



# City of Seattle

Department of Construction and Inspections  
Nathan Torgelson, Director

DESIGN  
REVIEW

**DATE:** 1/13/2016  
**TO:** Lucas Branham and Tony Fan  
**FROM:** Magda Hogness  
**RE:** Early Design Guidance 3 Meeting Packet (3020338)

This memo addresses my review of the submitted draft meeting packet for the upcoming meeting. Please address the following comments and drop off 7 final packets by 9am January 17<sup>th</sup>. Also upload a pdf file of the packet and cover image per the instructions on the DR web page:

[http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/cs/groups/pan/@pan/documents/web\\_informational/dpds021443.pdf](http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/cs/groups/pan/@pan/documents/web_informational/dpds021443.pdf)

## Response to Guidance/Massing Options

- At the last meeting, the DRB was *"concerned with the height of the retaining wall proposed adjacent to the sidewalk and recommended additional setbacks and planted landscape to improve the public realm. (CS2-A, CS2-B, CS3-A-1, PL1-B-3, DC4-D-4)"* For the Dewey façade planter height graphic (pg 11), dimension the height of each entry as measured from the sidewalk. Represent the terraced retaining wall beyond, as indicated on pg 20.
- Clarify if changes in plane are currently proposed for the retail window studies, pg 13.
- Sections shown on pages 14-16 are very helpful. The building structure beyond is difficult to read, please include hatch or increase line thickness. For each larger graphic, include height dimensions.
- Delineate the p-patch garden in the solar studies shown on pgs 16-18.
- Clarify/ indicate which trees are proposed to be removed on a site plan. The included arborist table is not legible. Provide legible text and distill critical information. *"While reviewing the existing vegetation and proposed replacement planting, the Board acknowledged the public's concern with tree canopy loss, green wall maintenance, and that fact that the proposed planting will take years to mature. The Board agreed that the setback depth, amount of landscape buffer, and green wall maintenance is important to address. For the next meeting, the Board recommended studying the depth of the setback and seriously examining the potential to save some of the existing trees. (CS1-D-1, CS2-B, CS2-D-2, DC3-C, DC4-D)"*
- Provide additional vehicular access studies and tie departure requests to specific guidelines which are better met. *"The Board acknowledged splitting the loading and parking access point into two locations appears logical, but agreed more information was needed before indicating their preference on the related departures. Related to developing a sensitive solution to the Dewey frontage, the Board requested studying alternates, such as one vehicular access point. (CS2-B-2, PL1, DC1, DC4)"* Please note, one option must be fully code compliant and require no departures, identify this option or past option in the packet.
- Increase transparency of trees on page 31 or provide another graphic. It's difficult to see the façade treatment beyond at this angle.

## Floor plans

- Dimension all floor plans; specify major dimensions, setbacks and vehicular access width.