

**CITY OF OLYMPIA
Olympia Design Review**

**BRIGGS VILLAGE MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT
STAFF REPORT
Thursday, August 8, 2013**

Case: Briggs Village Master Plan Amendment, 13-0039

Applicant: Briggs Village, LLC
Joe Mastronardi
27200 Agoura Rd., Suite 210
Calabasas, CA 91301

Representative: Jean Carr, Principal,
Shea Carr & Jewell, Inc.
2102 Carriage Dr. SW #H
Olympia, WA 98502

Architect: Ron Thomas, AIA
Thomas Architecture Studio
109 Capitol Way N
Olympia, WA 98501

Site Address: 4400 Blocks of Henderson Boulevard SE

Project Description: The applicant proposes amending the Briggs Village Master Plan (BVMP) consisting of revisions to the development densities and design guidelines and modification to the West Residential lot count and layout.

Zoning District: Urban Village (Briggs Village Master Plan)

Comprehensive Plan Designation: Urban Village

Scenic Vista: N/A

SEPA Determination: A SEPA Determination has not been issued at this time.

NOTIFICATION: Notice was mailed to the adjacent property owners within 300 feet of the project, to the Recognized Neighborhood Associations in the area, and to the parties of record on or before July 11, 2013.

Adjacent Development: Briggs Village is located north of Yelm Highway on both sides of Henderson Boulevard south of Middle Street (4400 Block of Henderson Boulevard). Ward Lake and residential are located to the east. To the south is residential, a nursery and a Grange. To the east is residential.

Existing Site Conditions: Briggs Village is 137 Acre site. Residential Development has been constructed on the north portion and Multi-family Development has occurred along Yelm Hwy west of the Briggs YMCA and additional multifamily is in various stages of development or review on the east side of Henderson Blvd. All of the streets and utility infrastructure has been installed. The central mixed use portion of the site is undeveloped at this time. A grocery store has been approved and not constructed for the south side of the town square.

PUBLIC PROCESS:

Step 1 Design Review Board. The proposed Master Plan Amendment is not Conceptual or Detailed Design Review. Rather, the Board is asked, pursuant to 18.57.080(B) Master plan approval process, to:

B. Design Review Board. A complete application including proposed draft design vocabulary and design guidelines (OMC Chapter [18.05A](#), Village and Center Design Guidelines), shall be submitted and reviewed by the Design Review Board for review and recommendation to the City Council. The Design Review Board shall not recommend approval of a Master Plan unless they determine that the proposed Master Plan complies with each of the applicable design guidelines contained in OMC Chapter [18.05A](#), Village and Centers Design Guidelines. The Design Review Board shall also review the applicant's proposed design vocabulary and provide a recommendation to the City Council. The Design Review Board may schedule additional meetings to consider the proposed Master Plan, or recommend denial or approval with or without conditions of approval. Public notice of meetings shall be provided pursuant to OMC Chapter [18.78](#), Public Notification.

Staff scheduled and sent public notice for three Design Review public meetings (July 25, August 8 and August 22 2013). On July 25, Ron Thomas AIA, with Thomas Architecture Studio presented the Board the applicant's proposal. As discussed below, tonight's meeting will provide some preliminary analysis and begin to discuss recommendations for Board consideration. It is anticipated that the Board may begin to

formulate recommendations and August 22 has been reserved for finalizing recommendations.

Step 2 Hearing Examiner. Following the Board's work, the application will be forwarded to the Hearing Examiner. The Hearing Examiner is tasked with conducting a public hearing and formulating recommendations to the City Council. A public hearing date has not been scheduled. Public Notice will be sent when a date has been selected.

Step 3 City Council. "The Board's and the Examiner's recommendations, together, with any conditions, shall be considered by the Council at a regular public meeting. Such consideration must be based upon the record established by the Design Review Board and the Examiner. If the Council finds that the Board's or Examiner's recommendation is in conflict with the City's adopted plans, policies and ordinances; or insufficient evidence was presented as to the impact on surrounding area the Council may:

- a. Deny the MPD application;
- b. Remand the matter back to the Design Review Board or Hearing Examiner for another hearing;
- c. Continue to a future date to allow for additional staff analysis desired by the Council;
- d. Modify the Design Review Board's and Examiner's recommendation based on the applicable criteria and adopt their own findings and conclusions, and deny or approve the Master Plan; or
- e. Schedule an open-record public hearing.

If the Council determines there are no conflicts and sufficient evidence was presented as to the impact on the surrounding area, it shall adopt the Board's and Examiner's recommendation as their own and approve the Master Plan by ordinance. A date for Council action has not been scheduled. Notice of the meeting will be sent to "Parties of Record."

ANALYSIS:

Staff continues to work with the applicant on the proposal. In summary, there is concurrence that to increase predictability, additional detail and specificity would be beneficial for architects and the City. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to explore, in depth, the following design issues identified by the Board and Staff, on July 25, 2013:

1. **Building Height** in relationship to number of stories. As proposed, the amount of commercial, office and associated parking is significantly reduced. This is accomplished by reducing the square footage of buildings fronting Henderson

Boulevard and around the town square resulting in single story buildings. To retain a sense of place, the relationship between the size of the town square and height of buildings becomes a challenge. One solution is to require these single story buildings to be at least 24 and 36 feet tall.

2. **Uniformity or Variety.** Consistent with master plans in the 1990's and 2000, the existing vision for Briggs Master Plan commercial areas generally calls for a high degree of uniformity in commercial building details. Although there is no proposal to change this, the recent trend for such neighborhood commercial centers is to encourage a wide variety of building forms, materials and details. Staff and the applicant believe that now is the appropriate time to discuss the existing approach to uniformity.

In addition, the existing commercial guidelines lack sufficient detail to ensure clarity for high quality development. The applicant and staff agree that more specificity would be beneficial.

- a. **Roof form** is currently uniformly flat. With single story buildings there appears to be value in allowing a variety of roof forms.
- b. **Articulation and Modulation** – More detail and examples are necessary. Buildings should have similar articulation, within the town center, and/or within the Village. Consider how building forms, edges, corners, and surface elements *combine* to define the form; the segments are unified by their interconnectedness.
- c. **Fenestration** – requirements (windows and exterior openings of a/the building) should be added to provide a clear hierarchy within the commercial areas. Consider all-around visibility. We suggest that the hierarchy ensure that the buildings fronting the village green have the highest level of treatment (60%), side streets have the second highest, followed by parking areas and finally lesser along pedestrian corridors (up to 25%). A different hierarchy is necessary for commercial buildings along Henderson.
- d. **Primary Public Entry** requirements should be added to clarify a hierarchy within the development that front the building toward the village green yet allows secondary access from the parking if requested. Entry to buildings along Henderson would be located on prominent corners.
- e. **Weather Protection** (awnings and canopies) requirements should also be added to provide a clear hierarchy within the development.
- f. **Building Materials** needs additional clarification and specificity.

- g. **Building Details** needs additional clarification and specificity.
3. **Signage** needs additional clarification and specificity. Consider an area sign plan and/or project-based signage proposal(s).
4. **Utility Services** were not included in the initial adoption and need additional clarification and specificity.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

City staff recommends that the Design Review Board consider the staff analysis during an oral power point presentation and provide direction to staff.

Submitted By: Steve Friddle, Principal Planner, (360) 753-8591
sfriddle@ci.olympia.wa.us

Attachments: None.

Please bring the July 25 staff report and attachments that included:

1. Attachment E – Briggs Village Master Plan Amendment Application Design Concepts, containing 4 pages of overview;
2. Proposed Briggs Village Design Guidelines (February 2013) that provide proposed changes in “bill format” (Strikethrough deletions and underlined additions); and
3. Briggs Village Design Guidelines Volume 2 (11” X 18”) drawings and narrative.