City of Seattle

Department of Construction & Inspections

DESIGN REVIEW

FINAL RECOMMENDATION OF THE NORTHWEST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Project Number:	3024352
Address:	6415 15th Ave NW
Applicant:	Lauren Garkel of Clark Design Group
Date of Meeting:	Monday, April 02, 2018
Board Members Present:	Christopher Bell Emily McNichols Dale Kutzera (Chair) Keith Walzak
Board Members Absent:	Mark Angelillo
SDCI Staff Present:	Beth Hartwick, Senior Land Use Planner

SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: NC3P-40 (Neighborhood Commercial P 3-40)

Nearby Zones: (North) NC2P-40 and LR2
(South) NC3-40 and LR3
(East) LR3
(West) NC3P-40

Lot Area: 15,000 sq. ft.

Access: Access is from 15th Ave NW and NW NW 65th St.

Environmentally Critical Areas: None

Current Development: The project site is currently occupied by a one story commercial structure and surface parking. There is also a billboard located along the south property line.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:
The Ballard swimming pool and Ballard High School are both directly north of the site across NW 65th St. To the east of the subject site is a three-story apartment building constructed in 1984. Further east along NW 65th St are multifamily structures that vary in age and size. Directly to the south in the NC3P zone is a single story commercial structure with surface parking that is in SDCI for MUP review under project #3027656, and in the LR3 zone, a zone three-story apartment building constructed in 2004. Across 15th Ave NW is a three-story office and commercial structure built in 2000.

15th Ave NW is a busy arterial that connects the northwestern neighborhoods of Seattle to areas south of the Ship Canal and downtown. NW 65th St is also an arterial that connects the neighborhoods to the east and west of 15th Ave NW. The D Rapid-ride bus line along 15th Ave NW runs past the site with bus stops within a block. This stretch of 15th Ave NW consists mostly of one or two story commercial structures, housing fast food type eateries, neighborhood commercial services and auto related services. A few blocks to the north is a new mixed use development with residential opportunities.

Along 15th Ave NW and in the Lowrise zones to the east and west of 15th Ave NW there is transition with many of the older commercial structures and single family residences being demolished to make way for multifamily or multi-story mixed use structures.

The site is located in the Ballard Hub Urban Village.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The project is proposing a 5-story building with approx. 60 apartment units, commercial space at grade and parking for 30 vehicles. Existing structure to be demolished. A contract rezone from NC3P-40 to NC3P-55(M) is part of the application.

The proposed development was reduced in height between the first and second Recommendation meetings, and the proposed rezone was reduced from NC3P-65 to NC3P-55.

The design packet includes information presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number at this website:
http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/aboutus/news/events/DesignReview/SearchPastReviews/default.aspx

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

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

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE September 19, 2016

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Questioned if the request to shift the building mass was due to the power line.
- Stated that they do not support the use of look of cement board panels with wood and that they encourage the use of brick siding in keeping with the materials of Ballard High School.
- Encouraged preserving trees and air space.
- Questioned the intent to keeping El Camino as a tenant. [The project team stated they have an option to stay if they want.]
- Supported the design concept with the angle with open space.
- Encouraged a plaza.

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

- Encouraged a development more in keeping with the height, bulk & scale of the nearby existing structures.
- Encouraged wider sidewalks be provided to accommodate better sight lines and safety for pedestrians.
- Concerned that the proposed structure will block light and adversely impact the tress across NW 65th St.
- Objected to the rezone from 40' in height to 65' as the of height, bulk & scale of the project would adversely affect the abutting property to the east.
- Concerned about the impact on traffic congestion.
- Encouraged additional parking be provided.

The following comments were provided from SDOT:

- Supported the location of the curb cut for access to parking.
- Street trees will be required along both street frontages.
- Appreciated the attention to public life, and pedestrian volumes and supports providing sidewalks wider than what is required to accommodate Ballard High School pedestrian traffic.
- Supported the provision of down lighting to provide illumination at the sidewalk level.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the project number: http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. **Height, Bulk, and Scale:** The project is seeking a contract rezone to raise the allowable height from 40' to 65'. It was explained to the Board that they may give guidance on the relationship of the project to the surrounding context and less intensive zone(LR3) as not

only is there a zone edge transition but with the rezone the allowable height difference will be up to 25' or more. The Board agreed with public comment that a transition to the LR zone is necessary and gave the following guidance. (CS2.D.1&4)

a. The proposed project does not relate to the context of the surrounding sites and is too tall. (CS2.D.3&4)
b. More relief should be provided at the zone edge by stepping the building and setting back the upper floors. (CS2.D.1,3,4&5)

2. **Massing and Design:** The Board supported the preferred massing Option C layout. There was discussion that the upper story angle along NW 15th St was being driven not by a design concept but by the location of the existing power lines and the required setback. The Board also noted that there needed to be more of a transition to the abutting residential sites (see above). The Board provided the following guidance:
    a. Provide a meaningful design concept that is not simply driven by accommodating the power lines. The massing and setback along NW 65th St should embrace the design concept and not simply be the result of setbacks from the power lines. (DC2.A.1, DC2.B.1)
    b. Provide more relief at the zone edge by stepping the building and setting back the upper floors. (CS2.D.3&4)
    c. Design the elevations with primary and secondary façade elements. (DC2.B.1)
    d. Consider a massing along NW 65th St that has more interesting proportions than the 3-story upper and lower massing shown. (DC2.B.1)
    e. Echoing public comment on materiality, the Board encouraged the use of brick or higher quality such as wood panels at a 3rd story band. (DC2.B.1, DC4.A.1)
    f. On the west elevation consider a design that provides more horizontality instead of the 'cubes' as shown in the packet. (DC2.B.1)
    g. Design the 'floating' mass at the SW corner of the structure to appear more civic and less residential to embrace this high visible corner due to the jog in the street alignment at this intersection.
    h. The treatment of the blank wall along the south property line is very important as it will be visible along 15th Ave NW and should be intentionally designed. (DC2.A.1, DC2.B.1)
    i. The roof amenity area should be configured away from the LR zone and focus the active rooftop uses at the SW corner. (CS2.D.5)

3. **Corner Design:** The Board noted that the corner at 15th Ave NW and NW 65th St was an important corner as it prominent and should have a strong design presence. (CS2.A.2, DC2.B.1)
    a. Provide a greater setback at the street level for pedestrian relief and emphasize the upper stories with materiality or design treatment. (PL1.B.2, DC2.D.2)
    b. Consider the different neighborhood contexts and uses along 15th Ave and NW 65th Street in the design of the corner as it wraps toward the residential lobby and residential uses along NW 65th St. (DC2.A.1, DC2.B.1)

4. **Street-Level Treatment:** The Board agreed that the proposed location of the curb cut and access to below grade parking near the east property line was the best location. (DC1.B.1) The Board gave the following guidance related to the street-level:
    a. Provide a greater setback at 15th Ave NW at street level. (PL1.B.2, DC3.B.3)
    b. Design the residential entry and the commercial entries to be different. (PL3.A.1)
    c. Along NW 65th St, transition the design with the uses along NW 65th St. (DC2.E.1)
    d. Screen the staging area for solid waste storage, if it is located along the east property line. (DC1.C.4)

For the Recommendation meeting:

- Provide elevation studies showing the relationship of the proposed windows to the windows of the existing structures in the LR3 zone.
- Provide graphics that show the relationship of the live/work units to the sidewalk.

FIRST RECOMMENDATION October 2, 2017

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Concerned about the narrowness of the sidewalk along NW 65th St.
- Stated that the shadow diagrams don't show the true impact of shade across the street.
- Concerned about safety given the sight triangle departure request due to the high volume of high school students in the area.
- Appreciated the design but stated concern about environmental impacts to the neighborhood.
- Concerned about the height in relationship to Ballard High school and suggested the proposed brick should be a slightly different color.
- Stated the bulk is too heavy and should be moved back from NW 65th St.

The following comments were provided by City staff from the Office of Planning and Community Development (OPCD):

- Background information regarding the multi-year community planning project led to the Ballard Urban Design and Transportation Framework (UDTF) in 2016. The effort reviewed this site and considered potential zoning through an extensive community engagement process. City staff decided not to upzone this site to 65' for the following reasons:

Zoning Height

- Concerned that the scale of the adjoining residential development is substantially lower as the majority of zoning in the area is L1, L2, L3 and SF. Adding a NC3-65 zone would create a more dramatic transition in scale.
- Concerned that the NC3-65 zone would overshadow Ballard high school which is a major community land mark, and scale defining element.

- During the MHA process, OPCD staff determined that the proposed NC-55MHA was an appropriate zone given the outcome of the recent planning effort. Preferred alternative is 55' as it would be a better fit to the neighborhood context.

Code Requirements

- The UDTF created new development standards to mitigate concerns about scale, that are in code section SMC23.47A.009.F. Since these are specific to the Ballard Urban Village, departures should receive careful review, and respond to the design guidance in the UDTF and citywide design guidelines if departures are considered.

UDTF Recommendations About Design

- Gateway - *Reinforce the desired gateway character through street level uses, landscaping, building character. Respond to the pedestrian's speed.*
  Noted this area is identified as an important emerging gateway and new development at this location should embrace a landmark quality reflective of its important location and adjacency to the high school.
- Street Level Uses – *Prioritize commercial uses on the street level.*
- Design and Materials. The UDTF *encourages development to integrate form, function, and material into a coherent design.*

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the project number: http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. **Overall Massing and Design:**
   a. The Board noted that their previous guidance to provide additional setbacks from the east property line beyond what a code compliant design would require was provided. However, the Board discussed that even with these setbacks the building will be taller than, and out of scale with, the neighborhood context, and the design does not provide for a comfortable relationship with Ballard High School. (CS2-D-1, CS2-D-3, CS2-D-4, CS3-A-1)
   b. The Board expressed concerns about the design of the cornice and railings at the roof. (DC2-A-2)
   c. The Board provided the following recommendations:
      i. Maintain the setbacks of the east façade. (CS2-D-3, CS2-D-4)
      ii. Consider a cornice design that will help mitigate height and bulk. (DC2-A-2)
      iii. Pull back the railings on the roof and locate them where needed to help mitigate bulk. (DC2-C-2)
      iv. Provide consistency of the railings at the balconies and parapet. (DC2-B-1, DC2-D-1)
      v. Explore the use of a different brick. (CS3-A-2)

2. **NW 65th Street Massing and Design:**
    a. The Board was not supportive of the design of the upper levels along the NW 65th St. north elevation, noting that the setback was not a part of an intentional design concept, an approach they clearly stated at the previous meeting. Rather, the setback was obviously dictated by following the required setbacks from the overhead power lines. (DC2-B-1, DC2- C-3)
    b. The choice of materials of the upper levels was not supported as they were not high quality and one Board member stated that the use of a light colored material to mitigate the bulk of the upper levels was gratuitous. The Board encouraged that as much care should be given to the design of the upper levels as was evident by the more successful use of materials and protrusions and vertical "bars" of the lower three levels. (DC4-A-1)
    c. The following guidance was given:
        i. Design the north façade massing as part of a larger, coherent, design concept that is not simply driven by the power line location. (DC2-B-1)
        ii. Provide better quality materials on the upper levels of the façade. (DC4-A-1)
        iii. Revisit the pedestrian entry notch and carry the notch down to grade, providing a setback at the ground level. Maintain the notch depth but provide a greater width. (DC2-B-1)
        iv. Consider using only one material for the protrusions and panels at the vertical bars, on levels 2 and 3. (DC2-B-1, DC4-A-1)

3. **15th Ave NW Massing and Design:** The west elevation, facing 15th Ave NW, did not meet code required setbacks at the two highest levels. The Board was not supportive of the design team's argument that providing setbacks at the east facade justified not meeting code required setbacks at the west façade. They noted that further justification was needed on how allowing departures from these Ballard specific setback requirements, would make the project better meet the intent of the design guidelines. (CS2-D-1, CS3-A-1)

    Additional guidance was given:
    a. Explore the composition of the "protruding" massing blocks. (DC2-B-1)
    b. Consider a lighter material on the massing block at the southwest corner. (DC2-B-1)
    c. Provide a design with the required upper setbacks along 15th Ave NW or make a strong design justification for a design with reduced setbacks. (CS2-D-1, CS3-A-1)

4. **South Façade:** During discussion of the south façade the design team clarified that the Hardi panels will be 2' to 4' spans with a metal reveal and clear glass railing. The following guidance was given:
    a. Use a lighter color material on the lower levels to help mitigate the impact to the existing residential structure to the south. (DC4-A-1)

5. **Residential Lobby Entry:**
    a. The Board noted that the entry is a very prominent corner along NW 65th St. and expressed their concern about the proposed design and materials. The Board critiqued the relationship of the canopy above the pedestrian entry, to the 2nd

and 3rd level massing above the garage entry, as lacking a cohesive design, and the faux wood as a nominal design move. (PL2-C-2, PL3-A-4, DC4-A-1)

b. The following guidance was given:
    i. Move back the residential lobby entry at the ground level. (PL3-A-4)
    ii. The depth of the notch above the entry should be carried down to the street is suitable, but the width of the notch should be increased. (DC2-B-1)
    iii. Design the entry with a well composed, pedestrian scale, relationship between the doors, canopy, and garage entry to the east. (PL2-C-2, PL3-A-4)

For the 2nd Recommendation meeting provide the following:

- Provide additional graphics showing the pedestrian context at the two street facing elevations.

FINAL RECOMMENDATION April 2, 2018

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Encouraged providing a place for benches at the street corner for the community as the project does not seem inviting to the public.
- Concerned with the scale of the project but appreciates the rearrangement of the massing from the previous meeting.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the project number: http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. **Massing and Design:** The Board was very supportive of the changes to the massing and design made by the design team since the Initial Recommendation meeting. They supported the elimination of an entire story and that the upper level massing had been broken into two planes helping to break up the façade along NW 65th St. The Board was supportive of the materials and color scheme as presented. The Board was concerned that the solo balcony at the upper level along 15th Ave NW did not match the balconies around the corner along NW 65th St and encouraged the applicant to examine the possibility of matching balconies on both street frontages. The Board was also concerned about the parapet treatments at different massing sections and advised the applicant to consider a solid parapet at the darker Nichiha massing along 15th Ave NW to match the solid white Hardie parapet at the upper levels, balanced against the parapet treatment at

the brick massing as shown on page 15 of the Recommendation packet. (CS2-D-3, DC2-B-1, DC2-C-1, DC4-A-1).

a. The Board recommended a condition to provide the vent shrouds as shown on the elevations in the Recommendation packet, especially at the brick facades. (DC2-B-1)
b. The Board recommended a condition to provide the lighting as shown in the Recommendation packet. (DC4-C)
c. The Board recommended a condition to provide white vinyl window frames at the white Hardie facades. (DC2-B-1, DC4-A-1)
d. Consider having the solo balcony at the upper level along 15th Ave NW match the smaller balconies at the white upper level along NW 65th St. The Board declined to make this a condition of approval. (DC2-B-1, DC2-C-1)
e. Consider a solid parapet at the darker massing along 15th Ave NW to match the solid white parapet at the upper levels balanced against the parapet treatment at the brick massing as shown on page 15 of the Recommendation packet. The Board declined to make this a condition of approval. (DC2-B-1)

2. **Street-level Treatment:** The Board was supportive of the street-level treatment but in response to public comments, encouraged the design team to work with SDOT on the possibility of moving the curb line along 15th Ave NW near the corner to provide an area for benches to support the community. The Board encouraged providing bike racks in the right-of-way as well as the required bike parking in the building. The Board was supportive of a wider curb cut which will help with safety concerns of cars exiting from the parking garage. With a 22' curb cut only one sight triangle will be required. See Departures below. PL1-B-1, (PL2-B-1, PL4-B-2, DC1-B-1)
    a. The Board recommended a condition to provide a 22' wide curb cut at the access along NW 65th St to below grade parking. Pull back the structure and other building elements as much as possible to be clear of the required sight triangle area. (PL2-B-1, DC1-B-1)
    b. The Board encouraged the applicant to work with SDOT to see if moving the curb line along 15th Ave NW at the turning lane near the corner is possible, and to provide benches for public use in any gained Right-of-Way. The Board declined to make this a condition of approval. (PL1-B-1)

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

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

At the Final Recommendation meeting the applicant handed out a revised sheet for the requested sight triangle departure as it had been determined by SDCI staff that the code allowed for a 20' wide curb cut but not a 22' curb cut. A curb cut less than 22' in width is required in this zone to have two sight triangles. During discussion about the departure, City

Staff present at the meeting stated that the applicant could request a departure for a 22' curb cut. A wider curb cut would only be required to have a sight triangle on the exiting side of the garage access.

1. **Curb Cut Width (SMC 23.54.030.F.1.b):** The Code allows one curb cut greater than 10 feet, but in no case greater than 20 feet in width, may be substituted for each two curb cuts permitted by subsection 23.54.030.F.1.a.

   The applicant had originally proposed a 22' wide curb cut until it was determined during a zoning review that code would only allow a 20' wide curb cut. During the meeting the Board conditioned that a 22' curb cut be provided.

   This Board agreed that this departure would provide an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Guidelines **DC1-B-1 Access Location and Design, and PL2-B-1 Eyes on the Street,** by having a wider curb cut a wider line of sight for exiting vehicles, which will help to minimize conflict between vehicles and pedestrians (many of them Ballard High School students) on the sidewalk.

   The Board voted unanimously to recommend in favor of this departure and to make providing the 22' wide curb cut a condition of approval.

2. **Sight Triangle (SMC 23.54.030.G.2 & 3):** The Code requires that for two-way driveways 22 feet wide or more, a sight triangle on the side of the driveway used as an exit shall be provided, and shall be kept clear of any obstruction for a distance of 10 feet from the intersection of the driveway with a sidewalk. The entrance and exit lanes shall be clearly identified. The sight triangle shall also be kept clear of obstructions in the vertical spaces between 32 inches and 82 inches from the ground.

   The applicant requested a structural column and metal screening to be located in the exit side sight triangle area for an area of 4'-5".

   The Board was concerned about this departure and gave guidance to try to eliminate or move the structure back as far as possible. Ultimately the Board voted unanimously to recommend in favor of this departure, conditioned to provide a wide 22' curb cut and to make every effort to eliminate the obstructions in the sight triangle area. With these conditions, the proposed departure better meets the intent of Design Guidelines **DC1-B-1 Access Location and Design, and PL2-B-1 Eyes on the Street,** to provide for the best lines of sight for exiting vehicles to minimize conflict between vehicles and pedestrians (many of them Ballard High School students) on the sidewalk.

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The priority Citywide and Neighborhood guidelines identified 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-A-2. Architectural Presence: Evaluate the degree of visibility or architectural presence that is appropriate or desired given the context, and design accordingly.

CS2-B Adjacent Sites, Streets, and Open Spaces

CS2-B-1. Site Characteristics: Allow characteristics of sites to inform the design, especially where the street grid and topography create unusually shaped lots that can add distinction to the building massing.

CS2-B-2. Connection to the Street: Identify opportunities for the project to make a strong connection to the street and public realm.

CS2-C Relationship to the Block

CS2-C-1. Corner Sites: Corner sites can serve as gateways or focal points; both require careful detailing at the first three floors due to their high visibility from two or more streets and long distances.

CS2-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-3. Zone Transitions: For projects located at the edge of different zones, provide an appropriate transition or complement to the adjacent zone(s). Projects should create a step in perceived height, bulk and scale between the anticipated development potential of the adjacent zone and the proposed development.

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

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

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

CS3-A Emphasizing Positive Neighborhood Attributes

CS3-A-1. Fitting Old and New Together: Create compatibility between new projects, and existing architectural context, including historic and modern designs, through building articulation, scale and proportion, roof forms, detailing, fenestration, and/or the use of complementary materials.

CS3-A-2. Contemporary Design: Explore how contemporary designs can contribute to the development of attractive new forms and architectural styles; as expressed through use of new materials or other means.

CS3-A-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-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.

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

PL2-B Safety and Security

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

PL2-B-2. Lighting for Safety: Provide lighting at sufficient lumen intensities and scales, including pathway illumination, pedestrian and entry lighting, and/or security lights.

PL2-B-3. Street-Level Transparency: Ensure transparency of street-level uses (for uses such as nonresidential uses or residential lobbies), where appropriate, by keeping views open into spaces behind walls or plantings, at corners, or along narrow passageways.

PL2-C Weather Protection

PL2-C-1. Locations and Coverage: Overhead weather protection is encouraged and should be located at or near uses that generate pedestrian activity such as entries, retail uses, and transit stops.

PL2-C-2. Design Integration: Integrate weather protection, gutters and downspouts into the design of the structure as a whole, and ensure that it also relates well to neighboring buildings in design, coverage, or other features.

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

PL3-B Residential Edges

PL3-B-3. Buildings with Live/Work Uses: Maintain active and transparent facades in the design of live/work residences. Design the first floor so it can be adapted to other commercial use as needed in the future.

PL3-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-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.

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-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-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.

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

DC2-A Massing

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

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

DC2-B Architectural and Facade Composition

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

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

DC2-C Secondary Architectural Features

DC2-C-1. Visual Depth and Interest: Add depth to facades where appropriate by incorporating balconies, canopies, awnings, decks, or other secondary elements into the façade design. Add detailing at the street level in order to create interest for the pedestrian and encourage active street life and window shopping (in retail areas).

DC2-C-2. Dual Purpose Elements: Consider architectural features that can be dual purpose— adding depth, texture, and scale as well as serving other project functions.

DC2-D Scale and Texture

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

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

DC2-C-3. Fit With Neighboring Buildings: Use design elements to achieve a successful fit between a building and its neighbors.

DC2-E Form and Function

DC2-E-1. Legibility and Flexibility: Strive for a balance between building use legibility and flexibility. Design buildings such that their primary functions and uses can be readily determined from the exterior, making the building easy to access and understand. At the same time, design flexibility into the building so that it may remain useful over time even as specific programmatic needs evolve.

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

DC3-A Building-Open Space Relationship

DC3-A-1. Interior/Exterior Fit: Develop an open space concept in conjunction with the architectural concept to ensure that interior and exterior spaces relate well to each other and support the functions of the development.

DC3-B Open Space Uses and Activities

DC3-B-1. Meeting User Needs: Plan the size, uses, activities, and features of each open space to meet the needs of expected users, ensuring each space has a purpose and function.

DC3-B-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-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-B Signage

DC4-B-1. Scale and Character: Add interest to the streetscape with exterior signs and attachments that are appropriate in scale and character to the project and its environs.

DC4-C Lighting

DC4-C-1. Functions: Use lighting both to increase site safety in all locations used by pedestrians and to highlight architectural or landscape details and features such as entries, signs, canopies, plantings, and art.

DC4-C-2. Avoiding Glare: Design project lighting based upon the uses on and off site, taking care to provide illumination to serve building needs while avoiding off-site night glare and light pollution.

DC4-D Trees, Landscape, and Hardscape Materials

DC4-D-1. Choice of Plant Materials: Reinforce the overall architectural and open space design concepts through the selection of landscape materials.

DC4-D-2. Hardscape Materials: Use exterior courtyards, plazas, and other hard surfaced areas as an opportunity to add color, texture, and/or pattern and enliven public areas through the use of distinctive and durable paving materials. Use permeable materials wherever possible.

DC4-D-3. Long Range Planning: Select plants that upon maturity will be of appropriate size, scale, and shape to contribute to the site as intended.

BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendation summarized below was based on the design review packet dated Monday April 2nd, 2018, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the Monday, April 2nd, 2018 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, four Design Review Board members recommended **APPROVAL** of the subject design and of the requested departures with the following conditions:

1. Provide the vent shrouds as shown on the elevations in the Recommendation packet, especially at the brick facades. (DC2-B-1)
2. Provide the lighting as shown in the Recommendation packet. (DC4-C)
3. Provide white vinyl window frames at the white Hardie facades. (DC2-B-1, DC4-A-1)
4. Provide a 22' wide curb cut at the access along NW 65th St to below grade parking. Pull back the structure and other building elements as much as possible to be clear of the required sight triangle area. (PL2-B-1, DC1-B-1)

3024352 - EDG REPORT SENT 10/17/16 EI **/OTHERS NOTICE OF APPLICATION *NOTICE OF APPLICATION & CHECKLIST SENT 1/19/17 BG NOTICE OF REVISED APPLICATION SENT 2/2/17 RGC NOTICE OF REVISED APPLICATION SENT 4/6/17 RGC REC MTG SENT 9/14/17 DRM REC REPORT SENT 11/15/17 EI 2nd REC MTG sent 3/15/18 rgc REC2 REPORT SENT 5-4-18 BCC

**Applicant, Owner, FRP:
lgarkel@clarkdg.com
curt@prydejohnson.com

BOARD:
Marc@streamre.com
Christophercabell@gmail.com
Emily@grouparch.com
DKutzera@gmail.com

PUBLIC REVIEW DOCUMENTS*
QUICK INFORMATION CENTER
SEATTLE PUBLIC LIBRARY
LB-03-01

SUUAMISH TRIBE*
PO BOX 498
SUQUAMISH, WA 98392

DUWAMISH TRIBE*
4705 W MARGINAL WY SW
SEATTLE, WA 98106

KAREN WALTER*
WATERSHEDS AND LAND USE TEAM LEADER
MUCKLESHOOT INDIAN TRIBE FISHERIES DIVISION
39015 172ND AVE SE
AUBURN WA 98092

*SEPA Agencies Email:
separegister@ecy.wa.gov
rad.cunningham@doh.wa.gov
kelly.cooper@doh.wa.gov
Gary.Kriedt@kingcounty.gov
SEPA@pscleanair.org
Ramin.pazooki@wsdot.wa.gov

andrew.natzel@gmail.com
ann@annmaki.com
aselznick@gmail.com
brooke@s2mc.com
davidw.goldberg@seattle.gov
dawngiberson@gmail.com

melinda_w@comcast.net
nelundberg@gmail.com
paul@aielloarchitecture.com
radsay@gmail.com
reneeremlinger@gmail.com
stevenneuman@me.com

elizabeth.larter@gmail.com
emilyguist@gmail.com
erictseo@gmail.com
erik@jacksonremodeling.com
fletchjim@aol.com
jack@theregistryps.com

STEWART0549@msn.com
thirtyacre@westlakeassociates.com
warkerin@gmail.com
westwoodlandneighbors@gmail.com
dawngiberson@gmail.com

jessie@mhseattle.com
joann98117@yahoo.com
leifonzo@yahoo.com
libellule11@comcast.net
LINDAMELVIN@msn.com
mcrkon@gmail.com

Rheinubung@msn.com

UNDELIVERABLE:
rk800lek@aol.com
cory@gramorwa.com
curt@prydejohason.com
dp@gramorwa.com
Kwalzak@nbbj.com