



City of Seattle

Department of Construction and Inspections
Nathan Torgelson, Director

DESIGN
REVIEW

DATE: 10/5/2016
TO: Lucas Branham and Tony Fan
FROM: Magda Hogness
RE: Early Design Guidance 2 Meeting Packet (3020338)

This memo addresses my review of the submitted draft meeting packet for the second EDG. Please address the following comments and drop off 7 final packets by 5pm October 14th. 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

Response to EDG Guidance, pgs 3-18

- Include the full language from the report and provide an itemized response for each section:
 1. **Height, Bulk, Scale and Massing Options:** *The Board acknowledged the public's concern with the height, bulk and scale of the proposal and agreed that the massing needed to further transition along Dewey and the single family zone. The Board commended the applicant's effort to date and unanimously agreed the general massing and frontage along Madison is an appropriate scale. The Board discussed the strengths of the massing options and supported the courtyard community space shown in Option 2 and terraced massing shown in Option 3, but also agreed more effort is needed to respond to the site topography and context. The Board directed the applicant to return with a modified, hybrid massing option based on the guidance provided.*
 - a. *The Board unanimously agreed with public comment that additional setbacks should be provided to respond to the site topography and transition to the single family zoning. While refining the massing at this location the Board also recommended studying if there is potential to save some of the existing trees. (CS1-C, CS1-D, CS2-A, CS2-B, CS2-D, DC2-A, DC3-C-3)*
 - b. *In order to address concerns about how the building height is calculated, the Board requested more information and if possible, verification that the calculation is code compliant for the next meeting. (CS1-C-2, CS2-D, DC2-A-1)*
 - c. *The Board supported the inclusion of a community space along the street as shown in Option 2. The Board also discussed if a courtyard should be provided and ultimately agreed that a courtyard could be developed, but providing adequate community space for gathering is a higher priority and noted this activity could potentially occur as part of the interior program. The Board recommended developing the grocery retail frontage with adequate space for outdoor/indoor dining opportunities and pedestrian amenities to engage and interact with the streetscape. (CS3-A, CS2-B-2, PL1, PL3-C, DC3)*
 2. **Response to Context and Topography:** *Echoing the public comment regarding the frontage along Dewey, the Board was concerned with the extent of blank wall shown.*
 - a. *The Board questioned if two stories of elevated parking provides the best frontage along Dewey and the adjacent single family zone. The Board recommended studying different alternates address the residential context and respond to existing topography. (CS1-C, CS2-A, CS2-D-2, CS3-A-1, CS2-B-3, DC1, DC3-C-3)*
 - b. *The Board was also concerned with the visibility of concrete and gabion baskets and recommended developing a sensitive solution using high quality materials which better relate to the surrounding residential context. (CS2-A, CS2-B, CS3-A-1, CS2-B-3, DC2-B, DC3-C-3)*

- c. *The Board noted that the tallest massing volume appears to be at the northeast corner and agreed this area will be highly visible and the scale relationship is critical. (CS2-A, CS2-B, CS2-C1, CS2-D, DC2-A-2, DC2-B, DC2-D-1)*
- 3. Site Features and Existing Tree Canopy:** *Affirming the public comment, the Board requested more information about the status of the trees, including snags, and the urban forest corridor. The Board stated that although replacement trees will never be the same, generous planting could still be provided. Reviewing the proposed planting, the Board was concerned with the equally spaced columnar row of trees and recommended differing scales of trees. For the next meeting, the Board requested more details about the landscape plan, including information on efforts to incorporate the existing tree canopy. (CS1-B-3, CS1-D, CS2-B, CS2-D-2, DC3-C, DC4-D)*
- 4. Trash, Vehicular Access and Loading Location:** *The Board recognized the diverse public opinions regarding the parking, garage and loading access locations. The Board agreed that splitting up the loading and parking access appears logical but requested more information before indicating their preference. For the proposed trash and loading area along Madison, the Board implied that the designing pedestrian character of the street is critical to address the priority of the pedestrian realm. (CS2-B-2, PL1, DC1-B-1, DC1-C, DC4)*
- 5. Materials:** *The Board strongly supported the quality of materials presented at this early phase. (CS3-A-1, DC2, DC4-A-1.)*

Massing Options

- One option must be fully code compliant with respect to exceptional trees, access and street improvement exception and require no departures.
- The request for vehicular access from Madison, requires a departure per 23.47A.032.A.2.a. Document this request and tie rationale to specific guidelines which are better met.
- Related to the departure request, provide more information about how proposed loading/parking access and façade treatment responds to past DRB Guidance. *“The Board agreed that splitting up the loading and parking access appears logical but requested more information before indicating their preference. For the proposed trash and loading area along Madison, the Board implied that the designing pedestrian character of the street is critical to address the priority of the pedestrian realm. (CS2-B-2, PL1, DC1-B-1, DC1-C, DC4)”*
- Demonstrate how the design respects adjacent properties and the design and site planning and responds to past DRB Guidance. At the last meeting the DRB *“questioned if two stories of elevated parking provide the best frontage along Dewey and the adjacent single family zone. The Board recommended studying different alternates address the residential context and respond to existing topography.” (CS1-C, CS2-A, CS2-D-2, CS3-A-1, CS2-B-3, DC1, DC3-C-3).* A more in depth analysis of the frontages should be provided. Include additional site sections documenting the changing setback condition; a series of diagrams and/or sections would be helpful.
- *“The Board noted that the tallest massing volume appears to be at the northeast corner and agreed this area will be highly visible and the scale relationship is critical.” (CS2-A, CS2-B, CS2-C1, CS2-D, DC2-A-2, DC2-B, DC2-D-1)”* Provide more detail on the design intent of the northeast corner massing. Explain how the design addresses the corner scale relationship. Provide additional studies and alternates/design options for the corner.
- *“The Board was also concerned with the visibility of concrete and gabion baskets and recommended developing a sensitive solution using high quality materials which better relate to the surrounding residential context.” (CS2-A, CS2-B, CS3-A-1, CS2-B-3, DC2-B, DC3-C-3)* Provide more specific information/detailing about this element in the packet (height, materials, etc.) Further explain how the proposed design responds to Board guidance to *“better relate to the surrounding residential context.”*

- For all applicable renderings, increase transparency of trees. It's difficult to see the façade treatment beyond.

Site plan and Floor plans

- Identify species (common and scientific), size and location of all onsite trees and trees 6" or greater in diameter as measured 4.5' above the ground located with encroaching driplines (see Tip 242) It appears there are identified Exceptional Tree(s), refer to correction dated 9/30. At least one option must show retention of all Exceptional Tree(s) including the grove per Director's Rule 16-2008, and any related departures so that massing alternatives preserving the trees may be considered with the other massing options.
- Clarify/ indicate which trees are proposed to be removed on the site plan. As requested by the DRB, *"provide more details about the landscape plan, including information on efforts to incorporate the existing tree canopy."* (CS1-B-3, CS1-D, CS2-B, CS2-D-2, DC3-C, DC4-D)
- Provide dimensioned floor plans for all floors with setbacks clearly dimensioned.

Priority Design Guidelines

- Update the section on pg 34-36; provide a response for each of the priority guidelines identified by the Board with a narrative and concept diagrams and/or graphics.

Landscape Concept

- *"Reviewing the proposed planting, the Board was concerned with the equally spaced columnar row of trees and recommended differing scales of trees. For the next meeting, the Board requested more details about the landscape plan, including information on efforts to incorporate the existing tree canopy."* (CS1-B-3, CS1-D, CS2-B, CS2-D-2, DC3-C, DC4-D) Document the landscape design concept, add a brief narrative explaining the intention behind the proposed trees and planting selection.