



# City of Seattle

Department of Construction and Inspections  
Nathan Torgelson, Director

DESIGN  
REVIEW

## RECOMENDATION GUIDANCE OF THE SOUTHWEST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Project Number: 3019962

Address: 4532 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave SW

Applicant: Brenda Barnes, Clark Design Group

Date of Meeting: December 1, 2016

Board Members Present: Todd Bronk (Chair)  
Donald Caffrey  
Matt Zinski

Board Members Absent: T. Frick McNamara  
Alexandra Moravec


SDCI Staff Present: Joshua Johnson

### SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: NC3P-85, NC3-65

Nearby Zones: (North) NC3-65  
(South) NC3P-85  
(East)  
LR3  
(West)  
NC3P-85

Lot Area: 13,985 square feet



**Current Development:**

The site contains a one-story duplex and gravel parking lot. The site slopes from the northwest corner to the southeast, with a grade change of approximately 15 feet.

The site is predominantly zoned NC3-65; however, the southern 25' of the site is zoned NC3P-85.

**Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:**

The site is located in the West Seattle Junction Hub Urban Village, a densely developed area consisting of a variety of building scale and types and a vibrant pedestrian character. Recent development activity includes several large-scale mixed use buildings, including the seven-story Oregon 42 at the north end of the block and seven-story Capco Plaza/Altamira Apartments on the adjacent site to the south of the site.

Directly north of the site is a single family home. Further north is a three story medical office building. Directly across 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue SW is a large surface parking lot that provides time-limited parking for visitors of the Junction. To the south of the parking lot is a nine-story multi-family building and the Junction Plaza Park. Across the alley to the east are town homes. A senior home is proposed just north of the townhomes.

**Access:**

The site is accessed by two curb cuts on 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave SW, as well as from the alley to the east of the site.

**Environmentally Critical Areas:**

No designated ECA at this time.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The proposal is for a six-story mixed-use building with approximately 64 dwelling units and 3,400 square feet of ground-level retail and office. Below grade parking is proposed for 50 vehicles.

**DESIGN DEVELOPMENT**

The packets include materials presented at the meetings, and are available online by entering the project number (3019962) at this website:

<http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/aboutus/news/events/DesignReview/SearchPastReviews/default.aspx>

The packets are 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)

<b>FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE July 2, 2015</b>
---

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Several comments were offered at this meeting:

- Concerned that the living areas of the adjacent house are facing the blank wall of the existing medical building to the north and would like to see greater visual interest on the north elevation of the proposed building. Also expressed concern with the loss of access to southern exposure, light and air.
- Supported the proposed setbacks that were included as part of the previously approved design on the subject site and would like to see the greater setbacks included on the north side to lessen adverse impacts on sunlight access and privacy.
- Supported Option 3 which showed a courtyard, but recommended it be shifted to the north and combined with setbacks to maximize the buffer to the existing house to the north.
- Noted that garage exhaust vents should not be located on the north side.
- Concerned with vehicles navigating the alley and would like to see it changed to a one-way only direction.
- Concerned with the excess of trash cans on the alley that are not put away on non-collection days.
- Supported retention of the existing Western Red Cedar on site, as it provides a natural buffer, helps make a more successful fit with the adjacent property, and contributes to the network of open spaces.
- Felt that continuous retail along 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave. SW would better enhance the pedestrian experience than a courtyard.
- Consider the setbacks on both the east and west corners of the alley in regards to pedestrian-car conflicts.
- Suggested setting the structure back to match Oregon 42 for continuity and consistency.
- Felt the design should respond and exhibit connectivity to the Junction Plaza Park.
- Suggested relocating the courtyard to the north as a public amenity and mid-block connection, which may present a rationale for the departure request.
- Concerned with the location of the garage exhaust vent on the north side of the proposed structure.

## PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the following siting and design guidance.

- 1. Exceptional Tree<sup>1</sup>, Massing & Sensitivity to Zone Transition across the Alley.** The Board agreed that the Exceptional Tree located on the site was both in very good health and located close to the property line and thus greater effort should be made to preserve the tree while also achieving a massing that is sensitive to the immediate context. (CS1.B, CS1.D1, CS2.B, CS2.D3, CS2.III, CS2.D5, DC2.A, DC3.A)
  - a. The Board felt that Option One was preferred as it preserved the tree and provided the required rear setback along the alley.
  - b. The Board agreed that the alley-facing courtyard of Option 2 provided a welcome relief to the Lowrise zone across the alley to the east. The Board also appreciated that both Options 2 and 3 included notches at the northeastern and northwestern corners that minimized bulk impacts on the structure to the north.
  - c. The Board would like to see greater efforts to investigate massing and develop a design that preserves the tree and is respectful to the adjacent sites, by maintaining access to light for these neighbors, as well as relief from the building mass. The Board also requested that a more rigorous examination of how the design with removal of the tree better meets the design guidelines be provided.
  - d. The Board noted that they alley is heavily used by pedestrians and cars. The high usage, zone change and limited width therefore deserve greater visual relief from the more urban, street facing frontage along 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave. The Board voiced concern regarding reduction of the rear setback as they agreed it is needed to address the zone transition and townhouses across the alley. The Board provided a caveat that they might be more inclined to consider a departure from the rear setback provided a design scheme were developed to preserve the tree and provide modulation and relief and well-considered open spaces to the east elevation.
- 2. Location of Open Space.** The Board discussed the protection of light and air to both the neighbors across the alley, as well as to the north and agreed that the location of open spaces on the site were critical to addressing this sensitive condition. In general, the Board would like to see the distribution and location of open spaces better respond to the context – specifically providing relief to the north and east. How this is achieved will be a critical consideration in the review of any departure requests. (DC3.A, DC3.C)
- 3. Enhanced Pedestrian Experience.** The Board was pleased with the proposed massing at the property line and agreed that it maintains an appropriate street edge. The Board suggested that as this urban streetscape is developing, any proposed open spaces and modulation on

---

<sup>1</sup> At the Early Design Guidance meeting, the existing Western Red Cedar on site was presented as meeting the standards in DR 16-2008 for designation as an Exceptional Tree. Subsequent to the meeting, the applicant provided additional information indicating that the Western Red Cedar does not meet the size requirements for designation as an Exceptional Tree.

this site be integrated towards the northern and eastern edges. (CS2.C2, PL1.B, PL2.II, PL3.A, DC1.C, DC2.B, DC2.C, DC4)

- a. The Board felt that preserving the tree and providing open space on the north side of the site will help to activate and enrich the pedestrian experience along 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave SW.
- b. The Board noted they would be supportive of a mid-block connection along the north side of the site combined with the tree preservation.
- c. The Board was supportive that the street elevation is intended to reinforce the positive aspects of the urban street wall established by the nearby Oregon 42 building.
- d. The Board looks forward to reviewing a well-considered architectural composition, landscape design and high-quality and durable material palette at the next meeting.
- e. The Board looks forward to reviewing a building entry that is clearly identifiable, architecturally distinctive and well-scaled.

<b>SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE November 5, 2015</b>
--

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Several comments were offered at this meeting:

- Supported the project, and appreciated that the developers are local.
- Did not support removal of the large Cedar on site, noting that the environmental benefits including habitat and air purification.
- Concerned about trash in the alley, and would like to see enclosed trash areas and better management of the cleanliness of the alley.
- Did not support the vehicular entry location.
- Would like to see dedicated space for move-in/out trucks and deliveries that does not block the alley.
- Encouraged using fences similar to the Oregon 42 development at this project.
- Discussed the property to the north, and that the developer explored purchasing the property.
- Concerned about ingress and egress on the alley. Encouraged consideration of sightlines and pedestrian traffic in the alley.
- Felt the design will be successful, but needs refinement, and encouraged the applicant to continue working with the neighborhood groups.
- Recommended pushing of the massing back to create a small plaza that visually and conceptually connects with Capco Plaza.
- Concerned about the lack of green and open space on site; noted that open space would be a great asset to the Junction.
- Concerned about lack of parking, and supported the parking proposed for the project.
- Supported the increase in density in the area.
- Noted that the tree wouldn't be seen from 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave SW.
- Felt the project would be a good addition to the neighborhood.
- Expressed that the tree is not Exceptional, and that the proposal is Code compliant.

- Felt that the adjacency to the north should be considered in regards to the development potential on site. Noted that a blank wall condition exists to the north of the proposal.
- Felt that parking is important for retail uses.
- Supported all retail uses on at the street-front.
- Supported guidance from EDG regarding the massing on 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave SW as a continuous streetwall.
- Supported continuing the dynamic landscape features on 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave SW, similar to the Oregon 42.
- Would like to see detailed landscaping plans at the Recommendation meeting.
- Felt that the response to the adjacency to the north could be improved and the impacts mitigated, even though the site could be redeveloped.
- Concerned about the safety of the alley, and encouraged additional studies regarding pedestrian traffic.
- Noted that parking is not required in a frequent transit area, and that removing the tree to provide parking appears contradictory to City plans and policies.

## **PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS**

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the following siting and design guidance.

- 1. Alley & Services Uses.** The Board noted that they alley is heavily used by pedestrians and cars, and was concerned about the proposed locations for parking access and services uses in regards to safety and visual impacts. (DC1-B, DC1-C, DC1-I)
  - a. The Board was concerned about the visibility of vehicles exiting the parking garage and alley, and requested a study showing the extent of the sightlines and an investigation of safety or mitigation measures to further lessen the potential safety impacts to alley circulation. The Board supported the notch at the southeast corner to improve sightlines for vehicles maneuvering the corner.
  - b. The location of trash pickup should be moved to the east side of the garage, along the north-south alley.
  - c. Consolidate access points to a single entry/exit to limit doors and reduce conflicts with pedestrian traffic and uses across the alley. Alternatively, move the access points, including trash pickup, to the center of the east façade to avoid potential conflicts at the corners with limited sightlines.
- 2. Urban Edge at 42<sup>nd</sup> Street SW.** The Board supported the massing pulled up to the property line along 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave SW, indicating that the strong urban edge with no upper setbacks fits the context and responds to the evolving street wall. (CS2-A, CS2-C, CS2-I, CS2-D, DC2-I, DC4-D)
  - a. The Board supported activating the street with continuous retail uses.

- b. The Board was concerned with the proposed 10' recess at the residential lobby, and agreed that glazing and retail uses should wrap the corner into the recess to make the entry more secure and inviting.
  - c. The Board supported the intention to continue a rhythmic landscaping and streetscape design related to the established context at Oregon 42.
  - d. The design should maintain a strong urban edge in response to its mid-block location, the evolving neighborhood character, and positive attributes of nearby development. The Board noted that creating a break in the massing at the north end of the site to provide a mid-block passage or open space would not diminish the strong urban edge.
3. **Zone Transition across the Alley.** The Board agreed that the proposed massing at the alley respects the sensitive transition to the LR3 zone by providing adequate access to light and air and reducing the perceived height, bulk and scale of the east façade. (CS1-B, CS2-B, CS2-D, CS2-III, DC2-A, DC2-B)
- a. The Board supported the central courtyard as it provides a break in the massing, further reducing the perceived bulk and scale of the east façade.
  - b. The Board supported stepping back the massing at the upper levels at the east façade, as it increases access to light and air for the LR3 zone and helps to reduce the perceived height and bulk of the structure.
  - c. The Board felt that if the massing was shifted to move the open space from the courtyard to the northeast corner to preserve the Western Red Cedar Tree, the break in massing would achieve the same reduction in the bulk and scale of the façade as the preferred massing. The Board provided the caveat that the courtyard could be removed and some of the tiering along the alley could be reduced in combination with retaining the Western Red Cedar Tree at the northeast corner of the site.
4. **North Façade & Setback.** The Board felt that the north façade should demonstrate greater sensitivity to existing context and potential development by providing adequate access to light and air and relief in massing. (CS1-B, CS1-D, CS2-B, CS2-D, CS3-A, PL1-A, DC2-A, DC2-B, DC3-A, DC3-B)
- a. The Board noted that a generous north setback is crucial for providing adequate access to light and air for the north-facing units and the adjacent site. The Board felt that the proposed 2'-0" setback and 6'-6" modulated recesses were minimal, and suggested providing alternatives that explore a thoughtful massing response.
  - b. The Board encouraged setting back the entire façade, including the parking garage, to provide an open space connection to the Western Red Cedar.
  - c. The Board agreed that the proposed modulation is not essential to reducing the perceived height, bulk and scale of the north façade. This façade could be simple, yet well-composed, and should incorporate a larger setback.
5. **Massing, Existing Vegetation & Open Space.** The Board discussed the significant vegetation (Western Red Cedar Tree) and location of open space at length. The Board felt

that preserving the Western Red Cedar Tree would contribute to the network of open spaces and habitat, foster a sense of place, help to achieve a massing that is sensitive to context by providing relief along the alley and to the north, and enhance the public realm. In the end, the Board felt that the massing study on P.29 was not developed to the extent that it allowed the Board to adequately evaluate if removing the tree would better meet the design guidelines, and repeated the request for a more rigorous examination of how the removal of the tree results in a better massing. The Board indicated that site planning and massing should result in an urban form that establishes a sense of place and provides open space connectivity. (CS1-D, CS2-A, CS2-B, CS2-D, CS2-III, CS3-A, CS3-B, PL1-A, DC2-A, DC3-A, DC3-B, DC3-C)

- a. The Board noted that if the tree is proposed to be removed, the resulting massing and site plan should clearly demonstrate an overall better design response than the current proposal. Additional study demonstrating a thorough exploration for a viable option that retains the tree should be provided, in order to clearly demonstrate how the proposed design with tree removal meets the Design Guidelines and Early Design Guidance.
- b. The Board was open to the idea of a mid-block connection or open space at the north end of the site that would incorporate the Western Red Cedar Tree, and observed that break in the street wall at this location would not detract from the strong urban edge. The Board realized that a pedestrian passageway would not connect through the entire block between 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave SW and 41<sup>st</sup> Ave SW, but that it could be an appropriate location for mid-block pedestrian permeability, and would work to connect to the public realm while creating a sense of place. If a mid-block connection is pursued, any blank façade conditions (due to the parking garage) should be resolved.
- c. The Board also discussed the merits of locating on-site open space in a manner that more directly interacts with the streetscape and enhances the pedestrian experience at the sidewalk. Locating large trees along the streetscape was discussed, though the Board was concerned about how the space needed to install larger trees would be accommodated on site.

### THIRD EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE April 21, 2016

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Several comments were offered at this meeting:

- Appreciated the open space at northeast corner of site.
- Expressed concern about proximity of existing house to the north. Would like to see an additional setback of at least 5 feet; 7.5 - 10 feet would be preferable for sunlight and ventilation, building maintenance, and reduction of height, bulk and scale.
- Felt art piece or other visible feature should be incorporated for public benefit.
- Liked the materials and look of the precedent studies that looked similar to Pioneer Square. Did not think the precedent studies from Ballard were appropriate for West Seattle.



- Felt the party walls should be designed to provide interest, as they will be visible for some time.
- Felt the setback to the north was not adequate.
- Encouraged a larger setback on the north, which would allow room for staggered and layered landscaping, or something more than a green wall. Alternatively, suggested the notches on the north side could be larger.
- Felt there was a lack of visuals that explained the relationship of the project to the adjacent structure to the north.
- Noted that the private open space at the northeast corner did not appear to be at grade,
- and did not appear to be respecting the adjacent site. Felt that the design would be improved if the open space were located at grade.
- Appreciated the effort to provide more relief to townhomes across the alley, but felt
- there was not enough information provide to demonstrate the relationship of the structures.
- Felt that design elements achieving PL1 were lacking, and that the project does not
- appear to include opportunities to add to public life, or for placemaking.
- Concerned about retaining wall at southwest corner.
- Felt that overall, the project should include more amenities and/or features to inspire activity and contribute to public life, including landscaping, seating, art, a focal point, fountain, specimen tree, etc.
- Encouraged the project to be designed to have an outward orientation that embraces the public realm.
- Felt that the project should include more pedestrian amenities, and not rely on retail to provide activation at the street.
- Supported relationship of entry to streetscape.
- Expressed concern about having 2 vehicular entries on the alley, especially the one located at the SE corner as it would require a 180 degree turn.
- Liked the designated trash room to reduce impacts on the alley.
- Liked the retail spaces.
- Liked the setback in the alley and the proposed area for landscaping buffer.
- Felt the roof deck should be expanded to capitalize on views and amenity space for residents.
- Supported the precedent images and design intent, and appreciated inclusion at EDG.
- Felt the design concept should reflect unique character of West Seattle.
- Felt that the setback on the north was sufficient.
- Felt there was a huge improvement of the massing, overall, since the previous meeting.
- Supported the project moving forward.
- Would like to see as much parking as possible on site; supports multiple entrances on alley if necessary to accommodate more parking.
- Expressed concerns regarding alley safety and traffic from QFC, as well as other uses along the alley including the memory care facility. Would like to see the alley be restricted to one-way traffic.

## **PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Design Review Board members provided the following siting and design guidance:

1. **Alley and Service Uses.** The Board repeated their concerns and noted public concerns regarding limited sightlines, safety impacts, and vehicular circulation on the alley. The Board recognized the desire for maximizing parking in the structure, and provided guidance on how to balance the project goals with minimizing conflicts on the alley. (DC1-B, DC1-C, DC1-I)
  - a. Access to parking should be limited to one entry to minimize conflicts with pedestrian and vehicular traffic in the alley. The entry should be located farther to the north, as to provide adequate sightlines for traffic turning the corner. The Board did not support the parking access located at the southeast corner.
  - b. Provide a study demonstrates how circulation, loading, garbage pick-up, and move-in/out will be handled.
  - c. The Board supported the planter at the alley, noting that it provides visual relief and improves the scale transition.
  - d. The Board supported the location of the trash room on the east side of the structure, abutting the north-south alley.
  
2. **North Setback.** The Board discussed the massing of the north façade at length, and agreed that the proposed massing did not provide adequate relief to the current and future context. The Board felt that a continuous setback was necessary for providing access to light and air, and would create a positive context for future development to respond to. (CS1-B, CS1-D, CS2-B, CS2-D, CS3-A, PL1-A, DC2-A, DC2-B, DC3-A, DC3-B)
  - a. The Board recommended that the structure be set back a minimum of 7.5' from the north property line, which would result in a total distance of 10' from the adjacent structure to the north. The Board noted that additional modulation on this façade is not necessary if the setback is adequate.
  - b. The Board agreed that neither incorporating upper level setbacks nor providing a notch in the massing that aligns with the location of the existing adjacent structure would be adequate for achieving a balanced response to existing and future context.
  - c. The Board discussed the dimension of the setback at length, and encouraged exploring how the setback would contribute to future urban design and pedestrian experience along the streetscape. One Board member suggested that a mid-block crossing may be beneficial in the future. The Board agreed that the space should be incorporated into the overall design scheme.
  
3. **Transition to LR3 Zone & Amenity Space.** The Board agreed that as proposed, the L-shaped massing with minimal setbacks at the upper levels does not provide adequate relief to the LR3 zone across the alley, and hinders the amount of light that reaches the amenity space at the northeast corner. (CS1-B, CS2-B, CS2-D, CS2-III, DC2-A, DC2-B, DC3-A)
  - a. The Board requested that the massing be revised to incorporate setbacks at the upper levels to maximize the potential for amenity space at the east of the site to

receive sunlight and reduce the perceived height, bulk and scale of the east façade.

- b. The Board suggested taking cues from the *Oregon 42* development to the north of the site of how to provide an appropriate massing transition using upper-level terraces.
- c. The Board felt that a more linear amenity space along the east would be appropriate for improving access to light.

4. **Architectural Composition & Response to Massing.** The Board appreciated the context analysis, design concepts and precedent studies shown on pages 13-16. The Board supported the project moving forward in the direction of the studies, and provided guidance on how to achieve a cohesive design language. (CS2-C, CS3-I, PL1-B, DC1-A, DC2-A, DC2-B, DC3-A)

- a. The Board supported the articulation of a base, middle, and top as shown on page 12.
- b. The Board generally supported the concepts shown on page 14, and looks forward to seeing the design refined to express a more coherent design language.
- c. The Board supported the intent to create light, airy spaces, as indicated by the precedent studies shown.
- d. The Board was highly supportive of the layered materials that create depth and interest, and help to unite the design language.
- e. The Board noted that as a midblock site, the design should respond accordingly.
- f. Consider the unit layouts, and how to strengthen the expression of units in the façade composition. The Board suggested restraining the number of window types, studying the relationship of window groupings, and exploring how fenestration patterns can reinforce the architectural concept and massing.
- g. Provide information on the material finishes, and how corners will be detailed.
- h. Notches and accents should be used for meaningful moves that relate to the overall parti.
- i. Echoing public comments, the Board would like to see more information pertaining to the details at the street-level that enhance the sense of place and create an inviting, human-scaled pedestrian experience.
- j. The Board agree with public comments and would like to see the open space at grade refined to provide pedestrian amenities, or relate to the retail uses.
- k. The Board noted that the packet has some discrepancies regarding the setback of the structure in relationship to the established streetwall to the north and south.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

Several comments were offered at this meeting:

- Concerned about garbage collection from townhome residents across the alley.
- Suggested mirrors at alley intersections.
- Wanted more clarification on alley side lighting of the project.
- Wanted more extensive use of the Alaska Way guidelines

## PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

The Design Review Board members provided the following siting and design guidance:

1. **Response to EDG:** The Board was satisfied with the design massing presented and noted the project had a strong base middle and capital layer at the front facade. The Board liked how the building responded to the context and noted how the northern edge had improved since the EDG phase. The alley planter has remained in the design as requested by the Board. The Board lauded the integration of EDG guidance regarding moving the garage entrance to the north end of the alley façade and consolidating the two parking entrances into one. The Board like the proposed material palette but provided guidance on specific applications as noted below.
2. **Signage.** The Board liked the scale and placement of the conceptual building signage as shown in the packet. The Board emphasized signage should not be internally lit. The large blade sign could be a bright bold color as the rest of the building is restrained. The large signs present on the blank facades of Oregon 42 and Junction Flats were noted as negative precedents.

The Board recommended a condition requiring that the signage not extend to facades other than those shown in the packet on page 19. (WS-DC4-I-i)

3. **Landscaping.** The Board was not comfortable with the height of landscaping in front of the northern set of retail bays as it could be a visual interruption between the pedestrian and the storefront.
  - a. The Board discussed an expansion of the plaza and ultimately recommended a condition expanding the plaza one bay to the north and south to embrace the relationship between the pedestrian experience and the retail. (WS-PL1-I-i)
  - b. The Board also suggested the applicant further explore a seating area in the sidewalk. (PL1-B-3)
  - c. The Board wanted the landscape buffer near the alley at the south end of the front façade to be maintained. They recommended a condition that the two dogwood trees be moved to the northernmost landscape area to keep the sight lines between pedestrians and the alley clearer. (PL3)

- d. The Board encouraged the applicant to work with SDOT to install street trees with a minimum caliper of 4" to mitigate the loss of the tree removed during EDG. (PL1-B-3)

**4. Rooftop/Amenity Area.**

- a. The Board observed that the renderings and landscape plans of the roof were not consistent throughout the packet. They appreciated the perspective view of the rooftop shown on page 20 but wanted the sedum area depicted in the landscape plan on page 23 located at the north edge of the roof included in the final design. This was recommended as a condition of approval.
- b. The Board suggested the applicant look at providing a greater indoor/outdoor amenity area for the rooftop to be located at the south edge of the building where there is greater allowance for height. (DC3-A)

**5. Property Edges.**

- a. The Board was pleased with the setback provided at the north property line in combination with the planter and landscaping. The planter should step down proportionally as the grade changes. The Board recommended a condition that the planter be no more than one foot above grade as viewed from the front elevation. (CS2-D)
- b. The Board discussed the alley edge of the project and was generally pleased with how it responded to the context. Much of the discussion was focused on lighting. The Board liked the description of step, sconce, and down lighting presented on the rear façade. They recommended a condition of approval that all lighting be downward facing. (CS2-D-5)
- c. Lighting on the front façade was adequate, but the Board wanted to see sconce lighting on the brick columns integral to the building lighting. (PL1-B-3)

6. **Materials:** The Board discussed the application of materials and was pleased with the selection presented at Recommendation. The focus of Board deliberation on materials was the application of brick as the project's base. The Board felt there should be a definitive termination of the base at the middle. The suggested a brick header at the second story and cited the precedent image on pg. 18 as a good reference. The Board liked the wrapped brick around the façade and the wood insets at the base level, but still wanted to prioritize the termination of the base at the middle. (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

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

#### CS1-D Plants and Habitat

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

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

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

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

#### *West Seattle Supplemental Guidance:*

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

**CS2-III-i. Zoning Context:** Applicant must analyze the site in relationship to its surroundings. This should include:

- a. Distance from less intensive zone; and
- b. Separation between lots in different zones (property line only, alley,

grade changes).

**CS2-III-ii. New Development in NC zones 65' or Higher:**

- a. Patterns of urban form in existing built environment, such as setbacks and massing compositions.
- b. Size of Code-allowable building envelope in relation to underlying platting pattern.

**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).

**CS2-III-iv. Break Up Visual Mass:** The arrangement of architectural elements, materials and colors should aid in mitigating height, bulk and scale impacts of Neighborhood Commercial development, particularly at the upper levels. For development greater than 65 feet in height, a strong horizontal treatment (e.g. cornice line) should occur at 65 ft.

Consider a change of materials, as well as a progressively lighter color application to reduce the appearance of upper levels from the street and adjacent properties. The use of architectural style, details (e.g. rooflines, cornice lines, fenestration patterns), and materials found in less intensive surrounding buildings should be considered.

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

***West Seattle Supplemental Guidance:***

**CS3-I Architectural Context**

**CS3-I-i. Facade Articulation:** To make new, larger development compatible with the surrounding architectural context, facade articulation and architectural embellishment are important considerations in mixed-use and multifamily residential buildings. When larger buildings replace several small buildings, facade articulation should reflect the original platting pattern and reinforce the architectural rhythm established in the commercial core (see map 1, page 1).

**CS3-I-ii. Architectural Cues:** New mixed-use development should respond to several architectural features common in the Junction's best storefront buildings to preserve and enhance pedestrian orientation and maintain an acceptable level of consistency with the existing architecture. To create cohesiveness in the Junction, identifiable and exemplary architectural patterns should be reinforced. New elements can be introduced - provided they are accompanied by strong design linkages. Preferred elements can be found in the examples of commercial and mixed-use buildings in the Junction included on this page.

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

**PL1-B Walkways and Connections**

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

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

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

**West Seattle Supplemental Guidance:**

**PL1-I Human Activity**

**PL1-I-i. California Avenue Commercial Core:** Proposed development is encouraged to set back from the front property line to allow for more public space that enhances the pedestrian environment. Building facades should give shape to the space of the street through arrangement and scale of elements. Display windows should be large and open at the street level to provide interest and encourage activity along the sidewalk. At night, these windows should provide a secondary source of lighting.

**PL1-I-ii. Public Space Trade-Off:** In exchange for a loss of development potential at the ground floor, the Design Review Board is encouraged to entertain requests for departures to exceed the lot coverage requirement for mixed-use projects.

**PL1-I-iii. Recessed Entries:** When a setback is not appropriate or feasible, consider maximizing street level open space with recessed entries and commercial display windows that are open and inviting.

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

**PL3-A Entries**

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

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

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

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

**DESIGN CONCEPT**

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



## **DC1-A Arrangement of Interior Uses**

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

**DC1-A-2. Gathering Places:** Maximize the use of any interior or exterior gathering spaces. **DC1-A-3. Flexibility:** Build in flexibility so the building can adapt over time to evolving needs, such as the ability to change residential space to commercial space as needed.

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

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

### **DC2-A Massing**

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

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

### **DC2-B Architectural and Facade Composition**

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

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

## **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.

## ***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 Recommendation meeting, no departures were requested.

### **BOARD DIRECTION**

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated Wednesday, November 23, 2016, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the Thursday, December 01, 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. Project signage should not exceed the size and height depicted on page 19 of the recommendation packet. No signage should be internally lit. No signage should be installed on side or rear facades. (WS-DC4-I-i)
2. The entry plaza should be extended by one bay to both the north and south as shown on the Landscape-Ground Floor Plan on page 22 of the recommendation packet. (WS-PL-I-i)
3. The applicant should maintain the landscape buffer at the south end of the sidewalk near the alley intersection.
4. The two dogwood trees near the south landscape area should be moved to the northern most landscape section of the front façade. (Reference on the Landscape-Ground Floor Plan on page 22) (PL3)
5. The rooftop landscaping should be as depicted on the perspective on page 20 of the recommendation packet but with the sedum area as shown on the landscape plan on page 23 of the recommendation packet.
6. The planter shown on the Landscape-Ground Floor Plan on page 22 of the recommendation packet at the north property line shall not rise over one foot above adjacent grade as seen from the front façade. (CS2-D)
7. Sconce lighting is required on the brick columns on the front façade and along the alley. It shall be integrated building lighting. (PL1-B-3)
8. All lighting along the alley shall be downward facing and shielded. (CS2-D-5)

