



City of Seattle

Department of Construction and Inspections
Nathan Torgelson, Director

DESIGN
REVIEW

DATE: 1/18/2017
TO: East Design Review Board Members
FROM: Magda Hogness, SDCI Land Use Planner
RE: Project No. 3020338, 2925 E Madison St
January 25, 2017 8:00 p.m.
Seattle University
901 12th Ave
Pigott Auditorium

Hi, enclosed are the past meeting report and packet for the upcoming third EDG meeting.

Project Summary: The 40,422 sf project site is located in the Madison Valley Neighborhood. The current proposal is a 7-story structure containing 73 residential units with 26,250 sq. ft. of retail at ground level and parking for 140 stalls. This is slightly modified from the proposal shown at the last meeting which contained 75 residential units, 26,600 sq. ft. of retail and 156-158 parking stalls.

Public Comment Summary: Additional design related public comments have not yet been received for the revised design. Comments received since the last EDG meeting held on 10/26/2016 have not raised new design related issues. Please refer to summarized public comment in the enclosed meeting report.

Project Highlights: My feedback to the applicant included guidance to resolve the proposed massing option based on Board direction from the last meeting (summary on back of this page). I've identified the following topics as important to address at this stage:

1. **Response to EDG:** A response to the second EDG meeting guidance is provided on pgs 5.
2. **Dewey Frontage: Height, Bulk, Scale and Response to Context:** At the last meeting the Board was concerned with the extent of blank wall shown and the potential for light and glare impacts and recommended further studying the arrangement of uses and the location of parking to provide a residential transition along the Dewey frontage. (CS1-C, CS2-A, CS2-D, CS3-A-1, DC1, DC2-A-2). In the current design the frontage has been substantially revised in line with Board guidance to include townhouse uses to better relate to the surrounding residential context. A series of secondary massing forms are depicted on pgs 14-15.

The height of the retaining wall proposed adjacent to the sidewalk was also a concern at the last meeting. (CS2-A, CS2-B, CS3-A-1, PL1-B-3, DC4-D-4) The applicant has responded by providing a series of terraced retaining walls to improve the pedestrian experience along Dewey. This feature is shown on pg 13 and subsequent perspectives.

Also I wanted to reiterate that the building height calculation methodology has been vetted with the Zoning Reviewer. Please note, the DRB's authority is limited to the Design Review Guidelines, as always. The DRB does not have the authority to weigh in on whether or not a project will meet height calculations. However, as some guidelines relate to height, such as height, bulk and scale, and those topics are in the DRB's purview. For example, the DRB could state that while the project appears to meet the code compliant height calculation, it is too tall in light of the Design Guidelines.

3. **Setbacks, Site Features and Existing Tree Canopy:** The Board recommended examining the potential to save some of the existing trees. Since the meeting, the applicant has explored the possibility of tree retention along Dewey and this study is summarized on pg 11. (CS1-D-1, CS2-B, CS2-D-2, DC3-C, DC4-D)

4. **Trash, Vehicular Access and Loading Location:** Related to the departure requests and developing a sensitive solution to the Dewey frontage, vehicular access alternates are shown on pg 41. Please note the traffic studies for this project have not yet been reviewed by SDCl. The review will occur after MUP submission, as always.
5. **Madison Streetscape and Gathering Space:** At the last meeting there was continued support for the addition of a community space along the street as well as the widening of the sidewalk along Madison to provide adequate space for streetscape interaction. (CS2-B-2, PL1, PL3-C, DC3). Both of these recommendations have been incorporated into the design as shown on pg 26. I've asked the applicant to specify the length of the 9' setback at the meeting.

To recap, your guidance provided during the last meeting was as follows:

1. **Response to EDG:** The Board recognized the applicant's effort to date and supported the changes including the additional setbacks provided. However, the Board agreed with the public's concern that the height, bulk and scale of the Dewey frontage was not yet resolved and that the massing needed to transition further to respond to the single family zone. The Board heard public comment regarding the Madison frontage and continued to support the frontage along Madison and noted that it appears to be an appropriate scale. The Board directed the applicant to return with a modified massing option based on the guidance provided for the Dewey frontage. (CS1-C, CS1-D, CS2-A, CS2-B, CS2-D, DC2-A, DC3-C-3)
2. **Dewey Frontage: Height, Bulk, Scale and Response to Context:** Echoing public comment, the Board was concerned with the extent of blank wall shown and the potential for light and glare impacts to surrounding residential properties. The Board agreed that the frontage and scale relationship at this location is critical to address before moving forward.
 - a. The Board discussed if the elevated parking provides the best frontage condition on Dewey and recommended studying the arrangement of uses and the location of parking to provide a residential transition to the single family zoning and better respond to the existing topography. (CS1-C, CS2-A, CS2-D, CS3-A-1, DC1, DC2-A-2)
 - b. Concerned with the visibility of the exposed wall and frontage, the Board agreed with public comment that additional massing transition, setback and landscape should be incorporated to develop a sensitive solution, which better relates to the surrounding residential context. (CS1-C, CS2-A, CS2-B, CS3-A-1, DC2-B, DC3-C-3)
 - c. Affirming the public comment regarding the pedestrian experience along Dewey, the Board was also 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)
3. **Setbacks, Site Features and Existing Tree Canopy:** 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)
4. **Trash, Vehicular Access and Loading Location:** 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)
5. **Madison Streetscape and Gathering Space:** The Board agreed with public sentiment and continued to support the addition of a community space along the street, beyond an enlarged entry sequence, and also encouraged studying the widening of the sidewalk along Madison to provide adequate space for pedestrian to engage and interact with the streetscape. (CS2-B-2, PL1, PL3-C, DC3)
6. **Materials:** The Board continued to strongly support the quality of materials presented. (CS3-A-1, DC2, DC4-A-1.)