



City of Seattle
Department of Construction and Inspections
Land Use Review

CHRIS DAVIDSON
 2001 Western Avenue, Ste 200
 Seattle, WA 98121

Re: Project# 3020338

Correction Notice #1

Review Type	LAND USE	Date	July 07, 2017
Project Address	2925 E Madison St	Contact Phone	(206) 587-3797
Contact Email	cdavidson@studioms.com	Contact Fax	(206) 587-0588
SDCI Reviewer	Magda Hogness	Address	Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections 700 5th Ave Suite 2000 PO Box 34019 Seattle, WA 98124-4019
Reviewer Phone	(206) 727-8736		
Reviewer Fax			
Reviewer Email	Magda.Hogness@seattle.gov		
Owner	LEAP ASSOCIATES		

Please contact me to schedule a meeting to review your responses to the Design Review issues raised in this correction notice.

A Design Review Recommendation meeting will be scheduled after this meeting once corrected plans are submitted and a draft Recommendation packet is emailed to me directly.

Alert me of the re-submittal and I will initiate scheduling the Recommendation meeting at the earliest available date (a minimum of six weeks). It is SDCI's expectation that you will continue to work with SDCI to further develop and refine the design in response to Board and staff reviews. If it is determined that the packet or design has not been responsive to guidance, it may result in postponement of the Recommendation meeting

Applicant Instructions

Please see the attached flyer to learn "[How to Respond to a SDCI Correction Notice](#)". If the 3-step process outlined in the aforementioned document is not followed, it is likely that there will be a delay in permit issuance and there is a potential for penalty fees.

Corrections

DESIGN REVIEW - After reviewing the plans and the design guidelines prioritized by the DR Board, the following items warrant further explanation to demonstrate responsiveness to Board guidance.

Please contact me to schedule a meeting to review your responses to the design review issues raised in this correction notice.

- 1 DEWEY FRONTAGE: HEIGHT, BULK, SCALE AND RESPONSE TO CONTEXT:** At the last meeting, the DRB supported the addition of townhouses along the Dewey frontage, and also agreed with public comment that the townhouses appeared shallow and that the north and south portions of the façade have yet to be resolved.

While the addition of another townhouse unit is a step in the right direction, the depth and detailing of these townhouse facades require further development to respond to guidance: *"For the townhouse frontage, the Board recommended exploring the height and depth of the modulation to read as a simplified and cohesive expression. In addition to refining the plane changes at the townhouses, the majority of the Board recommended further articulating the relationship between townhouse and retail above, potentially with additional upper level setbacks. (CS2-A, CS2-D, CS3-A-1, DC2-A-2)... The Board noted that the north and south ends of the frontage appeared very flat and requested continued massing development in order to develop a sensitive transition along the entire frontage. (CS2-A, CS2-D, CS3-A-1, DC2-A-2)"*

Provide detailed studies showing the exploration of depth, townhouse frontage height and simplification of plane changes, fenestration patterns, materials and textures to create a cohesive expression. A potential study may be to simplify/reorient the townhouse roof projections and increase upper level setbacks. Another potential study may to simplify the townhouse massing shifts and vary the height of townhouse to differentiate the massing shift from the retail above.

For the upper retail portion of the frontage, the changes of materials, application of color and fenestration patterns do not appear to have an entirely clear logic. This portion of the façade also relies on striated color changes to break up the massing . This approach was reviewed by the DRB and additional articulation as opposed to use of color, was recommended. Develop the relationship between townhouse and retail above with pedestrian perspectives and sections. A potential study may be to articulate upper level setbacks and bays with additional depth and material detailing. Refer to correction item 7.

- 2 NORTHEAST CORNER:** The DRB also noted *"that the tallest massing volume appears to be at the northeast corner and agreed this area will be highly visible."*

At this location, glazing quantity varies in the plan set perspectives and the elevations. Clarify intent and provide more information about the cladding treatment and transition to massing above. While further developing the Dewey frontage and pedestrian stairway through the Mercer ROW, study and resolve the design through pedestrian level perspectives. Demonstrate that the design will contribute to the streetscape and pedestrian experience and provide a well integrated transition. A potential study may be a connection from the townhouse units to the pedestrian stairway.

- 3 DEWEY FRONTAGE STREETScape DESIGN/LANDSCAPE:** The Board was *"supportive of the thoughtful approach to the streetscape treatment and agreed the various elements, including terraced retaining walls, railing design and layered planting, reflect a residential character. (CS2-B-2, CS3-A-1, PL1)"*

Document the streetscape and landscape design. On the landscape plan (sheet L1.01), provide more information (material, treatment, etc.) on the terraced retaining walls, gates, raised planters, etc and note the tw and bw heights. Include an enlarged plan and elevation of these elements.

- 4 SOUTH FRONTAGE:** *"Echoing public comment, the Board expressed concern about providing a sensitive transition to the adjacent residential properties to the south. The Board recommended further articulating the lower portion of the façade and adding clerestory windows to be cohesive with the rest of the architectural cladding concept. (CS1-C, CS2-D, CS3-A-1, DC2-A-2, DC2-B)"*

It's difficult to determine the success of the façade articulation and clerestory placement with 2-D elevations. Provide pedestrian level renderings/sketches with more detail. In order to transition to the residential frontage and be cohesive with the rest of the architectural cladding treatment, develop a change of depth where materials transition.

- 5 TREES AND CANOPY:** *"The Board acknowledged the public's concern for the loss of the significant mature planting, however, the Board deferred to the arborist study as reviewed and approved by the City and supported the arborist's findings recommending the removal of the canopy. Related to the replacement canopy, the Board stated their preference for the addition of evergreens, to provide year-round landscape buffer. (CS1-D-1, CS2-B, DC3-C, DC4-D)"*

The submitted arborist reports are being reviewed by Seth Amrhein, SDCI Arborist as noted below.

Explain how layered planting (including additional evergreens) has been incorporated into the design to provide a year round, landscape buffer. The DRB also acknowledged that the proposed planting will take years to mature. Given the amount of mature planting currently onsite, I strongly recommend specifying trees which are larger than the 2.5" caliper currently proposed.

- 6 MADISON STREETSCAPE AND GATHERING SPACE:** *"The Board discussed the character of the public community space along Madison. The Board approved of the widening of the sidewalk along the street as it creates more opportunity for interaction. For the additional outdoor space adjacent to the grocery entry, the Board recommended the development of a public space which is true to the nature of the space and agreed the space can either function as a gathering space or an active sidewalk. In either case, the Board encouraged incorporating additional seating, space for pause and sightlines for streetscape connection. (CS2-B-2, PL1, PL3-C, DC3)"*

Additional seating has been provided, but the development of a space for pause and sightlines for streetscape connection is not yet clearly developed. Document the intent for the outdoor space adjacent to the grocery entry and explain how it will promote pedestrian activity and contribute to the streetscape.

- 7 MATERIALS:** *"The Board continued to approve of the quality of materials presented, in particular along Madison. For the Dewey façade, the Board agreed with public comment that that colors are playing a larger role than needed in differentiating portions of the façade and recommended simplifying and resolving the material treatment into a cohesive language. The Board also encouraged the introduction of masonry along the Dewey façade to incorporate residential character and relate to the other main frontage. (CS3-A-1, DC2, DC4-A-1.)"*

Provide more information on the type of material proposed and material transitions. Articulate the relationship between the different materials and how the detailing strengthens the design concept.

For the elevations, include more detailed material descriptions and specify color using callouts or a material legend. Clarify the type of fiber cement panel proposed (thickness, integral color, etc.).

Related to the Dewey Frontage, the DRB recommended simplifying and resolving the material treatment into a cohesive language and encouraged masonry for the Dewey frontage as an opportunity to strengthen the architectural expression. Provide more specific information/intent in the draft packet on how the design responds to this guidance.

- 8 VEHICULAR ACCESS AND RELATED DEPARTURE:** *"The Board agreed with public comment that the code compliant alternative showing vehicular access solely off Dewey was the least preferred of the alternatives shown as it creates visual impacts and pedestrian circulation conflicts. The Board discussed the two other options, split access and all access off Madison. Ultimately the Board agreed that they would like additional information, graphics, and input from the technical experts*

including the City, before indicating their preference on vehicular access location and the related departures. (PL1, DC1-B-1, DC1-C) "

Related to this item it will be important to address all corrections items related to SDCI's Transportation Review by John Shaw, dated 06/26/2017.

In the draft packet, document the alternates preliminarily supported by the DRB in detail; two points of access from both E Madison St and Dewey Pl E, and the option showing all access from Madison St.

- 9** CURB CUT WIDTH DEPARTURE: As noted in the Zoning Correction by Art Pederson the Code would allow one 25' curb cut to become a 30' curb cut if car and truck access is combined; two 25' curb cuts would not be allowed.

Additional information and rationale is needed to justify the proposed 40' curb cut width off of E Madison St. Provide a diagram of the widened curb cut along Madison in full use and a code compliant alternate. Design this area to maintain the pedestrian character of the street and address safety.

- 10** STREET TREES: Coordinate with SDOT for approval of all planting in the ROW. Please confer with Ben Roberts, City Arborist and forward on correspondence.
- 11** SIGNAGE: Please add the following note to all elevations: "All signs require a separate review and permit per SMC 23.55. Design Review approval does not supersede the Sign Code or review."

DESIGN REVIEW RECOMMENDATION PACKET

- 12** The SDCI website includes a design recommendation packet checklist (<http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/permits/permittypes/designreviewfull/default.htm> - go to "Steps to get Your Permit/#4 Design Recommendation" sections and click on "Recommendation Packet Checklist") that explains in detail the items that should be included in the draft design packet. I generally utilize this checklist to verify completeness of the DR Recommendation packet.

Include specific information requested by the Board in the EDG report.

State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)

- 13** TREES AND ANIMALS: On the site plan (AS101) show the dripline of
- 1) all trees on the site,
 - 2) adjacent trees that encroach on the site that are greater than 6 inches in diameter as measured 4.5 ft above ground, and
 - 3) all trees located in the adjacent ROW.

Include common and scientific names for all trees shown with callout notes or a legend. For more information, see Director's Rule 16-2008, per this link, <http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/dirrulesviewer/Rule.aspx?id=16-2008> and Tip 242, per this link: <http://web1.seattle.gov/dpd/cams/CamDetail.aspx?cn=242>

The submitted reports are being reviewed by Seth Amrhein. Additional comments may be forthcoming.

- 14** APPENDIX A: The submitted Appendix A has been routed to DON for their review.



Step 1: Wait for all reviews to be completed

- You may check the status of any review at the following link: <http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/permitstatus>
- All reviews must be completed before the applicant can respond, upload, or submit any correction responses.
- **Electronic Plans:** We will send correction letters to the Seattle DCI Project Portal. We will notify the primary contact for the project when all reviews in the review cycle are complete.
- **Paper Plans:** We will notify the primary contact for the project by email or phone when all reviews in the review cycle are complete and plans are ready to be picked up. Once you have been notified, pick up the plans at Plans Routing in the Applicant Service Center.

Step 2: Make Corrections

Provide a written response for each item on all correction notices. We will not accept corrected plans without written responses. Include the following information for each item:

- Describe the change
- Say where the change can be found in the plan set
- If you have not made a requested change, give a code citation or provide calculations to explain why not
- Coordinate responses to correction items among all designers, architects, engineers, and owners
- If you make voluntary changes to your plans, describe the changes you have made in your response letter

Correct your Plans:

- Cloud or circle all changes
- You may add new sheets to the plan set if you have new information to show

For Electronic Plans:

- Always upload a complete plan set

For Paper Plans:

If you replace sheets in the paper plan sets:

- Remove the old sheets, mark them as "VOID," and include them loose at the back of each plan set
- All original sheets and plan pages must be returned to Plans Routing in the Applicant Service Center
- Insert the new sheets and staple the plan sets

If you make changes to the original paper plan sheets:

- Make all changes with ink (preferably red, waterproof ink). Do not use pencil to make changes
- Do not tape or staple anything to the plan sets

Platting Actions: Provide new copies of the survey when responding to a correction notice for a shortplat, lot boundary adjustment, or other platting action. Provide the same number of copies that were required when you submitted the project.

Step 3: Submit Corrected Plans

Electronic Plans:

Upload your corrected plan set and correction response letter through your Seattle DCI Project Portal.

Paper Plans:

Return your corrected plans and your correction response letter to Plans Routing in the Applicant Services Center.

If you don't follow these instructions:

- **Plans Routing may not accept your corrected plans**
- **We may be delayed in starting corrected plan review, which can delay permit issuance**
- **We may charge a penalty fee**