

# Comparative Review

## Downtown Design Review for Recent Projects

### **Axeltree**

5-story mixed-use building with c.7,200 sq ft of ground-floor commercial space and 110 dwelling units on upper floors

(11125 SE 21<sup>st</sup> Ave—primary file #DR-2017-001, addressed as 2036 SE Washington St)

- Needed a variance from the 6-ft step back requirement for the fourth and fifth stories. *(This was previously a development standard that was moved from MMC 19.304.5 to MMC 19.508.4 in 2019.)*
- Design review issues:
  - Washington Street façade did not meet the horizontal articulation standard—was supposed to provide significant breaks along every 150 linear feet, at least 20 ft deep and 15 ft wide and continuous along the full height of the building. Instead, the design proposed a vertical band of four projecting windows, with color and material changes for variety and to break up the wall. Also, proposed public art on each side of the parking garage entrance door.
  - Washington Street ground-floor wall area was just under the required 40% openings.
  - Upper-floor windows did not meet the 60% vertical orientation standard (was around 50%). Instead, the design proposed oversized glass windows with no vertical mullions to block the view.

➤ *What would be different if reviewed under the proposed new code?*

No variance would be needed for the step back standard—the discretionary review process (Type III) would be used to consider the proposed deviation from the step back design standard. The other design issues noted above would be addressed with discretionary review as before.

### **Ledding Library**

new library building

(10660 SE 21<sup>st</sup> Ave—primary file #CSU-2018-002)

No variance requests. Design review issues:

- Front façade (west elevation) did not meet the horizontal articulation standard—supposed to provide significant breaks along every 150 linear feet, at least 20 ft deep and 15 ft wide and continuous along the full height of the building. Instead, the design proposed full-building-height glass at main entry to break the west elevation into two distinct façades.

- Weather protection (canopy) exceeded the 6-ft extension limit by extending 11 to 13 ft over the pedestrian area.
- Just under 20% of ground-floor wall area along western elevation was openings; approximately 35% of Harrison Street façade included glazing. The requirement for both was 40%.
- The bottom edge of windows along pedestrian ways exceeded the 30-inch height limit (was 40 inches in some places due to grade change).
- Undulating roof design did not provide a parapet wall or cornice as required for a shed-roof style.

➤ *What would be different if reviewed under the proposed new code?*

No difference—the project would use the same discretionary review process (Type III) as before.

**Henley Place** (formerly the Kellogg Bowl)

6-story residential-only building with 178 units (including two live/work units on ground floor)

(10306 SE Main St—primary file #DR-2021-003)

- Required variances for several downtown development standards:
  - Street setbacks/build-to lines = Due to the property's flag lot configuration, the front of the building was set back over 250 ft from Main Street (10-ft maximum allowed).
  - Frontage occupancy = Again due to flag lot configuration and proposed building setback, the 50% occupancy standard could not be met (no building was proposed along the frontage).
  - Off-street parking = Again due to flag lot configuration, surface parking was provided within 50 ft of the Main Street right-of-way.
  - Open space = Only approximately 7% of the setback area was utilized as open space, where 50% was the requirement.
  - Parking structures (MMC 19.611) = The two street-facing façades provided just under 60% ground-floor windows or wall openings (minimum requirement was 75%).
- Design review issues:
  - Weather protection = Southwest corner of building provided only 40% weather protection (50% required), and one ground-floor building entry did not have a canopy or 3-ft recess.
  - Exterior building materials = Neither street-facing façade (east and west elevations) provided the minimum required 65% minimum of primary materials.
  - Windows and doors = Less than 60% of upper-level windows vertically oriented.

➤ *What would be different if reviewed under the proposed new code?*

The need for four out of five variances would be eliminated, as the discretionary review process (Type III) would be used to address what would now be design standards for street setbacks/build-to lines, frontage occupancy, off-street parking location, and open space. Only the standard related to parking structures would still need a variance. The other design issues noted above would be addressed with discretionary review as before.

### **Coho Point**

6-story mixed-use building with c.7,000 sq ft of ground-floor commercial space and 195 dwelling units

(11103 SE Main St—primary file #DR-2021-001)

- Required variances for downtown development standards:
  - Building height = Proposed building was six stories (78 ft)—with allowable height bonuses, the standard was five stories or 69 ft.
  - Street setbacks/build-to lines = Building façades on Main Street, Washington Street, and Adams Street were set back 2 to 3 ft from the property line (maximum allowed setback along those frontages was 0 ft).
- The project did not meet most of the specific downtown design standards and so went through the discretionary review process (Type III), making the case that the design met the purpose statement for each applicable element.

➤ *What would be different if reviewed under the proposed new code?*

The need for the street setback/build-to lines variance would be eliminated, as the discretionary review process (Type III) would be used to address what would now be a design standard. The design would still require a height variance (Type III) and would use the discretionary review process to evaluate compliance for all applicable elements.

### **Dogwood Station**

6-story residential-only building with 55 units

(2206 SE Washington St—primary file #VR-2021-017)

- Required a variance for building height (for one additional story).
- Addressed the multifamily design guidelines of MMC 19.505.3 instead of the downtown design standards/guidelines of MMC 19.508.

➤ *What would be different if reviewed under the proposed new code?*

The project would still require a variance for building height (Type III) and would now also have to address the downtown design standards instead of opting to use the multifamily guidelines. The larger design review could be Type I or Type III, depending on whether the downtown design standards could be met.