



City of Seattle

Department of Construction and Inspections

Nathan Torgelson, Director

DESIGN
REVIEW

RECOMMENDATION OF THE EAST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Project Number: 3020338

Address: 2925 E Madison St

Applicant: Charles Strazzara of Studio Meng Strazzara

Date of Meeting: Wednesday, September 13, 2017

Board Members Present: Curtis Bigelow, Chair
Barbara Busetti
Kenny Pleasant
Andrew Haas

Board Members Absent: Melissa Alexander

SDCI Staff Present: Magda Hogness, Lisa Rutzick


SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: Neighborhood Commercial (NC2P-40 and NC2P-30)

Nearby Zones North: Single Family (SF 7200)
South: SF 5000
East: SF 5000
West: NC2P-40

Lot Area: 40,422 SF

Access: The subject property currently has vehicular access off E Madison S.



Environmentally Critical Areas: The site is a mapped Environmentally Critical Areas (ECA), due to steep slope and liquefaction prone soils.

Current Development:

The site is occupied by one story retail structure, known as the City People's Garden Store.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:

The project site is located in the Madison Valley neighborhood, characterized by its close proximity to Madison Park to the east and the Arboretum to the north. This neighborhood is predominately comprised of single family and multifamily residential housing types and commercial and retail uses along E Madison St, which the City has designated as an arterial.

The site has street frontage on E Madison St, Dewey Pl E and an unimproved portion of E Mercer St. Access for E Mercer St dead-ends Dewey Ave due to steep topography. A pedestrian hill climb is proposed at this location as part of this proposal.

Recent development includes sizeable residential and mixed-use buildings. To the northwest, across E Madison Ave, is a 3-story masonry building, the Madison Loft Condominium. Adjacent to the southwest is a 2-story wood frame structure, the Washington Park Art Studios. To the south and east of the site are single family structures as the zoning transitions to single family. This site has the potential to serve as a transition area from the multifamily and commercial uses along E Madison St to the single family zone south and east of the site.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant is proposing a 6-story building consisting of 82 residential units above 26,100 sf of retail space and includes parking for 140 vehicles. The existing structures are proposed to be demolished.

FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE July 13, 2016**PUBLIC COMMENT**

The following comments were offered at the meeting:

- Concerned with the height, bulk and scale of the proposal; the proposed development completely overwhelms the site and displays a lack of sensitivity to its potential neighborhood, and is inconsistent with Design Guidelines CS2.B1 and CS2.C2
- Noted that the site has two or more individual Exceptional Trees and an Exceptional Grove and that the proposed removal of these trees is inconsistent with Design Guideline CS1.D1. The proposal disregards direction to provide a fully code compliant option with respect to the steep slope, ECA and buffer, access and street improvement exception.
- The proposal utterly fails to respond appropriately to the context and site per Design Guidelines, CS1-C Appropriate Use of Natural Topography, CS1-D Incorporate onsite landscaping, and CS2-B Open Space to inform site design.
- Concerned with how height is being measured; approximately one third of the site is a 40 percent steep slope, with more than 30 feet elevation change from toe to top, yet the height diagram shows only a 2.5 ft differential step down between the flat area and the 30 ft drop in elevation.

- Noted that the graphic of the section cut is not representative of the true massing proposed; at the north end of the site, the building mass looms over the Dewey residences. A more than 60 ft vertical façade rises above Dewey. This is a 40' commercial zone, neighboring a single family zone and is inconsistent with Design Guidelines CS2.D11 and CS2.D4.
- Rather than respecting the topography, or using the site features to inform the design, this project eradicates the site topography, inconsistent with Design Guideline CS1.C2.
- Currently a natural buffer with a mature urban tree canopy sits between the NC2P-40 commercial zone and single-family homes. This project would remove that buffer, rather than providing a transition between more and less intense zones, as Design Guidelines CS2.D3 and CS2.D4 recommend.
- Lack of support for the 156 car, two story, 320 foot long parking garage exposed on Dewey. It will release fumes, noise, and light into neighboring homes. The proposed façade changes the character of Dewey and creates an unfriendly and unsafe- feeling pedestrian environment, inconsistent with guidelines Dc1.C1, DC1.C2, andDC4.C2.
- Lack of support for the garage entrance of Dewey Place, a non-conforming street because of its narrow width, which will draw a large influx of traffic and impact safety. The proposal includes 30 additional parking spaces above requirements and is inconsistent with design guidelines CS2.D5 and CS2.B2.
- Concerned with the removal of existing vegetation, which includes 39 mature trees, over 20 native plant species and over 14,600 sf of tree canopy. The urban tree canopy and green space on Dewey is contiguous with the Mercer Madison Wood, the Arboretum, and is part of a larger urban forest corridor. The Design Guidelines CS1.D2 encourage preserving or extending urban forest corridors.
- Lack of support for the south façade blank wall. The east side along Dewey continues the visual effect of a blank wall. All these walls are at street level, creating an unfriendly pedestrian environment, inconsistent with guideline DC2.B2.
- Concerned that the proposed retail floor is below street level, causing people to have to walk down ramps or steps. The grade separation is unnecessary and is poor design, inconsistent with guideline CS2.B2.
- Concerned that the proposal severely curtails privacy and outdoor activities on its south and east side, inconsistent with guideline CS2.D5.
- Supportive of the development; this project will bring a socially responsible grocery co-op and add many needed residential units to this fast growing city that is experiencing a housing supply crisis.
- Noted that the neighborhood doesn't currently have a central community space and views this project as a rare opportunity. Supported the courtyard space shown in Option 2.
- Impressed by the proposed street frontage along Madison.
- Supported the proposed materials.
- Would like to see more setback and terracing along the Dewey façade.
- Concerned with tree removal. The project will eliminate a mature and grove of urban trees that shelters, shades, and beautifies the adjoining neighborhood.

- Lack of support for back-lit signage or obtrusive lighting; prefer to see unlit stencils and awning signage.
- Concerned with the location of loading off Madison St; it is not in keeping with a pedestrian friendly environment. Would like to see more consideration given to the placement and design of the garage and loading area.
- Concerned with noise impacts, in particular from the HVAC units.
- Strongly supported a combined option of with the community space as shown in Option 2 and Option 3.
- Lack of support for the proposed hillclimb.
- Supported proposal Option 3, as it provides a good balance of attractive commercial property with minimal disruption to the neighborhood.
- Supported the scale of proposal; it is in scale with other development on Madison
- The Madison Greenways group has been in discussions with the City and SDOT to implement a greenway through the neighborhood, with the greenway crossing Madison St. at 29th Ave E. As a part of that effort, Madison Greenways, SDOT and Metro are in talks to move the existing eastbound bus stop along Madison east one block to the front of this building site. The design should plan for the repositioning of this bus stop.
- Would like to see significant sized trees on Dewey and on Madison and a variety of planting proposed.
- Concerned with traffic and parking entry impacts for pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Would like to see a smaller grocery, the green space and tree canopy preserved and the natural topography respected.
- Concerned with drainage impacts.
- Supported the project, but would like to see the south frontage refined.
- Supported a pedestrian connection from Madison to Dewey.

SDCI staff also summarized design related comments received prior to the EDG meeting:

- Lack of support for strong accent colors.
- Supported the proposed vehicular entrances; splitting the entries is seems to be a reasonable way to reduce congestion.
- Supported the proposed materials brick and natural wood to blend into the streetscape.
- Supported the Dewey frontage; the architect has done a good job of reducing the visual impact of the building as well as its effect on shading.
- Would like to see the building be more adventurous in terms of saving energy, by committing to meeting one of the green standards currently offered by the City of Seattle.
- Concerned with the shading of the p-patch garden; would like to see the developer and architect respond to the presence of and potential impacts on the Mad P-Patch.
- Lack of support for a commercial loading on a residential street. Would like to see most traffic and commerce on the main thoroughfare, Madison St.
- Would like to see increased setbacks along the parking structure and a substantial screen of tall trees to soften that view.

- The garage entrance on Dewey would be hazardous to pedestrians, as Dewey is a very narrow street with no planting strips, narrow sidewalks, and a single lane that hosts two-way traffic.
- Supported the preferred design Option 3; it is successful at minimizing shading to adjacent structures and using the natural topography to inform the design.
- Noted that building will serve as the east anchor of the Madison Valley commercial district and that many of the buildings in the area feature square-paned/divided windows. Would like to see that feature repeated here, particularly in the transoms above the large retail windows. The transom windows shown in the EDG renderings come close, but would like to see a more modern, rectangular panel.
- Would like to see more balance between this building's NE corner and the Madison Lofts building.
- Supported the retail space on the NE corner; as the first retail space, most westward-bound travelers will encounter in the retail core, and should be distinctive per Design Guideline CS2-C.
- Supported Option 2 as it is suited for greater community involvement and is better for more users of the site. The preferred design (Option 3) does include a generous setback for the retail entry (10'), but its width along the street front is limited compared to Option 2.
- Noted that Option 2 does have a greater impact on the residents in the valley below, and that must be addressed.
- Supported Option 3 as it transitions to the single family zones to the east and south.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the project number: <http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/>

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the following siting and design guidance.

- 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.)

SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE October 26, 2016

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following comments were offered at the meeting:

- Concerned with the height calculation methodology.
- Lack of support for the project; at the first EDG, the Board made a number of recommendations regarding the proposed building, none of which are adequately addressed.
- The proposal is inconsistent with guideline CS2.D1. A mature, urban canopy, continuous with the Arboretum, would be removed and replaced with small, dwarf ornamental trees which at maturity will not equal the present canopy.
- Medium and large trees and a diverse understory are not viable with 5', 10', or 15' setbacks. A green wall on the garage is a decoration distracting from the significant loss of urban ecological services.
- Preference for a 30' setback to accommodate large, native trees and plantings, a rich understory and diverse ecological habitat that would screen the neighborhood from the structure throughout the year.
- Lack of support for the 320' long eastern façade; it is a 74' wall, situated in a 40' zone, and abutting 25' homes. The Board expressed concerns about the northeast corner of the building at the first EDG, and it remains grossly out of scale with the context and insensitive to the topography; inconsistent with Guideline CS2.D3.
- The applicant's renderings are drawn with a profusion of trees which could never in reality grow as proposed.
- The retaining wall height is not clearly stated, but is evidently over 10' in places. The sidewalk has no planting strip and the design will create an unfriendly pedestrian experience, inconsistent with Guidelines PL2 and PL3.
- The eastern and southern facades, rather than being a "lush layered landscaping greenbelt," instead are blank walls and are inconsistent with guideline DC2.B2
- The two story above grade garage is inconsistent with guidelines DC1.C1, DC1.C2, and DC4.C2. Would like to see a significantly smaller garage, entirely below ground.
- There is no community space offered on Madison as was requested by the Board; inconsistent with guideline PL1.C2.
- Concerned with the errors and omissions in the applicant's traffic report.
- Would like to see a design option that reduces the size of the garage and lessens the traffic impact for the entire area.
- Concerned with signage and lighting impacts and potential noise from rooftop ac units.
- Would like to see low income housing proposed.
- Would like to see sustainable systems incorporated such as rain water collection, PV panels, insulated to "passive house" standards, street level covered bicycle parking, and no off-gassing materials.

- Would like to see a reduced building footprint.
- Support for the project, noted that additional height is being contemplated for the area related to HALA. Project will be a legacy to Madison park community.
- Would like to see onsite plants and habit incorporated.
- Concerned that the drawing provided by the developer is inaccurate in that it includes trees that do not exist in the neighboring yards and landscape at what appears to be full maturity.
- Concerned with the height bulk and scale of the massing facing the residential context. Would like to see the Board accept a better design, as opposed to the code compliant version which is inconsistent with CS2-A1, CS2, CS2.
- Support for project; the architect has worked very hard to listen to what the community wants and put forth a lot of effort. The proposal could become an asset.
- Lighting, night glare and light pollution will be a significant problem with the building perched atop the slope above single-family residences, and remains unaddressed in this design, DC4.C2.
- Concerned that the proposed development does not fit with the nature of the neighborhood. The context of the neighborhood is gardens and the proposed scale is incompatible.
- Concerned with the height, bulk and scale of the frontage along Dewey.
- Appreciated the added buffer and the pedestrian experience and attention that is being paid on Madison.
- Concerned with traffic and parking entry impacts.
- Support for the split parking garage entrance

SDCI staff summarized design related comments received prior to the EDG meeting:

- Concerned with storm water flooding impacts.
- Supported the northeast corner of the proposed building. The choice of natural materials for this portion of the façade integrates the building with the landscape plantings and urban forest to the east.
- Supported tree removal; any departures granted to preserve the trees and maintain the allowed FAR would significantly increase the building's scale, bulk and mass.
- Supported the greater variety of larger trees and overall lush landscaping which has improved the design.
- Supported the improvements the development will make to both the front and back of the building; the project will widen sidewalks and improve pedestrian safety by creating quality places for people to walk.
- Supported the outdoor seating at street level and the recessed alcove for market entry.
- Not convinced there is a need of a 50' curb cut on Madison, and would like to see a scaled drawing included as 50' seems excessive.
- Concerned with the Dewey side retaining wall as it will be taller than pedestrians, the green wall (if it is successful) may take a decade to fill in, and the setbacks are

inadequate to grow trees to their full size. The result is that the eastern façade, and the southern façade will remain blank walls DC2.B2.

- Increasing part of the setback on Dewey Place by 5 feet is not a suitable response to previous Board direction.
- The northeast corner of the building will tower over the context and create an oppressive and overwhelming pedestrian experience.
- The combination of the height, bulk and scale of this building with apartments staring down into the back yards of the neighboring single-family residences does not respect the privacy and outdoor activities of the neighbors; CS2.D5.
- The code-compliant option retaining some trees is presented with many negative attributes and without adequate justification for them.
- The proposed 4-6 ft max height stepped wall along Dewey will not make for a pleasant pedestrian experience, as the green space will be too separated from the sidewalk.
- Would like to see the Board insist that the building be reduced in size and height along Dewey.
- Concerned with accommodating bike passing along Madison Street.
- Would like to see public space incorporated outside, on top of the new building, potentially as part of PCC's eating area.
- Would like to see one of the future tenants be a nursery.
- Supported the much improved pedestrian experience along Madison. It will be great to have wider sidewalks and new landscaping.
- Concerned with the plan's ivy covered wall, as it is still a monotonous wall and requires high maintenance, DC2-B.
- Would like to see more space or setback at the ground level along Madison as it is a very narrow arterial street.
- Would like to see a little park or trail along Dewey that could lead up to the building, which may make for a better transition and also offer pedestrian access.
- Concerned with solar access. The design does not respect adjacent sites in that it towers over them, completely blocking all afternoon light from the entire neighborhood to the east. It will block the sun from much of the street for most of the year. CS1B, CS2-D.
- No alternative to an above ground parking garage on Dewey has been offered. Rather than moving the garage underground, it remains exposed to the public on the eastern side of the site.
- Would like to see a structure that had apartments facing south starting at the level of Dewey with parking underneath and behind these residences. And only two stories of residences above the PCC.
- Would like to see parking eliminated in excess of required capacity, and reduced parking requirements to half in recognition of emerging patterns of urban mobility.
- Lack of support for the departure; the PCC retail garage entrance on Madison, it is not consistent with "pedestrian friendly" zoning of the lot.

SDCI staff also summarized the following design related comments received prior to the Second EDG meeting in the memo to the Board:

- Would like to see nice-sized balconies; that would probably help the appearance.
- Supported the scale of proposal; it is in scale with other development on Madison, would like to see higher density of housing along arterials.
- Supported a version of the plan that allows for a larger open area facing Madison so that it is more street friendly and less of a canyon.
- Supported many street trees on all sides, as well as landscaping on the roof. Keeping streets green is very important in maintaining the character of the neighborhood, and this design achieves that goal.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the project number: <http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/>

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

- 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.)

THIRD EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE January 25, 2017

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Noted that progress has been made on the design of this project since the last design review meeting; the biggest improvement is residential screening of the above grade parking along Dewey.
- Concerned that the proposed height, bulk, and scale are not sufficiently mitigated to provide a reasonable transition to the residential block. The proposal does not respond to design guidelines addressing Context and Site, specifically CS1 Topography, CS2 Urban Pattern and Form, and CS3 Architectural Context and Character.
- The limited setback at the lowest level, is now less than shown in EDG2 and does not appear adequate to accommodate the growth and layering of mature trees and diverse plantings.
- Would like to see more housing, denser landscaping, less cars and a smaller garage. The lack of depth of the townhouse facades combined with the imposing upper level retail read as flat vertical plane towering more than 75 feet above the Dewey Place.
- Concerned that the proposed development does not fit in and alters key characteristics of the neighborhood – green space and trees creating a buffer and ecological connection to the Arboretum, walkable streets, open light and space, modest scaled buildings with similar height and bulk.
- Supported the addition of housing on the Dewey frontage. The addition fully conceals the garage and eliminates the possibility of car noise and fumes and parking garage light.
- The guidelines support the replacement of ecological services. Would like to see a more appropriate transition between the zones such as a 20-30 ft setback.

- The share of traffic exclusive residential access is minimal. The logic supporting split access implies that it would reduce congestion by spreading traffic over two driveways, but the reality is that only residential traffic, a modest amount, would be diverted from a Madison driveway.
- Preference for a single vehicular entrance on Madison. The garage entrance on Dewey will do little to help mitigate the traffic issues on Madison, but will dramatically alter the nature of Dewey and the surrounding streets.
- Noted that Dewey remains a narrow (18 feet wide), sub-standard two-way street.
- Would like to see the vehicular access departure approval conditioned to include an onsite turnaround to avoid truck backups on Madison.
- Noted that a nearby comparable size grocery store is not moving forward in the design review process as it is too large, would like to see the program of this project reduced before it is moved forward.
- Would like to see greater setbacks on the east facade of the building to mirror the steep slope that exists on the site today.
- The upper level setbacks are inadequate so that the net result is a large, looming building that towers over the narrow, largely pedestrian street of Dewey.
- Supported separating the commercial parking access from the residential parking access.
- Would like to see the building footprint reduced, which can be achieved by reconfiguring the parking and retail space.
- Support for design changes along Dewey Pl E. The proposed townhouses are a much better transition to the surrounding neighborhood and are more attractive.
- The Board asked for more information related to trees and the information provided is not sufficient; would like to see the mature urban tree canopy corridor maintained.
- This proposal eliminates significant trees and green landscape, and does not provide adequate replacement to ecologically sustain the environment.
- The planting area in front of the townhomes is minimal, and the setbacks are too small to grow full-sized trees to maturity and won't be adequate to recreate the urban green space that has provided ecological services to the area and served as a buffer.
- Lack of support for the townhouses, the usefulness of this setback to ecological function is eliminated by the townhomes tacked onto the building's backside.
- Concerned with traffic and parking entry impacts.
- At minimum, the developer should be required to contribute toward road and sidewalk improvements, as well as traffic calming measures, along the site's adjacent residential streets.
- Lack of support for the parking entrance on Dewey as it exposes 2 stories of parking garage to the residential zone.
- Supported the proposed 11-foot setback to accommodate townhomes and the lowered retaining wall to create people-scale views back and forth between the homes and passers-by.
- Concerned that the proposal will reduce the amount of green space in the neighborhood.
- Lack of support for the vehicular garage entry on Dewey. It is a narrow alley widely used as a walkway; having a garage will be devastating.

- Concerned with the blank wall appearance of the south side of the building.

SDCI staff also summarized design related comments received in writing prior to the meeting:

- Noted that some object to the removal of large trees on the existing property, but the hillside is in a liquefaction zone and has been poorly maintained.
- Preference for split vehicular access.
- Supported the garage access point on Madison which includes decorative screening, improving the appearance of the entryway.
- Would like to see a gathering space for the general community on Madison.
- Supported the enlarged the pedestrian and sidewalk spaces along Madison.
- Would like to see a diagram of the widened curb cut along Madison in full use. Concerned that two-way vehicle traffic combined with truck loading/unloading is going to create a dangerous pedestrian environment.
- Would like to see that vehicles will be able to enter and exit the commercial parking level concurrently to avoid a significant back up along Madison.
- Concerned with “screened retail access” indicated page 31. Renderings should be true to the predominant condition.
- Would like to see the façade above the townhomes at the PCC ground level be more uniform in color to contrast with the townhouses below.
- The color and material transitions should relate to massing changes; at the moment they don’t relate to form at all. It would be much nicer to carry the dark wood-like material shown on either end of the façade across the elevation to connect them, providing a uniform back drop to the townhouse façade.
- Supported how the wood terminates at the PCC window sills as indicated.
- Concerned with lighting glare impacts from the supermarket.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the project number: <http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/>

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. Response to EDG:** The Board acknowledged the public comments concerned with the height bulk and scale of the proposal, however, they concluded that the massing development is responsive to previous guidance and that the design, overall, is on the right track. The Board strongly supported the rearrangement of uses, specifically the addition of townhouse units along the Dewey frontage as the use better reflects the residential character of the neighborhood, provides an intentional transition to the surrounding single family zoning and better responds to the existing topography. The Board directed the applicant to proceed with the developed Massing Option 3. (CS1-C, CS2-A, CS2-D, CS3-A-1, DC1, DC2-A-2)
- 2. Dewey Frontage: Height, Bulk, Scale and Response to Context:** Although the Board supported the addition of townhouses along the Dewey frontage, the Board agreed with public comment that the townhouses appeared shallow and that the north and south portions of the façade have yet to be resolved. The Board gave the following guidance on the proposal’s edges and transitions:

- a. 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)
 - b. 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)
 - c. 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)
3. **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 facade 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)
4. **Vehicular Access:** 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)
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)
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)
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 facade

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.)

RECOMMENDATION September 13, 2017

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comments were offered at this meeting:

- Lack of support for the project, the proposal fails to respond appropriately to the context and site. (CS1-C CS2-B)
- Concerned that the project's height bulk and scale has not been reduced since EDG2. (CS2-B.1, CS2-C.2, CS2-D.1 and CS2-D.4)
- Concerned that the project would be devastating environmentally because it would be not keep environmental impacts to a minimum, keep the removal of trees and vegetation to a minimum, or keep grading activities and impervious surfaces to a minimum. (CS1-D1 and D2)
- Concerned that the project eradicates the site topography, rather than respecting the topography or using site features to inform the design. (CS1-C.2)
- Lack of support for the proposed landscaping; an entire greenbelt, that includes an Exceptional tree and Exceptional grove will be removed. Would like to see an adequate replacement including evergreen trees along with layering and an understory. (CS1.D1)
- Concerned with the Dewey vehicular entrance. Dewey is a narrow street that many people walk down the center of on their way to the p-patch or to Madison and the stairs up to the Arboretum.
- Felt that the proposal overpowers the site. Concerned that the project's height, bulk and scale are far too massive for this site and are larger than at EDG 1. (CS2-B.1, CS2-C.2, CS2-D.1 and CS2-D.4)
- Concerned with the NE corner as it is still flat, tall, and set back minimally. Would like to see additional setbacks incorporated to respond to site topography and transition to the single family zone.
- Concerned with the proposed tree removal within the greenbelt, which supports rare wildlife.
- Concerned that the proposal does not fit in with the scale of the neighborhood or provide an adequate response to the Seattle Design Guidelines.
- Concerned with the effect the newly constructed project will have on the community.
- Would like to see a transition from the old to the new incorporated.
- Concerned that the proposal has become a larger building with reduced setbacks.
- Concerned with the lack of transition where the site abuts single family homes. Noted that the project site is adjacent to less intensive zones on three sides, and it is inconsistent with all five of the design guidelines that address the height, bulk, and scale of zone transitions. (CS2.D.1-5)

- Concerned that the design of the building does not take in account the existing slope and would significantly decrease the daylight for the surrounding neighborhood.
- Stressed that the upper level setbacks are inadequate so the result is a large, looming building that towers over the narrow, largely pedestrian street of Dewey.
- Would like to see current building reduced, especially along the east facade.
- Concerned with the large windows of the retail space, which has privacy impacts for the surrounding single family houses.
- Lack of support for access off Dewey; would like to see the sidewalks remain safe.
- Lack of support for the project; it will completely enclose the surrounding single family area.
- Concerned with the removal of trees.
- The building height and the removal of the tree buffer zone are inconsistent with the requirement for a transition between more and less intense zones in Design Guidelines CS2-D.3 and CS2-D.4.
- Would like to see the existing trees incorporated into the design.
- Concerned with stormwater and that the proposal will significantly impact site drainage.
- Appreciated the work that the architect has done; this project should go forward.
- Would like to see the project incorporate more biking parking/facilities and the vehicular parking reduced.
- Support for the project; noted that the project site is on a major transportation route.
- Lack of support for the removal of the existing significant trees, as it is inconsistent with the Design Guidelines.
- Concerned that the site topography, building height and the removal of the tree buffer zone provides no transition to single-family homes. (CS2-D)
- Concerned with the traffic that will come with this project, adding to an already congested Madison St.

SDCI staff also summarized design related comments received in writing prior to the meeting:

- Concerned that the proposed building will shade the Mad-P community garden.
- Lack of support for the townhouse units and entrances on Dewey.
- Preference for a 25'-30' setback along Dewey.
- Concerned with the removal of trees and healthy urban forest habitat;
- Concerned that the proposal will significantly decrease the amount of permeable surface on the site and will maximize the hardscape surfaces.
- Would like to see the buffer between the proposed development and the single family homes increased to afford and increased area for trees.
- Concerned that the planting area in front of the townhomes is minimal and won't be adequate to recreate the urban green space that has provided ecological services to the area and served as a buffer. Exceptional trees are being removed, and the replacement plantings are not comparable.
- Would like to see the existing tree canopy retained or replaced 1 for 1 to provide adequate buffers.

- Supported the proposed landscape; the architect's landscape plan is generous, in contrast to other new developments of similar size.
- Noted that the builder should take serious precautions to prevent migratory birds from colliding with this building. Would like to see bird-friendly lighting and glass.
- Lack of support for vehicular access on Dewey; dual access solves the applicant's internal problem of how to have an oversized supermarket and 82 residences on the same site but does nothing to alleviate the problem on Madison and the surrounding streets.
- Concerned with a vehicular entrance on Dewey as it threatens pedestrians' safety and is inconsistent with guidelines CS2D5 and CS2B2.
- Supported the split vehicular entries, having residents enter and exit on Dewey this will ease congestion on Madison St during rush hour, which is a concern for those who use the Madison street arterial. Would like to see dumpsters located on the Dewey side of the parking garage.
- Would like to see the project consider widening Dewey.
- Supported vehicular access exclusively from Madison.
- Concerned with pedestrian safety and the garage entrance on Madison.
- Supported the pedestrian stair. Lighting on such a stair is important, and will be difficult to get right. Public safety must be balanced against the additional light shining into the neighborhood nearby.
- Lack of support for the staircase to Madison as it would disrupt the quiet, residential community.
- Lack of support for back-lit signage or obtrusive lighting; would like to see signage and lighting that is tasteful.
- Concerned with the potential for light pollution from ambient and security flood lights around the building and on the terraces, as well as the headlights from traffic entering and exiting the garage.
- Lack of support for bold accent colors on the exterior of the building.
- Support for the project and the changes that have been made.
- Concerned with the removal of tree and vegetation and the effect that has on site drainage and safety and quality of life of people who live and work in this neighborhood.
- Lack of support for the massing, lack of open space and lack of consideration of light and shadow effects.
- Would like to see the building shortened by one story to bring it more in line with every other building on Madison and dramatically reduce the visual and visceral impact on its southern neighbors.
- Preference for increasing the setback on Madison Street to promote a walking friendly atmosphere.
- Encouraged multiple business spaces.
- Preference for a proposal that incorporates City People's into its design.
- Supportive of the size of the project, which will house many people and improve walkability and livability of the region but would like to see vehicle parking reduced and bicycle parking increased.

- Reduction of parking can contribute to a reduction in the bulk and scale of the building as well as reduce the development's effect on mobility and safe pedestrian passage on East Madison Street and in the adjacent neighborhood.
- Concerned that where the site abuts single family homes, the setback has gone from 15 feet in EDG -2 to 10 feet in the current proposal. The row of trees and what appears to be a very tall fence it is not a very sensitive transition. (CS2-D3, CS2-D4, CS2-D5, PL3-B1)
- Concerned that the net gain in setbacks on Dewey are misleading. It is mentioned that they have increased the setback from 6,200 sf to 6,800 sf. That increased amount includes the townhouses which are part of the building. (CS2-D3, CS2-D4, CS2-D5, PL3-B1)
- Concerned that the proposed landscaping is lacking. The choice of trees on Dewey are slow growing and unless they are well maintained and pruned regularly, they are more bush-like and will only grow to about 15 feet. (CS1-D1, CS1-D2, CS2-B3, DC2-C3B, DC3-C3)
- Would like to see the neighborhood amenities of high value recognized and supported. These include the Dewey Basin walking route and the Mad P p-patch community garden.
- Concerned with pedestrian safety; It is potentially hazardous to have delivery trucks backing out onto a busy major traffic corridor.
- Concerned with the additional setbacks provided; at the last EDG meeting the Board asked for additional setbacks on Dewey. Eighteen inches was added above the commercial level, which is at approximately 30 feet high will be visually lost to anyone standing on Dewey.
- Concerned with the development of public space on Madison, which appears to be an extension of the supermarket. (CS2.B2)
- Concerned with who will be responsible for ensuring that the staircase/hill-climb assist remains properly lit and maintained.

One purpose of the design review process is for the Board and City to receive comments from the public that help to identify feedback and concerns about the site and design concept, identify applicable citywide and neighborhood design guidelines of highest priority to the site and explore conceptual design, siting alternatives and eventual architectural design. Concerns with building height calculations are addressed under the City's zoning code and are not part of this review.

All public comments submitted in writing for this project can be viewed using the following link and entering the project number: <http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/>

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the following recommendations.

- 1. Response to EDG, Dewey Frontage:** The Board acknowledged the public's concern with the height bulk and scale of the proposal and recognized the site and change of topography as

challenging. However, the Board concluded the applicant has done a thoughtful job of modifying the proposal to respond to the context and previous guidance. The Board supported the overall design advancement and recommended changes to the upper setbacks along the Dewey frontage to better differentiate the lower and upper massing.

- a. The Board noted that the setback had decreased with the addition of townhouse units along the Dewey frontage, as shown at the previous Early Design Guidance meeting. The Board continued to support the arrangement and massing of the townhouse units, as opposed to a visible parking garage and larger setback, since the design better reflects and responds the residential character of the neighborhood. (CS1-C, CS2-A, CS2-B, CS2-D, CS3-A-1, DC1, DC2-A-2)
- b. The Board strongly supported the development of the townhouse frontage, in particular the simplification of the townhouse massing and the use of masonry and quality materials. (DC2, DC4-A)
- c. Although the Board supported the refined townhouse frontage, the Board agreed that the upper level setback at the retail clearstory was not yet adequate and had too many surface treatments. In order to unify the two surface colors and setbacks into one, the Board recommended a condition to increase the setback at the retail clearstory and residential above by 2' to match the deepest retail clearstory setback and to limit the variation of color to massing shifts. (CS2-A, CS2-B, CS2-D, CS3-A-1, DC2-A-2)
- d. For the south frontage, the Board approved of the proposed design which included a landscape buffer and wooden fence. (CS2-B, DC2, DC4-A)
- e. Related to Madison, the Board agreed the proposal is appropriately scaled and supported the massing and use of quality materials. (CS2-B, CS2-D, DC2, DC4-A)

2. Trees and Replacement Canopy: The Board discussed the removal of trees and recognized the public's concern for the loss of the significant mature planting, however, the Board continued to support a replacement landscape buffer. For the buffer, the Board approved of the proposed design which showed evergreen trees and planting designed to provide year-round buffer. (CS1-D-1, CS2-B, DC3-C, DC4-D)

3. Madison Streetscape: The Board supported the developed streetscape design which included two retail spill-out spaces, additional seating and bike parking. In order to avoid conflicts with pedestrian circulation, the Board recommended a condition to relocate the bike parking between trees to another more suitable location along Madison that does not impede pedestrian circulation. The Board also encouraged additional bike parking be provided along Madison, but declined to recommend a condition for this item. (CS2-B-2, PL1, PL3-C, DC3).

4. Hillclimb and Northeast Corner: The Board supported the preliminary hill-climb design and the adjacent retail frontage including the retail storefront windows at the corner. Related to the storefront windows, the Board agreed the amount windows could be reduced facing Dewey but declined to recommend a condition for this item. The Board also noted the public comment related to privacy and upper windows. While the Board recognized impacts

such as reduced light, privacy and view are difficult, the Board agreed the design adequately responds to the context and declined to recommend a condition. (CS2-B, DC2, DC4-A, DC3).

- 5. Materials and Detailing:** The Board commended the proposed quality materials, in particular the masonry along the Madison and Dewey façades. The Board noted that the decision to use brick on the upper stories is not common in many current projects and agreed the proposed application, quality and detailing of materials strengthen the design. (DC2, DC4-A)
- 6. Vehicular Access and Related Departures:** The Board discussed the departure related to vehicular access and gave the following guidance:
 - a. The Board noted that SDOT and SDCI support the dual access proposal for both safety and traffic operation reasons and unanimously recommended approval of the departure for two points of access as it provides a better pedestrian experience and has the potential to reduce pedestrian circulation conflicts than the code compliant alternative with all vehicular access off Dewey or the other alternate showing all access from Madison St. (DC1-B-1, DC1-C).
 - b. The Board agreed with public comment that Dewey is a narrow street and would not have adequate room for trash staging. In order to develop a sensitive solution, the Board recommended a condition to ensure there is no trash pickup staging along Dewey. (DC1-B-1, DC1-C).
 - c. Related to the Madison curb cut departure, the Board discussed the two proposed doors and whether reducing the openings into one larger door would provide a better frontage. Ultimately, the Board agreed with the rationale that having two separate doors for loading and garage access allows the loading door to be closed when not in use. The Board unanimously recommended approval of the related departure, provided the width is decreased to the minimum necessary as the resulting design reduces the conflict with the curb and landscaping and the pedestrian safety is upheld with the tactile paving strips, mirror and sensory alert systems. (DC1-C)

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board's recommendation on the requested departure(s) will be based on the departure's potential to help the project better meet these design guidelines priorities and achieve a better overall project design than could be achieved without the departure(s).

At the time of the Recommendation Meeting the following departures were requested.

- 1. Vehicular Access (SMC 23.47A.032.A.21):** The Code requires vehicular access from Dewey Pl E. The applicant prefers two points of access from both E Madison St, a pedestrian street, and Dewey Pl E, but has also shown an option showing all access from Madison St.

The Board unanimously recommended approval of the departure for two points of access as it provides a better pedestrian experience and has the potential to reduce pedestrian

circulation conflicts than the code compliant alternative with all vehicular access off Dewey or the other alternate showing all access from Madison St. The Board agreed the resulting design better meets Design Guidelines DC1-B-1 Access Location and Design and DC1-C Parking and Service Uses.

- 2. Curb Cut Width (SMC 23.54.030F.2.b.2):** The Code allows a maximum 30' curb cut. The applicant proposes a 40' curb cut width off of E Madison St.

The Board unanimously recommended approval of the departure, provided the width is decreased to the minimum necessary. The resulting design likely reduces the conflict with the curb and landscaping and pedestrian safety is upheld with tactile paving strips, mirror and sensory alert systems. The Board agreed the design better meets Design Guideline DC1-C Parking and Service Uses, subject to the condition listed at the end of this report.

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The priority Citywide and Neighborhood guidelines identified as Priority Guidelines are summarized below, while all guidelines remain applicable. For the full text please visit the [Design Review website](#).

CONTEXT & SITE

CS1 Natural Systems and Site Features: Use natural systems/features of the site and its surroundings as a starting point for project design.

CS1-B Sunlight and Natural Ventilation

CS1-B-3. Managing Solar Gain: Manage direct sunlight falling on south and west facing facades through shading devices and existing or newly planted trees.

CS1-C Topography

CS1-C-1. Land Form: Use natural topography and desirable landforms to inform project design.

CS1-C-2. Elevation Changes: Use the existing site topography when locating structures and open spaces on the site.

CS1-D Plants and Habitat

CS1-D-1. On-Site Features: Incorporate on-site natural habitats and landscape elements into project design and connect those features to existing networks of open spaces and natural habitats wherever possible. Consider relocating significant trees and vegetation if retention is not feasible.

CS1-D-2. Off-Site Features: Provide opportunities through design to connect to off-site habitats such as riparian corridors or existing urban forest corridors. Promote continuous habitat, where possible, and increase interconnected corridors of urban forest and habitat where possible.

CS2 Urban Pattern and Form: Strengthen the most desirable forms, characteristics, and patterns of the streets, block faces, and open spaces in the surrounding area.

CS2-A Location in the City and Neighborhood

CS2-A-1. Sense of Place: Emphasize attributes that give a distinctive sense of place. Design the building and open spaces to enhance areas where a strong identity already exists, and create a sense of place where the physical context is less established.

CS2-A-2. Architectural Presence: Evaluate the degree of visibility or architectural presence that is appropriate or desired given the context, and design accordingly.

CS2-B Adjacent Sites, Streets, and Open Spaces

CS2-B-1. Site Characteristics: Allow characteristics of sites to inform the design, especially where the street grid and topography create unusually shaped lots that can add distinction to the building massing.

CS2-B-2. Connection to the Street: Identify opportunities for the project to make a strong connection to the street and public realm.

CS2-B-3. Character of Open Space: Contribute to the character and proportion of surrounding open spaces.

CS2-C Relationship to the Block

CS2-C-1. Corner Sites: Corner sites can serve as gateways or focal points; both require careful detailing at the first three floors due to their high visibility from two or more streets and long distances.

CS2-D Height, Bulk, and Scale

CS2-D-1. Existing Development and Zoning: Review the height, bulk, and scale of neighboring buildings as well as the scale of development anticipated by zoning for the area to determine an appropriate complement and/or transition.

CS2-D-2. Existing Site Features: Use changes in topography, site shape, and vegetation or structures to help make a successful fit with adjacent properties.

CS2-D-3. Zone Transitions: For projects located at the edge of different zones, provide an appropriate transition or complement to the adjacent zone(s). Projects should create a step in perceived height, bulk and scale between the anticipated development potential of the adjacent zone and the proposed development.

CS2-D-4. Massing Choices: Strive for a successful transition between zones where a project abuts a less intense zone.

CS2-D-5. Respect for Adjacent Sites: Respect adjacent properties with design and site planning to minimize disrupting the privacy of residents in adjacent buildings.

CS3 Architectural Context and Character: Contribute to the architectural character of the neighborhood.

CS3-A Emphasizing Positive Neighborhood Attributes

CS3-A-1. Fitting Old and New Together: Create compatibility between new projects, and existing architectural context, including historic and modern designs, through building articulation, scale and proportion, roof forms, detailing, fenestration, and/or the use of complementary materials.

PUBLIC LIFE

PL1 Connectivity: Complement and contribute to the network of open spaces around the site and the connections among them.

PL1-A Network of Open Spaces

PL1-A-1. Enhancing Open Space: Design the building and open spaces to positively contribute to a broader network of open spaces throughout the neighborhood.

PL1-A-2. Adding to Public Life: Seek opportunities to foster human interaction through an increase in the size and quality of project-related open space available for public life.

PL1-B Walkways and Connections

PL1-B-3. Pedestrian Amenities: Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian oriented open spaces to enliven the area and attract interest and interaction with the site and building should be considered.

PL1-C Outdoor Uses and Activities

PL1-C-1. Selecting Activity Areas: Concentrate activity areas in places with sunny exposure, views across spaces, and in direct line with pedestrian routes.

PL1-C-2. Informal Community Uses: In addition to places for walking and sitting, consider including space for informal community use such as performances, farmer’s markets, kiosks and community bulletin boards, cafes, or street vending.

PL1-C-3. Year-Round Activity: Where possible, include features in open spaces for activities beyond daylight hours and throughout the seasons of the year, especially in neighborhood centers where active open space will contribute vibrancy, economic health, and public safety.

PL3 Street-Level Interaction: Encourage human interaction and activity at the street-level with clear connections to building entries and edges.

PL3-C Retail Edges

PL3-C-1. Porous Edge: Engage passersby with opportunities to interact visually with the building interior using glazing and transparency. Create multiple entries where possible and make a physical and visual connection between people on the sidewalk and retail activities in the building.

PL3-C-3. Ancillary Activities: Allow space for activities such as sidewalk vending, seating, and restaurant dining to occur. Consider setting structures back from the street or incorporating space in the project design into which retail uses can extend.

PL4 Active Transportation: Incorporate design features that facilitate active forms of transportation such as walking, bicycling, and use of transit.

PL4-C Planning Ahead For Transit

PL4-C-1. Influence on Project Design: Identify how a transit stop (planned or built) adjacent to or near the site may influence project design, provide opportunities for placemaking.

DESIGN CONCEPT

DC1 Project Uses and Activities: Optimize the arrangement of uses and activities on site.

DC1-B Vehicular Access and Circulation

DC1-B-1. Access Location and Design: Choose locations for vehicular access, service uses, and delivery areas that minimize conflict between vehicles and non-motorists wherever possible. Emphasize use of the sidewalk for pedestrians, and create safe and attractive conditions for pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers.

DC1-C Parking and Service Uses

DC1-C-1. Below-Grade Parking: Locate parking below grade wherever possible. Where a surface parking lot is the only alternative, locate the parking in rear or side yards, or on lower or less visible portions of the site.

DC1-C-2. Visual Impacts: Reduce the visual impacts of parking lots, parking structures, entrances, and related signs and equipment as much as possible.

DC1-C-4. Service Uses: Locate and design service entries, loading docks, and trash receptacles away from pedestrian areas or to a less visible portion of the site to reduce possible impacts of these facilities on building aesthetics and pedestrian circulation.

DC2 Architectural Concept: Develop an architectural concept that will result in a unified and functional design that fits well on the site and within its surroundings.

DC2-A Massing

DC2-A-1. Site Characteristics and Uses: Arrange the mass of the building taking into consideration the characteristics of the site and the proposed uses of the building and its open space.

DC2-A-2. Reducing Perceived Mass: Use secondary architectural elements to reduce the perceived mass of larger projects.

DC2-B Architectural and Facade Composition

DC2-B-1. Façade Composition: Design all building facades—including alleys and visible roofs— considering the composition and architectural expression of the building as a whole. Ensure that all facades are attractive and well-proportioned.

DC2-B-2. Blank Walls: Avoid large blank walls along visible façades wherever possible. Where expanses of blank walls, retaining walls, or garage facades are unavoidable, include uses or design treatments at the street level that have human scale and are designed for pedestrians.

DC2-D Scale and Texture

DC2-D-1. Human Scale: Incorporate architectural features, elements, and details that are of human scale into the building facades, entries, retaining walls, courtyards, and exterior spaces in a manner that is consistent with the overall architectural concept

DC3 Open Space Concept: Integrate open space design with the building design so that they complement each other.

DC3-C Design

DC3-C-1. Reinforce Existing Open Space: Where a strong open space concept exists in the neighborhood, reinforce existing character and patterns of street tree planting, buffers or treatment of topographic changes. Where no strong patterns exist, initiate a strong open space concept that other projects can build upon in the future.

DC3-C-3. Support Natural Areas: Create an open space design that retains and enhances onsite natural areas and connects to natural areas that may exist off-site and may provide habitat for wildlife.

DC4 Exterior Elements and Finishes: Use appropriate and high quality elements and finishes for the building and its open spaces.

DC4-A Exterior Elements and Finishes

DC4-A-1. Exterior Finish Materials: Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.

DC4-C Lighting

DC4-C-1. Functions: Use lighting both to increase site safety in all locations used by pedestrians and to highlight architectural or landscape details and features such as entries, signs, canopies, plantings, and art.

DC4-C-2. Avoiding Glare: Design project lighting based upon the uses on and off site, taking care to provide illumination to serve building needs while avoiding off-site night glare and light pollution.

DC4-D Trees, Landscape, and Hardscape Materials

DC4-D-1. Choice of Plant Materials: Reinforce the overall architectural and open space design concepts through the selection of landscape materials.

DC4-D-4. Place Making: Create a landscape design that helps define spaces with significant elements such as trees.

RECOMMENDATIONS & BOARD DIRECTION

At the conclusion of the RECOMMENDATION meeting, the Board unanimously recommended approval of the project with conditions.

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated Wednesday, September 13, 2017, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the Wednesday, September 13, 2017 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the four Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design and departures with the following conditions:

1. Along the Dewey frontage, increase the setback at the retail clearstory and residential above by 2' to match the deepest retail clearstory setback; limit the variation of color to massing shifts. (CS2-A, CS2-B, CS2-D, CS3-A-1, DC2-A-2)
2. Relocate the bike parking between trees to another more suitable location on Madison that does not impede pedestrian circulation. (CS2-B-2, PL1, PL3-C, DC3)
3. Ensure there is no trash pickup staging area located along Dewey. (DC1-C)
4. Decrease the 40' curb cut width off of Madison to the minimum necessary. (DC1-C)

3020338 - EDG REPORT SENT 8/11/2016 KM NOTICE OF DESIGN REVIEW BOARD 2ND EDG MEETING SENT 10/6/16 DRM EDG2 REPORT SENT 12/23/16 EI NOTICE OF DESIGN REVIEW 3RD EDG MEETING SENT 1/5/17 DRM NOTICE OF 3RD EDG MEETING TO CHANGE MEETING LOCATION SENT 1/19/17 DRM EDG3 REPORT SENT 2/28/17 EI - *NOTICE OF APPLICATION & CHECKLIST **OTHERS NOTICE OF APPLICATION SENT 4/27/17 RGC NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING SENT 5/11/17 DRM **OTHERS NOTICE OF DR BOARD REC MEETING SENT 8/24/17 DRM REC REPORT SENT 10/30/17 EI

*PUBLIC REVIEW DOCUMENTS
QUICK INFORMATION CENTER
SEATTLE PUBLIC LIBRARY
LB-03-01

*KAREN WALTER
WATERSHEDS & LAND USE TEAM LEADER
MUCKLESHOOT INDIAN TRIBE FISHERIES
DIVISION
39015 172ND AVE SE
AUBURN WA 98092

*ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW SECTION
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY
PO BOX 47703
OLYMPIA WA 98504-7703
separegister@ecy.wa.gov

*SHIRLEE TAN, PHD
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DIVISION
PUBLIC HEALTH SEATTLE & KING COUNTY
401 5TH AVE
SEATTLE WA 98104
shirlee.tan@kingcounty.gov

a_profumo@hotmail.com
aaronsvetter@gmail.com
Agreene5088@msn.com
aimee73@gmail.com
alexfrom@gmail.com
smvanover@yahoo.com

andyengelsson@gmail.com
andymo99@gmail.com
anne@conklin.net
annie@mauad.com
annwyman@outlook.com
auatineats@icloud.com

brie@wordyfolks.com
bvoss2012@gmail.com
cafrick@yahoo.com
cahill@bnd-law.com
caldanz@gmail.com
carolp@speakeasy.net

daniel.stokes@gmail.com
danielspils@gmail.com
david.baum.seattle@gmail.com
david.raubvogel@aecom.com
davigoli@gmail.com
dawn.cleveland@gmail.com

dmp1406@gmail.com
doey@udon.org
dohern@gmail.com
dr@centraldistrict.net
drewgm@usa.net
dsigrist@sbcglobal.net

**Applicant, Owner, FRP:
cdavidson@studioms.com
hfbroe@hotmail.com

Undeliverable:
steves@velmeir.com

*DUWAMISH TRIBE
4705 W MARGINAL WY SW
SEATTLE WA 98106-1514

*GARY KRIEDT
KC METRO - REAL ESTATE/LAND
USE/ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
201 S JACKSON ST MS KSC-TR-0431
SEATTLE WA 98104-3856
Gary.Kriedt@kingcounty.gov

*MR. RAMIN PAZOOKI
WSDOT, NORTHWEST REGION
15700 DAYTON AVE N
SEATTLE WA 98133
Ramin.pazooki@wsdot.wa.gov

*ANNETTE PEARSON
SEATTLE CITY LIGHT
annette.pearson@seattle.gov

Alexisyounberg@gmail.com
alichelanczos@msn.com
amiller@careplanning.org
amongthetrees@gmail.com
amydavis@uw.edu
amydeshaw@gmail.com

austineats@yahoo.com
barbacovi@gmail.com
barbdunshee@gmail.com
barleyanddeb@yahoo.com
bbriardy@comcast.net
bdwgen@gmail.com

Cathy.Higgins@PACCAR.com
catlady1@wavecable.com
ccarrs52@gmail.com
cch@drizzle.com
celeste_berg@mac.com
cfrick3@comcast.net

dbrown2559@me.com
deannaboyle@hotmail.com
deannadixon@me.com
dearsg@gmail.com
debbytante@gmail.com
defdumbandblind@gmail.com

duanehl@gmail.com
dwymanproperties@qwestoffice.net
eaclark007@gmail.com
ec1f0402@opayq.com
edomino.ed@gmail.com
elaine.jennifer@gmail.com

BOARD:
Curtisbigelow@msn.com
B@allied8.com
kenny@globalinvestorsolutions.com
andrewdhaas@hotmail.com

*SUQUAMISH TRIBE
PO BOX 498
SUQUAMISH WA 98392

*PUGET SOUND CLEAN AIR AGENCY
1904 3RD AVE STE 105
SEATTLE WA 98101-3317
SEPA@psccleanair.org

*RAD CUNNINGHAM
DEPT OF HEALTH
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DIVISION
PO BOX 47820
OLYMPIA WA 98504-7822
rad.cunningham@doh.wa.gov
kelly.cooper@doh.wa.gov

amypoley@gmail.com
andrazito@yahoo.com
andreabkurs@gmail.com
andrew_taylor@mac.com
andrew_taylor@me.com
andrewkirsh@hotmail.com

beckjohnson@gmail.com
beth.clark@foster.com
bfstone@comcast.net
bijinesu1947@gmail.com
Blclark007@gmail.com
brianmichaelbailey@gmail.com

[chiggin\\$@paccar.com](mailto:chiggin$@paccar.com)
cjinunneley@yahoo.com
contact@bryankirschner.me
corrie.watterson@gmail.com
csato77@comcast.net
Cweed25711@aol.com

Delialacson@gmail.com
dianezerbe@icloud.com
Dianne.casper@hotmail.com
dleechin@comcast.net
sfwilson@gmail.com
justdana@gmail.com

elliedav1@comcast.net
ericasmil6945@att.net
erik.christensen@gmail.com
erikpoley@hotmail.com
erundell@gmail.com
evancott@yahoo.com

evayjensen@gmail.com
faulds@gmail.com
Floydngono@gmail.com
frutherford@comcast.net
gary@brown-shay.com
mark_kot@comcast.net

ideaidevi@gmail.com
info@jp-portfolio.com
intlekofert@lanepowell.com
jaime.pharr@yahoo.com
jaimepharr@gmail.com
janenic@earthlink.net

jit119@gmail.com
Jlschmidt_74@yahoo.com
jm@w74.org
john@sosnowy.com
johnhollett@outlook.com
johnsonsyliac@icloud.com

kathy.mar@gmail.com
kattoo@gmail.com
keenan.dru@me.com
kelsey.boys@gmail.com
kemurphy@microsoft.com
kirsten.verlander@gmail.com

laura.j.laun@comcast.net
lbranham@studiums.com
leedeboraht@aol.com
lenswork64@gmail.com
leskooy@gmail.com
lesleybh@me.com

LSHOFFER@gmail.com
lsolesnowy@gmail.com
mail.for.jen@gmail.com
mailforjen@gmail.com
margotcase@gmail.com
mariannalevant@hotmail.com

melissastoker1@gmail.com
michaelsitt@gmail.com
MIKECONN@exchange.microsoft.com
mikey.connachan@gmail.com
mmace4@gmail.com
mollieness@comcast.net

padriff@hotmail.com
pascalp@ix.netcom.com
patn68@gmail.com
patriciav@ori.org
paulnoski@yahoo.com
pcreagle@gmail.com

Rathornt@gmail.com
reimerica@gmail.com
Reitzm11@gmail.com
richdon32@gmail.com
RJNewbeck@comcast.net
rkwelch@hotmail.com

seattlesmog@comcast.net
sergei.shevyagin@gmail.com
serin@soundfamiliesolutions.com
shane.burnett@gmail.com
shanerepking@gmail.com
shlopey@gmail.com

gdfrick@uw.edu
gfp323@hotmail.com
hadleyj1725@gmail.com
hal_a_brown@yahoo.com
happily@seanet.com
mark@madisonskin.com

janettufts@gmail.com
jata.adam@gmail.com
jdchesko@yahoo.com
jeffwscott@icloud.com
jendaniels@gmail.com
Jennifer@revolutionpr.com

johnwaggoner@me.com
josephandrea@hotmail.com
jrotkis@gmail.com
jsfloor@gmail.com
julietaryn@gmail.com
juliuss@gmail.com

kjosowski@gmail.com
knutringen@msn.com
krautureau@yahoo.com
kruse.megan@gmail.com
ktkeller@earthlink.net
ktsouka@icloud.com

liams@uw.edu
Librariankemp@gmail.com
lindy@madisonvalley.org
lindy@studioprima.com
lippmank@comcast.net
lisapeiffer@gmail.com

mark@madisonskin.com
mark@skintour.com
mark_kot@comcast.net
mark_kot@mac.com
markmcp626@gmail.com
markmcdermott1@msn.com

mozcooper@hotmail.com
MSprug@MillerHull.com
mstoker462@aol.com
mw1484@gmail.com
nat@cafe flora.com
newman@bnd-law.com

pearsg@gmail.com
perezdesign91@gmail.com
peter@steinbrueckurbanstrategies.com
pjh20001@gmail.com
pkarovsky@gmail.com
pkarovsky@yahoo.com

rob@harrisonarchitects.com
robin@mayflyeng.com
romi2@comcast.net
ross@tilghmangroup.com
rover@kellerrohrback.com
rozziebarnett@comcast.net

snelson.karin@gmail.com
sngai3@yahoo.com
sololaw@msn.com
splandie@gmail.com
stephcross@live.com
tonyhackerphd@gmail.com

hargens@u.washington.edu
henrilechat1@gmail.com
hollispalmer@q.com
holly@marklyn.com
huffhaha@gmail.com
HuskiesFan@outlook.com

JeremyBlanchfield@gmail.com
jerryfulks@comcast.net
jerrysus24@gmail.com
jgat@yahoo.com
jim@divotworks.com
jimpacyga@yahoo.com

jwb305@gmail.com
karenbarrettdesign@gmail.com
karenemeritt@msn.com
Karias77@gmail.com
karin.brookes@gmail.com
tpantages@gmail.com

kyle@canlis.com
lanapierce376@gmail.com
larinlondon3010@gmail.com
larry@wilcynskipartners.com
larrypo@gmail.com
laura.ea.bernstein@gmail.com

lisastgeorge@msn.com
lizabike@yahoo.com
ljsalkin@gmail.com
louise@theqsba.org
lpharr@comcast.net
janenichols@me.com

mars@redecho.org
marsha@kilburnarchitects.com
matt@centraldistrict.net
matthewbrooks@hotmail.com
Melissa@melissachevalier.com
melissachevalier@mac.com

nls56@hotmail.com
noel_cross@hotmail.com
normanlundin@gmail.com
oliverhacker2@gmail.com
Omahonylila@gmail.com
johnwaggoner@me.com

Plantgrl5@gmail.com
polly.kenefick@gmail.com
ppbolton@gmail.com
private3020338@digitalaidhosting.com
py@pybateman.org
r_m_brown@hotmail.com

sabrinasscott@gmail.com
sandraberto@yahoo.com
saraburgess1@gmail.com
Sarabtbrethewey@gmail.com
satolily@gmail.com
savemadval@gmail.com

stephenmnash@yahoo.com
sthaves@aol.com
susieinseattle@gmail.com
suzld@comcast.net
suzpdx@hotmail.com
tayles@jps.net

tfan@studioms.com
Theresa_olson@msn.com
Thierry@thechefinthehat.com
tonyhackerphd@gmail.com
traciree@gmail.com
tracy@impwear.com

zitojosepha@gmail.com
julilea@icloud.com
richdon32@gmail.com
pamweeks@comcast.net
nnattallie@gmail.com
annette@annettekraus.com

daniel.stokes@gmail.com
kdttoo@gmail.com
mollieness@comcast.net
zahndsea@msn.com
scotgibson@gmail.com
kirsten.wiggers@gmail.com

jaime.pharr@yahoo.com
kyasi57@gmail.com
alexis.kane@gmail.com
andrewkirsh@hotmail.com
tonyhackerphd@gmail.com
liz.brandzel@gmail.com

klauman@comcast.net
mark@madisonskin.com
janenic@earthlink.net
polly.kenefick@gmail.com
barblmarshall@yahoo.com
ki@seattleu.edu

janettufts@gmail.com
lshoffer@msn.com
scotgibson@gmail.com
splandie@gmail.com
cpoole@speakeasy.net
daniel.stokes@gmail.com

melissastoker1@gmail.com
tonyhackerphd@gmail.com
savemadval@gmail.com
pascalp@ix.netcom.com
gcjnzn@gmail.com
mptimes@nwlink.com

edomino.ed@gmail.com
galenjefferson@earthlink.net
newman@bnd-law.com
shirlwil@aol.com
idocter@live.com
patn68@gmail.com

wallisbolz@gmail.com
tyrtel@gmail.com
mollieness@comcast.net
cpoole@speakeasy.net
shirlwil@aol.com
melissastoker1@gmail.com

catlady1@wavecable.com
jimpacyga@yahoo.com
andrew.sang32@gmail.com
gcjnzn@gmail.com
csato77@comcast.net
padriff@hotmail.com

underwoodshannon@hotmail.com
vborgonovi@yahoo.com
vera.giampietro@seattle.gov
veroniquep@earthlink.net
vonkorff.m@gmail.com
waggoner2000@comcast.net

dicklehman77@gmail.com
dylannelsonsmail@gmail.com
joannegraham@me.com
karenleelehman@gmail.com
levin.karovsky@me.com
lshoffer@msn.com

holly@marklyn.com
biztin@yahoo.com
jdchesko@yahoo.com
cfrick3@comcast.net
pwcsea@aol.com
brandithi@gmail.com

ananbrown2004@yahoo.com
sharon@msn.com
doey@udon.org
chloebrussard@hotmail.com
romi2@comcast.net
estherfields@q.com

justdana@gmail.com
deakden@uw.edu
smal.sadie@yahoo.com
jerrypt@aol.com
andrewkirsh@hotmail.com
melissastoker1@gmail.com

mail.for.jen@gmail.com
kdttoo@gmail.com
juliuss@gmail.com
dianezerbe@icloud.com
lambert@riseup.net
jerrysfulks@gmail.com

melissastoker1@gmail.com
jtbraun@theweirdhotel.net
andrewkirsh@hotmail.com
henrilechat1@gmail.com
mark_kot@comcast.net
krlehman@comcast.net

skagitrecording@yahoo.com
private3020338@digitalaidhosting.com
alexiskane@gmail.com
tpantages@gmail.com
savemadval@gmail.com
markmcdermott1@msn.com

alice@alicecunningham.com
austineats@yahoo.com
elliedav1@comcast.net
dianezerbe@icloud.com
andrew.sang32@gmail.com
janettufts@gmail.com

dwymanproperties@qwestoffice.net
mail.for.jen@gmail.com
IntlekoferT@LanePowell.com
cjunneley@yahoo.com
karenemerritt@msn.com
joaklief@j-arch.com

wallisbolz@gmail.com
whitnuld@gmail.com
williamsderek@gmail.com
yspellman@msn.com
yun.pitre@seattle.gov
zachlubarsky@outlook.com

njohnst@aol.com
mark_kot@comcast.net
elaine.jennifer@gmail.com
ishbel_dickens@hotmail.com
jeffandloiescharmerdocter@comcast.net
pascalp@ix.netcom.com

jscott@richmarklabel.com
josieroskin@gmail.com
janettufts@gmail.com
denisehemus@gmail.com
goverbye@comcast.net
polly.kenefick@gmail.com

MKelly@radiax.com
tpantages@gmail.com
MKelly@radiax.com
charm0790@gmail.com
tpantages@gmail.com
terryngenya@gmail.com

elliedav1@comcast.net
julilea@icloud.com
hathandy@gmail.com
saraburgess1@gmail.com
justdana@gmail.com
susieinseattle@gmail.com

jata.adam@gmail.com
sgoodwin34@gmail.com
bbriardy@comcast.net
richdon32@gmail.com
nnattallie@gmail.com
mollieness@comcast.net

alice@alicecunningham.com
marion.holder@gmail.com
janenichols@me.com
bmkaplan@qwestoffice.net
sarahbtretthewey@gmail.com
larry@powelson.com

larry@powelson.com
jaime.pharr@yahoo.com
Leslie@worktankseattle.com
wallisbolz@gmail.com
amydeshaw@gmail.com
IntlekoferT@LanePowell.com

sarahbtretthewey@gmail.com
david_raubvogel@comcast.net
pkarovsky@yahoo.com
liz.brandzel@gmail.com
charleereed@gmail.com
justdana@gmail.com

rajsreddie@yahoo.com
rahnds@comsn.com
Sandra.shanahan@hotmail.com
ympaschal@outlook.com
thernieford@icloud.com
myers.zachary@gmail.com

corrievaa@yahoo.com
jmgablon@comcast.net
jerryfulks@comcast.net

Asked to be removed:

patu@nwrain.com
abarker62@gmail.com
fredkassab@gmail.com

Returned e-mails:

jerryapt@aol.com
clancyvalneservices.com
cmerritt54@comcast.net
deoakden@uw.com
small.sadie@yahoo.com

Returned e-mails:

dick@richardcarllehman.com