

Dela Cruz, Jeff

From: Torres, Crystal
Sent: Monday, December 03, 2018 7:38 AM
To: PRC
Subject: FW: Questions about the ED Review Process

From: Knut Ringen <knutringen@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2018 12:18 PM
To: Torres, Crystal <Crystal.Torres@seattle.gov>
Cc: kruse.megan@gmail.com; Jacky Randall <jackyrandall@msn.com>
Subject: Questions about the ED Review Process

Dear Ms. Torres,

I am one of the residents in the Fischer Studio Building who is greatly concerned about the proposed 1521 2nd Ave project (3032531), and the way it has gone through the Early Design review process, so far with no regard to the Historical Landmark buildings that surround this project.

I just became aware of another project that is being planned (3033067) at 2nd and Virginia, which held a Pre-application meeting with City officials, including you, on November 8.

The notes from that meeting (attached) references meetings with the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) of the City's Historic Preservation Board, which apparently were held to review the planned designs in relation to one or more adjacent Landmark(s).

My questions are:

- Were the meetings between project 3033067 and ARC mandatory?
- Have any meetings between project 3032531 (1521 2nd Ave) and ARC taken place or are any being planned?
- When in the review process for project 3032531 will Historical Landmark considerations be addressed?
- How will neighbors be able to comment on Landmark considerations?

Thanks,

Knut Ringen
Fischer Studios Building Apt 701
1519 3rd Ave
Seattle, WA 98101
knutringen@msn.com
206-696-2224

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.



2nd and Virginia | Pre-Application Meeting

Approved Presub Notes 11/20/2018

Meeting Agenda

Project: 1931 2nd Avenue

AM Project #: 174030

SDCI Project #: 3033067-EG and 3033057-EG

Attendees: Crystal Torres, SDCI- reviewed
 Rachel Huck, SDOT- reviewed
 Christopher Ndifon, SDCI- reviewed
 Ray Ramos, SCL- no comments provided, please follow-up with RR as needed.
 Glen Peterson, The Schwartz Company
 Jennifer Sobieraj Sanin, Ankrom Moisan Architects
 Jason Lamb, Ankrom Moisan Architects
 Todd Bronk, Berger Partnership
 Jessie Clawson, MHL
 Dan McKinney, Transpo Group
 Andrew Delia, Navix
 Jon O'Hare, PCNW

Meeting Date/Time: November 8, 2018, 10:30-11:30 AM PST

Location: Seattle Municipal Tower SDCI

Meeting Agenda:

1. Introduction of project team members
2. AMA presentation of project proposal
3. Q&A of project
4. Pre-submittal Conference Application Project Issues/Questions

SDCI/Planner

- a. Additional overhead protection (canopies) interpretation and guidance.
- b. Clarification requested on projections over the property lines: Attachment of curtain wall features over the property line.
- c. Clarification on landscape requirement in the ROW – conflict within code section.

SDOT

- d. Requirements for long-term use of 2nd and/or Virginia for construction?
 - e. Requirements for temporary use of the alley for construction?
 - f. Possible relocation corner traffic control box in below grade vault?
5. Open Discussion

Project summary:

This project is proposed as a 440' tower located at the corner of 2nd and Virginia. Proposed hotel uses on approximately levels 1-14, condo use on approximately levels 15-43, street-level retail, and underground parking. The total stall count is not known that this time. The project is proposing to retain the existing parking lot curb cut on Virginia for a port cochere access, with addition alley access to the loading dock and the ramp to the below-grade levels.

SCL general comments:

Ray stated the project is in downtown network area. A transformer vault is required, with a likely connection off the alley. There maybe have been an application submitted under the

ARCHITECTURE
 INTERIORS
 URBAN DESIGN
 IDENTITY

Ankrom Moisan Architects

PORTLAND
 38 NW Davis Street
 Suite 300
 Portland, OR 97209
 503.245.7100

SEATTLE
 1505 5th Avenue
 Suite 300
 Seattle, WA 98101
 206.576.1600

SAN FRANCISCO
 1014 Howard Street
 San Francisco, CA 94103
 415.252.7063

previous project's MUP. This project will be required to submit a new application(s). The project will be assigned to ESE due to the size of the project.

SCL will want to review the shoring design when it is available. The project team will provide notice when it is submitted. SCL would normally rely on SDOT to be informed of the shoring plans. SCL recommends direct contact by the applicant to avoid missing the review and SCL comments prior to SDOT's completed review. In the interest of timelines, notify SCL (through Jon O or whomever) to review.

SCL will not complete a technical review or approval but will provide comments to shoring.

There is concern on the duct bank location in alley and other utility congestion. The team will work with SCL. For potholing in the alley, the project team will make contact with SCL. There may be a safety stand-by. When meeting minutes are issued, SCL will establish a contact person. Richard Ohashi is a good start for a contact person, Ray will update as necessary. SCL recommends getting an application in. SCL will coordinate with the GC to locate the duct bank

SDOT general comments:

The project will require an alley dedication, street trees, and ROW improvements. All unused curb cuts must be closed. Per SMC 23.49.019.H.1.a, if the site abuts an alley, vehicle access must be taken from the alley. SDOT does not support a curb cut on Virginia, as it is a Class II pedestrian street. It may be possible to designate a temporary load and unload zone along the project's frontage on Virginia St to accommodate passenger pick-up and drop-off.

A new ROW Manual is available with downtown design standards, including paving, and pedestrian lighting requirements. Exterior lighting is required. The fixtures can be affixed to the building. Refer to the Downtown Design Standards here:
<http://streetsillustrated.seattle.gov/design-standards/downtown/>

Any deviations from the Standards require a deviation process. Rachel will link the contact and process in the notes. This is especially true for paving patterns and materials. SDOT's preference is to not deviate. SDOT will not replace non-standard paving should work be required in the ROW. Information on the process and deviation application may be found here:
<http://streetsillustrated.seattle.gov/navigating-the-process/deviation-process/>

Rachel noted a 5.5' planting strip, 6' sidewalk is required on Virginia St. On 2nd Ave, the SMC requires a 15' sidewalk. A 5.5' minimum planting strip may be included as part of the 15' on 2nd Ave.

Todd noted there is a conflict with an existing streetlight/pole that was placed for Tower 12. There are no plans to move the electrical/controller equipment and the light pole currently in the ROW. Should the project presume all equipment is to remain unchanged? Yes.

She will review with operations engineering and provide confirmation/recommendations. project does not wish to make adjustments at the corner. Confirm with SCL how much clearance is required between building and the light pole at the corner. SDOT encourages the project to design the corner of the site to facilitate pedestrian movement along 2nd Ave and around the corner on Virginia St.

It may be possible the 2nd Avenue bus lane can be used for staging, but not during peak hours as there is frequent transit here. The Construction Hub contact will have more guidance on staging. The project will need to coordinate with construction hub coordinator. The project team is to contact Chris Dimmitt. Rachel noted there will be a new coordinator soon and will provide

the new contact. Johanna Landherr is the interim coordinator for this area. Contact Johanna.Landherr@seattle.gov and SDOTConstructionHub@seattle.gov.

Glen noted the project will want to discuss the shoring and façade bracing in the ROW. Rachael recommended to contact the construction hub coordinator.

Partial Alley Dedication from -4' to +26', and 2' into the property.

A loading dock reduction will require a traffic study, turning movement diagrams, loading dock practices, and a loading dock management plan. Include comparison information on projects of similar use and size (e.g. how many loading docks, deliveries/day, time of delivery, etc). The project should ensure that all loading can be dealt with on site, this is something that SDOT and SDCI will look at carefully.

Rachel noted with all the activity downtown it is encouraged to ensure any loading dock deviations are very carefully considered and prepared for transportation operation All deviations from requirements will be looked at on a case-by-case basis.

Crystal noted SDCI wants to make sure the alley functions and the project should not compromise functionality. She advises the team to work within the constraints on the site, provide what is required by the zoning code in terms of the size and number.

Overhead weather protection is required. Rachel noted that SDOT is moving away from requiring an annual permit for overhead weather protection in the ROW as long as the canopy meets certain standards. She will include where to find Standards and other SDOT information in notes. (see below). If the criteria are met, no PSM renewable permit is required.

Criteria for qualifying as overhead weather protection:

- 8'-15' vertical clearance measured from sidewalk (16' over alley) to lowest point of structure (including any accessory elements like signage or lighting)
- Material must provide protection from the rain
- 3' min horizontal clearance from curb face
- 3' min protrusion from building face

Todd will be in contact with Shane at SDOT for urban forestry issues and monitor through 30% SIP. Emily Ehlers will be SIP contact person.

Zoning general comments:

Departures are granted through DRB. It was noted that the project should meet structural building overhang dimensional criteria, this is not departable.

Land Use/Design general comments:

Jennifer provided a walkthrough of the Early Design Guidance packet, with the three massing options, and project departures.

Highlights:

- 1) All massing options include the same north-side tower location, explored through a tower location study. The influences and drivers are the Viktoria Apartment and the landmark building.
- 2) The landmark building is informing the project massing which was addressed in the two previous ARC (Architectural Review Committee) meetings.
- 3) A corner plaza is an important part of the project program and goal.
- 4) The main differences between the three massing options are the relationships to the landmark building.
- 5) Crystal inquired on the responses by the ARC. ARC summary:

- a. ARC likes some of the references and alignment taken from the landmark (design elements, architecture - Seattle Tower).
- b. ARC likes the use of the landmark datums and holding the current levels.
- c. ARC likes the experiential integration of the landmark building.
- d. ARC likes retaining the landmark entry.
- e. Exposing and activating the corner is important.
- f. ARC focused on structure of the landmark, including into the alley. ARC encouraged the project to be mindful of how the volume can come through and preserving the floor levels of the landmark on the interior.
- g. It is not determined how the project will address the north party wall. The structure requires significant work. The project is studying how to address openings and transparency at this location.

The project team will provide Crystal with an invite to all future ARC meetings. The project team will send her meeting minutes, and other updates if she is not able to attend.

Crystal inquired if the ARC provided feedback on the Porte Cochere, the vehicular entry way, and the curb cut on Virginia? The ARC did not provide feedback to those elements.

Crystal inquired if there could be some commercial uses on the northwest corner. Has the project team looked at moving the lobby over and putting the Porte Cochere along the alley? It will be helpful to the Board to understand design rationale, and how the design team arrived at the best option. Crystal requested a legitimate design response to moving the port cochere. The updated packet should include this study.

The current configuration is related to the core placement and keeping the landmark element. The project team will illustrate these conditions in the updated packet.

Crystal noted she cannot stress enough regarding loading dock design. There is legitimacy on moving forward with buildings that work with their neighbors as best they can.

Christopher provided the trash checklist. The project team has started communication with Angela Wallis.

SDCI next steps and closing comments:

The project team does not need to meet with Crystal again but will provide Crystal with the next draft. Crystal will provide additional comments with the comments to the notes. The project team will concurrently continue to work on the packet towards the EDG.

Crystal will provide questions and prompts for the Board and highlight topics that are important within the packet.

The project team should complete the Checklist Worksheet and return the checklist with the hard copy. Areas that are still work in progress should be noted as such. Crystal provided the TIP 238.

The project has completed the outreach process.

Certificate of approval is required before MUP issuance.

The preferred massing option is compelling, however Crystal expressed concerns that the other two options are not equally weighted in documentation. The project should document three viable and thoughtfully designed options.

Another concern is how the two buildings meet. Crystal noted that the transition occurring on the side of the landmark to the tower appeared more successful than the street facing transition as the side transition seemed to create a clear transitional language between the two expressions (tower and landmark) while the street facing elevation lacked the transitional expression to bridge the two. As such, the project team should continue to refine transition between the two buildings.

The project team to make sure to breakdown the packet in a narrative, analysis, context, big takeaways, design goals, and parameters. Include precedent studies of how other project integrate with landmark structures. Address how the project is dealing with street level and street character. This includes additional development at tower terminus.

The packet should include more views from pedestrian level and from far away (the building in the context of the skyline).

The Design Review Packet to include:

- a) The packet should create a clear narrative for the Board and the public to understand the context (general and immediate adjacencies), site opportunities and constraints, identify priority design guidelines, 3 massing options which offer different design solutions to the identified site conditions, and precedent images (including designing with landmarks) of where the design team sees the project evolving as the project moves forward.
- b) Other packet examples include 3028747 and 3020955
- c) PROVIDE ANNOTATED EDG WITH DRAFT EDG PACKET. TO BE COMPLETED BY THE ARCHITECT.

d)

Dela Cruz, Jeff

From: Torres, Crystal
Sent: Monday, December 03, 2018 7:38 AM
To: PRC
Subject: FW: Attachment
Attachments: 1931-2nd Ave. #3033067 PREAPPLICATION.pdf

From: Knut Ringen <knutringen@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2018 12:20 PM
To: Torres, Crystal <Crystal.Torres@seattle.gov>
Cc: kruse.megan@gmail.com; Jacky Randall <jackyrandall@msn.com>
Subject: Attachment

This is the attachment I was referring to in my earlier message.

Knut Ringen
knutringen@msn.com
206-696-2224

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.