



City of Seattle

Department of Construction & Inspections
Nathan Torgelson, Director

DESIGN
REVIEW

FINAL RECOMMENDATION OF THE DOWNTOWN DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Project Number: 3019177

Address: 1201 2nd Avenue

Applicant: Christian Gunter of Skanska

Date of Meeting: Tuesday, April 05, 2016

Board Members Present: Anjali Grant, Acting Chair
Peter Krech (substitute)
Grace Leong
Gundula Proksch

Board Members Absent: Murphy McCullough (recused)
Alan McWain


SDCI Staff Present: Garry Papers, M.Arch, Senior Land Use Planner

SITE & VICINITY

Site Zone: East Parcel: DOC1 U/450/U
West Parcel: DMC 240/290-400

Nearby Zones: (North) East: DOC1 U/450/U
West: DMC 240/290-400
(South) East: DOC1 U/450/U
West: DMC 240/290-400
(East) DOC1 U/450/U
(West) DMC 240/290-400

Lot Area: East Parcel: 25,812 sq ft
West Parcel: 17,649 sq ft



Current Development:

East Parcel: Two existing mixed use buildings, 2 and 5 stories tall. The south Seneca building at 1201 2nd Avenue, was denied nomination by the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board on 9/05/2014 (letter LPB 517/14). The north Galland Building at 1211 2nd Avenue was denied nomination by the Seattle Landmarks Board on 9/19/2014 (letter LPB 550/14). West Parcel: Three narrow commercial buildings, two stories tall, and a vacant parcel at the southwest corner.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character:

The block is in the heart of the mixed use core of downtown Seattle, with a mix of cultural, office, hotel and residential uses nearby. The Seattle Art Museum and Benaroya concert Hall are to the north, and major office towers are to the east and south. The University station of the light rail line is immediately across the northeast intersection.

Access:

Pedestrian access is from the four surrounding street sidewalks. Vehicle access is via the existing north-south alley. (Note: the alley is not continuous to the south or north from this block)

Environmentally Critical Areas:

None

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project includes two sites straddling the alley between Seneca and University Streets, and includes the assumed vacation of $\frac{3}{4}$ of the southern length of that alley. The existing Diller Building at the northwest corner of the block is not included in the project, and its associated alley stub is not part of the vacation.

The proposed project is a stepped, 31 story tower of 671,000 sf of office and 18,500 sf of retail and mixed commercial at the ground and lower levels. Parking for 476 vehicles is below grade with parking and loading access off Seneca Street. A four story tall 'village undercroft' occupies the site below the office tower, occupied by lobbies, retail, building cores and publically accessible courtyards.

FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE February 17, 2015

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3019177) at this website: <http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/>

The packet is also available to view in the file, by contacting the Public Resource Center at SDCl:

Mailing Public Resource Center
Address: 700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000
P.O. Box 34019
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

PUBLIC COMMENT

Several members of the public were in attendance and offered the following comments:

- Concerned that the proposed lower levels do not reinforce a pedestrian scaled, finely grained form compatible with the immediate street wall context, particularly along 2nd Avenue.
- Concerned that the proposed tower lacks a distinct base scale, and that the tall exposed columns reinforce only a high rise scale to the street.
- Concerned about the experiential quality of the proposed roof terraces in the undercroft below the lifted tower, especially in terms of spatial tightness, sunlight penetration and wind impacts.
- Supported the innovative design concept and initial renderings presented.
- Supported the concept that exploits the vacation and creates mid-block public spaces with a diverse mix of uses, and also activating street edges.
- Supported the addition of more trees and more diverse and active evening uses for residents in this district.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

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

FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE February 17, 2015

1. BLOCK PARTI/CONCEPT & “LIFT”:

- a. The Board enthusiastically endorsed the design concept which “lifts” the tower up, creates a mixed-use and public undercroft, and exploits the spatial, circulation, use and view opportunities of the site’s steep slope. This support is qualified by the numerous studies and conditions described below, and the Board requests extensive large scale sections through the complex proposal, to ensure various concerns are addressed or mitigated. (A1, B3, D1)
- b. The Board supported the preferred ground level concept plan, and the diagonal circulations, interior courts and occupiable terraces are strongly supported in

principle as expansions of the typical sidewalk public realm. However, they must be well-activated and not supplant perimeter activation and scale. (C1, D3)

- c. The Board supported the level soffit under the tower, with the lower 'village' of commercial levels stepping down with the slope, as it opens the bay-facing west sides to more sunlight and views. This assumes the key structural columns are resolved, and the street wall definition and use concerns are balanced. The eventual correct height and scale of the soffit is dependent on a series of sectional, urban perspectives and micro-climate studies, to verify the experiential vitality and quality of this large, unusual space in the city. (B4, D1)
- d. The Board understood the intent to not fully enclose the undercroft or create a winter garden, but would like to review a micro-climate analysis of sun penetration and winds that will inform the detailed massing and design of the interior lower levels and public spaces, in particular the terraces above the commercial uses. To fulfill the urban consequences of the 'lifted tower' these places must be pleasant and dynamic extensions of the public realm, with useful circulation, interesting uses, and/or lush plantings and gardens. (C5, D2)

2. LOWER LEVEL MASSING & STREET PERIMETER:

- a. The Board supported the preferred massing scheme and its 2-4 story minimum street walls along 1st, University and Seneca Streets; large scale street elevations are needed to confirm the scale and how the permeable (doors) and activated edges negotiate the sloping sidewalks. (C2, C3)
- b. The Board agreed with the primary office lobby address on 2nd Avenue, with a tall, light filled lobby to mitigate the afternoon self-shadowing from the tower. The Board also endorsed the tall but modulated tower with deflected ends being strong on that street. (B4, C4)
- c. The Board strongly supported the tall, 2-story retail spaces shown on most of the perimeter, and particularly along the majority of 1st Avenue. The Board supported the voluntary sidewalk setback along most of 1st, but advised a transition back to the Diller street façade, rather than the abrupt exposure of the Diller sidewall. (B1, C1)
- d. The Board endorsed all the parking, loading and service access to occur mid-block on Seneca, and supported the stated intent to increase the depth of retail at the southwest corner, and to create retail frontage along all edges of the diagonal and central courtyard. (E1, E2, E3)
- e. The proposed pedestrian treatment of the alley stub behind the Diller building was endorsed by the Board, as well as the deflected edge of the proposal along University Street; that will wrap activating uses into the alley and provide a pedestrian link into the block center, should that alley be occupied by vehicles in a current or future Diller building scenario. (C6, D3)

- f. The Board advised the applicants to carefully assess and integrate the 2 ‘blank walls’ of the Diller building which will become highly visible to the undercroft of the proposal, and adjacent streets. (B2)

3. MID-BLOCK USES & ACTIVATION:

- a. The Board endorsed the concept of mixed uses, stepping forms, and strategically located ramps through the mid-block, but unanimously agreed the complexity of ramps and movement presented should be simplified and clarified, to ensure a legible public circulation system, with genuine destinations that draw users to terraces and viewpoints. A public ramp to valuable viewpoints/destinations is welcome, and the southeast corner terrace appears most promising as a major destination. (D1, D3)
- b. The Board agreed a few “discovery pathways” are acceptable (Pike Place Market was cited), but the predominant circulation and way-finding should be generous, legible and very well-lit. The perimeter uses of the central courtyard are essential to the concept, and should all be very activating to maximize user comfort and safety. The Board supported the cultural and office-loft diversity of uses stated. (D1, D5, D6)
- c. The Board agreed the primary at-grade diagonal desire line is from the southwest to the northeast, and supported a recess at the critical southwest street corner. (C1)
- d. The Board agreed the circulation diagonals are not equal in activity and possibly size, and they may not need to be symmetrical on the block; the southeast corner was suggested as a possible starting point for the primary ramp, and/or that diagonal pathway might be a glazed portal that orients and distinguishes that entry from the other corners. (C2, D3)
- e. The Board was enthusiastic about public uses of the roof terraces above the commercial ‘village’, including a mix of active destinations such as cafes, and more peaceful gardens. Both should include vegetation and low parapets that show users to the streets below, and possibly integrated windscreens/lighting elements. (D3)
- f. The Board agreed all the elevations of the 2 exposed cores will be essential to the character of the undercroft, and their materials, lighting and shadow impacts should be carefully studied as part of the other section and perspective studies. (B2)

4. TOWER EXPRESSION:

- a. The Board endorsed the two stepped and interlocked forms of the office program, and the proposed setback of the northwest mass from the Diller Building. At the next meeting, the applicants should provide alternatives for the materiality and composition of these two forms, and whether they are unified or distinct. (B4)

- b. The Board agreed the tall, visible structural columns are strategic components of the concept, and discussed them at length. They supported a strong tectonic expression, and were intrigued by the branching forms proposed. However, the Board was not certain the columns all had to be the same form, or if they all must be visible to grade. The Board agreed the logic of how such a large, lifted tower is grounded, is very important, and further studies are required, including how the bottom floor(s) of the tower transitions to the columns. (B2, B4)
- c. The Board endorsed the offset core along 2nd Avenue, and the expression and modulation of that core to the façade. The Board endorsed more study of the core's central zone facing 2nd Avenue (possible multi-story sky-gardens?), and the fenestration into service elements. (B4, C2)
- d. The Board endorsed tower facades that express the structural system (diagrid or other), and the notion of a rooftop transition that feathers to the sky, but they were not convinced about the southwest directionality of the trellis shown. (A2)
- e. The Board agreed the tower height and profile fits well into the larger downtown skyline, especially viewed from the west, where the tower joins a row of mid-height towers, rather than being taller (which zoning allows). (A2, B1)

SECOND EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE May 19, 2015

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3019177) at this website: <http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/>

The packet is also available to view in the file, by contacting the Public Resource Center at SDCI:

Mailing Public Resource Center
Address: 700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000
P.O. Box 34019
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

PUBLIC COMMENT

Several members of the public were in attendance and offered the following comments:

- Supported the pedestrian scale and porosity of the lower levels, and the open spaces available for pedestrians.
- Suggested transparent or translucent loading doors to the Seneca sidewalk.
- Supported the variety of architecture on the ground level perimeter.
- Advocated that high quality public art be integrated throughout the public areas of the proposal.
- Concerned the proposed tower not block light and air to the adjacent Diller Building.

- Supported the retail “village” as it will bring needed activities, services and amenities to residents in the area.

RECOMMENDATION April 5, 2016

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3019177) at this website: <http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/>

The packet is also available to view in the file, by contacting the Public Resource Center at SDCl:

Mailing Public Resource Center
Address: 700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000
P.O. Box 34019
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

PUBLIC COMMENT

During public comment, the following issues and concerns were raised:

- Supported the project, the amount of retail, the high degree of pedestrian interaction, and the open spaces available for pedestrians.
- Supported the project and stated (as the owners) they are exploring the possibility of new openings on the south and east sides of the adjacent Diller Building.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Downtown Design Review Board members (the Board) provided the following siting and design guidance [Downtown Guidelines referenced].

NOTE: The Board Recommendation comments in **bold text**, follow the individual EDG#2 topics below.

5) GROUND PLANE & LOWER LEVELS:

- A) The Board regretted the absence of complete and clear floor plans for the four key lower levels (1st Avenue +65; Alley level +78; 2nd Avenue +90; ‘roofscape’+115), but understood the spatial concept enough to endorse the basic simplification of pedestrian routes and the spatial zones intended. The Board endorsed the primary public overlook at the southwest corner, supported - but not privatized – by the adjacent ‘creative commons’.[B3; D1]

At the Recommendation meeting the Board supported the lower level floor plans and uses as shown on pg 36-40, and strongly supported the three wide, courtyard entrances at the south and northeast corners, and the retail 'catwalk balcony' overlooking the central courtyard (as shown on pg 38). The Board specifically supported the light, sculptural switchback stair at the southwest entrance (pg 27) and the wide steps at the northeast corner entrance (pg 30). [B3, D1]

- B) The Board agreed the public ramp to the overlook needs adjusting and widening to ensure it is welcoming to pedestrians at the corner, and that its directional sightlines (currently focused on a concrete core) are not pinched by the 'commons'. [D1]

At the Recommendation meeting the Board supported the revised stair, seating platform and ramp from the southeast corner, as shown on page 20/21. [D1]

- C) The Board agreed the ADA route from 1st Ave to the 'alley plaza' was not clear or intuitive, and the stated 'hillclimb assist' interior lobby/elevator should be more transparent and evident to all public users. Similar concern was expressed for the ADA and/or public route from the midblock on 2nd Ave to the 'alley plaza' level, which was not clear. [C1; D1]

At the Recommendation meeting the Board supported the ADA route and elevator off of 1st Avenue (pg 37), which serves all three public levels of the 'village', and the ADA elevator off of 2nd Avenue, which is located in the office tower lobby (in a visually hidden corner) (pg 39). All these routes will require strategic and legible signage. [C1]

- D) The Board supported the transparent corner retail and access stairs at the 1st Ave midblock, but not the height of the 'overlook dining', due to the shadows it casts on public steps, and the tall, unfriendly wall it presented to 1st Avenue. These stairs appear overly privatized, and the ephemeral perspectives shown were not clear or definitive enough to confirm this or other ground floor conditions. [C1; C3; D1]

At the Recommendation meeting the Board supported the retail wall and revised stair/water runnel at the mid-block on 1st Avenue (pg 29). [C1,C3]

- E) The Board supported the large central court, and the implied degree of perimeter activating uses. The Board was skeptical the loading dock –no matter how programmed - would provide consistent activation, but supported that wall being transparent or translucent. The landscaping strips appear random and clutter the plaza for flexible uses. The Board requested detailed lighting studies to ensure the 'village' is safely but not glaringly well lit. [D1; D2; D3]

At the Recommendation meeting the Board reiterated support for the activating uses around the central court (pg 38) including a modest translucent overhead door to the loading dock. The Board strongly supported the two full-height windows at the office elevator cores overlooking the central courtyard (pg 39). The Board agreed the

landscape design and materials were well resolved (pg 22), as was the village lighting plan (pg 76). [D1,D2,D3]

- F) The Board supported the diagonal stairs from the northeast corner, and the substantial bike parking presence at the bottom, off the alley stub. A bike tunnel on these stairs from the 2nd Ave cycle tracks was suggested. The Board supported the low, wide seating steps on the east side of the 'wedge' and encouraged they wrap onto the University frontage as well, to energize that important pedestrian corridor. [B1; C1; D1]

At the Recommendation meeting the Board supported the quantity and wide access for the bike parking under the northeast stairs (pg 38), and the revised design for the pavilion, landscaping and low wall on University, as shown on pg 18, 32 and 39. [B1, E2]

6) LOWER PERIMETER ELEVATIONS:

- A) The Board regretted the absence of complete and clear elevations for the essential lower levels, but understood them enough to provide some guidance. The primary concern was that the lower levels exhibited an entirely different architectural character at odds with the tower columns and facades above. The Board strongly endorsed the design development of the 'V' columns, but recommended substantially more integration of the architectural elements above and below the soffit. [B4; C2]

At the Recommendation meeting the Board supported the revised character of the lower levels, as shown on pg 32-34 (excepting pg 35 along 2nd Avenue; see comments under 6E below), and especially endorsed the animated roofs, wood soffits, and quality materials for the village forms on 1st, Seneca and University (pg 23,27, and 29). The Board agreed no other material should compete with the buff texture and color of the precast 'V' columns, which are the defining feature of the project. The Board strongly supported the terra cotta material for the lower levels, in the rich red color shown, or other colors that do not compete with the precast 'V' columns. [C2, C3]

- B) The Board endorsed the 2-story height and relatively transparent storefront character shown on 1st Ave, and the setbacks which allow the structural 'V' columns to be in the round. [C1; C3; C4]

At the Recommendation meeting the Board reiterated support for the height, layering and materiality of the retail walls along 1st Avenue, as shown on pg 27 and 29. The open guardrails on the terraces (pg 25) improve street activation and public access.[C1]

- C) The Board supported the stepped street wall along Seneca and the high transparency at the corners, but was less certain about the translucent portion suggested at the mid-block loading zone; detailed study of façade materials, canopies and lighting options is needed. [C1; C3]

At the Recommendation meeting the Board supported the basic materiality and transparent corners of Seneca Street (pg 34), but had substantial concerns about the

transparency, depth and pedestrian interest throughout the middle portion of this elevation. See comments under departures 6 and 10, and recommended condition #1. [C1, C3]

- D) The Board tentatively supported the short street wall 'folly' of the 'SAM wedge' on University, and its large activating retail windows onto the street and the alley. [C2; C3]

At the Recommendation meeting the Board endorsed the revised 'wedge' as a pavilion design, including the high transparency, two level access points, 4 ft high, sloping with grade wall along University, and the dynamic roof form (pg 18 and 23). The Board supported the dramatically cantilevered roof, but agreed the supporting column shown on pg 19 was too heavy and its shape competed with the more important 'V' columns nearby. See recommended condition #2 regarding this column. [C2, B4]

- E) The Board supported the double-height, highly transparent and skylit lobby along 2nd Ave, but agreed the merging of the 'V' columns into the core elements above needed better resolution. Possibly the vertical core elements should be brought to ground. The Board strongly supported the three tall, transparent retail corners that wrap into the inner 'village' from the 2nd Ave sidewalk, and the publically populated roof deck above the lobby/retail, but questioned how the public and disabled will intuitively access them. [B1; B4; C1]

At the Recommendation meeting the Board generally supported the plan and simplified tower columns and composition on 2nd Avenue (pg 30 and 35), but had the following concerns: a) the mid-block office lobby entrance appears bland, under-scaled and not identifiable within the retail village; b) the fenestration of the recessed service core in the tower appears fussy and foreign to the design; c) the open-air gap between the lobby and tower level 7 lacks purpose since it's no longer occupied; d) the single 'outrigger column' south of the lobby is odd and should be better integrated. See recommended condition #3. [B2, B4]

- F) The Board agreed the large tower soffit will be highly visible to the public on adjacent streets and function as a sky for the 'village' below, and agreed neither of the two design studies shown was compelling. The rectangle and infill was too banal, and the dia-grid was too alien to the design language; further studies are required, including generous but not glaring night lighting for all portions and places under the soffit. [B4; D5; D6]

At the Recommendation meeting the Board supported the soffit design shown on pg 52/53, including the strong perimeter band, the lighting, the materials and the composition, but the Board agreed the soffit should integrate a subtle element of brightness, such as reflective accent strips which would 'sparkle' when uplit. This would offset the relatively neutral colors of the very large and highly visible soffit surface. See recommended condition #4. [B4,D5,D6]

7) TOWER & ROOFTOPS:

- A) The Board supported the reduced tower height as a better fit into the downtown skyline, as trade-off for the enlarged office floor plates since EDG #1. The Board also supported the revised, symmetrical stairs and simpler modulation along the 2nd Ave elevation, and the more solid mass elements that anchor that façade to the street (also see comment 6E). [A2; B4]

At the Recommendation meeting the Board reiterated support for the overall tower form and the two, mass piers coming to grade on 2nd Avenue. The Board supported the tower materiality as shown on pg 56, including clear glass in the tower, and agreed the column covers of the tower could be a shaped metal panel that does not compete with the precast 'V' columns. [B4]

- B) The Board supported the double-height horizontal 'notch' on the south façade that interlocks the two towers, and the west-facing corner balcony/notches that modulate the tower every fifth floor. [B4]

At the Recommendation meeting the Board strongly supported the 2-story notch at the south and southeast corner of the tower, as it provides mid-scale relief and aligns with the level 19 amenity feature (pg 73). [B1,B4]

- C) The Board supported the structural system and trellis above the lower tower mass, but recommended it be raised to approximately align with the 'notch' along Seneca; this creates a stronger interlock and better proportions to the waterside elevation. [B2; B4]

At the Recommendation meeting the Board supported the detached amenity pavilion on level 19, and the landscape design for that large, shared terrace, as shown on pg 58. [B4, D1]

- D) The Board supported the structural system and symmetrical (except for the minor cut out) rooftop trellis, but agreed it appeared too short and compressed; the height should be raised approximately one more floor to mostly or fully conceal the equipment screen. [A2; B4]

At the Recommendation meeting the Board strongly supported the revised design for the tower rooftop, including the recessed glass line, and folded form of the roof, which relates to the level 19 pavilion and lower level village forms, providing a unifying device and a strong skyline identity. [A2, C2]

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The Downtown Guidelines identified by the Board as **Priority Guidelines** are summarized below, while all guidelines remain applicable. For the full text please visit the [Design Review website](#).

SITE PLANNING AND MASSING

A1 Respond to the Physical Environment: Develop an architectural concept and compose the building's massing in response to geographic conditions and patterns of urban form found nearby or beyond the immediate context of the building site.

A1.1. Response to Context: Each building site lies within a larger physical context having various and distinct features and characteristics to which the building design should respond. Develop an architectural concept and arrange the building mass in response to one or more of the following, if present:

- a. a change in street grid alignment that yields a site having nonstandard shape;
- b. a site having dramatic topography or contrasting edge conditions;
- c. patterns of urban form, such as nearby buildings that have employed distinctive and effective massing compositions;
- d. access to direct sunlight—seasonally or at particular times of day;
- e. views from the site of noteworthy structures or natural features, (i.e.: the Space Needle, Smith Tower, port facilities, Puget Sound, Mount Rainier, the Olympic Mountains);
- f. views of the site from other parts of the city or region; and
- g. proximity to a regional transportation corridor (the monorail, light rail, freight rail, major arterial, state highway, ferry routes, bicycle trail, etc.).

A1.2. Response to Planning Efforts: Some areas downtown are transitional environments, where existing development patterns are likely to change. In these areas, respond to the urban form goals of current planning efforts, being cognizant that new development will establish the context to which future development will respond.

A2 Enhance the Skyline: Design the upper portion of the building to promote visual interest and variety in the downtown skyline. Respect existing landmarks while responding to the skyline's present and planned profile.

A2.1. Desired Architectural Treatments: Use one or more of the following architectural treatments to accomplish this goal:

- a. sculpt or profile the facades;
- b. specify and compose a palette of materials with distinctive texture, pattern, or color;
- c. provide or enhance a specific architectural rooftop element.

A2.2. Rooftop Mechanical Equipment: In doing so, enclose and integrate any rooftop mechanical equipment into the design of the building as a whole.

ARCHITECTURAL EXPRESSION

B1 Respond to the neighborhood context: Develop an architectural concept and compose the major building elements to reinforce desirable urban features existing in the surrounding neighborhood.

B1.1. Adjacent Features and Networks: Each building site lies within an urban neighborhood context having distinct features and characteristics to which the building design should respond. Arrange the building mass in response to one or more of the following, if present:

- a. a surrounding district of distinct and noteworthy character;
- b. an adjacent landmark or noteworthy building;
- c. a major public amenity or institution nearby;
- d. neighboring buildings that have employed distinctive and effective massing compositions;
- e. elements of the pedestrian network nearby, (i.e.: green street, hillclimb, mid-block crossing, through-block passageway); and
- f. direct access to one or more components of the regional transportation system.

B1.2. Land Uses: Also, consider the design implications of the predominant land uses in the area surrounding the site.

B2 Create a Transition in Bulk and Scale: Compose the massing of the building to create a transition to the height, bulk, and scale of development in nearby less-intensive zones.

B2.1. Analyzing Height, Bulk, and Scale: Factors to consider in analyzing potential height, bulk, and scale impacts include:

- a. topographic relationships;
- b. distance from a less intensive zone edge;
- c. differences in development standards between abutting zones (allowable building height, width, lot coverage, etc.);
- d. effect of site size and shape;
- e. height, bulk, and scale relationships resulting from lot orientation (e.g., back lot line to back lot line vs back lot line to side lot line); and
- f. type and amount of separation between lots in the different zones (e.g. , separation by only a property line, by an alley or street, or by other physical features such as grade changes); g. street grid or platting orientations.

B2.2. Compatibility with Nearby Buildings: In some cases, careful siting and design treatment may be sufficient to achieve reasonable transition and mitigation of height, bulk, and scale impacts. Some techniques for achieving compatibility are as follows:

- h. use of architectural style, details (such as roof lines, beltcourses, cornices, or fenestration), color, or materials that derive from the less intensive zone.
- i. architectural massing of building components; and
- j. responding to topographic conditions in ways that minimize impacts on neighboring development, such as by stepping a project down the hillside.

B2.3. Reduction of Bulk: In some cases, reductions in the actual bulk and scale of the proposed structure may be necessary in order to mitigate adverse impacts and achieve an acceptable level of compatibility. Some techniques which can be used in these cases include:

- k. articulating the building's facades vertically or horizontally in intervals that reflect to existing structures or platting pattern;
- l. increasing building setbacks from the zone edge at ground level;
- m. reducing the bulk of the building's upper floors; and
- n. limiting the length of, or otherwise modifying, facades.

B3 Reinforce the Positive Urban Form & Architectural Attributes of the Immediate Area.: Consider the predominant attributes of the immediate neighborhood and reinforce desirable siting patterns, massing arrangements, and streetscape characteristics of nearby development.

B3.1. Building Orientation: In general, orient the building entries and open space toward street intersections and toward street fronts with the highest pedestrian activity. Locate parking and vehicle access away from entries, open space, and street intersections considerations.

B3.2. Features to Complement: Reinforce the desirable patterns of massing and facade composition found in the surrounding area. Pay particular attention to designated landmarks and other noteworthy buildings. Consider complementing the existing:

- a. massing and setbacks,
- b. scale and proportions,
- c. expressed structural bays and modulations,
- d. fenestration patterns and detailing,
- e. exterior finish materials and detailing,
- f. architectural styles, and
- g. roof forms.

B3.3. Pedestrian Amenities at the Ground Level: Consider setting the building back slightly to create space adjacent to the sidewalk conducive to pedestrian-oriented activities such as vending, sitting, or dining. Reinforce the desirable streetscape elements found on adjacent blocks. Consider complementing existing:

- h. public art installations,
- i. street furniture and signage systems,
- j. lighting and landscaping, and
- k. overhead weather protection.

B4 Design a Well-Proportioned & Unified Building: Compose the massing and organize the interior and exterior spaces to create a well-proportioned building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept. Design the architectural elements and finish details to create a unified building, so that all components appear integral to the whole.

B4.1. Massing: When composing the massing, consider how the following can contribute to create a building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept:

- a. setbacks, projections, and open space;
- b. relative sizes and shapes of distinct building volumes; and
- c. roof heights and forms.

B4.2. Coherent Interior/Exterior Design: When organizing the interior and exterior spaces and developing the architectural elements, consider how the following can contribute to create a building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept:

- d. facade modulation and articulation;
- e. windows and fenestration patterns;
- f. corner features;
- g. streetscape and open space fixtures;
- h. building and garage entries; and

i. building base and top.

B4.3. Architectural Details: When designing the architectural details, consider how the following can contribute to create a building that exhibits a coherent architectural concept:

- j. exterior finish materials;
- k. architectural lighting and signage;
- l. grilles, railings, and downspouts;
- m. window and entry trim and moldings;
- n. shadow patterns; and
- o. exterior lighting.

THE STREETScape

C1 Promote Pedestrian Interaction: Spaces for street level uses should be designed to engage pedestrians with the activities occurring within them. Sidewalk-related spaces should appear safe, welcoming, and open to the general public.

C1.1. Street Level Uses: Provide spaces for street level uses that:

- a. reinforce existing retail concentrations;
- b. vary in size, width, and depth;
- c. enhance main pedestrian links between areas; and
- d. establish new pedestrian activity where appropriate to meet area objectives. Design for uses that are accessible to the general public, open during established shopping hours, generate walk-in pedestrian clientele, and contribute to a high level of pedestrian activity.

C1.2. Retail Orientation: Where appropriate, consider configuring retail space to attract tenants with products or services that will “spill-out” onto the sidewalk (up to six feet where sidewalk is sufficiently wide).

C1.3. Street-Level Articulation for Pedestrian Activity: Consider setting portions of the building back slightly to create spaces conducive to pedestrian-oriented activities such as vending, resting, sitting, or dining. Further articulate the street level facade to provide an engaging pedestrian experience via:

- e. open facades (i.e., arcades and shop fronts);
- f. multiple building entries;
- g. windows that encourage pedestrians to look into the building interior;
- h. merchandising display windows;
- i. street front open space that features art work, street furniture, and landscaping;
- j. exterior finish materials having texture, pattern, lending themselves to high quality detailing.

C2 Design Facades of Many Scales: Design architectural features, fenestration patterns, and material compositions that refer to the scale of human activities contained within. Building facades should be composed of elements scaled to promote pedestrian comfort, safety, and orientation.

C2.1. Modulation of Facades: Consider modulating the building facades and reinforcing this modulation with the composition of:

- a. the fenestration pattern;
- b. exterior finish materials;
- c. other architectural elements;
- d. light fixtures and landscaping elements; and
- e. the roofline.

C3 Provide Active — Not Blank — Facades: Buildings should not have large blank walls facing the street, especially near sidewalks.

C3.1. Desirable Facade Elements: Facades which for unavoidable programmatic reasons may have few entries or windows should receive special design treatment to increase pedestrian safety, comfort, and interest. Enliven these facades by providing:

- a. small retail spaces (as small as 50 square feet) for food bars, newstands, and other specialized retail tenants;
- b. visibility into building interiors;
- c. limited lengths of blank walls;
- d. a landscaped or raised bed planted with vegetation that will grow up a vertical trellis or frame installed to obscure or screen the wall's blank surface;
- e. high quality public art in the form of a mosaic, mural, decorative masonry pattern, sculpture, relief, etc., installed over a substantial portion of the blank wall surface;
- f. small setbacks, indentations, or other architectural means of breaking up the wall surface;
- g. different textures, colors, or materials that break up the wall's surface.
- h. special lighting, a canopy, awning, horizontal trellis, or other pedestrian-oriented feature to reduce the expanse of the blank surface and add visual interest;
- i. seating ledges or perches (especially on sunny facades and near bus stops);
- j. merchandising display windows or regularly changing public information display cases.

C5 Encourage Overhead Weather Protection: Project applicants are encouraged to provide continuous, well-lit, overhead weather protection to improve pedestrian comfort and safety along major pedestrian routes.

C5.1. Overhead Weather Protection Design Elements: Overhead weather protection should be designed with consideration given to:

- a. the overall architectural concept of the building
- b. uses occurring within the building (such as entries and retail spaces) or in the adjacent streetscape environment (such as bus stops and intersections);
- c. minimizing gaps in coverage;
- d. a drainage strategy that keeps rain water off the street-level facade and sidewalk;
- e. continuity with weather protection provided on nearby buildings;
- f. relationship to architectural features and elements on adjacent development, especially if abutting a building of historic or noteworthy character;
- g. the scale of the space defined by the height and depth of the weather protection;

- h. use of translucent or transparent covering material to maintain a pleasant sidewalk environment with plenty of natural light; and
- i. when opaque material is used, the illumination of light-colored undersides to increase security after dark.

C6 Develop the Alley Façade: To increase pedestrian safety, comfort, and interest, develop portions of the alley facade in response to the unique conditions of the site or project.

C6.1. Alley Activation: Consider enlivening and enhancing the alley entrance by:

- a. extending retail space fenestration into the alley one bay;
- b. providing a niche for recycling and waste receptacles to be shared with nearby, older buildings lacking such facilities; and
- c. adding effective lighting to enhance visibility and safety.

C6.2. Alley Parking Access: Enhance the facades and surfaces in and adjacent to the alley to create parking access that is visible, safe, and welcoming for drivers and pedestrians. Consider

- d. locating the alley parking garage entry and/ or exit near the entrance to the alley;
- e. installing highly visible signage indicating parking rates and availability on the building facade adjacent to the alley; and
- f. chamfering the building corners to enhance pedestrian visibility and safety where alley is regularly used by vehicles accessing parking and loading.

PUBLIC AMENITIES

D1 Provide Inviting & Usable Open Space: Design public open spaces to promote a visually pleasing, safe, and active environment for workers, residents, and visitors. Views and solar access from the principal area of the open space should be especially emphasized.

D1.1. Pedestrian Enhancements: Where a commercial or mixed-use building is set back from the sidewalk, pedestrian enhancements should be considered in the resulting street frontage. Downtown the primary function of any open space between commercial buildings and the sidewalk is to provide access into the building and opportunities for outdoor activities such as vending, resting, sitting, or dining.

- a. All open space elements should enhance a pedestrian oriented, urban environment that has the appearance of stability, quality, and safety.
- b. Preferable open space locations are to the south and west of tower development, or where the siting of the open space would improve solar access to the sidewalk.
- c. Orient public open space to receive the maximum direct sunlight possible, using trees, overhangs, and umbrellas to provide shade in the warmest months. Design such spaces to take advantage of views and solar access when available from the site.
- d. The design of planters, landscaping, walls, and other street elements should allow visibility into and out of the open space.

D1.2. Open Space Features: Open spaces can feature art work, street furniture, and landscaping that invite customers or enhance the building's setting. Examples of desirable features to include are:

- a. visual and pedestrian access (including barrier-free access) into the site from the public sidewalk;
- b. walking surfaces of attractive pavers;
- c. pedestrian-scaled site lighting;
- d. retail spaces designed for uses that will comfortably “spill out” and enliven the open space;
- e. areas for vendors in commercial areas;
- f. landscaping that enhances the space and architecture;
- g. pedestrian-scaled signage that identifies uses and shops; and
- h. site furniture, art work, or amenities such as fountains, seating, and kiosks. residential open space

D1.3. Residential Open Space: Residential buildings should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive, well-integrated open space. In addition, the following should be considered:

- i. courtyards that organize architectural elements while providing a common garden;
- j. entry enhancements such as landscaping along a common pathway;
- k. decks, balconies and upper level terraces;
- l. play areas for children;
- m. individual gardens; and
- n. location of outdoor spaces to take advantage of sunlight.

D2 Enhance the Building with Landscaping: Enhance the building and site with generous landscaping— which includes special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, and site furniture, as well as living plant material.

D2.1. Landscape Enhancements: Landscape enhancement of the site may include some of the approaches or features listed below:

- a. emphasize entries with special planting in conjunction with decorative paving and/or lighting;
- b. include a special feature such as a courtyard, fountain, or pool;
- c. incorporate a planter guard or low planter wall as part of the architecture;
- d. distinctively landscape open areas created by building modulation;
- e. soften the building by screening blank walls, terracing retaining walls, etc;
- f. increase privacy and security through screening and/or shading;
- g. provide a framework such as a trellis or arbor for plants to grow on;
- h. incorporate upper story planter boxes or roof planters;
- i. provide identity and reinforce a desired feeling of intimacy and quiet;
- j. provide brackets for hanging planters;
- k. consider how the space will be viewed from the upper floors of nearby buildings as well as from the sidewalk; and
- l. if on a designated Green Street, coordinate improvements with the local Green Street plan.

D2.2. Consider Nearby Landscaping: Reinforce the desirable pattern of landscaping found on adjacent block faces.

- m. plant street trees that match the existing planting pattern or species;
- n. use similar landscape materials; and
- o. extend a low wall, use paving similar to that found nearby, or employ similar stairway construction methods.

D3 Provide Elements That Define the Place: Provide special elements on the facades, within public open spaces, or on the sidewalk to create a distinct, attractive, and memorable “sense of place” associated with the building.

D3.1. Public Space Features and Amenities: Incorporate one or more of the following a appropriate:

- a. public art;
- b. street furniture, such as seating, newspaper boxes, and information kiosks;
- c. distinctive landscaping, such as specimen trees and water features;
- d. retail kiosks;
- e. public restroom facilities with directional signs in a location easily accessible to all; and
- f. public seating areas in the form of ledges, broad stairs, planters and the like, especially near public open spaces, bus stops, vending areas, on sunny facades, and other places where people are likely to want to pause or wait.

D3.2. Intersection Focus: Enliven intersections by treating the corner of the building or sidewalk with public art and other elements that promote interaction (entry, tree, seating, etc.) and reinforce the distinctive character of the surrounding area.

D5 Provide Adequate Lighting: To promote a sense of security for people downtown during nighttime hours, provide appropriate levels of lighting on the building facade, on the underside of overhead weather protection, on and around street furniture, in merchandising display windows, in landscaped areas, and on signage.

D5.1. Lighting Strategies: Consider employing one or more of the following lighting strategies as appropriate.

- a. Illuminate distinctive features of the building, including entries, signage, canopies, and areas of architectural detail and interest.
- b. Install lighting in display windows that spills onto and illuminates the sidewalk.
- c. Orient outside lighting to minimize glare within the public right-of-way.

D6 Design for Personal Safety & Security: Design the building and site to promote the feeling of personal safety and security in the immediate area.

D6.1. Safety in Design Features: To help promote safety for the residents, workers, shoppers, and visitors who enter the area:

- a. provide adequate lighting;
- b. retain clear lines of sight into and out of entries and open spaces;
- c. use semi-transparent security screening, rather than opaque walls, where appropriate;
- d. avoid blank and windowless walls that attract graffiti and that do not permit residents or workers to observe the street;

- e. use landscaping that maintains visibility, such as short shrubs and/or trees pruned so that all branches are above head height;
- f. use ornamental grille as fencing or over ground-floor windows in some locations;
- g. avoid architectural features that provide hiding places for criminal activity;
- h. design parking areas to allow natural surveillance by maintaining clear lines of sight for those who park there, for pedestrians passing by, and for occupants of nearby buildings;
- i. install clear directional signage;
- j. encourage “eyes on the street” through the placement of windows, balconies, and street-level uses; and
- k. ensure natural surveillance of children’s play areas.

VEHICULAR ACCESS AND PARKING

E1 Minimize Curb Cut Impacts: Minimize adverse impacts of curb cuts on the safety and comfort of pedestrians.

E1.1. Vehicle Access Considerations: Where street access is deemed appropriate, one or more of the following design approaches should be considered for the safety and comfort of pedestrians.

- a. minimize the number of curb cuts and locate them away from street intersections;
- b. minimize the width of the curb cut, driveway, and garage opening;
- c. provide specialty paving where the driveway crosses the sidewalk;
- d. share the driveway with an adjacent property owner;
- e. locate the driveway to be visually less dominant;
- f. enhance the garage opening with specialty lighting, artwork, or materials having distinctive texture, pattern, or color
- g. provide sufficient queueing space on site.

E1.2. Vehicle Access Location: Where possible, consider locating the driveway and garage entrance to take advantage of topography in a manner that does not reduce pedestrian safety nor place the pedestrian entrance in a subordinate role.

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). The Board’s final recommendation will be reserved until the final Board meeting. [Design Guidelines citation]

At the time of the Final Recommendation meeting, the following departures were requested:

1. **Open Space Standards (SMC 23.49.016.C):** The Code requires all private open space that is fulfilling the Open Space requirement to be open to the sky and consistent with the Downtown Amenity Standards (found under 23.49.013.B.4). The applicant proposed

13,420 sq ft of Open Space which makes the total area exactly compliant, but 27% of that area is under a roof or building overhang at the level 19 roof terrace; the Amenity Standards allow for up to 20% of the area to be covered.

The Board supported the additional area and overhang design on level 19, as it provides sheltered and well-designed open space and adds needed architectural scale elements. [C2; C5; D1]

The Board unanimously recommended that Seattle DCI grant this departure.

2. Overhead Weather Protection (SMC 23.49.018): The Code requires continuous weather protection along all street frontages, 8ft minimum width, at a height 10 – 15 ft above the adjacent sidewalk. The applicants proposed code compliant canopies except at the following locations: a) a 5 ft wide canopy along University Street, because of street tree clearances; b) a 5 ft wide portion of canopy mid-block on Seneca Street, because of street tree clearances; c) 3 portions of canopy along Seneca Street that are above or below the 10-15 ft range; d) a 5ft wide canopy at the south portion along 2nd Avenue, to ‘match’ the 5 ft section wrapping the corner; e) 4 short gaps in the canopy along 2nd Avenue, to express the two ‘tower pilasters’ reaching grade, and the two glass corners (see pg 84).

The Board supported various aspects of the requests as follows: a), b) and d), the Board agreed all canopies should be typically and consistently 8ft wide minimum, except where SDOT tree-specific clearance requirements prevail; c) the west and middle portions are supportable, but the east portion is too close to the sidewalk, and so the corner canopy should wrap further west along the Seneca frontage, within the 10-15 ft zone; e) the two gaps at the primary ‘pilasters’ are supportable (pending resolution of all aspects described under condition #2), but the canopies should extend along the full extent of the glass corners, especially since one is a retail entrance. The Board supported the additional canopies proposed on pg 84 and others, even where strictly not required. [C5]

The Board unanimously did not recommend most aspects of this departure, as described above. The aspects needing code-compliant design are covered by conditions on the last pages of this report.

3. Minimum Façade Height (SMC 23.49.056.A): The Code requires minimum façade heights as follows: 1st Avenue, 2nd Avenue and University St are 35 ft; Seneca, east and west 35ft from corners are 35ft height; Seneca, west mid-block 15 ft; and Seneca, east mid-block are 25 ft. The applicant proposes a largely compliant façade on 1st, but various portions of the other three streets have large openings and façade elements from 20-35 ft height (see diagrams on pg 86/87; the blue areas are the non-compliant portions).

The Board supported the variations in street wall scale and generous openings into the public courtyard, and considering the tower mass above, agreed the street corners and walls - especially along Seneca and 1st Avenue - were well defined. [B3; C2]

The Board unanimously recommended that Seattle DCI grant this departure.

- 4. Facade Setback Limits (SMC 23.49.056.B.1):** The Code requires a property line facade at or within 2 ft of 1st Avenue for facades 15-35 ft height, with very prescriptive exceptions; one is that any facade greater than 2 ft setback shall be a maximum of 40% of the area between 15-35 ft height. The applicant proposes structural columns and a tower facade (starting at about 70 ft high) at the property line, but proposes an arcade behind those columns with a 2-3 story retail facade at 15 ft setback depth. That setback facade is 81% of the area between 15 and 35 ft height.

The Board supported the arcade setback dimensions and the 81% of facade enclosure, as it creates a tall, activated street wall and extra pedestrian space along a busy sidewalk. [B3; C1; C2]

The Board unanimously recommended that Seattle DCI grant this departure.

- 5. General Setback Limits (SMC 23.49.056.B.2.d):** The Code requires a consistent streetwall along 2nd, Seneca and University streets, with maximum 10 ft deep corner recesses of 20 ft x 20ft. The applicant proposes a 4 ft deeper recess at the southwest corner, for an area of 36 sq ft; and 3 setback areas along 2nd Avenue: 4 ft for door recesses and 4 ft at the central office lobby portion.

The Board supported the deep corner entrance/recesses that qualify as exterior public open spaces, and as such they are exempt from the setback requirements. The Board supported the remaining small portions that exceed the setback limits, as they provide scale and pedestrian interest at the primary office entrance. [C1; C4]

The Board unanimously recommended that Seattle DCI grant this departure.

- 6. Blank Façade (SMC 23.49.056.D.2.a):** The Code requires any blank facade segments (anything other than garage doors or transparency) shall be a maximum 30 ft wide, between 2-8 ft high, on Seneca Street. The applicant proposes two segments on Seneca that exceed 30 ft; one is 84 ft and made up of louvers and solid cladding, and another is 35 ft and made up of solid cladding concealing a parking level.

The Board did not support such long blank segments, and in two locations on one frontage. The Board recommended redesign of the louvered section to incorporate artful design elements and pedestrian visual interest for all of the louvered portions (the three “#6 terra cotta” portions can remain), and redesign of the midblock “#5

metal panel” portion to incorporate a deeper recess, contrasting materials and/or translucency, and a bench for a pedestrian resting point on the 12% slope.

The Board acknowledged the quality and variety of materials proposed on this street level façade, but recommended more depth and expression of the frame and infill on the entire Seneca frontage (not only the two garage door recesses); per the plans on pg 100, this appears possible, including at the two locations cited above. [C3]

The Board unanimously recommended against this departure as presented, and recommended design revisions provided in the conditions, to address the issues relevant to this departure request.

7. **Façade Modulation (SMC 23.49.058.C.3):** The Code requires façades above 85 ft high to have maximum lengths as follows, unless they are set back 15 ft or greater from the property line, or are separated by inset modulations that are 15 ft minimum deep x 60 ft minimum length: 86-160 ft = 155 ft long; 161-240 ft = 125 ft long; 241-500 ft = 100 ft long; 501+ ft = 80 ft long. The applicant proposes the 180 ft façade along 2nd avenue (at the property line) to have a central recessed modulation that is 15 ft deep and 54 ft long, leaving the two flanking facades to be less than the Code stipulated maximum lengths (78 ft and 48 ft).

The Board supported the 6ft reduction in the minimum length of the recess, since the different character and materials of the recess ensure the desired modulation will be legible. Also see comments under 6E. [B4, C2]

The Board unanimously recommended that Seattle DCI grant this departure.

8. **Upper Level Width Limit (SMC 23.49.058.D.1):** The Code requires a maximum tower width of 145 ft parallel with the avenues, above 240 ft height. The applicant proposes a consistent tower width of 180 ft along 2nd Avenue, with no stepping at 240 ft.

The Board supported the consistent tower form as it preserves the required view corridor setbacks on both east-west streets, and creates a coherent and unified building form. [B4]

The Board unanimously recommended that Seattle DCI grant this departure.

9. **Parking at Street Level (SMC 23.49.019.B.1):** The Code requires other uses separating the street façade and any parking or loading located at street level on the Class 2 Pedestrian Street of Seneca. The separating use shall equal 30% of the subject length and it shall be transparent, and the non-separating use shall be screened from street views and the street façade shall be enhanced by architectural detailing, artwork, landscaping,

or similar visual interest features. The applicants propose two 2ft wide portions of 'parking use' flanking the parking garage door which have no separating use or artwork; and there is a loading use which is partly screened with a clear and transparent glass infill, and a separating mechanical room, but that is 23% of the subject frontage, is not transparent, and has no artwork.

The Board supported the two flanking 'parking use' portions of the parking door, and the glass infill for the loading use façade, and agreed the mechanical room door and 7% reduction in use frontage are acceptable, provided the revisions under departures #6 and #10 are fully implemented. [C1; C3]

The Board unanimously recommended that Seattle DCI grant this departure.

10. **Facade Transparency (SMC 23.49.056.C):** The Code requires a minimum of 25% transparency in the street level, street-facing façade of the Pedestrian Class 2, sloping over 7.5%, Seneca Street, between 4-8 ft above the sidewalk grade. The applicants propose true transparency windows that equal 12%, and translucent windows in the parking and loading doors that equals 25%, for a combined transparent/translucent effect of 37%.

The Board agreed the translucent percentage was comparatively too high and recommended at least 13% of those doors change to clear glass in the specified vertical locations, ideally in the 4-6 ft high eye-level zone, to meet the 25% total. [C3]

The Board unanimously recommended against this departure as presented, and recommended design revisions provided in the conditions, to address the issues relevant to this departure request.

BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation summarized above was based on the #3019177 design review booklet dated Tuesday, April 05, 2016, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the Tuesday, April 05, 2016 Design Recommendation meeting. Unless a condition below, the design should not change from what the Board reviewed, especially aspects noted in the narrative above, which the applicant should carefully read through to fully understand the context for the conditions.

After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, three of the four Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design and departures with the following conditions [Design Guidelines referenced]: These conditions should be resolved with Seattle DCI staff prior to MUP issuance.

- 1) **Seneca Street:** The Board recommended the following revisions to the Seneca Street elevation, to address the issues related to the requested departures 6 and 10, and improve overall street façade design: a) redesign the louvered section to incorporate artful design elements and/or glass for pedestrian visual interest at all of the louvered portions (the three “#6 terra cotta” portions can remain); b) redesign of the midblock “#5 metal panel” portion to incorporate a deeper recess, and a bench or leaning rail for a pedestrian resting point on the 12% slope; c) revise at least 13% of the translucent parking and loading doors to clear glass in the specified vertical locations, ideally in the 4-6 ft high eye-level zone, to meet the 25% Code total; d) retain the quality and variety of materials proposed on this street level façade, but add 6-8” of depth to express the frame and infill on the entire Seneca frontage (not only the two garage door recesses); per the plans on pg 100, this appears possible. [C1, C3, E3]
- 2) **University Street Pavilion Roof:** The Board recommended the roof of the pavilion remain dramatically cantilevered to the north (to provide street definition), but the support column shown on pg 19 (if needed) should be reduced in size, and have a simpler shape and color that does not compete with the precast ‘V’ columns nearby. [B4]
- 3) **2nd Avenue Façade Revisions:** The Board recommended redesign of the 2nd Avenue elevations as follows: a) increase the height and scale of the lobby, and provide an identifier for the office entrance that is scaled to the tower in the streetscape; possibly a special canopy or other projecting element; b) retain the two precast or metal panel piers that anchor the tower to the street, but redesign the tower wall in the recess to be consistent with the materials and character of the rest of the tower (and not be idiosyncratic of the service core behind). This also applies to the small vertical bands north and south of the piers; c) shift or re-design the monitor skylights over the lobby to integrate with the larger scale lobby and/or projection noted under a; d) integrate the single column south of the lobby (pg 21) by wrapping it in glass similar and symmetrical to the north stair, or another technique. [B1, B4,C2,C4]
- 4) **Soffit Refinement:** The Board recommended adding a subtle element into the extent of the tower soffit, to ensure a measure of brightness or ‘sparkle’ occurs when uplit or sun angles occur. Narrow strips of reflective metal across the entire soffit were mentioned. [D3]
- 5) **Continuous Weather Protection (see departure #2):** a)The Board recommended all canopies should be typically and consistently 8ft wide minimum, except where SDOT tree-specific clearance requirements prevail; b) the west and middle portions of the proposed Seneca canopies are supportable, but the east portion is too low to the sidewalk, and so redesign the corner canopy to wrap further west to cover that portion of Seneca frontage, within the 10-15 ft zone; c) the two gaps at the primary ‘pilasters’ are supportable (pending resolution of all aspects described under condition #2), but the canopies should extend along the full extent of the glass corners on 2nd Avenue, especially since one is a retail entrance. [C5]