Supported the intention for raingardens, and encouraged more landscaping throughout the site and along the streetscape to create a lush, park-like feel.

### *Other Issues*

- Suggested that even within the height limit, a massing option could be developed to better fit community goals, such as a structure which includes one floor of retail and two stories of office or residential above.
- Urged the applicant to design the alley to be more pedestrian-friendly, and to consider the alley as more of a mid-block pedestrian connection, such as the mid-block connection across the street, rather than for vehicle access only.
- Questioned how the project and design ties in with the street concept plan for Fauntleroy Way.
- Noted that the relocation of the Les Schwab trailer to the northeast portion of the site would put a large blank wall in line with the new fire station project, blocking the sightlines to it.
- Concern about the effect of the project on the community staircase to the south of the site, and encouraged the applicant to consider this in the project design.

- Suggested providing more weather protection, both along the mid-block crossing and through the parking areas.
- Expressed concern about pedestrian safety in the parking areas and along the alley. Encouraged more buffering and terracing to separate cars and pedestrians.
- Appreciated the separation of the drive-through and screening from residential uses across the alley.

<p><b>PRIORITIES &amp; BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p>
--

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.

**FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE March 19, 2015**

1. **Site & Context Response:** The Board stated that the overall design concept does not appropriately respond to the urban, pedestrian-oriented urban context in the West Seattle Junction Hub Urban Village.
  - a. The overall design concept for the project needs to be strengthened and should demonstrate pedestrian-oriented design approach. The Board suggested a “jewel box in a park-like setting” as a strategy to incorporate the client’s programmatic requirements while responding to the project context. (CS2-A, CS2-B, DC2-A)
  - b. The Board noted that the site composition prioritizes vehicular infrastructure, creating voids in the public realm and streetwall. The Board suggested resolving this issue by reorganizing to site to devote a smaller, or at least less visible, footprint to vehicular infrastructure and placing greater emphasis on the pedestrian experience. (PL1-A, DC1-C, DC1-I)
  - c. The zoning of the site (NC3-85) anticipates a more dense use than proposed; the Board encouraged the applicant to achieve the intent of the zoning by designing the project to promote and capture the type and intensity of activity a more dense development would generate. (CS2-D, PL1-A)
  - d. The Board noted that as presented, the project appears to take on a corner lot orientation. The sightline from the primary entry to the corner was endorsed, but the Board questioned if the building orientation and visual connection north to the parking lot and SW Alaska Street is an appropriate response. The Board requested that the applicant revise the design to appropriately respond to its mid-block location, and strengthen the relationship of the project to Fauntleroy Way SW. (CS2-C, CS3-A)
  - e. The Board supported the concept of the mid-block crossing and entry plaza on the proposed development site. (CS2-B, PL1-A, PL1-C, PL2-II)
  - f. The Board observed that establishing a relationship with the mid-block crossing across Fauntleroy Way was one possible urban design response; however, the Board noted that the relationship would most likely be only visual, and thus should not dictate the location of the building massing on site. The Board encouraged the applicant to explore design alternatives

that create the visual response across Fauntleroy Way, including building modulation, secondary architectural features, or a focal point to align with the sightline. (PL1-A, PL1-B, DC2-C, DC3-B)

- 2. Massing & Architectural Composition:** The Board expressed concern that the massing alternatives presented did not appropriately respond to site characteristics and the urban context, nor adequately explore options that arrange the mass of the building in regards to the proposed internal programming and surrounding open space. The Board requested that the applicant present three massing alternatives with varied site plans responding to context and the proposed program. (DC2-A)
  - a. The Board supported the proposed massing presented in Option 2 which breaks the building into two storefronts; the Board encouraged the applicant to further explore modulation that reinforces the design concept and relates to the referenced commercial character along California Ave. (CS2-III, CS3-A, DC2-C)
  - b. The Board supported the composition and mid-century reference of the prominent entry presented in Option 3, featuring an angled roof and transparent corner. (CS2-A, CS3-A, PL3-A)
  - c. The Board felt that the facade on Fauntleroy does not engage the pedestrian realm. The Board encouraged further exploration of modulation and façade articulation that references exemplary architectural patterns in the Junction and visually reinforces the streetwall. (CS2-III, PL2-B, PL3-C, DC2-II, DC2-B)
  - d. As presented, the retail entry is above the sidewalk grade at Fauntleroy Way. The Board encouraged the applicant to rethink the grade changes from the sidewalk to the mid-block crossing and entry to improve accessibility on site. (PL2-A)
  - e. The Board endorsed the intention to use high-quality finishes and fine-grained textures to enhance the pedestrian-experience. (DC2-D, DC4-A)
  - f. The Board agreed that the roof plane will be highly visible from surrounding structures, and should be paid special attention as a 5th façade. (DC2-B, CS2-D)
  - g. The blank wall at the south end of the building would be highly visible; the Board encouraged the applicant to further explore options for relieving this condition, possibly by revising the layout of the internal programming or further exploring design treatments for reducing the visual impact and enhancing the pedestrian environment. (DC1-A, DC2-B, PL3-C)
  
- 3. Open Space & Pedestrian Amenities:** Develop a design concept that reinforces the relationship to the building and streetscape while establishing a unique identity that promotes human activity.
  - a. The Board supported the concept of the angled pedestrian area presented in Option 2 and 3, as it begins to establish an identity. The Board encouraged exploring strategies to strengthen and clarify the overall building-open space relationship. (CS2-A, PL1-B, DC3-A, DC3-C)
  - b. The Board requested additional development of the landscape plan at a conceptual level that reinforces the open space design, and encouraged the applicant to consider larger planting areas to give the site a park-like character. (DC4-D)
  - c. The massing concepts indicated overhead weather protection, which the Board endorsed. (PL2-I)

- d. The Board supported the intent to incorporate pedestrian improvements to compliment the transit stop, and encouraged the applicant to explore opportunities for integrating the transit stop into the design of the open space. (PL4-C)
- e. The Board encouraged the applicant to continue developing the open space to include amenities that support informal uses to promote activity and enhance the public realm. (PL1-A, PL1-B, PL3-C)

**4. Vehicular Access & Circulation:** Minimize the impacts of drive-through and parking lots on the pedestrian-environment and streetscape compatibility.

- a. The Board deliberated on the advantages of the channeled drive-through being tucked below the grade of the alley and the potential safety issues. The Board asked the applicant to provide more information on how safety would be addressed and revise the design to remove this area if possible. The Board requested elevations, sections, and perspectives of the alley with adjacent structures to better assess the visual impacts. (PL2-B, CS2-D)
- b. The Board expressed concern over the visual impact of the northwest parking lot, drive-through, and service areas from Fauntleroy, and requested that the applicant further explore alternatives for a site plan that reduces the amount of void space, visually reinforces the street wall, and establishes a pedestrian-oriented streetscape. (PL1-A, PL1-B, DC1-C, DC1-II, DC2-A, DC3-A)
- c. The Board asked for more detail regarding the parking areas in relation to the pedestrian environment, including screening and safe pedestrian pathways through parking lots. (DC1-B, DC1-C, DC1-I)
- d. The Board discussed the treatment of the alley, especially at the north end of the site, where the mid-block crossing leads to the additional surface parking area. As presented, the mid-block crossing is part of a potential alternate route to high-volume rapid ride bus stops along SW Alaska St. As such, the Board suggested adding pedestrian-oriented features and/or infrastructure to improve the safety and functionality of the alley as indicated. (PL4-A, PL4-C, PL1-B)

<b>SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE June 25, 2015</b>
---

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3015817 & 3019746) at this website:

[http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design\\_Review\\_Program/Project\\_Reviews/Reports/default.asp](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 DPD:

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

**Email:** [PRC@seattle.gov](mailto:PRC@seattle.gov)

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

- Appreciated the plaza/pocket park, but concerned about viability and security issues due to the remoteness from active uses.
- Felt that massing reads as one large box, and that the final design needs a finer level of articulation.
- Concerned over the tall blank wall along the south end of the structure.
- Felt the Les Schwab dumpster is not adequately screened.
- Opposed the departure for the drive through, noting that a drive through is not appropriate for this dense urban area, and that the access point is too tight for adequate circulation.
- Felt the proposed roof pattern is not an adequate response to the concern over a blank facade, and that the design needs to further correspond to the overall design concept.
- Encouraged the applicant to consider a mixed-use structure and/or programming.
- Supported the concept of angled roof planes.
- Supported the concept of the pocket park, and felt it should be larger than proposed.
- Felt there was too much parking, and that half could be eliminated.
- Appreciated the pocket park as a neighborhood amenity that could serve the community for years to come.
- Supported the amount of proposed landscaping and continuation of the green street.
- Appreciated the revisions to improve accessibility on site.
- Would like to see more layering and hierarchy of the landscaping and plaza.
- Felt the plaza/park should establish a connection with the sidewalk, as opposed to the parking lot.
- Expressed desire for the guardrails to be integrated into the design of the building.

## **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.

### **SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE June 25, 2015**

1. **Massing and Context Response.** The Board appreciated the clear explanation of how the major issues from EDG were addressed, and the Board felt that the proposed massing demonstrated a more thoughtful design concept and site specific response to the context. (CS2-A, CS2-B, DC2-A)
  - a. The Board supported the siting of the building and general massing concept of the preferred option, including the location and relationship of the structure to the pocket park. The Board felt that the design more adequately reflected the mid-block location, and should continue to evolve with careful consideration of strategies to hold a strong urban street edge strengthening the relationship of the project to Fauntleroy. (CS2-A, CS2-C, CS3-A)



- b. The Board recognized the comments regarding the desire for more density on site, and acknowledged the challenge of fitting the proposed program, height, and amount of parking into an urban setting. However, the Board noted that the addition of the pocket park responded to the guidance of promoting and capturing urban activity on site. (CS2-D, PL1-A, PL1-C)
  - c. The Board felt that the applicant had largely addressed the concern about the impacts of the amount of void space on the pedestrian environment by shifting the building to the south and utilizing the design of the pocket park to continue the strong urban street edge. However, there is still a significant amount of space dedicated to vehicular infrastructure, and the Board encouraged the applicant to consider further reducing the perceived void space of the parking lot (see item 3, below). (PL1-A, PL1-B, DC1-C, DC1-II, DC2-A, DC3-A)
2. **Architectural Composition.** The Board generally supported the design concepts presented, and indicated that they would be open to other solutions that incorporate the following guidance as the design evolves.
- a. The design rationale for raising the building, especially at the entry, was unclear. The Board encouraged the applicant to explore options for locating the building and entry at grade for improved accessibility and to establish a stronger connection with the sidewalk along Fautleroy. (CS3-A, PL2-A, DC2-A, DC2-II)
  - b. The proposed high quality materials, amount of glazing, and fine level of articulation and texture are appropriate for the scale of the building and enhancing the pedestrian experience. (DC2-B, DC2-D, DC2-II, DC4-A)
  - c. The façade treatment should have a holistic articulation, and the Board requested the applicant provide a parti diagram to clarify the overall design concept. (DC2-B, DC2-C, DC2-II)
  - d. Provide more detail regarding the blank wall condition on the southwest corner and south façade of the building. The Board urged the applicant to explore rearranging the internal programming to locate the pharmacy along the east wall of the building to relieve the blank wall condition of the south façade. The Board noted that if the condition remains, the facades should demonstrate detailed articulation, or create interest through materials, art, or shadowing. (DC1-A, DC2-B, PL3-C)
  - e. The large canopy reinforces the prominence of the entry, and the Board would like to see further refinement of the design of the entry that establishes a clear hierarchy and defines the relationship with the park and sidewalk. The Board mentioned the angled entry and roof presented at EDG 1 as a possible strategy for uniting the overall design concept of the park and entry. (PL3-A, DC2-B, DC2-C)
  - f. The proposed concept for modulating the structure to appear as a series of retail spaces, is appropriate for the scale of the building and intended architectural character. (CS2-III, CS3-A, DC2-C, DC2-II)
  - g. The Board requested more detail regarding signage and how it relates to the façade composition. (DC4-I)

3. **Park, Parking, & Open Space Concept.** The Board supported the concept of the pocket park as a pedestrian amenity, and potential to establish an urban edge along Fautleroy, and enhance the pedestrian experience. (PL1-A, PL1-B, PL1-C, DC3-B, DC3-C)
  - a. The design of the park should reinforce the design concept of the building. The Board suggested using the park to reinforce wayfinding to the entry. (DC3-A, PL2-D)
  - b. Tie the entry on the northeast side of the building into the overall open space concept. (DC3-A)
  - c. The materials and design of the landscaping is crucial to the success of the site design and activation of the park. The Board requested more information including the open space-building relationship, the design concept for the open spaces, and hardscape materials and detailing. The park should be designed to be safe, vibrant, and welcoming. (PL1-A, PL2-B, PL2-D, DC3-B, DC3-C)
  - d. The Board felt that the increase in density due to new development in the immediate area would help to activate the park, but expressed concern over potential security issues, as the park is somewhat separated from active uses. As the design of the park evolves, demonstrate how the design promotes continued activity in the park. (PL2-B, DC3-B, DC3-C)
  - e. The design should include careful consideration of lighting components for security as well as visual interest. (PL2-B)
  - f. The Board requested more detail regarding how the park is designed in regards to safety and security concerns. (PL2-B)
  - g. Landscaping should be layered, as opposed to creating walls or fences. (DC3-A, DC3-B, DC4-D)
  - h. The park should engage the sidewalk. The Board suggested more screening from the parking lot and a stronger visual connection to the sidewalk. (PL1-C, PL2-B,
  - i. Break down the scale of the void created by the parking lot. A significant portion of the site is dedicated to vehicular traffic and hardscaping, and the Board was still concerned about the visual impacts of the parking lot on the overall open space-building relationship. (DC1-B, DC1-C, DC1-I, DC3-A, DC4-D)
  - j. Tie the parking lot and park together through design, and unite the spaces visually within the open space concept. Explore the use of materials and landscaping to make the parking lot appear as an extension of the park, and not as an asphalt parking lot. The Board suggested using pavers and landscaping throughout the park and parking lot. (DC1-B, DC1-C, DC1-I, DC3-A, DC4-D)
  - k. Provide more detailing of the landscape buffers, especially for the Les Schwab trailer and dumpsters. (DC1-C)
  
4. **Roof Plane.** The Board appreciated the design progress of the roof plane, and would like to see a more thorough and cohesive response to this highly visible façade.
  - a. The mechanical screening should be taken into consideration as part of the overall massing scheme. (DC2-A, DC2-B, CS2-D)

- b. Incorporate more layering of design features and design an attractive façade as visible from nearby development. The Board indicated that there is no reason for the roof to be a flat plane, and that suggested that sloped roof forms and interesting angles, such as presented at EDG 1, should be incorporated. (CS2-D, CS3-A, DC2-A, DC2-B, DC2-C)
- c. Demonstrate a design response that establishes a relationship between the roof and vertical facades. The Board suggested that the façade expression turn the corner onto the roof plane. (DC2-A, DC2-B)
- d. The Board encouraged the applicant to consider adding green roof elements; however, this should not come at the expense of less landscaping at the ground plane. (CS2-D, DC2-B, DC4-D)
- e. The Board requested perspectives of the roof from taller, nearby developments, including those currently in progress. (CS2-D, DC2-B)

## DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The priority Citywide and Neighborhood guidelines identified by the Board as Priority Guidelines are summarized below, while all guidelines remain applicable. For the full text please visit the [Design Review website](#).

### CONTEXT & SITE

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

#### ***West Seattle Supplemental Guidance:***

**CS2-I Streetscape Compatibility**

**CS2-I-ii. Punctuate Street Wall:** Provide recessed entries and ground-related, small open spaces as appropriate breaks in the street wall.

**CS2-III Height, Bulk and Scale**

**CS2-III-iii. Facade Articulation:** New buildings should use architectural methods including modulation, color, texture, entries, materials and detailing to break up the façade— particularly important for long buildings—into sections and character consistent with traditional, multi-bay commercial buildings prevalent in the neighborhood’s commercial core (see map 1, page 1).

**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.

**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-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.

**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-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-D Wayfinding**

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

***West Seattle Supplemental Guidance:***

**PL2-I Human Scale**

**PL2-I-i. Overhead Weather Protection:** Overhead weather protection should be functional and appropriately scaled, as defined by the height and depth of the weather protection. It should be viewed as an architectural amenity, and therefore contribute positively to the design of the building with appropriate proportions and character. Overhead weather protection should be designed with consideration given to:

- a. Continuity with weather protection on nearby buildings.
- b. When opaque material is used, the underside should be illuminated.
- c. The height and depth of the weather protection should provide a comfortable scale for pedestrians.

**PL2-II Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances**

**PL2-II-i. Street Amenities:** Streetscape amenities mark the entry and serve as way finding devices in announcing to visitors their arrival in the commercial district. Consider incorporating the following treatments to accomplish this goal:

- a. pedestrian scale sidewalk lighting;
- b. accent pavers at corners and midblock crossings;
- c. planters;
- d. seating.

**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-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-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-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.

**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-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-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-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.

***West Seattle Supplemental Guidance:***

**DC1-I Visual Impacts of Parking Structures**

**DC1-I-ii. Improve Pedestrian Environment:** The design of parking structures/areas adjacent to the public realm (sidewalks, alley) should improve the safety and appearance of parking uses in relation to the pedestrian environment.

**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-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-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.

***West Seattle Supplemental Guidance:***

**DC2-II Human Scale**

**DC2-II-i. Pedestrian-Oriented Facades:** Facades should contain elements that enhance pedestrian comfort and orientation while presenting features with visual interest that invite activity.

**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-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-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.

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

**West Seattle Supplemental Guidance:**

**DC4-I Human Scale**

**DC4-I-i. Signage:** Signs should add interest to the street level environment. They can unify the overall architectural concept of the building, or provide unique identity for a commercial space within a larger mixed-use structure. Design signage that is appropriate for the scale, character and use of the project and surrounding area. Signs should be oriented and scaled for both pedestrians on sidewalks and vehicles on streets. The following sign types are encouraged:

- a. pedestrian-oriented blade and window signs;
- b. marquee signs and signs on overhead weather protection;



c. appropriately sized neon signs.

## **DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES**

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

At the time of the **FINAL** Early Design Guidance the following departures were requested:

1. **Access to Parking (SMC 23.47A.032):** The Code requires that access to parking shall be from the alley if the lot abuts and alley improved to the standards of Section 23.53.030.C. The applicant proposes to take access from a curb cut on Fauntleroy Ave SW, at the south end of the site.

The Board expressed concern over creating additional conflict points with pedestrian traffic, citing the existing vehicular crossing at the north end of the site to the an east-west alley. The Board was also concerned about the impact on the pedestrian experience and creating void spaces along the mid-block site.

The siting of the building and pocket park are crucial to the success of the site design, and that the Board indicated that they would consider the departure should a revision necessitate shifting the building north, decreasing the size of the park, or expanding the amount or impact of vehicular infrastructure at the street edge. To this end, the Board requested more information demonstrating the circulation, sightlines, and how the access would be designed to minimize conflicts with pedestrian traffic. (CS2-C, PL1-B, PL4-A, DC1-B, DC1-C, DC1-I)

## **BOARD DIRECTION**

At the conclusion of the FINAL EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE meeting, the Board recommended moving forward to MUP application.