

APPROVED/DISAPPROVED: Ayes: 7

# OLYMPIA DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION

**CONCEPT DESIGN REVIEW** 

RECOMMENDATION

Community Planning & Development 601 4th Avenue E. – PO Box 1967 Olympia WA 98501-1967 Phone: 360.753.8314 Fax: 360.753.8087

cpdinfo@ci.olympia.wa.us www.olympiawa.gov

## **ATTACHMENT 3**

DATE:	January 19, 2017			TIME: 8:00 p.m.		
MEETING DATE: _January 12, 2017						
PROJECT NAME: Washington Realtors Building						
PROJECT NO.: 16 - 9076						
PROJE	CCT DESCRIPTION: <u>Demolish existi</u>	ng offi	ce building and replace with a	new office building.		
APPLI	CANT: Washington Association of	Realto	ors			
AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Bill Riley, 1002 39 <sup>TH</sup> Avenue SE, #302, Puyallup, WA 98373						
ATTENDEES: $\mathbf{P}$ = Present; $\mathbf{A}$ = Absent; $\mathbf{X}$ = Excused STAFF:						
P	THOMAS CARVER (Architect)	P	JAMI HEINRICHER (Citizen at Large)	□ CARI HORNBEIN (Senior Planner)		
X	JANE LACLERGUE, Vice Chair (Citizen at Large)	P	JOSEPH LAVALLE, Chair (Citizen at Large)	☐ TIM SMITH (Principal Planner)		
P	DUANE EDWARDS (Landscape Architect)	P	MARNIE MCGRATH (Citizen at Large)	□ CATHERINE MCCOY (Associate Planner)		
P	ROBERT FINDLAY (Architect)	A	DAVID GOULARTE (Business Representative)			
P	ANGELA RUSH (Citizen at Large)					
The Board's review was based on the design review packet date-stamped December 21, 2016 and material samples presented at the Design Review Board meeting.						
<b>Note</b> : The applicant had originally applied for Combined Concept/Detail Design Review, but the Board voted to separate the review in order to focus on the conceptual elements of the project. A motion to separate the review						
was made by Robert Findlay, seconded by Angela Rush. All voted in favor of the motion.						
CON	ΓΕΧΤ PLAN: Approve as proposed.					
VOTE MOVED BY: <u>Tom Carver</u> SECONDED BY: <u>Duane Edwards</u>						
APPF	ROVED/DISAPPROVED: Ayes: 5	N	Nays: <u>2</u> Abs	stain: <u>0</u>		
PRELIMINARY SITE & LANDSCAPE: Approve with conditions to be addressed during Detail Design Review (see conditions on following page).						
VOTE MOVED BY:SECONDED BY:						

Nays: \_

0

Abstain: \_

0

conditions below).	<del></del>
VOTE MOVED BY: <u>Joseph Lavelle</u>	SECONDED BY: <u>Tom Carver</u>
APPROVED/DISAPPROVED: Aves: 5	Navs: 2 Abstain: 0

**PRELIMINARY BUILDING DESIGN:** Approve with conditions to be addressed during Detail Design Review (see

#### CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Note: Conditions 1 - 14 were included in the staff recommendation; conditions 15 - 19 are Board recommendations.

### Site and Landscape Design:

- 1. Increase the width of the walkway between the drive aisle and bioretention facility to 6 feet. OMC 18.110.030
- 2. Provide additional landscaping in the pedestrian plaza. This can be achieved through the use of pots and/or landscape beds. *OMC 18.110.050*
- 3. Plans submitted for engineering and building permit review shall show the location and method of screening of mechanical equipment, utility vaults, and meters. OMC 18.110.190
- 4. Provide a greater variety of hard surfaces or streetscape treatments (e.g., street trees, bollards, pots) to increase visual diversity of walkways/pedestrian areas. OMC 18.120.100
- 5. Construct a pedestrian connection between the east parking area and building. One option is a pathway through the landscape island near the northeast building corner. OMC 18.120.110
- 6. Revise the landscape plan to meet the requirements of OMC 18.36. More detailed comments will be provided in the substantive review letter to the applicant.
- 7. Provide additional detail showing how the plaza and associated elements tie into existing frontages, the bioretention facility, and the building.

#### **Building Design:**

- 8. Incorporate elements that provide human scale and reduce building mass. Specific measures are listed in the guidelines under *OMC 18.110.080*
- 9. Provide deeper window recesses and visually significant window elements such as those listed in the guidelines under *OMC 18.110.100* for increased detail and relief.
- 10. Provide greater relief, detail, and variation to rooflines, in particular on the south elevation where continuous rooflines are proposed. *OMC 18.110.120*
- 11. Use similar building details and materials on the east 110' of the north elevation to provide consistent visual identity. *OMC 18.110.140 and 200*
- 12. Eliminate or reduce the use of EIFS on the building exterior. Use materials that provide greater texture and pattern, and that complement other buildings in the area. *OMC 18.110.150 and OMC 18.120.060*
- 13. Provide greater variation of architectural elements, materials, and building planes along the south building façade. *OMC 18.120.070*
- 14. Modify the design and dimensions of the canopies to provide weather protection along walkways and pedestrian plaza. Provide a canopy over the main building entrance. *OMC 18.120.090*
- 15. Extend the stone veneer around the entire base of the building to address blank walls and provide consistent visual identity.

- 16. Move the entrance away from the south east building corner to 1) create more room at the building entrance and 2) make a statement at a key entrance to the City.
- 17. Extend the parapet on the north elevation to screen rooftop mechanical equipment.
- 18. Reduce the profile of the cornice to better cohere with the building design and create a lighter element along the roof line.
- 19. Reconfigure or reduce paving in the plaza to serve the board room and building entrance.