

CITY OF OLYMPIA
Olympia Design Review Board

CONCEPT DESIGN REVIEW
STAFF REPORT
January 26, 2017

Case Number: 16-9070

Applicant: MGPX X Properties, LLC

Representative: Glen Goodman of Merlone Geier

Site Address: 1200 Cooper Point Road SW

Project Description: Re-Use and new construction two retail buildings at the northernmost portion of the existing retail development. New construction will include approximately 45,000 square feet of new/replacement structure(s).

Zoning District: High Density Corridor - 4

Comprehensive Plan: Urban Corridor

Scenic Vista: Not Applicable for this project.

Critical Areas: Wellhead Protection Area – Allison Springs

SEPA Determination: A SEPA Determination has not yet been made.

Notification: Notice of the Neighborhood Meeting, Application, and Design Review Board Meeting was posted on the site and mailed to the adjacent property owners within 300 feet of the project, to the Recognized Neighborhood Associations in the area, and to Parties of Record on November 28, 2016.

Board Responsibility: The Design Review Board will make a recommendation to the Director of the Community Planning and Development Department regarding the adequacy of the projects design. Conceptual Design Review involves the major design elements of a project as they relate to the general citywide design criteria and the specific design criteria of the design district. In situations where explicit compliance is not feasible, the Olympia Municipal Code encourages creative solutions in meeting the requirements as long as these design solutions are equal to, or better than, the guidelines listed in the requirement sections.

Site Plan Review

Committee Comments: The proposal is currently under review by the Site Plan Review Committee; no decision will be made until after that review is complete.

Staff Provided Assistance: City staff evaluated the project based on the applicable design standards and prepared a variety of support materials to help in your assessment of this project (see attached). This report focuses on areas that Staff recommends careful attention be paid by the Board. Suggested conditions of approval have been provided for the Board's review and recommendation.

Project Context / Existing Site Conditions:

The northern portion of this existing retail complex is configured as a “U” shaped with several small tenant spaces. Unlike the other larger retail spaces within the complex, this “U” shaped configuration has been challenging for the property owner to acquire and maintain tenants within. The project proposal is intended to modify the site layout in a way that will increase marketability of the northern portion of the site by more closely matching the existing development pattern on the southern portion of the site. This includes significant remodel and replacement of existing structures, replacement of parking and landscaping areas.

Review of Design Criteria:

This project is required to comply with both the Basic Commercial Design Criteria (OMC 18.110) and the High Density Corridor Design Criteria (OMC 18.130). Staff has provided specific analysis of the projects compliance with each design requirement and associated guidelines within the attached “Design Review Checklists”. Overall, Staff has found the project design to adequately address the criteria, however there are a few areas that Staff suggests the Board pay specific attention as follows:

Re-Development and Street Frontage Orientation:

Several design criteria emphasize bringing buildings to the front of the site and placing parking behind the building. As this site is a redevelopment within the context of a larger shopping center strict compliance with this overarching principle cannot be met in whole. Careful consideration of this was paid by both the applicant and City staff when considering the design of this project. Generally, the proposal brings the site closer to conformance than is seen in the current configuration as follows:

- Building 100 is being significantly remodeled but will remain in much the same location. Currently the structure generally meets the requisite 10’ maximum front yard setback from Cooper Point Road. The remodel will not reduce compliance and in fact will likely enhance the pedestrian environment within this front yard area by adding more pedestrian oriented features and improving pedestrian connections.
- Buildings 200 and 300 will be replaced and moved forward on the site so that they will be in line with the other large retailers currently operating on the rear portion of the site. This move forward will not completely satisfy the code as parking will remain in front, but it will place the buildings closer to conformance than the current situation. Additionally, some parking is moving from the front of the building to the back. Full compliance was evaluated, but determined to not be feasible as it would significantly impact the existing circulation and would be problematic for the visibility of the other existing retailers.

Pursuant to the nonconforming provisions of the OMC 18.37.040 developments may be enlarged or remodeled provided the alterations do not further contribute to the nonconformity. In this case, the remodel and alteration bring the project closer to conformance. Based on this analysis, some of the provisions listed in the design criteria checklist are identified as Not Applicable.

Pavement Markings:

Pursuant to the Basic Commercial Design Criteria (OMC 18.110.030) driveway and sidewalk connections between the adjoining street, bus shelters and public entries to the building are required to be 6’ wide. The project includes such pathways and exceeds the width by including 8’ wide paths. Areas where vehicle lanes are to be crossed are currently proposed to be marked with paint. Enhanced markings such as alternative materials, or raised walkways are encouraged

in some instances, but not required. Staff suggests the Board evaluate these crossing areas and determine if enhanced markings are appropriate, if so a condition of approval could be recommended by the Board to encourage the applicant to provide such enhanced features. For convenience, staff has drafted language for such a condition. Based on the Board's feedback this condition can be removed or altered as determined appropriate at the meeting.

Bike Parking Locations (OMC 18.050 & OMC 18.38.220(c)):

The project includes three separate buildings with several individual tenant spaces. Short term bike parking is intended to provide convenient and covered parking for customers and is required based on the total square footage of the structure. While the appropriate number of bike parking spaces has been provided the location of these spaces does not seem to cater to each individual tenant, rather they are grouped together and in somewhat obscure locations. The code emphasizes the intent to place short term bike parking within 50' of the building entry, but this is not a strict requirement. For this project, there are several individual tenant spaces and therefore spacing the short term bike parking evenly between these tenant spaces seems appropriate. Staff encourages the Board to review the bike parking locations and to make a recommendation to revise plans to show more conveniently located short term bike parking for all tenant spaces. For convenience, staff has drafted language for such a condition. Based on the Board's feedback this condition can be removed or altered as determined appropriate at the meeting.

Modulation / Screening of blank walls:

The project proposal provides clear efforts to break up the buildings mass through a variety of means along the frontage both from Cooper Point Road and from the interior parking lot. The Side and rear of buildings do not show the same degree of effort. This is likely due to the fact that these areas are far less prominent locations on the site and is unlikely that these areas will be seen by many customers or community members. Nevertheless, Staff is interested in hearing from the Board regarding the proposed design. Guidelines encourage modulation, screening, and roof form variety. Design criteria place emphasis on the "front" of structures, as is proposed and do not seem to provide a direct policy regarding the side and rear of buildings. For convenience, staff has drafted language for such a condition. Based on the Board's feedback this condition can be removed or altered as determined appropriate at the meeting.

Building Material Choices:

The project plans identify Stucco as the predominant building material. Often EIFS is used as a Stucco Alternative. EIFS has not been shown to be particularly durable in the Pacific Northwest and is therefore not a preferred material within the City of Olympia. Staff suggest the Board condition their recommendation to provide clear guidance regarding the potential use of EIFS.

Public Comments:

(Please note that the Design Review Board is no longer taking public comment at the meeting. Comments related to the project design submitted to the Lead Planner will be forwarded to the Board with the Packet. Only those comments related to the project design will be forwarded to the Board.)

- None Received

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Based on review and analysis of the applicable Design Review Code Criteria, Staff has determined that the proposal appears to meet the intent of the Design Review Requirements. Staff therefore encourages the Design Review Board to recommend approval of the Conceptual Design of the Cooper Point Market Place Project, to the Director Community Planning & Development Department (CP&D) with the following conditions (as deemed appropriate by the Board):

A. Context Plan: Recommend approval to the Director of CP&D.

B. Preliminary Site & Landscape Design: Recommend conditional approval to the Director of CP&D as follows:

1. Provide enhanced pavement markings at vehicular intersections including raised walkway and alternative materials.
2. Short term bike parking should be dispersed as evenly as possible between the numerous tenant spaces. Revised plans showing these efforts must be submitted with the Detailed Design Review Board application.
3. Increased efforts to screen and or modulate blank walls should be paid along the side and rear of buildings 100, 200, and 300. Such efforts should be identified in the Detail Design Review Board Application submittal.

C. Preliminary Building Design: Recommend Conditional approval to the Director of CP&D as follows:

1. EIFS should not be substituted for Stucco. Building Permit Plans should be evaluated by Staff to ensure compliance.

Submitted By: Nicole Floyd, Senior Planner

- **Attachment 1:** This Staff Report
- **Attachment 2:** Design Review Checklists (Basic Commercial OMC 18.110 & HDC OMC 18.130)
- **Attachment 3:** Concept Design Review Applications, Architectural Package, Architectural Plan Set, and Landscaping Plan (all date-stamped Nov.16, 2016)