

**CITY OF OLYMPIA
Olympia Design Review Board**

**CONCEPT DESIGN REVIEW
STAFF REPORT
June 27, 2019**

Case / Project:	19-1636, Intercity Transit Expansion on Pattison
Applicant:	Intercity Transit
Project Representative:	Barb Berastequi of Stantec
City Staff Contact:	Nicole Floyd, Senior Planner
Site Address:	526 Pattison Street SE
Project Description:	Construction of a new administration and operation building (43,500sf), and a new fuel, wash, and facilities building (25,000sf).
Zoning District:	High Density Corridor 4
Applicable Design Criteria:	Basic Commercial and High Density
Comprehensive Plan:	Urban Corridor and High Density Neighborhood
Scenic Vista:	Not Applicable
Critical Areas:	None present
Notification:	Notice of the Neighborhood Meeting, Application, and Design Review Board Meeting was posted on the site, mailed to the adjacent property owners, and sent to Recognized Neighborhood Associations in the project vicinity on May 2, 2019.
Board Responsibility:	The Design Review Board will review the project to determine compliance with the applicable design criteria and make a recommendation to the Site Plan Review Committee regarding the adequacy of the projects design. The Hearings Examiner will make the final decision. Conceptual Design Review involves the major design elements of a project as they relate to the general project design and how they comply with the specific design criteria of the design district. In situations where explicit compliance is not feasible, the Olympia Municipal Code (OMC) 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.

Staff Provided Assistance:

City staff evaluated the project based on the applicable design standards and prepared a variety of support materials including design review checklists to assist in the Board's assessment of this project (see attached). This report focuses on issues that staff recommends for Board discussion. Suggested conditions of approval have been provided for the Board's review and recommendation.

Project Context / Existing Site Conditions:

The project has been developing in phases over the last several years. The Intercity Transit Campus is broken into two distinct parcels, the “north” parcel which is adjacent to Martin Way and the “south” parcel which is where the current headquarters buildings are located. A development agreement was created between Intercity Transit and the City in 2015 to facilitate a clear understanding of a timeline for the phasing of the campus upgrades. This proposal before the Board represents Phase II of the development agreement and includes the final site work proposed on the south parcel. During construction of Phase I a significant portion of the stormwater improvements, upgrades to the fueling tanks and various other infrastructure improvements were completed that help set the stage for this next portion of site development. Now the applicant is proposing to complete the construction of two large buildings. The administrative building is proposed to be located on the corner of Pattison Street and Martin Way and the fuel/wash/maintenance building will be situated along Martin Way. On the site interior will be a large secure vehicle storage area intended for buses and vans. Future site work will likely include remodel and modification to the existing buildings on the “south” site.

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 reviewed the project for compliance with these criteria and has provided a detailed analysis within the attached Design Review Checklists. The checklists identify areas of compliance and deficiency. Recommended conditions of approval are provided for the Board’s consideration.

As outlined in the checklists, staff has found that the project design generally addresses the criteria within the code, however there are a few issues that staff suggests the Board pay specific attention to, as follows:

Modulation and Fences and Walls (OMC 18.110.040):

The code requires the minimization of the use of fences that inhibit pedestrian movement and that where fencing is necessary, it be of a human scale with gates, variation in fence height, visual interest, repeating of building materials, and well lit. Given the use of the site, it is clear that this site cannot minimize the use of fencing because the vast majority needs to be inaccessible to the general public. Instead, the applicant has broken the site into areas where the public will circulate and areas where employees will circulate. The internal site (which includes much of the perimeter) will be fenced. Plans do not show the fencing type in detail, except to say “sight obscuring fencing”. The elevations show what appears to be a wooden fence. The area between the administrative building and the fuel, wash, facilities building is proposed to include a 75 ft. long, 8 ft. tall fence parallel to Martin Way. Landscaping is provided to help screen the fence, however it is unclear if this landscaping will adequately address the code requirement. Additional information should be provided to help determine how human scale is being supported with this fencing. The fence does appear to include variation, or texture and is unclear how the materials repeat use of building façade materials.

Condition of Approval: Break up large expanses of fences along street frontages to enhance the pedestrian environment. Generally, break up fencing at intervals no greater than 30 ft. Add elements from the building into the fencing.

Street walls / Transparency OMC 18.110.090:

The code requires 60 percent transparency on the ground floor on both street frontages for displays or to reveal services available where appropriate. The administrative office building on the corner of

Pattison Street and Martin Way meets this requirement, but the fuel/wash/and facilities building falls short of meeting the standard. Efforts to create transparency are evident, however due to the buildings intended use full compliance does not seem practical. Staff does not find that the full compliance with this requirement is appropriate, but questions the viability of the various options of alternative methods listed in the code. The code suggests providing pedestrian areas, enhanced vegetation, or other similar features. It is noteworthy that the requisite amount of modulation is also not provided along this frontage. Adding transparency and/or modulation or other features might be appropriate and could satisfy a few of the code provisions related to this street frontage. If deemed appropriate, the Board could add a condition of approval asking for improvements to the frontage by providing a pedestrian area, enhanced vegetation, or other features as an alternative to the glazing as is outlined in the code as potential alternatives to glazing.

Weather Protections in the Right of Way (OMC 18.110.110):

The weather protections provided along the administrative building are well designed and clearly support pedestrian movements. The awnings along the fuel, wash, facilities building are placed in locations that may provide building definition, but do not appear to connect to apparent pedestrian pathways. A specific amount of awning protection is not established in the code. Further clarification regarding their purpose and intended use and design maybe beneficial.

Parking Structures (OMC 18.110.170) / Screening of Surface Parking (OMC 18.130.040):

A minimum of 60 percent of the street façade between two and eight feet in height must be screened when placed on a street frontage. The parking proposed in the administration building is directly adjacent to Pattison Street and must comply with this standard. Plans do not show the requisite screening. The code establishes several ways in which to obtain compliance such as decorative metal grille work, artistic detailing, vertical trellises, and landscaping. The landscaping plan indicates several trees, shrubs and ground covers will be installed in the landscaping area between the sidewalk and the street, however it is not clear if this landscaping alone will adequately provide screening. Additionally, all surface parking facing a street must be screened with landscaping, berms or low walls. It is unclear if surface parking areas will be adequately screened.

Proposed Condition of Approval: The applicant shall revise the elevation plans to show proposed screening devices and plantings to ensure 60 percent coverage between two and eight feet in height along the wall.

Screening of Blank Walls (OMC 18.110.200):

The code requires for long expanses of blank walls or fences to be screened. The fencing along Martin Way between the buildings and the fencing behind the administrative structure separating the public and employee only area appear to be long expanses of fencing/walls. The elevations do not show screening, but the landscaping plan shows a series of trees and shrubs in these locations. It is likely that these plantings will adequately screen the long expanses of fencing, however in some areas it is somewhat unclear if plantings are proposed on the inside or outside of the fencing. For example, the landscaping plan shows a fenced employee area along Martin Way associated with the fuel, wash, and facilities building that includes vegetation on the inside, but not outside of the fence. This area is not easily identifiable from the elevation plans, but can be seen on the landscaping plan. Elevation plans that show landscaping would help show the effect the proposed landscaping has on the long expanses of fencing and other portions of the building. This is necessary to determine if the landscaping adequately screens these long expanses of fences.

Condition of approval: Show landscaping and other site features that are intended to be greater than 30 in. above grade in the elevation plans with Detail Design Review.

Building Design (OMC 18.130.030):

The code requires all walls visible to pedestrians that are over 30 ft. in length to be modulated and building elements to be articulated. The façade along the administrative building comply, but there are some areas along the façade of the fuel, wash, and facilities building that are 45 ft. in length without modulation. Plans should be revised to comply.

Condition of Approval: Revise plans to ensure walls are modulated at intervals of no less than 30 ft. where visible from pedestrians.

Written Public Comments:

Although this Design Review Board meeting is open for public attendance, oral testimony or comments will not be solicited or permitted to be submitted at the meeting. Written comments related to project design may be submitted in advance of the meeting.

To date, no written comments related to design have been submitted for this project. Any comments submitted following the packet distribution, must be submitted to the project planner before 4:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting to allow for processing and distribution.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on review and analysis of the applicable Design Review Code Criteria, staff has determined that the proposal meets the intent of the Design Review requirements. Staff recommends the Design Review Board to recommend approval of the Conceptual Design to the Site Plan Review Committee, with the following conditions:

- A. Context Plan:** Recommend approval.
- B. Preliminary Site & Conceptual Landscape Design:** Recommend conditional approval as follows:
 - 1. Show landscaping and other site features that are intended to be greater than 30 in. above grade in the elevation plans with Detail Design Review.
 - 2. The applicant shall revise the elevation plans to show proposed screening devices and plantings to ensure 60 percent coverage between two and eight feet in height along the wall.
 - 3. Break up large expanses of fences along street frontages to enhance the pedestrian environment at intervals no greater than 30 ft. Add elements from the building into fencing.
- C. Preliminary Building Design:** Recommend conditional approval as follows:
 - 1. Revise plans to ensure walls are modulated at intervals of no less than 30' where visible from pedestrians.

Submitted By: Nicole Floyd, Senior Planner
360.570.3768, nfloyd@ci.olympia.wa.us

- **Attachment 2:** Design Review Checklists (Basic Commercial OMC 18.110 & Downtown OMC 18.120)
- **Attachment 3:** Concept Design Review application and plans