Seattle Department of Construction & Inspections

DESIGN REVIEW

RECOMMENDATION OF THE
DOWNTOWN DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Record Number:	3031140-LU
Address:	1931 2nd Avenue
Applicant:	Jason Lamb, Ankrom Moison Architects
Date of Meeting:	Tuesday, November 09, 2021
Board Members Present:	Aaron Luoma, Chair Carey Dagliano Jason Henderson Ed Palushock
Board Members Absent:	Matt Bissen
SDCI Staff Present:	Crystal Torres, Senior Land Use Planner

SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: Downtown Mixed Core 240/290-440

Nearby Zones: (North) DMC 240/290-440
(South) DMC-145, DMC 240/290-440
(East) DMC 240/290-440
(West) DMC-145

Lot Area: 19,440 sq. ft.

Current Development:
The site contains three buildings: 1919 2nd Avenue, a four-story building, 1923 2nd Avenue, a one story building and the Terminal Sales Annex, which is a City of Seattle Landmark structure. There are also two surface parking lots on both sides of the Terminal Sales Annex.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:
The site is located just northeast of the Pike Place Market Historical District and is across 2nd Ave from the Moore Theatre, The Josephinum and the Palladian Apartments, all designated landmark structures. Another landmark structure, the Terminal Sales Building is across the

alley. Newer development has occurred within the past few years with the construction of a residential structure just to the south of the site construct and a hotel located at the southwest corner of the block, on 1st Ave. The site has easy access to the downtown retail core as well as Pike Place Market. Construction is also starting across Virginia St. to the north.

Access:
Vehicular access is currently proposed off Virginia Street. Pedestrian access is proposed of 2nd Avenue.

Environmentally Critical Areas:
No mapped environmentally critical areas.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Land Use Application to allow a 42-story hotel building with 200 apartment units and retail. Parking for 170 vehicles proposed. Existing buildings to be demolished; existing façade (Terminal Sales Building Annex) to remain. Design Review conducted under Project #3033067-EG.

The design packet includes information presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the record number at this website:
http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/aboutus/news/events/DesignReview/SearchPastReviews/default.aspx
Any recording of the Board meeting is available in the project file. This meeting report summarizes the meeting and is not a meeting transcript.

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

FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE March 5, 2019

PUBLIC COMMENT
The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Concerned with the functional design of the project related to loading, waste, and recycling, specifically at the alley.
- Concerned with cumulative impacts of this project and other projects on the alley.
- Concerned with the pedestrian/vehicular conflicts due to the proposed porte cochere.
- Not supportive of the response to the existing historic structure on site.

- Concerned with creating a canyon effect along Virginia between the proposed tower and tower across Virginia.
- Commented that the design looks incongruous to the rest of the context. Would like to see a more historic design for the rest of the podium.
- Disagreement with the historic Architectural Review Committee: building should be more of a back drop and let the historic façade stand out more.
- Supported a curb cut on Virginia St to take pressure off the alley.
- Wanted to see greater retail opportunities and wants more outreach to RiseUp Belltown.
- Wanted to see fewer parking spaces to discourage vehicle ownership.
- Concerned with proposed hotel/condo uses that don't seem to be reflective of local Belltown economy.

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

- A 42-story structure is inappropriately too high for the proposed site.
- The design should be limited to 10 stories at the most.
- The design will inappropriately and adversely impact the views in the area. Currently, private units face views of the water and ferris wheel and market which will completely disappear.
- Private unit faces the proposed site and will lose privacy as the building will be too close in proximity and window blinds will have to remain closed.
- This large scale high rise design will negatively impact the local environment impact and already problematic traffic congestion.
- The proposed parking design is not enough for the proposed number of units and rooms.
- The design is contrary to established design and planning considerations.
- Believed whoever is profiting from this development should at least cover the costs for the hardships listed above.
- Commented they did not receive notification of the community outreach meeting held in August.
- Commented a desire to see development done properly with concern for historic buildings, light and air, and building tower mass, the project could be an asset to the area.
- Not supportive of the design options presented. Believed additional/better options were possible. Specifically, would have liked to see greater clearance between the proposed tower and Tower 12.
- Concerned with impacts of potential canyon effect on Virginia due to the new tower. Specifically noted concerns with wind and reduced light impacting the pedestrian realm.
- Concerned with the design response to the historic context.
- Would like to see the existing facade of the Terminal Sales Annex all along 2nd Avenue continue around the corner and along Virginia to the alley.
- Concerned neither the existing or proposed towers have any sensitivity or relation to their beautiful historic neighbors (Moore Theatre, Palladian, or Terminal Sales building).
- Opposed to any variance that would allow more massing that the code permits.
- More emphasis on public open space on Virginia rather than 2nd Avenue which has more opportunity for sun and a view corridor.

- Consider relocating the car pull-in area from Virginia to 2nd Avenue site to provide a better pedestrian response on Virginia OR placing a covered driveway down the southern boundary line from 2nd Avenue to the alley.
- Concerned with impacts to light access.
- Concerned with the impacts to the views for neighbors to the north and east.
- Would like to see the stepping concept occur from the southwest direction which would echo efforts made by existing tower (One Pacific Tower and Market Place North) to preserve these critical attributes on Virginia.
- Commented if stepping the building away from Virginia while maintaining appropriate distance from Viktoria causes unacceptable loss of square footage, consider expanding the building envelope eastward to some degree. The TSA does not need an aggressive setback to achieve the desired preservation effect and no one cares about setbacks, in general, from 2nd.
- Not supportive of the proposed integration of the historic building and tower, not supportive of the setbacks from the Terminal Sales Buildings.
- Would like to see a meaningful and functional entry occur from the Terminal Sales Annex.
- Concerned with parking impacts, would like to see one parking space/unit.
- Concerned public comments are not being addressed by the Design Review Board.
- Concerned with applicant team members interrupting the Board deliberation.
- Concerned with functionality of loading berths, trash pickup, and overall impacts/functionally of the alley due to vehicular impacts.
- Not supportive of utilizing the alley for residential drop-off/pick-up.
- Not supportive of the proposed porte cochere as this occupies valuable space for loading, waste and recycling infrastructure.
- Commented a 42-story structure is inappropriate for the proposed site. The design should be limited to a maximum of 10 stories. The design will inappropriately and adversely impact on the views in the area and will impact local environmental and traffic considerations.
- Commented the proposed parking design is woefully inadequate. Each apartment and hotel room should have a minimum of 1.5 parking spaces.
- Commented the design is contrary to established design and planning considerations.
- Commented the current road and public transport infrastructure is not capable of managing additional vehicle traffic.
- Commented the proposed building will impact negatively on the impact of the views from the space needle which is a protected building and view.
- Concerned with the proposed number and size of loading berths.

SDOT comments

- 2nd Ave is also a Class I Pedestrian Street designated in the Seattle Municipal Code (SMC). Pedestrian streets should emphasize pedestrian safety and movement along the block. 2nd Ave also currently supports a two-way protected bike lane on the east side of the street. Virginia St supports a shared lane (sharrow) bike facility that acts as a connector into the larger city-wide bike network. Virginia is also a Class II Pedestrian Street, where pedestrian safety and movement should be prioritized. Because the site

fronts an alley, the Seattle Municipal Code prohibits curb cuts along both 2nd Ave and Virginia St.

- Per SMC 23.49.019.H.1.a, all vehicle access is required to be taken from the alley. SDOT supports the code-compliant plan shown in Concept 1. Specifically, this concept minimizes the impact to pedestrians due to closing of curb cuts, thus an elimination of any motorist/pedestrian conflict. This concept best supports pedestrian mobility.

One purpose of the design review process is for the Board and City to receive comments from the public that help to identify feedback and concerns about the site and design concept, identify applicable Seattle Design Guidelines and Neighborhood Design Guidelines of highest priority to the site and explore conceptual design, siting alternatives and eventual architectural design. Concerns with off-street parking, traffic and construction impacts are reviewed as part of the environmental review conducted by SDCI and are not part of this review. Concerns with standards such as building height calculations and bicycle storage standards are addressed under the City's zoning code and are not part of this review. SDCI does not have the purview to protect views from private property.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the record number-EG: 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. **Massing and Design Concept.** The Board was supportive of the applicant's preferred massing alternative, Option C, as this option seemed to offer the most relief to the historic structure by setting back from the existing landmark building, the Terminal Sales Annex, on site and provided the strongest design concept (stepping massing) which created an interesting concept and means to breaking down the height, bulk, and scale of the proposed tower. Further the Board supported the location of the tower on site as the proposed tower siting provided setback from the Viktoria Tower to the south. Moving forward, the Board provided guidance related to the following: vehicular access, street-level development, tower massing, and tower terminus refinements. **(A1 Respond to the Physical Environment, B3 Reinforce the Positive Urban Form & Architectural Attributes of the Immediate Area)**
2. **Street-Level.**
    a. 2nd Avenue. Overall the Board was pleased with the elevation at street-level along 2nd Avenue including the small open areas to the north and south of the landmark. However, the Board echoed public comment regarding the desire for an active street-level and expressed concern related to activation of the setback area becoming inactive, dead space. At the next meeting, the Board would like more information related to these setback areas including **(C1 Promote Pedestrian Interaction, Belltown C1.III. Desired Public Realm Elements, D1 Provide Inviting & Usable Open Space, D3.III: Street Furniture/Furnishings along Specific Streets)**:

i. Study of good/bad examples of projects within Belltown that utilize larger setbacks/entry courts.
ii. Illustration of how programming and design of the adjacent uses and spaces will support activated areas. The Board specifically noted that lobby uses are of concern and should be designed thoughtfully with activation in mind.
iii. Sections clarifying relationship to grade (along the entire street frontage).

b. Virginia Street. The Board echoed some public comment as they were not supportive of locating vehicular access off of Virginia Street as this interrupted the pedestrian experience both in terms of activation and safety of downtown streets by increasing curb cuts. The Board further noted that they have seen recent projects integrate porte cocheres successfully at the alley and questioned why this was not feasible. Though the Board acknowledged the challenges of programming uses around the core structure, they did not believe the presented design served as an asset to the pedestrian realm and commented the design was seemed to create a car focused area. At the next meeting the Board would like to see the following **(C1 Promote Pedestrian Interaction, Belltown C1.III. Desired Public Realm Elements, E1 Minimize Curb Cut Impacts, D6 Design for Personal Safety & Security)**:
    i. Studies of alternative vehicular access location
    ii. Activated street response
    iii. Minimize curb cuts
    iv. Update on review of traffic information by SDOT/SDCI transportation planner.

3. Tower Form and Terminus.

a. The Board was supportive of the concept of the stepping tower form as shown along 2nd Avenue. However, the Board commented it was not clear how the stepping would be carried around to all facades of the tower. At the next meeting the Board would like to review the following **(A2 Enhance the Skyline, B2 Create a Transition in Bulk and Scale, B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building, C2 Design Facades of Many Scales)**:
    i. Diagram of how the design concept is carried to all facades.
    ii. Clarification on how the tower form meets the podium and landmark structure.
    iii. Additional images of each façade, including images from both the City and pedestrian view.

b. The Board was supportive of the direction of the tower terminus, however noted, it was unclear how the stepping concept resolved itself at the tower's top as the setbacks were inconsistent around the tower terminus form which seemed to conflict with the overall tower concept and cohesion. At the next meeting the Board requested **(A2 Enhance the Skyline)**:
    i. Refinement of the tower terminus, which supports a logical transition and termination of the tower's stepping concept. The Board further noted while the street-level would be marked by the landmark, the tower form and terminus should add to the City's skyline and be designed as such.

4. Relationship to the Landmark Structure. The Board was supportive of setbacks provided around the landmark structure. In addition, the Board commented that the conceptual design images seemed successful in re-appropriating the language of the landmark into a

new form and composition (for the new portions, page 83). The Board disagreed with public comment to mimic the historic language across the entire podium and noted the new structure should be distinctive and compliment the landmark rather than mimic the historic structure. The Board further noted special attention should be given to the design of the party wall and expressed a desire to see a design response that was not a blank wall. **(Belltown B1, B1.II. Historic Style, C3 Provide Active — Not Blank — Facades)**

SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE July 23, 2019

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Concerned with functional design of the alley related to pedestrian safety, vehicular movement, and loading space.
- Would like to see greater setback at the alley to further accommodate vehicles.
- Would like to see a turning radius study for vehicles at the alley.
- Would like to see more waste storage along the alley.
- Concerned with sightlines at the alley.

One purpose of the design review process is for the Board and City to receive comments from the public that help to identify feedback and concerns about the site and design concept, identify applicable Seattle Design Guidelines and Neighborhood Design Guidelines of highest priority to the site and explore conceptual design, siting alternatives and eventual architectural design. Concerns with off-street parking, traffic and construction impacts are reviewed as part of the environmental review conducted by SDCI and are not part of this review. Concerns with standards such as building height calculations and bicycle storage standards are addressed under the City's zoning code and are not part of this review. SDCI does not have the purview to protect views from private property.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the record number-EG: 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. **Podium:**
    a. Virginia Street. The Board strongly supported removing the porte cochere which vastly improved engagement with the right-of-way by bringing the building closer to the sidewalk; integration of a double height street-level expression at the corner of 2nd Avenue and Virginia which wrapped along Virginia Avenue; and bringing entries and entry plaza closer to the street. (C1 Promote Pedestrian Interaction, Belltown C1.III. Desired Public Realm Elements, D1 Provide Inviting & Usable Open Space, D3.III: Street Furniture/Furnishings along Specific Streets)

b. 2nd Avenue. The Board also supported the scale of the entry plaza along 2nd Avenue, enhancing the building entries and creating a more subtle residential entry which the Board commented was appropriate with so many small moves happening at the street-level. (C1 Promote Pedestrian Interaction, Belltown C1.III. Desired Public Realm Elements, D1 Provide Inviting & Usable Open Space, D3.III: Street Furniture/Furnishings along Specific Streets)
c. 2nd Avenue. The Board was intrigued by the proposed interactive entertainment space (potential radio station use), and would like more information on what physical design features are proposed to support this use and space as an activated and engaging use along the street. And if this does change, how will this space remain engaging and active? (C1.V. Pedestrian Attraction)
d. Alley. The Board supported the additional setback at the alley. (C6 Develop the Alley Façade)
e. Alley. Further look at practicality of the glass corner, would this require bollards or column to protect this corner? (C6 Develop the Alley Façade)
f. Alley. The Board acknowledged the utilitarian use of the southwest corner, however, requested more information on how the articulation of the alley will reinforce the overall tower concept, specifically the Board requested the loading dock doors be considered as well. (C6 Develop the Alley Façade, E1.1. Vehicle Access Considerations, C6.III. Architectural Concept)
g. Moving forward, the Board provided guidance demonstrate how the vertical language of the tower would be carried down through the street-level expression. (B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building)

2. Relationship to landmark structure:

a. The Board supported use of the vertical language to create a unified tower language and elegant solution to complimenting the landmark. (B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building, B1.II. Historic Style)
b. The Board also commented on the successful tower proportions in relation to the landmark as a result of the stepping form. (B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building, B1.II. Historic Style)
c. The Board supported the material and façade development presented in the packet, commenting the materials were appropriately scaled and complimented the landmark structure, such as the metal panel sizes. (B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building, B1.II. Historic Style, (B1.I. Compatible Design)
d. The Board appreciated efforts made to coordinate and address the Landmark Review Board's guidance. Specifically, the Board supported expressing the landmark volume though the hotel lobby and at the alley. The Board was more supportive of less busy art treatment if a mural was pursued, to allow the landmark volume to be the element that is highlighted. (B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building, B1.II. Historic Style)

3. Tower Form:

a. The Board commended the design team's responsiveness to initial guidance and refinements made to the tower form which reinforced the architectural concept of the stepping tower form in a more unified, deliberate, and rigorous manner around all sides of the tower. (B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building)

b. The board supported stepping away from the smaller scale building to the south and continuous tower form along Virginia which reinforced and completed the stepping tower form. (B1.I. Compatible Design)
c. At the next meeting, the Board requested more information detailing the resulting parti wall condition along the south edge. (B1.I. Compatible Design)

4. Top:

a. The Board expressed some concern with the tower's top terminus, providing guidance to further refine the tower top to be more in keeping with the rules (stepping concept) established by the body of the tower form and should be scaled appropriately (large enough moves) to create a logical terminus form in keeping with the tower proportions and form.（A2 Enhance the Skyline, B2 Create a Transition in Bulk and Scale, B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building, C2 Design Facades of Many Scales)
b. Appreciated the additional views, page 24 for example, provided by the applicant team, and would like to see these views (night and day) provided at the next meeting illustrating how the tower top has been further enhanced to add to the skyline and support the building identity. The Board would like to see the materiality of adjacent buildings in future images as this will inform guidance related to how the tower sits within the skyline context.（A2 Enhance the Skyline, B2 Create a Transition in Bulk and Scale, B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building, C2 Design Facades of Many Scales)

RECOMMENDATION November 9, 2021

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Concerned with parking supply in the area
- Concerned with functionality of the proposed loading berths and impacts to alley traffic
- Concerned with solid waste staging and impacts to the alley
- Concerned with vehicle queuing entering and exiting the garage

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

- Opposed to the proposed development.
- Encouraged using materials which will not create glare on a sunny day.

SDCI received non-design related comments concerning

- Concerned the number, size, and accessibility of loading berths is inadequate to support the anticipated size and volume of delivery, waste collection, and passenger vehicles.
- Concerned about alley access to the loading berths.
- Requested more space and thoughtful location of onsite solid waste collection and staging.
- Concerned with project documents, the public comment period, the TIA, the Determination of Significance, traffic, parking, SEPA, infrastructure connections, and project files.

One purpose of the design review process is for the Board and City to receive comments from the public that help to identify feedback and concerns about the site and design concept, identify applicable Seattle Design Guidelines and Neighborhood Design Guidelines of highest priority to the site and explore conceptual design, siting alternatives and eventual architectural design. Concerns with off-street parking, traffic and construction impacts are reviewed as part of the environmental review conducted by SDCI and are not part of this review. Concerns with building height calculations and bicycle storage standards are addressed under the City's zoning code and are not part of this review.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the record 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. Responses to EDG. Overall, the Board was very pleased with responses to early design guidance, commenting on the thoughtful organization of the packet and clearly illustrated responses to previous concerns as further discussed below:

a. Tower top. The Board appreciated the additional views around the tower top as previously requested and recommended approval of the tower's roof form and material articulation. The Board expanded on this item, approving of the modifications which better aligned the service core and improved the articulation of the terminus by carrying up the curtain wall and vertical expression. (A2 Enhance the Skyline, B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building)

b. Tower body and south adjacency. The Board discussed the detailing of the proposal along the south lot line, expressing appreciation for the clarification of materials and plantings along this shared lot line. The Board specifically recommended approval of the materials along this edge condition, screening of mechanical equipment, and the added landscape buffer on the terrace. The Board recommended approval with a condition to confirm height of the screening element is sufficient to conceal mechanical equipment. In addition, the Board recommended a condition to maintain the placement of the landscape buffer at the terrace level. (B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building, B1.I. Compatible Design)

c. Podium.

i. The Board recommended approval of the vertical language of the tower coming down to street-level and overall podium expression. The Board restated their earlier support for expressing the landmark volume through thoughtful material detailing, which provided a distinct and subtle legibility of the landmark's volume along both 2nd Avenue and at the alley. The Board acknowledged the applicant's efforts to coordinate review of the landmark

through both the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) and Design Review Board. The Board acknowledged the ARC was supportive of integrating a mural onto the landmark volume and stated the Board would be comfortable with this as well. (B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building, B1.II. Historic Style)

ii. The Board discussed the entries, expressing some concern regarding the legibility and distinction between entry types (hotel/retail). As such, the Board recommended a condition to further refine the entries with the goal of improving legibility and distinction between entry type. (C-4 Reinforce Building Entries)

iii. The Board approved of the proposed uses along the street, including the proposed radio station, noting the retail and restaurant can also extend into this space should the radio broadcasting area be removed. (C-1 Promote Pedestrian Interaction)

2. Materials, Signage, and Lighting.

a. The Board recommended approval of the proposed material palette and landscape plan as shown in the Recommendation packet. (B-3 Reinforce the Positive Urban Form & Architectural Attributes of the Immediate Area, B-4.3. Architectural Details)

b. Tower Top. The Board recommended approval of the proposal to carry up the material palette to the terminus, to creative a cohesive and subtle terminus to the tower. (B-3 Reinforce the Positive Urban Form & Architectural Attributes of the Immediate Area, B-4.3. Architectural Details, A2 Enhance the Skyline, B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building)

c. Tower Body. Though there was some discussion regarding appropriateness of the vertical corrugated panels, a majority of the Board was supportive of this material, noting the ribbed panels provided subtle texture and subtle reflectance greater than would be offered by a flat panel. The Board also recommended approval of the additional solid surface area into the tower through use of the vertical bands. (B-3 Reinforce the Positive Urban Form & Architectural Attributes of the Immediate Area, B-4.3. Architectural Details, B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building)

d. Landmark. The Board recommended approval of the panel pattern and glazing proposed for the landmark volume, which provided visual interest and a successful transition between the landmark façade tower expression. (B-3 Reinforce the Positive Urban Form & Architectural Attributes of the Immediate Area, B-4.3. Architectural Details, B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building)

e. Alley façade. The Board recommended approval of the revised solution to how the tower expression wrapped from Virginia St. to the alley. (B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building)

f. Alley Façade. The Board was concerned with the painted stucco façade over the garage doors along the alley, noting the material application at this location did not yet appear to be cohesive with the rest of the building. The Board noted the success

and rigor of material application on all other facades of the building. As such, the Board recommended a condition to revisit the articulation of the façade above the garage doors (currently painted stucco) with the goal of further unifying this façade area with the material palette already utilized elsewhere. (B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building)

g. Lighting. The Board recommended approval of the restrained lighting approach as shown in in the rendering images. (B-4.3. Architectural Details)
h. Signage. The Board recommended approval of the proposed signage plan as shown within the recommendation packet. The Board noted that signage may be revised to better address the condition related to entries. (B-4.3. Architectural Details)

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 time of the Recommendation meeting the following departures were requested:

1. **Street-level Setbacks (SMC 23.49.056.B.1.b.2.b.i):** The Code requires facades between 15 and 35 feet above sidewalk grade to be located within 2', up to a maximum of 10'. The applicant proposes 15' on the south and 20'-5" on the north.

The Board unanimously recommended approval of the requested departure as the proposed setbacks provide additional relief for the existing landmark structure, as well as creating opportunity for enhanced entry experiences, better meeting the intent of Design Guidelines B-2 Create a Transition in Bulk and Scale, B-3 Reinforce Positive Urban Form & Arch. Attributes, D-1 Provide Inviting and Usable Open Space.

2. **Street Façade Width (SMC 23.49.056.B.1.b.2.b.ii):** The Code states setbacks greater than 2' shall be no wider than 20' wide. The applicant proposes a 48' wide setback south of the landmark and 30' wide setback north of the landmark.

The Board unanimously recommended approval of the requested departure as the proposed setbacks provide additional relief for the existing landmark structure, as well as creating opportunity for enhanced entry experiences, better meeting the intent of Design Guidelines B-2 Create a Transition in Bulk and Scale, B-3 Reinforce Positive Urban Form & Arch. Attributes, D-1 Provide Inviting and Usable Open Space.

3. **Maximum Tower Width (SMC 23.49.058.C):** The Code states the maximum façade width for portions of a building above 85 feet along the general north/south axis of a site (parallel to the Avenues) shall be 120 feet or 80 percent of the lot measured on the

Avenue, whichever is less. The maximum permitted width at this site is 120'. The applicant proposes a tower width of 132' above 85' high.

The Board unanimously recommended approval the requested tower width departure, as the increased width reinforces the design of the tower stepping and enhances the scaling moves as you move up the tower. The Board also appreciated the reduction in the departure request (from EDG 1 to EDG 2), which they recommended should be maintained moving forward. The proposal with the departure better meets the intent of Design Guidelines A2.1. Desired Architectural Treatments, B1 Respond to the neighborhood context, B-2 Create a Transition in Bulk and Scale, B-3 Reinforce Positive Urban Form & Arch. Attributes.

4. **Loading Berth Size (SMC 23.54.035.C.1):** The Code requires three loading berths at 10' wide, 35' long and 14' high. Four loading berths are proposed. The applicant proposes to reduce the height of one the loading berths to 9'.

A majority of the Board recommended approval of the requested departure, as it supported an interior loading space completely off the alley. The Board recommended a condition that the departure is approved subject to alley design approval by SDCI and SDOT, and that the setbacks along the alley are maintained. The Board clarified they were supportive of refinements along the alley, to be determined by SDCI and SDOT as necessary to support loading functionality. With the condition, the proposal better meets the intent of Design Guidelines C1 Promote Pedestrian Interaction, C6 Develop the Alley Façade, E1 Minimize Curb Cut Impacts, E3 Minimize the Presence of Service Areas.

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The Downtown Design Guidelines recognized by the Board as Priority Guidelines are identified above. All guidelines remain applicable and are summarized below. For the full text please visit the Design Review website.

SITE PLANNING AND MASSING

A-1 Respond to the Physical Environment: Develop an architectural concept and compose the building's massing in response to geographic conditions and patterns of urban form found nearby or beyond the immediate context of the building site.

A-1.1. Response to Context: Each building site lies within a larger physical context having various and distinct features and characteristics to which the building design should respond. Develop an architectural concept and arrange the building mass in response to one or more of the following, if present:

a. a change in street grid alignment that yields a site having nonstandard shape;
b. a site having dramatic topography or contrasting edge conditions;
c. patterns of urban form, such as nearby buildings that have employed distinctive and effective massing compositions;
d. access to direct sunlight—seasonally or at particular times of day;

e. views from the site of noteworthy structures or natural features, (i.e.: the Space Needle, Smith Tower, port facilities, Puget Sound, Mount Rainier, the Olympic Mountains);

f. views of the site from other parts of the city or region; and

g. proximity to a regional transportation corridor (the monorail, light rail, freight rail, major arterial, state highway, ferry routes, bicycle trail, etc.).

A-1.2. Response to Planning Efforts: Some areas downtown are transitional environments, where existing development patterns are likely to change. In these areas, respond to the urban form goals of current planning efforts, being cognizant that new development will establish the context to which future development will respond.

A-2 Enhance the Skyline: Design the upper portion of the building to promote visual interest and variety in the downtown skyline. Respect existing landmarks while responding to the skyline's present and planned profile.

A-2.1. Desired Architectural Treatments: Use one or more of the following architectural treatments to accomplish this goal:

a. sculpt or profile the facades;

b. specify and compose a palette of materials with distinctive texture, pattern, or color; and

c. provide or enhance a specific architectural rooftop element.

A-2.2. Rooftop Mechanical Equipment: In doing so, enclose and integrate any rooftop mechanical equipment into the design of the building as a whole.

ARCHITECTURAL EXPRESSION

B-1 Respond to the Neighborhood Context: Develop an architectural concept and compose the major building elements to reinforce desirable urban features existing in the surrounding neighborhood.

B-1.1. Adjacent Features and Networks: Each building site lies within an urban neighborhood context having distinct features and characteristics to which the building design should respond. Arrange the building mass in response to one or more of the following, if present:

a. a surrounding district of distinct and noteworthy character;

b. an adjacent landmark or noteworthy building;

c. a major public amenity or institution nearby;

d. neighboring buildings that have employed distinctive and effective massing compositions;

e. elements of the pedestrian network nearby, (i.e.: green street, hillclimb, mid-block crossing, through-block passageway); and

f. direct access to one or more components of the regional transportation system.

B-1.2. Land Uses: Also, consider the design implications of the predominant land uses in the area surrounding the site.

B-2 Create a Transition in Bulk & Scale: Compose the massing of the building to create a transition to the height, bulk, and scale of development in nearby less-intensive zones.

B-2.1. Analyzing Height, Bulk, and Scale: Factors to consider in analyzing potential height, bulk, and scale impacts include:

a. topographic relationships;

b. distance from a less intensive zone edge;

c. differences in development standards between abutting zones (allowable building height, width, lot coverage, etc.);

d. effect of site size and shape;

e. height, bulk, and scale relationships resulting from lot orientation (e.g., back lot line to back lot line vs back lot line to side lot line); and

f. type and amount of separation between lots in the different zones (e.g. , separation by only a property line, by an alley or street, or by other physical features such as grade changes);

g. street grid or platting orientations.

B-2.2. Compatibility with Nearby Buildings: In some cases, careful siting and design treatment may be sufficient to achieve reasonable transition and mitigation of height, bulk, and scale impacts. Some techniques for achieving compatibility are as follows:

h. use of architectural style, details (such as roof lines, beltcourses, cornices, or fenestration), color, or materials that derive from the less intensive zone.

i. architectural massing of building components; and

j. responding to topographic conditions in ways that minimize impacts on neighboring development, such as by stepping a project down the hillside.

B-2.3. Reduction of Bulk: In some cases, reductions in the actual bulk and scale of the proposed structure may be necessary in order to mitigate adverse impacts and achieve an acceptable level of compatibility. Some techniques which can be used in these cases include:

k. articulating the building's facades vertically or horizontally in intervals that reflect to existing structures or platting pattern;

l. increasing building setbacks from the zone edge at ground level;

m. reducing the bulk of the building's upper floors; and

n. limiting the length of, or otherwise modifying, facades.

B-3 Reinforce the Positive Urban Form & Architectural Attributes of the Immediate Area: Consider the predominant attributes of the immediate neighborhood and reinforce desirable siting patterns, massing arrangements, and streetscape characteristics of nearby development.

B-3.1. Building Orientation: In general, orient the building entries and open space toward street intersections and toward street fronts with the highest pedestrian activity. Locate parking and vehicle access away from entries, open space, and street intersections considerations.

B-3.2. Features to Complement: Reinforce the desirable patterns of massing and facade composition found in the surrounding area. Pay particular attention to designated landmarks and other noteworthy buildings. Consider complementing the existing:

a. massing and setbacks,

b. scale and proportions,

c. expressed structural bays and modulations,

d. fenestration patterns and detailing,
e. exterior finish materials and detailing,
f. architectural styles, and
g. roof forms.

B-3.3. Pedestrian Amenities at the Ground Level: Consider setting the building back slightly to create space adjacent to the sidewalk conducive to pedestrian-oriented activities such as vending, sitting, or dining. Reinforce the desirable streetscape elements found on adjacent blocks. Consider complementing existing:

h. public art installations,
i. street furniture and signage systems,
j. lighting and landscaping, and
k. overhead weather protection.

B-4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building: Compose the massing and organize the interior and exterior spaces to create a well-proportioned building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept. Design the architectural elements and finish details to create a unified building, so that all components appear integral to the whole.

B-4.1. Massing: When composing the massing, consider how the following can contribute to create a building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept:

a. setbacks, projections, and open space;
b. relative sizes and shapes of distinct building volumes; and
c. roof heights and forms.

B-4.2. Coherent Interior/Exterior Design: When organizing the interior and exterior spaces and developing the architectural elements, consider how the following can contribute to create a building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept:

d. facade modulation and articulation;
e. windows and fenestration patterns;
f. corner features;
g. streetscape and open space fixtures;
h. building and garage entries; and
i. building base and top.

B-4.3. Architectural Details: When designing the architectural details, consider how the following can contribute to create a building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept:

j. exterior finish materials;
k. architectural lighting and signage;
l. grilles, railings, and downspouts;
m. window and entry trim and moldings;
n. shadow patterns; and
o. exterior lighting.

THE STREETSCAPE

C-1 Promote Pedestrian Interaction: Spaces for street level uses should be designed to engage pedestrians with the activities occurring within them. Sidewalk-related spaces should appear safe, welcoming, and open to the general public.

C-1.1. Street Level Uses: Provide spaces for street level uses that:

a. reinforce existing retail concentrations;

b. vary in size, width, and depth;

c. enhance main pedestrian links between areas; and

d. establish new pedestrian activity where appropriate to meet area objectives. Design for uses that are accessible to the general public, open during established shopping hours, generate walk-in pedestrian clientele, and contribute to a high level of pedestrian activity.

C-1.2. Retail Orientation: Where appropriate, consider configuring retail space to attract tenants with products or services that will "spill-out" onto the sidewalk (up to six feet where sidewalk is sufficiently wide).

C-1.3. Street Level Articulation for Pedestrian Activity: Consider setting portions of the building back slightly to create spaces conducive to pedestrian-oriented activities such as vending, resting, sitting, or dining. Further articulate the street level facade to provide an engaging pedestrian experience via:

e. open facades (i.e., arcades and shop fronts);

f. multiple building entries;

g. windows that encourage pedestrians to look into the building interior;

h. merchandising display windows;

i. street front open space that features art work, street furniture, and landscaping;

j. exterior finish materials having texture, pattern, lending themselves to high quality detailing.

C-2 Design Facades of Many Scales: Design architectural features, fenestration patterns, and material compositions that refer to the scale of human activities contained within. Building facades should be composed of elements scaled to promote pedestrian comfort, safety, and orientation.

C-2.1. Modulation of Facades: Consider modulating the building facades and reinforcing this modulation with the composition of:

a. the fenestration pattern;

b. exterior finish materials;

c. other architectural elements;

d. light fixtures and landscaping elements; and

e. the roofline.

C-3 Provide Active — Not Blank — Facades: Buildings should not have large blank walls facing the street, especially near sidewalks.

C-3.1. Desirable Facade Elements: Facades which for unavoidable programmatic reasons may have few entries or windows should receive special design treatment to increase pedestrian safety, comfort, and interest. Enliven these facades by providing:

a. small retail spaces (as small as 50 square feet) for food bars, newstands, and other specialized retail tenants;

b. visibility into building interiors;

c. limited lengths of blank walls;
d. a landscaped or raised bed planted with vegetation that will grow up a vertical trellis or frame installed to obscure or screen the wall's blank surface;
e. high quality public art in the form of a mosaic, mural, decorative masonry pattern, sculpture, relief, etc., installed over a substantial portion of the blank wall surface;
f. small setbacks, indentations, or other architectural means of breaking up the wall surface;
g. different textures, colors, or materials that break up the wall's surface.
h. special lighting, a canopy, awning, horizontal trellis, or other pedestrian-oriented feature to reduce the expanse of the blank surface and add visual interest;
i. seating ledges or perches (especially on sunny facades and near bus stops); and
j. merchandising display windows or regularly changing public information display cases.

C-4 Reinforce Building Entries: To promote pedestrian comfort, safety, and orientation, reinforce building entries.

C-4.1. Entry Treatments: Reinforce the building's entry with one or more of the following architectural treatments:

a. extra-height lobby space;
b. distinctive doorways;
c. decorative lighting;
d. distinctive entry canopy;
e. projected or recessed entry bay;
f. building name and address integrated into the facade or sidewalk;
g. artwork integrated into the facade or sidewalk;
h. a change in paving material, texture, or color;
i. distinctive landscaping, including plants, water features and seating; and
j. ornamental glazing, railings, and balustrades.

C-4.2. Residential Entries: To make a residential building more approachable and to create a sense of association among neighbors, entries should be clearly identifiable and visible from the street and easily accessible and inviting to pedestrians. The space between the building and the sidewalk should provide security and privacy for residents and encourage social interaction among residents and neighbors. Provide convenient and attractive access to the building's entry. To ensure comfort and security, entry areas and adjacent open space should be sufficiently lighted and protected from the weather. Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.

C-5 Encourage Overhead Weather Protection: Project applicants are encouraged to provide continuous, well-lit, overhead weather protection to improve pedestrian comfort and safety along major pedestrian routes.

C-5.1. Overhead Weather Protection Design Elements: Overhead weather protection should be designed with consideration given to:

a. the overall architectural concept of the building;

b. uses occurring within the building (such as entries and retail spaces) or in the adjacent streetscape environment (such as bus stops and intersections);
c. minimizing gaps in coverage;
d. a drainage strategy that keeps rain water off the street-level facade and sidewalk;
e. continuity with weather protection provided on nearby buildings;
f. relationship to architectural features and elements on adjacent development, especially if abutting a building of historic or noteworthy character;
g. the scale of the space defined by the height and depth of the weather protection;
h. use of translucent or transparent covering material to maintain a pleasant sidewalk environment with plenty of natural light; and
i. when opaque material is used, the illumination of light-colored undersides to increase security after dark.

C-6 Develop the Alley Façade: To increase pedestrian safety, comfort, and interest, develop portions of the alley facade in response to the unique conditions of the site or project.

C-6.1. Alley Activation: Consider enlivening and enhancing the alley entrance by:
a. extending retail space fenestration into the alley one bay;
b. providing a niche for recycling and waste receptacles to be shared with nearby, older buildings lacking such facilities; and
c. adding effective lighting to enhance visibility and safety.

C-6.2. Alley Parking Access: Enhance the facades and surfaces in and adjacent to the alley to create parking access that is visible, safe, and welcoming for drivers and pedestrians. Consider:
d. locating the alley parking garage entry and/ or exit near the entrance to the alley;
e. installing highly visible signage indicating parking rates and availability on the building facade adjacent to the alley; and
f. chamfering the building corners to enhance pedestrian visibility and safety where alley is regularly used by vehicles accessing parking and loading.

PUBLIC AMENITIES

D-1 Provide Inviting & Usable Open Space: Design public open spaces to promote a visually pleasing, safe, and active environment for workers, residents, and visitors. Views and solar access from the principal area of the open space should be especially emphasized.

D-1.1. Pedestrian Enhancements: Where a commercial or mixed-use building is set back from the sidewalk, pedestrian enhancements should be considered in the resulting street frontage. Downtown the primary function of any open space between commercial buildings and the sidewalk is to provide access into the building and opportunities for outdoor activities such as vending, resting, sitting, or dining.
a. All open space elements should enhance a pedestrian oriented, urban environment that has the appearance of stability, quality, and safety.
b. Preferable open space locations are to the south and west of tower development, or where the siting of the open space would improve solar access to the sidewalk.

c. Orient public open space to receive the maximum direct sunlight possible, using trees, overhangs, and umbrellas to provide shade in the warmest months. Design such spaces to take advantage of views and solar access when available from the site.

d. The design of planters, landscaping, walls, and other street elements should allow visibility into and out of the open space.

D-1.2. Open Space Features: Open spaces can feature art work, street furniture, and landscaping that invite customers or enhance the building's setting. Examples of desirable features to include are:

a. visual and pedestrian access (including barrier-free access) into the site from the public sidewalk;

b. walking surfaces of attractive pavers;

c. pedestrian-scaled site lighting;

d. retail spaces designed for uses that will comfortably "spill out" and enliven the open space;

e. areas for vendors in commercial areas;

f. landscaping that enhances the space and architecture;

g. pedestrian-scaled signage that identifies uses and shops; and

h. site furniture, art work, or amenities such as fountains, seating, and kiosks.

D-1.3. Residential Open Space: Residential buildings should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive, well-integrated open space. In addition, the following should be considered:

i. courtyards that organize architectural elements while providing a common garden;

j. entry enhancements such as landscaping along a common pathway;

k. decks, balconies and upper level terraces;

l. play areas for children;

m. individual gardens; and

n. location of outdoor spaces to take advantage of sunlight.

D-2 Enhance the Building with Landscaping: Enhance the building and site with generous landscaping— which includes special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, and site furniture, as well as living plant material.

D-2.1. Landscape Enhancements: Landscape enhancement of the site may include some of the approaches or features listed below:

a. emphasize entries with special planting in conjunction with decorative paving and/or lighting;

b. include a special feature such as a courtyard, fountain, or pool;

c. incorporate a planter guard or low planter wall as part of the architecture;

d. distinctively landscape open areas created by building modulation;

e. soften the building by screening blank walls, terracing retaining walls, etc;

f. increase privacy and security through screening and/or shading;

g. provide a framework such as a trellis or arbor for plants to grow on;

h. incorporate upper story planter boxes or roof planters;

i. provide identity and reinforce a desired feeling of intimacy and quiet;

j. provide brackets for hanging planters;
k. consider how the space will be viewed from the upper floors of nearby buildings as well as from the sidewalk; and
l. if on a designated Green Street, coordinate improvements with the local Green Street plan.

D-2.2. Consider Nearby Landscaping: Reinforce the desirable pattern of landscaping found on adjacent block faces.

m. plant street trees that match the existing planting pattern or species;
n. use similar landscape materials; and
o. extend a low wall, use paving similar to that found nearby, or employ similar stairway construction methods.

D-3 Provide Elements That Define the Place: Provide special elements on the facades, within public open spaces, or on the sidewalk to create a distinct, attractive, and memorable "sense of place" associated with the building.

D-3.1. Public Space Features and Amenities: Incorporate one or more of the following a appropriate:

a. public art;
b. street furniture, such as seating, newspaper boxes, and information kiosks;
c. distinctive landscaping, such as specimen trees and water features;
d. retail kiosks;
e. public restroom facilities with directional signs in a location easily accessible to all; and
f. public seating areas in the form of ledges, broad stairs, planters and the like, especially near public open spaces, bus stops, vending areas, on sunny facades, and other places where people are likely to want to pause or wait.

D-3.2. Intersection Focus: Enliven intersections by treating the corner of the building or sidewalk with public art and other elements that promote interaction (entry, tree, seating, etc.) and reinforce the distinctive character of the surrounding area.

D-4 Provide Appropriate Signage: Design signage appropriate for the scale and character of the project and immediate neighborhood. All signs should be oriented to pedestrians and/or persons in vehicles on streets within the immediate neighborhood.

D-4.1. Desired Signage Elements: Signage should be designed to:

a. facilitate rapid orientation,
b. add interest to the street level environment,
c. reduce visual clutter,
d. unify the project as a whole, and
e. enhance the appearance and safety of the downtown area.

D-4.2. Unified Signage System: If the project is large, consider designing a comprehensive building and tenant signage system using one of the following or similar methods:

a. signs clustered on kiosks near other street furniture or within sidewalk zone closest to building face;

b. signs on blades attached to building facade; or
c. signs hanging underneath overhead weather protection.

D-4.3. Signage Types: Also consider providing:

d. building identification signage at two scales: small scale at the sidewalk level for pedestrians, and large scale at the street sign level for drivers;
e. sculptural features or unique street furniture to complement (or in lieu of) building and tenant signage; and
f. interpretive information about building and construction activities on the fence surrounding the construction site.

D-4.4. Discourage Upper-Level Signage: Signs on roofs and the upper floors of buildings intended primarily to be seen by motorists and others from a distance are generally discouraged.

D-5 Provide Adequate Lighting: To promote a sense of security for people downtown during nighttime hours, provide appropriate levels of lighting on the building facade, on the underside of overhead weather protection, on and around street furniture, in merchandising display windows, in landscaped areas, and on signage.

D-5.1. Lighting Strategies: Consider employing one or more of the following lighting strategies as appropriate.

a. Illuminate distinctive features of the building, including entries, signage, canopies, and areas of architectural detail and interest.
b. Install lighting in display windows that spills onto and illuminates the sidewalk.
c. Orient outside lighting to minimize glare within the public right-of-way.

D-6 Design for Personal Safety & Security: Design the building and site to promote the feeling of personal safety and security in the immediate area.

D-6.1. Safety in Design Features: To help promote safety for the residents, workers, shoppers, and visitors who enter the area:

a. provide adequate lighting;
b. retain clear lines of sight into and out of entries and open spaces;
c. use semi-transparent security screening, rather than opaque walls, where appropriate;
d. avoid blank and windowless walls that attract graffiti and that do not permit residents or workers to observe the street;
e. use landscaping that maintains visibility, such as short shrubs and/or trees pruned so that all branches are above head height;
f. use ornamental grille as fencing or over ground-floor windows in some locations;
g. avoid architectural features that provide hiding places for criminal activity;
h. design parking areas to allow natural surveillance by maintaining clear lines of sight for those who park there, for pedestrians passing by, and for occupants of nearby buildings;
i. install clear directional signage;

j. encourage “eyes on the street” through the placement of windows, balconies, and street-level uses; and
k. ensure natural surveillance of children’s play areas.

VEHICULAR ACCESS AND PARKING

E-1 Minimize Curb Cut Impacts: Minimize adverse impacts of curb cuts on the safety and comfort of pedestrians.

E-1.1. Vehicle Access Considerations: Where street access is deemed appropriate, one or more of the following design approaches should be considered for the safety and comfort of pedestrians.

a. minimize the number of curb cuts and locate them away from street intersections;
b. minimize the width of the curb cut, driveway, and garage opening;
c. provide specialty paving where the driveway crosses the sidewalk;
d. share the driveway with an adjacent property owner;
e. locate the driveway to be visually less dominant;
f. enhance the garage opening with specialty lighting, artwork, or materials having distinctive texture, pattern, or color; and
g. provide sufficient queueing space on site.

E-1.2. Vehicle Access Location: Where possible, consider locating the driveway and garage entrance to take advantage of topography in a manner that does not reduce pedestrian safety nor place the pedestrian entrance in a subordinate role.

E-2 Integrate Parking Facilities: Minimize the visual impact of parking by integrating parking facilities with surrounding development. Incorporate architectural treatments or suitable landscaping to provide for the safety and comfort of people using the facility as well as those walking by.

E-2.1. Parking Structures: Minimize the visibility of at-grade parking structures or accessory parking garages. The parking portion of a structure should be architecturally compatible with the rest of the building and streetscape. Where appropriate consider incorporating one or more of the following treatments:

a. Incorporate pedestrian-oriented uses at street level to reduce the visual impact of parking structures. A depth of only 10 feet along the front of the building is sufficient to provide space for newsstands, ticket booths, flower shops, and other viable uses.
b. Use the site topography to help reduce the visibility of the parking facility.
c. Set the parking facility back from the sidewalk and install dense landscaping.
d. Incorporate any of the blank wall treatments listed in Guideline C-3.
e. Visually integrate the parking structure with building volumes above, below, and adjacent.
f. Incorporate artwork into the facades.
g. Provide a frieze, cornice, canopy, overhang, trellis or other device at the top of the parking level.
h. Use a portion of the top of the parking level as an outdoor deck, patio, or garden with a rail, bench, or other guard device around the perimeter.

E-2.2. Parking Structure Entrances: Design vehicular entries to parking structure so that they do not dominate the street frontage of a building. Subordinate the garage entrance to the pedestrian entrance in terms of size, prominence on the street-scape, location, and design emphasis. Consider one or more of the following design strategies:

i. Enhance the pedestrian entry to reduce the relative importance of the garage entry.
j. Recess the garage entry portion of the facade or extend portions of the structure over the garage entry to help conceal it.
k. Emphasize other facade elements to reduce the visual prominence of the garage entry.
l. Use landscaping or artwork to soften the appearance of the garage entry from the street.
m. Locate the garage entry where the topography of the site can help conceal it.

E-3 Minimize the Presence of Service Areas: Locate service areas for trash dumpsters, loading docks, mechanical equipment, and the like away from the street front where possible. Screen from view those elements which for programmatic reasons cannot be located away from the street front.

E-3.1. Methods of Integrating Service Areas: Consider incorporating one or more of the following to help minimize these impacts:

a. Plan service areas for less visible locations on the site, such as off the alley.
b. Screen service areas to be less visible.
c. Use durable screening materials that complement the building.
d. Incorporate landscaping to make the screen more effective.
e. Locate the opening to the service area away from the sidewalk.

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated Tuesday, November 09, 2021, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the Tuesday, November 09, 2021 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. Confirm height of the screening element is sufficient to conceal mechanical equipment. (B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building, B1.I. Compatible Design)

2. Maintain the placement of the landscape buffer at the 5th level terrace. (B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building, B1.I. Compatible Design)

3. Further refine the entries with the goal of improving legibility and distinction between entry type. (C-4 Reinforce Building Entries)

4. Revise the articulation of the façade above the garage doors (currently painted stucco) to further unify this façade area with the material palette already utilized elsewhere. (B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building)

5. The departure to reduce the loading berth height is approved subject to alley design approval by SDCI and SDOT, and that the setbacks along the alley are maintained. (C1 Promote Pedestrian Interaction, C6 Develop the Alley Façade, E1 Minimize Curb Cut Impacts, E3 Minimize the Presence of Service Areas)

REC REPORT SENT 12/28/2021 BCC

LU Record Number	Contact	Email
3031140-LU	Applicant	EDDIE.TAI@PEAKDPM.COM
3031140-LU	Applicant	JASONL@ANKROMMOISAN.COM
3031140-LU	Applicant	JON@PERMITCNW.COM
3031140-LU	Applicant	jyonce@paceagle.com
3031140-LU	Board	aluoma@hbbseattle.com
3031140-LU	Board	cdagliano@nbbj.com
3031140-LU	Board	ed.palushock@perkinswill.com
3031140-LU	Board	jasonh@cascademgt.com
3031140-LU	Public	aaasen@paceagle.com
3031140-LU	Public	aleleu@paceagle.com
3031140-LU	Public	bart.dudie@gmail.com
3031140-LU	Public	bognar@kkaa.co.jp
3031140-LU	Public	bpfeiffer@kingcounty.gov
3031140-LU	Public	craig.davenport@mza-us.com
3031140-LU	Public	davidk@ankrommoisan.com
3031140-LU	Public	etely@me.com
3031140-LU	Public	evette.yu@mza-us.com
3031140-LU	Public	frank.lo@mza-us.com
3031140-LU	Public	glen@theschwartzco.com
3031140-LU	Public	gregb@bergerpartnership.com
3031140-LU	Public	jasonl@ankrommoisan.com
3031140-LU	Public	jbrueckner@paceagle.com
3031140-LU	Public	jennifers@ankrommoisan.com
3031140-LU	Public	jessie@mhseattle.com
3031140-LU	Public	jgillespie@kilroyrealty.com
3031140-LU	Public	john@theschwartzco.com
3031140-LU	Public	jqi@paceagle.com
3031140-LU	Public	katie.sheremet@greystar.com
3031140-LU	Public	kik@ankrommoisan.com
3031140-LU	Public	kruse.megan@gmail.com
3031140-LU	Public	machozen@live.com
3031140-LU	Public	mccolld@wsdot.wa.gov
3031140-LU	Public	meghan@theregistryps.com
3031140-LU	Public	ming@mza-us.com
3031140-LU	Public	richard.granger@greateagle.com.hk
3031140-LU	Public	rick@rhwdesigns.com
3031140-LU	Public	rsmith@martinsmith.com
3031140-LU	Public	saras@ankrommoisan.com
3031140-LU	Public	stephaniew@bergerpartnership.com
3031140-LU	Public	tbarth@kilroyrealty.com