



**CITY OF SEATTLE
ANALYSIS AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR OF
THE SEATTLE DEPARTMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND INSPECTIONS**

Project Number: 3036111-LU

Applicant Name: Jodi Patterson-O'Hare for SRM Development

Address of Proposal: 101 W Roy Street

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

Land Use Application to allow an 8-story, 132-unit apartment building with 36 hotel rooms. Parking for 89 vehicles proposed. Existing building to be demolished. Design Review conducted under 3035904-EG.

The following approval is required:

Design Review with Departures (Seattle Municipal Code 23.41)*

Departures are listed near the end of the Design Review Analysis in this document

SITE AND VICINITY

Site Zone: Seattle Mixed – Uptown with an 85' height limit (M1) [SM-UP 85 (M1)]

Nearby Zones: (North) SM-UP 85 (M1)
(South) SM-UP 85 (M1)
(East) SM-UP 85 (M1)
(West) Midrise (M) [MR (M)]

The site sits at the northwest edge of the mixed-use commercial zone in the Uptown neighborhood. The uses transition to Mid-Rise and Low Rise residential zone to the west and north of the site.

Lot Area: 25,570 sq. ft.

Overlays: Uptown Urban Center
Airport Height District
Uptown Design Review Guideline Area



The top of this image is North. This map is for illustrative purposes only.

In the event of omissions, errors or differences, the documents in SDCI's files will control.

Current Development:

The subject site sits at the southwest corner of 1st Ave W and W Roy St in the Uptown Urban Center. The development site comprises two existing tax parcels developed with a multifamily residential structure built in 1918 and a surface parking lot. The site descends north to south approximately six feet. No alley borders the site.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:

Adjacent to the site are a performance art building, On the Boards (a theater), to the north, multifamily residential uses to the east and west, and an office building to the south. The Uptown neighborhood is primarily comprised of multifamily housing uses to the north and west which transition to single-family residences moving north. To the south and east exist a mix of multifamily residential, commercial, office, and dining establishments. Several historic City Landmark structures are found throughout the neighborhood, including the Del a Mar Apartment Building one block to the north. Recreational opportunities include Climate Pledge Arena and the Seattle Center campus two blocks to the southeast and Counterbalance Park one block to the east. The area was rezoned from Neighborhood Commercial 3-40 to Seattle Mixed - Uptown 85 (M1) on November 10, 2017.

The Uptown neighborhood has witnessed new development joining historic structures to form an eclectic mix of building types, including large, early-twentieth century warehouse and apartment buildings to modern, commercial office buildings and recent mixed-use multifamily structures. Moving west of the subject site along W. Roy St residential structures average four- stories in height and primarily consist of neutral-colored panels and brick materials. In contrast, residential character found along First Ave W. gives way to a commercial presence south of W Mercer St. More recent developments in the vicinity average five- to six-stories in height and include street-level setbacks, balcony insets on the upper levels, and building masses distinguished by changes in materials. Street signs, artwork, and lighting elements found throughout the neighborhood are used to identify Uptown as an Art and Culture District. Multiple projects in the vicinity are currently in review or under construction for proposed development, including 413 3rd Ave W and 505 3rd Ave W.

Access:

Existing vehicular access occurs from both W. Roy St. and First Ave. W.

Environmentally Critical Areas:

There are no mapped environmentally critical areas located on the subject site.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant proposes an eight story, 132-unit apartment building, 32 hotel keys and, parking for 89 vehicles proposed. Vehicular access is proposed from First Ave W. Pedestrian access is proposed from 1st Ave W. and W. Roy St. Existing building to be demolished.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

The public comment period ended on March 22, 2022. Comments were received and carefully considered, to the extent that they raised issues within the scope of this review. These areas of public comment related to:

- Support for proposed uses along Roy St and 1st Ave W, including residential.
- Suggestion for a 10' width landscape buffer between sidewalk and unit entries.
- Request to incorporate art elements into the building façade.
- Request for an open plaza at the northeast corner of Roy St and 1st Ave W.
- Request to incorporate 'Uptown' branding in signage, lighting or other locations.
- Suggestion to replace brick with other high quality material.
- Support for the use of black color to add depth to the façade.
- Support for a square-shaped mural on the upper level panels close to Roy St.
- Suggestion to add a painted sign for 'Uptown Arts' on the lower level instead of adding textural materials.

I. ANALYSIS – DESIGN REVIEW

ADMINISTRATIVE EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE* June 17, 2020

**On April 27, 2020, the Seattle City Council passed emergency legislation [Council Bill 119769](#) which allows projects subject to full design review to opt into Administrative Design Review temporarily. As one of the projects impacted by Design Review Board meeting cancellations, this project elected to make this change for the Early Design Guidance. The Recommendation meetings for this proposal were Full Design review and discussed by the Board at a public virtual design review board meeting.*

The packet includes materials presented for review, and is available online by entering the project number 3035904-EG 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 of Proposal: **Public Resource Center**
700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000
P.O. Box 34019
Seattle, WA 98124-4019
Email: PRC@seattle.gov

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, Staff provides the following siting and design guidance.

PRIORITIES & RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Massing and response to context

- a. The surrounding neighborhood has a strong context of simply shaped buildings clad in masonry. For this reason, staff agrees with public comment regarding context and agrees with the applicant that their preferred option best responds to the surrounding neighborhood and should be used to build future iterations of the proposal. (CS2-A, CS3-A-3, CS2-C-1, CS2-3-a, CS3-A-1, DC2-A-1, DC2-B-1)
- b. In agreement with public concerns about scale, staff notes that the proposed gridded frame feature is not in keeping with the surrounding context and is too large to use effectively as a scaling feature. Use masonry as a field material with deeply set windows as a scaling element. This will help respond to the many comments about the proposed building's size. (CS3-A-1 CS3-A-3, DC2-A-2, DC2-B-1, DC2-C-1, DC2-D-2, DC2-3-b, DC4-A-1, DC4-1-a)
- c. Study the pattern of openings and rhythm of the surrounding context and use your findings to instruct the creation of window modules. Review the proposal for 3025946-EG page (16-27) for an example of a successful examination of façade features along Roy street. Provide a similar exploration at the Recommendation phase. (CS3-A-1 CS3-A-3, DC2-A-2, DC2-B-1, DC2-C-1, DC2-D-2, DC2-3-b, DC4-A-1, DC4-1-a)
 - i. The window module examples included in the EDG packet are strong. Explore how to use them with traditional patterning in a field of masonry.
- d. Differentiating the top floor could emphasize the height of the building. The size of the building came up frequently in public comment. At Recommendation, please explore bringing masonry up to the higher floor and maintaining a simple shape as this is the context of the neighborhood. You should include an examination of how each treatment responds to guidelines in this exploration. (CS3-A-1, DC2-B-1)
- e. The metal scrim feature is not in keeping with the context of the neighborhood. Explore more traditional ways of marking the corner that responds specifically to permanent architectural features of the buildings in the surrounding area. Respond to the Uptown Guidelines that request art in a way that does not overwhelm the art across the street. (CS3-A-1, CS2-C-1, CS3-1-b and DC4-1-c)
- f. There is a precedent for corner entries in the neighborhood. Explore this feature at the Recommendation phase. This could be a way of defining the corner entry without the scrim feature. Options without the corner entry should be detailed simply, with a masonry column like the buildings in the neighborhood. (CS3-A-1, CS2-C-1 and CS3-1-b)

2. Ground floor and landscape

- a. Successful ground floor units include a buffer to create a semi-private weather protected, space with stoops wide enough for personalization. At Recommendation, show how this guidance is integrated into your proposal explain and why the units will not present as a blank wall of drawn curtains when completed and occupied. (PL2-B-1, PL3-B-2, PL3-A-3P, PL3-A-4 and PL3-3-a)
- b. The frame element defining the ground floor units makes them look overly commercial. Explore ways to create fine-grained detail at the units. Use brick as a field material that comes all the way to the stoop level. (CS3-A-1 CS3-A-3, DC2-A-2, DC2-B-

1, PL3-B-2, PL3-A-3P, PL3-A-4, PL3-3-a DC2-C-1, DC2-D-2, DC2-3-b, DC4-A-1 and DC4-1-a)

c. Members of the public commented that the buildings should include eco-friendly design and features. At recommendation, illustrate how the proposal responds to Chapter CS1 of the design guidelines. Public comment also requested the preservation of a significant tree on site. If it is lost, in the proposal, consider plantings as a buffer at ground floor units as a way of mitigating the loss of canopy (CS1-A, CS1-B, CS1-C, CS1-D, CS1-E, CS1-2, DC4-D and DC4-E)

RECOMMENDATION MEETING: August 4, 2021

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Concerns about the size of mechanical units on the roof
- Request that the applicant consider the scale of the double height entry in comparison with the scale of the theater entry across the street.
- Suggestion of a setback at upper levels of the south façade
- Disagreement with Early Design Guidance suggesting the use of masonry
- Support for the proposed project
- Request for the integration of art into the project
- Suggestion that a plaza at the northeast corner would be important
- Request for inclusion of lush landscaping
- In support of lighting, murals and landscaping as proposed

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

- Concerned the building would not fit the aesthetic of the surrounding block which is primarily comprised of older, red brick apartment buildings that carry the heritage of older architecture.
- Observed that the current adjacent buildings are no taller than four stories and would thus experience shade impacts from the proposed eight-story structure.
- Encouraged the building to be no more than four stories tall and include red brick architecture to match the neighborhood and conform to its character rather than replacing it.
- Suggested locating a taller portion of the building on the south side of the structure to avoid blocking views on W Roy St.
- Suggested incorporating a landscaped buffer instead of building directly adjacent to the sidewalk.

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

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. Street-facing elevations and Penthouse

a. The Board expressed frustration that previously unseen renderings were provided at the meeting that depicted materials colors in slightly different arrangements than what was shown in their printed packets, creating confusion about which aspects of the design had changed. After some deliberation about how to approach this discrepancy, they unanimously chose the elevations and materials rendered on presentation slide #87 shown at the Recommendation meeting as their preferred version of the project and asked the design team to develop their responses to the recommendations based on that page. Staff requested the presentation from the applicant, and it was uploaded to the record for the project for reference by the public. The Board recommended a condition of approval to document the materials depicted on this slide in the MUP approval plans. They cited some clarifications and instructions for modifying the proposal illustrated on slide 87 of the presentation, including the following: (CS2-A-2, CS3-A-1, CS3-A-3, CS3-1-a, DC2-A-2, DC2-B-1, DC2-C-3, DC2-D-2, DC2-2-b, DC2-3-b, DC2-5-e, DC4-A-1 and DC4-1-a)

i. The hierarchy and color palette should be applied around the building including the west elevation.

ii. The dark vertical depicted on page 87 should go all the way down the elevation breaking up the spandrel panels that create horizontal lines.

b. The Board commended the project, as illustrated on slide 87 of the presentation, for how it uses textures in a way that creates secondary scale and they cautioned against the use of color blocking as design-strategy for the project. The Board noted they support textured and natural-colored materials like terra-cotta if the applicant desires further scaling or elements. The Board described the material palettes shown in the rest of the presentation and printed materials as “all over the place,” and stated they did not recommend approval of those material palettes since they did not meet the design guidelines as well as their chosen palette on slide 87. (CS2-A-2, CS3-A-1, CS3-A-3, CS3-1-a, DC2-B-1, DC2-D-2, DC2-2-b, DC2-5-e, DC4-A-1 and DC4-1-a)

c. The Board noted that the upper floor lacks detailing that is present in the rest of the building, and the top floor also appears very flat. Conversely, the Board members also

appreciated this floor's contrast with the lower floors. They agreed that the light color of the top floor allowed the element to disappear and allows the datums of the brick volume to better connect with the surrounding context. However, they stated that a stronger cornice would help create a visual terminus for the element and the building. The Board highlighted the large cornice feature of the On the Boards building across the street as a good precedent and suggested that the applicant use it as inspiration to create a cornice that wraps the corner on the building from Roy Street to 1st Ave W. They explained that a wrapping cornice that projected on either side would help mitigate the flatness of the top floor façade and tie the design of the building to the context of historic buildings that surround it. They therefore recommended a condition of approval to accentuate the eave and cornice detail around the corner from Roy to 1st Avenue W by pulling the roof feature on the top floor out farther toward the property lines, or by pushing the wall of the top story further back from the face of the elevation. (CS2-A-, CS3-A-1, CS3-A- 2, DC2-A-2, DC2-C-1, DC2-C-3)

d. The Board noted that vents should not be used as an architectural feature on the street facing facades of the proposal. They stated that the integration of vents in the plane of the window modules was successful in allowing the building's architectural design to show through. They recommended a condition that vents not pop out from the plane of any street facing volumes of the building including the top floor. (DC2-B-1 and DC2-D-2)

2. Non-Street Facing Elevations

a. The Board noted the South elevations of the building were bland, unbalanced and did not meet the design guidelines. They stated that this elevation needed more depth and that the base nearest to 1st Ave W created a blank wall condition. They also suggested that the applicant's decision to place art in the center of the elevation away from the public realm may not be the best way to balance the elevation. The Board recommended a condition that the applicant work with staff to balance the design of this elevation and add more texture, using the street facing elevations on slide 87 of the applicant's presentation as a starting point. The Board mentioned strategies to meet this condition could include adding more art or placing the art closer to the right of way. (CS2-A-2, CS2-C-1, CS3-A-1, DC2-B-1, DC2- B-2, DC2-C-1, DC2-D-1, DC2-D-2, DC2-2-a, DC4-A-1 and DC4-1-a)

b. The Board discussed the courtyard of the proposal and encouraged the applicant to consider creating hierarchy here by applying the quality materials, hierarchy and a lighter version of the palette than appears on the street facing elevations. (CS2-A-2, CS2-C-1, CS3-A-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-B-2, DC2-C-1, DC2-D-1, DC2-D-2, DC2-2-a, DC4-A-1 and DC4-1-a)

3. Landscaping, Lighting, and Details

a. The Board recommended approval of the lighting and signage plan as depicted in the design review packet but recommended a condition that no up-lighting be included in the project unless it's integrated into the art or covered by a canopy. (PL2-B-2 and DC2-B-1)

b. The Board did not have specific comments about the landscaping as illustrated and recommended that it met the design guidelines. (PL3-A-4, PL3-1-b DC2-2-b)

c. The Board called out the lattice work brick at the entries as a very positive feature of the proposal and recommended a condition that it should be included in future iterations of the project. This feature provides visual interest and scale within the overall vocabulary of the building and places a dynamic visual feature to mark the entry. (CS2-3-b, CS3-A-1, CS3-A-2, PL2-B-3, PL3-1-c, DC2-C-1, DC2-C-2, DC2-1-a and DC2-2-b)

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

At the time of the Recommendation meeting no departures were requested by the applicant.

RECOMMENDATIONS

BOARD DIRECTION

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated Wednesday, August 04, 2021, the presentation entered into the record Thursday, August 5th and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the Wednesday, August 04, 2021, Design Recommendation meeting, uploaded to the Record on August 10, 2021. 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 with the following conditions:

1. Use the material palette and contrasts in texture shown on page 87 of the presentation provided at the Board meeting (uploaded to the Record on August 10, 2021). (CS2-A-2, CS3-A-1, CS3-A-3, CS3-1-a, DC2-B-1, DC2-D-2, DC2-2-b, DC2-5-e, DC4-A-1 and DC4-1-a)
- d. Further accentuate the eave and cornice detail around the corner from Roy to First Avenue W by pulling the roof feature out further toward the property lines, or by pushing the wall of the top story further back from the face of the elevation. (CS2-A, CS3-A-1, CS3-A-2, DC2-A-2, DC2-C-1, DC2-C-3)
2. All vents on street facing elevations, including but not limited to the top floor, should be shrouded within the design of the building, and not extrude from the face of the elevations. (DC2-B-1 and DC2-D-2)
3. Work with the planner to add a more textured design to the south elevation, using the street facing elevations on page 87 of the applicant's presentation as a starting point. (CS2-A-2, CS2-C-1, CS3-A-1, DC2-B-1, DC2-B-2, DC2-C-1, DC2-D-1, DC2-D-2, DC2-2-a, DC4-A-1 and DC4-1-a)
4. Do not include any up lighting unless it is within the art feature or underneath a canopy. (PL2-B-2 and DC2-B-1)
5. The lattice work brick at the entry should remain as rendered in the Recommendation packet. (CS2-3-b, CS3-A-1, CS3-A-2, PL2-B-3, PL3-1-c, DC2-C-1, DC2-C-2, DC2-1-a and DC2-2-b)

ANALYSIS & DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

Director's Analysis

The design review process prescribed in Section 23.41.008.F of the Seattle Municipal Code describing the content of the SDCI Director's decision reads in part as follows:

The Director's decision shall consider the recommendation of the Design Review Board, provided that, if four (4) members of the Design Review Board are in agreement in their recommendation to the Director, the Director shall issue a decision which incorporates the full substance of the recommendation of the Design Review Board, unless the Director concludes the Design Review Board:

- a. Reflects inconsistent application of the design review guidelines; or
- b. Exceeds the authority of the Design Review Board; or
- c. Conflicts with SEPA conditions or other regulatory requirements applicable to the site; or
- d. Conflicts with the requirements of state or federal law.

Subject to the recommended conditions, the design of the proposed project was found by the Design Review Board to adequately conform to the applicable Design Guidelines.

At the conclusion of the Recommendation meeting held on Wednesday, August 04, 2021, the Board recommended approval of the project with the conditions described in the summary of the Recommendation meeting above.

Five members of the West Design Review Board were in attendance and provided recommendations (listed above) to the Director and identified elements of the Design Guidelines which are critical to the project's overall success. The Director must provide additional analysis of the Board's recommendations and then accept, deny or revise the Board's recommendations (SMC 23.41.008.F3).

The Director agrees with the Design Review Board's conclusion that the proposed project and conditions imposed result in a design that best meets the intent of the Design Review Guidelines and accepts the recommendations noted by the Board.

Following the Recommendation meeting, SDCI staff worked with the applicant to update the submitted plans to include the recommendations of the Design Review Board.

Applicant response to Recommended Design Review Condition (Land Use Correction Response and Revised MUP plan set uploaded on 10/18/2021):

1. Regarding materials and colors, the applicant responded: 'We have adjusted design to match slide 87 in the following ways: A) vertical textured sections of siding on east and north facades are continuous through the floor lines. B) the colored panels on the east façade have been adjusted to a single color that is darker than the bright orange and lighter than the dark burnt orange on slide 87. C) Siding at floor lines on the north will not match adjacent charcoal textured panel color, rather it will be a mid-tone Grey, darker than the floor lines on the east side but not as dark as the charcoal panels on the north.' The response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision.

2. Regarding the eave and cornice detail, the applicant responded: “We have adjusted the roof overhang at this location to be the same on north and east by extending the east overhang”. The response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision.
2. Regarding the vents, the applicant responded: “All vents on the street facing elevations are now “hidden” and do not extrude from the face of the building.” The response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision.
3. Regarding the textured materials, the applicant responded: “We have added texture at the bottom two floors of the building by providing two different sized recessed areas in the wall with smooth surfaced panel while the rest of the wall will have a textured surface. This pattern is taken from the similar patterns along the east façade bottom two floors. We have also relocated the large mural to be closer to 1st Ave West as discussed by the board for “study”. The new location is supported by Uptown Alliance (uptown [sic] LURC) in the letter they submitted to the city and attached to this letter for your reference. They also requested a small additional mural art piece in the lower two floors that incorporates reference to “Uptown Arts”. We understand that based on the design of this smaller mural it will not be a sign as it is a mural art piece, BUT the signage zoning code (23.55.030.E.3) notes that the maximum area for each wall sign is 672 sf. This art piece will be smaller than that and complies with other requirements for the zone.” The response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision.
4. Regarding the textured materials, the applicant responded: “Up lighting has been removed from the project except at the sculptural art feature and underneath canopies. There is horizontal lighting that projects across portions of the façade including the lattice brick noted below.” The response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision.
5. Regarding the brick patterning, the applicant responded: “The lattice work brick near the entry is included in the project.” The response satisfies the recommended condition for the MUP decision.

The applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that all construction documents, details, and specifications are shown and constructed consistent with the approved MUP drawings. The Director of SDCI has reviewed the decision and recommendations of the Design Review Board made by the five members present at the decision meeting and finds that they are consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines. The Director is satisfied that all the recommendations imposed by the Design Review Board have been met.

DIRECTOR’S DECISION

The Director accepts the Design Review Board’s recommendations and **CONDITIONALLY APPROVES** the proposed design with the conditions at the end of this Decision.

CONDITIONS – DESIGN REVIEW

For the Life of the Project

1. The building and landscape design shall be substantially consistent with the materials represented at the Recommendation meeting and in the materials submitted after the Recommendation meeting, before the MUP issuance. Any change to the proposed design, including materials or colors, shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Theresa Neylon, theresa.neylon@seattle.gov, 206-615-0179).

Theresa Neylon, Senior Land Use Planner
Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

Date: May 23, 2022

TN:adc
3036111-LU Decision.docx