



OLYMPIA DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION

CONCEPTUAL DESIGN REVIEW

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

To: The Site Plan Review Committee whom will make a recommendation to the Hearings Examiner

Meeting Date: 8/10/2017

Time: 6:30PM

FROM: Nicole Floyd

PROJECT NAME: VIEWS ON 5TH

PROJECT No.: 17-2528

PROJECT ADDRESS: 410 5TH AVE SW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT FOR COMMERCIAL AND MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL USE

APPLICANT: VIEWS ON 5TH LLC

AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: RON THOMAS OF THOMAS ARCHITECTURE STUDIO

ATTENDEES: P = Present; A = Absent; X = Excused

STAFF:

P	THOMAS CARVER (Architect)	X	DAVID GOULARTE (Citizen at Large)	<input type="checkbox"/> CARI HORNBEIN (Senior Planner)
P	JANE LACLERGUE, Vice chair (Citizen at Large)	P	JAMI HEINRICHER (Citizen at Large)	<input type="checkbox"/> TIM SMITH (Principal Planner)
P	DUANE EDWARDS (Citizen at Large)	X	JOSEPH LAVALLE, Chair (Citizen at Large)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CATHERINE MCCOY (Associate Planner)
P	ROBERT FINDLAY (Architect)	P	MARNIE MCGRATH (Citizen at Large)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NICOLE FLOYD (Senior Planner)
X	ANGELA RUSH (Citizen at Large)			<input type="checkbox"/> PAULA SMITH (Assistant Planner)

CONTEXT PLAN: Recommend Approval

VOTE Moved by: Tom Carver

Seconded by: Jamie Heimricher

Approved: Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Abstain:

PRELIMINARY SITE & LANDSCAPE PLAN: Recommend conditional approval as follows:

1. Provide plans with the detailed design review packet that show the textured pavement with the necessary painted pavement markings for directional traffic movement, parking stalls, and accessible routes and Consider revising the textured patterns to emphasize these safety and circulation features pursuant to OMC 18.110.030 – Connections, 18.110.050 – Pedestrian amenities, and 18.120.110 – Pedestrian access from parking areas.
2. If mid-block crossing is proposed, revise plans to show the stamped concrete adjacent to Sylvester Street aligning with the park pathway and add the appropriate crosswalk features to the roadway. Provide the

appropriate revision with the Detailed Design Review packet pursuant to OMC 18.120.110 – Pedestrian access from parking areas.

3. Provide plans with the Detailed Design Review packet that show all directional signage for vehicles and any proposed signage that emphasize that pedestrians have the right of way pursuant to OMC 18.120.110 – Pedestrian access from parking areas.
4. Work to disperse the short-term bike parking (visitor parking) as evenly as possible to provide convenient covered parking for all business entries. Show covered areas on plans. In areas where bike parking spaces are more than 50' from a business entry, signage will be required and should be shown on detailed design plans pursuant to OMC 18.110.050 – Pedestrian amenities and OMC 18.38.220(c).
5. Plans must show which buildings or units will be assigned use of the bike storage room and which will have space in the individual units. Signage for long-term bike storage will be required in and around buildings as appropriate. Show proposed signage locations on plans at Detailed Design Review pursuant to OMC 18.110.050 – Pedestrian amenities and OMC 18.38.220(c).
6. Should fencing of the outdoor seating area be proposed in the future with the tenant occupation of the restaurant/bar, staff should review the fencing and ensure it maintains a human scale by providing openings at frequent intervals and that the fencing material is compatible with the structure pursuant to OMC 18.110.040.
7. Proposed lighting locations and fixture types shall be provided with the Detailed Design Review packet including lighting for the pedestrian walkway, woonerf, and all three of the buildings pursuant to OMC 18.110.050 Pedestrian amenities and 18.110.160 – Lighting.
8. Provide plans that clearly identify all site utility and mechanical equipment locations and the anticipated measures to screen such features pursuant to OMC 18.110.190 – Screening of Site Services.
9. Look at any potential issues with the 45 degree angle parking associated with physical barriers as outlined in OMC 18.110.030
10. Define landscaping and planter boxes on the east side of the building as outlined in OMC 18.110.180.

VOTE Moved by: Tom Carver

Seconded by: Duane Edwards

Approved: Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Abstain:

PRELIMINARY BUILDING DESIGN: Recommend approval

VOTE Moved by: Tom Carver

Seconded by: Duane Edwards

Approved: Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Abstain:

[Note: Numbered items are recommended conditions.]

cc:

- Applicant
- Authorized Representative
- DRB Record
- DRB Members

Good evening and welcome to the City of Olympia's August 10, 2017 DRB meeting.

We are here to discuss Case #17-2528 , the Views on 5th. First I have to ask if any board member thinks they have a conflict of interest with tonight's project. Seeing none, does anyone in the audience think a member has a conflict of interest?

It's nice to see this gathering of dedicated citizens here. On behalf of the board, we want to thank the staff for providing us with a larger room to accommodate all of you. We thank you for coming and for all the comments you've sent. Staff has gotten copies of them to us.

Before we start the case, I'll briefly explain how the DRB works. Our charge is to do a technical review for compliance with the design criteria within the Olympia's Municipal Code. Projects going thru the city's planning dept go thru several reviews. Our board's only authority is what the code says about design review. Tonight the two chapters from the code we will be using for this case are the Basic Commercial Design Criteria chapter and the Commercial Design Criteria Downtown chapter. The location of a project determines which chapters we will use. Each chapter has stated requirements followed by guidelines showing how to meet the requirements. All our decisions must be based on the requirements in these chapters. For example if we were reviewing a project on Capital Way and the board decided we wanted it to have a domed entry way. We could not do such a thing as there is nothing in the code that states, "All buildings on Capital Way must have a domed entry way." Likewise, when we deny a project, we have to

state what requirement has not been met. We can't just deny a project because of our personal likes or dislikes. When we vote no, we must state which requirements in the code have not been met to explain our No vote. Before we approve a project, we have to carefully see that the developer's plans are in compliance with all of the requirements.

There were many issues in the letters you took the time and effort to send to us. Many of them address worthy issues such as traffic, building heights grandfathered in, and sea level rise which are out of the scope of our work. All of these issues will be analyzed and addressed by other city departments. The board very much appreciates the information about the Olmstead brothers plan for our Capitol. Unfortunately the municipal code does not address their plan. Therefore we cannot take into consideration during our deliberation.

Tonight's case is for Concept Design only. When projects are approved for concept, then they have to come back later for Detailed Design review. On the front page of the plans presented by the applicant, it says, Combined Design Review. That might cause you to think that we are doing both Conceptual and Detailed tonight. We do that sometimes for small projects. However, this project is too big for that. Thus it is only for concept design review as stated in the staff report that we are doing tonight.

To start the case, the staff will give their review of the project. That will be followed by the applicant's presentation. Then the board will have our discussion including info from the letters that are applicable to the code. We will then make a recommendation to forward on to the Hearings Examiner who makes the final decision about the project.

DRB does not take public testimony. Our board meetings are considered to be a limited public forum. Staff will explain the next opportunity for public comment to you.

Jane Laclergue

Vice Chairman

