



# Design Review Board

July 11, 2018

5:30-7:00 PM

City Council Briefing Center

**TIMES GIVEN ARE AN ESTIMATE AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE**

## Board Briefing Session:

5:30 - 5:35	1) Chair Report	Steven Meek
	2) Secretary Report	Dean Gunderson

## Board Business:

5:35 – 5:40	3) Approve the <a href="#">June 27th meeting minutes</a> .	
	4) Old Business	
	• Approve June 27 <sup>th</sup> actions	
	○ US Pavilion – 3 <sup>rd</sup> DRB meeting Recommendation	Steven Meek
	○ Father Bach Haven 5 – DRB Advisory Actions	
	5) New Business	
	6) Changes to the agenda?	

## Workshop:

5:40 – 7:00	7) <a href="#">Review of 2 Step Review Process</a>	
	• Nature of Step 1 Submittals	
	○ Impact on length of DRB review on applicants	All
	○ Has this resulted in demonstrably better built results?	
	• Alternatives	

## Adjournment:

The next Design Review Board meeting is scheduled for July 25, 2018.

The password for City of Spokane Guest Wireless access has been changed: **Username: COS Guest Password: G758C7Vr**

**AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) INFORMATION:** The City of Spokane is committed to providing equal access to its facilities, programs and services for persons with disabilities. The Council Briefing Center in the lower level of Spokane City Hall, 808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd., is wheelchair accessible and also is equipped with an infrared assistive listening system for persons with hearing loss. Headsets may be checked out (upon presentation of picture I.D.) through the meeting organizer. Individuals requesting reasonable accommodations or further information may call, write, or email Human Resources at 509.625.6363, 808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd, Spokane, WA, 99201; or [jjackson@spokanecity.org](mailto:jjackson@spokanecity.org). Persons who are deaf or hard of hearing may contact Human Resources through the Washington Relay Service at 7-1-1. Please contact us forty-eight (48) hours before the meeting date.

## **Meeting Rules of Procedure - Spokane Design Review Board**

### **Call to Order**

- Chair calls the meeting to order, noting the date and time of the meeting.
- Chair asks for roll call for attendance.

### **Board Briefing**

- Chair Report – Chair gives a report.
- Secretary Report – Sr. Urban Designer gives a report.

### **Board Business**

- Meeting Minutes - Chair asks for comments on the minutes of the last meeting; Asks for a motion to approve the minutes.
- Chair asks is there any old business? Any old business is discussed.
- Chair asks is there any new business? Any new business is discussed.
- Chair asks if there any changes to the agenda.

### **Board Workshop**

- Chair announces the first project to be reviewed and notes the following: a) the Board will consider the design of the proposal as viewed from the surrounding public realm; b) the Board does not consider traffic impacts in the surrounding area or make recommendations on the appropriateness of a proposed land use; c) it is the applicant's responsibility to meet all applicable code requirements regardless of what might be presented or discussed during workshops.
- Chair asks for a staff report.

### **Staff Report**

- Staff report on the item, giving findings of fact. Presentation will be kept to 5-10 minutes.

### **Applicant Presentation**

- Chair invites the applicant(s) to sit at the table and invites the applicant to introduce the project team and make a 10-15 minute presentation on the project.

### **Public Comment\***

- Chair asks if there are comments from other interested parties – comments shall be kept to 3 minutes, and confined to the design elements of the project.
- Chair reads any written comments submitted by interested citizens.

\* *Contact Planning Department staff after the meeting for additional opportunities to comment on the proposal.*

### **DRB Clarification**

- Chair may request clarification on comments.

### **Design Review Board Discussion**

- Chair will ask the applicants whether they wish to respond to any public comments, after their response (if any) they are to return to their seats in the audience.
- The Chair will formally close public comments.
- Chair leads discussion amongst the DRB members regarding the staff recommendations, applicable design criteria, identification of key issues, and any proposed design departures.

### **Design Review Board Motions**

- Chair asks whether the DRB is ready to make a motion.
- Upon hearing a motion, Chair asks for a second. Staff will record the motion in writing.
- Chair asks for discussion on the motion.
- Chair asks the applicant if they would like to respond to the motion.
- After discussion, Chair asks for a vote.

### **Design Review Board Follow-up**

- Applicant is advised that they may stay or leave the meeting.
- Next agenda item announced.

### **Other**

- Chair asks board members and audience if there is anything else.

### **Adjourn**

- Chair asks for a motion to adjourn. After the motion is seconded, and approved by vote, Chair announces that the meeting is adjourned, noting the time of the adjournment.

**AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) INFORMATION:** *The City of Spokane is committed to providing equal access to its facilities, programs and services for persons with disabilities. The Council Briefing Center in the lower level of Spokane City Hall, 808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd., is wheelchair accessible and also is equipped with an infrared assistive listening system for persons with hearing loss. Headsets may be checked out (upon presentation of picture I.D.) through the meeting organizer. Individuals requesting reasonable accommodations or further information may call, write, or email Human Resources at 509.625.6363, 808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd, Spokane, WA, 99201; or [jjackson@spokanecity.org](mailto:jjackson@spokanecity.org). Persons who are deaf or hard of hearing may contact Human Resources through the Washington Relay Service at 7-1-1. Please contact us forty-eight (48) hours before the meeting date.*

# Design Review Board - Meeting Minutes

June 27, 2018

Meeting called to order at 5:39 PM

## Attendance

- Board Members Present: Dave Buescher - Chair pro-tem, Anne Hanenburg, Ted Teske, Kathy Lang (CA Liaison).
- Board Members Not Present: Alex Maxwell, Steven Meek - Chair, Charlene Kay, Ryan Leong.
- Quorum present. NO
- Staff Present: Dean Gunderson and Omar Akkari

## Briefing Session:

1. **Chair Report:** No report.
2. **Secretary Report:** Update to hearing schedule provided. Two applications have been received.
3. **Approval of the June 13, 2018 meeting minutes. (no quorum)**
  - No Old Business
  - No New Business
  - No Changes to Agenda

## Workshop:

4. **Recommendation Meeting: '74 Expo U.S. Pavilion**
  - **Staff Report:** Omar Akkari - City of Spokane
    - The shade structure was discussed.
  - **Applicant Presentation: Rob Kuffel, NAC Architecture**
    - Shade structure recommendation items were addressed.
    - Presented information regarding blade lights, approach to north entrance, and discussion with the Spokane Tribe and City Parks Department regarding signage.
  - **Public Comment:** None
  - **Motion to Approve made by Anne, seconded by Ted: Passed unanimously 4/0. Due to no quorum present at this meeting, the board will vote to ratify the recommendation during the next meeting on July 11, 2018.**
5. **Collaborative Workshop: Father Bach Haven V**
  - **Staff Report:** Dean Gunderson - City of Spokane
    - The proposed project was discussed.
    - Project subject to Downtown Design Guidelines and Design Standards.
  - **Applicant Presentation: Chris Weiland, Architecture All Forms**
    - Development objectives and design goals were presented.
  - **Public Comment:** None
  - **Board Discussion:**
    - Landscaping, artwork for people living in the space, and weather protection at the south entrance.
  - **Motion to Approve Advisory Actions made by Ann, seconded by Kathy: Passed unanimously 4/0. Due to no quorum present at this meeting, the board will vote to ratify the advisory actions during the next meeting on July 11, 2018.**

Meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Next Design Review Board meeting is scheduled for **July 11, 2018**

## **Step 1 Question**

### **Background**

The original purpose for adding a Step 1 phase was to encourage applicants to engage with the Design Review Board early on in the design process. It was thought that by limiting the submittal requirements to only site and context analysis, the DRB could more positively influence the direction of a design while limiting the adverse impacts to an applicant's development project. That is, if additional design information were required of an applicant they will have invested more in the project (money and time) – and be more resistant to recommended changes offered by the board.

Yet, a design professional will often perform his or her initial site and context analysis by testing potential designs against the proscriptive standards and guidelines (contained within the zoning code and Comprehensive Plan). It is reasonable to presume that the *Design Evolution*, the *Design Guideline/Ordinance Compliance*, and any potential *Design Standards Departure(s)* (all of which must be identified in the Written Project Summary component of the Step 1 submittal) are prepared through the lens of a potential design concept (or concepts).

### **Presumption**

The *Step 1 Collaborative Workshop* submittal requirements can result in applications that aren't substantive enough to provide adequate critique of a proposed design approach. As such, early conceptual design(s) should be included as a submittal requirement, not merely identified as a helpful (non-required) addition to the application.

### **Items for Consideration**

Is it reasonable to request that an applicant include the conceptual sketches developed to prepare portions of their Written Description (*Design Evolution*, compliance with *Design Guidelines/Standards*, identification of any potential *Design Standards Departures*)?

This might not result in any additional costs to an applicant, if the conceptual sketches have already been prepared. But, if such sketches have not been prepared could an application still be deemed "counter complete" without the inclusion of such sketches? This would still allow an applicant to be scheduled for a Collaborative Workshop (also vesting certain development rights); but with the applicant's understanding that the DRB's deliberations may be hampered, resulting in a longer series of review meetings.

The careful construction of the handbook's language separates the notion of "number of meetings" from "number of steps". That is, there is no presumption that the two Steps of the review process would be completed within the framework of two meetings – though this is often the case. In fact, the Standard Board Review Application fee covers up to *three* meetings with the Design Review Board (this is stated on the application form). This might cover circumstances where an applicant has not submitted conceptual sketches for the Step 1 application – resulting in a longer series of review meetings.

The information provided on the following pages covers the application process conveyed to Design Review applicants, and is provided for reference. This information is extracted from the current Design Review Application Handbook, first published in January 2010 and last revised in February 2012.

# Standard Design Review Board Process

It is a goal of the Design Review Board to work in partnership with designers and developers to help implement the City's adopted plans and design guidelines as well as to identify and help resolve any design issues that may be of concern to the broader community. Therefore, it is important that design review begin early in the design process while there is still flexibility and any necessary changes are still relatively easy. To assist project proponents, the Design Review Board offers a Collaborative Workshop prior to the Recommendation Meeting as part of its standard two-step process.

## ***Step 1 - Program Review/Collaborative Workshop***

This step must occur prior to a Land Use Permit application. The Collaborative Workshop is an opportunity for project applicants to share preliminary information about the proposal early in the design process before any major decisions have been made. The meeting is open to the public, and citizens are invited to offer comments to help guide design decisions that will respect and build on the positive aspects of the neighborhood. The staff report prepared for the Program Review / Collaborative Workshop is the most detailed. During the meeting, the Board will identify design guidelines or criteria of highest priority (as a set of Advisory Actions).

## ***Step 2 - Recommendation Meeting***

After the project design has been refined to respond to the prioritized design guidelines and other applicable permitting requirements, proponents may schedule a recommendation meeting with the DRB. At this meeting, the Board will review public comments on the project's design, the summary *Advisory Actions* from the Collaborative Workshop, and the staff's review of the design with regard to the design criteria. The staff report for the Recommendation Meeting will address only those items that are specific to the Meeting, or those items new to the proposal since the Collaborative Workshop. At the close of the Recommendation Meeting, the DRB will prepare a report or set of Recommendations regarding the proposal's consistency with applicable design guidelines and will forward the report or Recommendations to the action approving authority.

## ***Additional Meetings***

For projects of greater complexity it may be desirable to schedule an interim review prior to the board's Recommendation Meeting. Or, in some instances a follow up meeting to the Recommendation Meeting may be requested as a condition of approval in order to verify specific design details. This may be determined by the project applicant, the DRB, or by Urban Design staff.

**Application for Collaborative Workshop**  
*Staff Consultation & Determination of Completeness*

**Concept level program review.** Collaborative Workshop may be scheduled after staff has determined that the submittal requirements have been met and the application can be determined to be “Counter Complete.”

**Step 1 – Program Review/Collaborative Workshop**  
*Board Review*

Project orientation, site & context analysis, massing diagrams, and relationships with surrounding area. Citizens may identify context information & community concerns, and the DRB establishes priorities among design guidelines.

**Ongoing Staff Consultation**

The applicant is strongly encouraged to set up an ongoing dialog throughout the design & permitting process with staff from Urban Design, Planning, and other City Departments about information or requirements that will affect their proposal. A Pre-Development Conference may be required, often the requirement for Design Review is identified at the Pre-Development Conference.

**Schematic Design**

Optional DRB Review

Revised Schematic Design

**Application for Recommendation Meeting**

**Design Development or early Construction Document phase.** This submittal is more complete than the one for the Collaborative Workshop, it is the first time the applicant is required to present the building design and/or detailed site design with a planting plan (including designs details for signage, lighting, color/texture/pattern of materials).

**Step 2 – Recommendation Meeting**  
*Board Review*

Design Revisions and Optional Follow-up Review

**Permit Application**

The Collaborative Workshop must have been completed prior to a Land Use Permit application. It is highly encouraged that both steps be completed prior to Building Permit application.

**Decision by Action Approving Authority**

The Design Review Board’s Recommendation(s) or report will be forwarded to the Action Approval Authority (Hearing Examiner, Department Director) to be incorporated in the final decision – except in limited circumstances.

## **Submittal Requirements for Step 1 (Program Review / Collaborative Workshop)**

### **Written Project Summary**

- Statement of development objectives. For example include building square footage and approximate number of residential units (if applicable).
- Describe design goals, site opportunities and constraints, site character, architectural character, and how the project fits within the local context.
- Note how the proposal addresses issues in the Comprehensive Plan and any other applicable design plans or guidelines; i.e. The Downtown Plan and Design Guidelines.
- Describe any proposed departures from design standards and note how the proposed alternatives are equal to or better than the standard.
- Description of Design Evolution. Describe what design alternatives have been explored, why choices have been made, and any limiting factors. This description can be written and/or graphic.

### **Context Analysis**

- Vicinity Map. Note public viewpoints and major traffic corridors from which the site is visible.
- Photos of adjacent properties and streetscape(s) – show both sides of street.
- Aerial photograph showing site and all surrounding properties within 200'.

*On the graphics above identify pedestrian, bike and auto circulation patterns, zoning, topography, street names, any major building names, and surrounding development (including streetscape improvements such as overhead weather protection, bus stops, bicycle racks, landscaping, specialty paving, etc.).*

### **Site Analysis**

- Scalable plan or preferably an aerial photo denoting existing conditions including topography, healthy trees, substantial vegetation, significant land forms, rock outcroppings, existing structures, curb line, streetscape improvements, above ground utilities, hydrants, or other prominent elements on or abutting the site.
- Site photos

*On the graphics above, identify access opportunities and constraints as well as important views to and from the site.*

### **Concept**

- Concept plan (scalable). A generalized massing, bulk and orientation study of the proposed program elements and site access, preferably superimposed over an aerial photograph. All required setbacks, and all elements required by zoning code such as street trees, sidewalks, required landscape areas, or parking requirements shall be shown on this plan.
- For proposed buildings over 150' height provide a graphic showing how the proposal will fit within Spokane's skyline. Perspective can be from either north or south of the City.

### **Not required, but always welcome**

- Rough sketches of concept alternatives. Axonometric or other 3-D drawing, models, or cross sections ideally showing surrounding context.
- Conceptual building elevations (scalable).

## ***Submittal Requirements for Step 2 (Recommendation Meeting)***

### **Written Project Summary**

- Note any changes to the project since the Collaborative Workshop.
- Describe how the project addresses the direction given by the DRB at the Collaborative Workshop.

### **Site Design**

- Scalable Site Plan – including building footprints, hardscape, lighting, signage and streetscape elements.
- Planting Plan.
- Conceptual Grading Plan.
- Axonometric 3-D drawing or Site Cross Sections to show massing and spatial relationships between major site elements and all surrounding properties within 200' (buildings, trees, berms, light standards, streets, etc.). Cross sections are preferred for projects on steep slopes.

### **Building Design**

- Building Elevations – full building.
- Building Elevations – street level (first 3 to 4 floors) at  $\frac{1}{4}'' = 1'-0''$  min.
- Schematic Floor Plans – when/if germane to achieving a design objective.

### **Design Details**

- Signage
- Lighting
- Color, texture, pattern, materials, illustrations or submittals.