



CANCELLED -Spokane Design Review Board

Wednesday, January 13, 2021

5:30-7:30 PM

Teleconference

TIMES GIVEN ARE AN ESTIMATE AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Board Briefing Session:

5:30 – 5:40	1) Call to Order	Chair
	2) Roll Call	Dean Gunderson
	3) Changes to the Agenda?	Chair
	4) Motion to Temporarily Suspend Rules	Chair

Workshop:

5:40 – 7:15	5) Design Review Board Retreat	Chair
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• See attached discussion topics	

Board Business:

7:15 – 7:30	6) Approve the 12/15/2020 meeting minutes.	Chair
	7) Old Business	
	8) New Business	
	9) Chair Report	Chair
	10) Secretary Report	Dean Gunderson
	11) Other	
	12) Adjourn	

The next Design Review Board meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 27, 2021.

In order to comply with public health measures and Governor Inslee's *Stay Home, Stay Safe* order, the Design Review Board meeting will be held on-line

Members of the general public are encouraged to join the on-line meeting using the following information:

To participate via video follow the link on your computer (click on "Join meeting")

[Join meeting](#)

To participate by phone

Call: 1 (408) 418-9388

Enter: **146 838 7800** followed by # when prompted for a meeting number or access code. Enter # when prompted for an attendee ID

While the meeting begins at 5:30pm, you can join as early as 5:15pm on the date of the meeting.

Please note that public comments cannot be taken during the meeting, but the public is encouraged to continue to submit their comments or questions in writing to:

Dean Gunderson, Sr. Urban Designer
dgunderson@spokanecity.org

The audio proceedings of the Design Review Board meeting will be recorded, with digital copies made available upon request.

Meeting Process - 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.
- Chair asks if there any changes to the agenda.
- Chair asks for motion to temporarily suspend the rules (see Agenda packet)

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) the Board will not consider un-permitted, possible surrounding development(s) except those which are contemplated under the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code; 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 introduce the project team and make a 10-15 minute presentation on the project.

Public Comment *

** During the Stay Home, Stay Safe order, public comments are being accepted in writing.*

DRB Clarification

- Chair may request clarification on comments.

Design Review Board Discussion

- Chair will ask the applicants whether they wish to respond to any written public comments, after their response (if any) they are to return to their seats in the audience.
- The Chair will formally close public comments (unless motioned otherwise).
- Chair leads discussion amongst the DRB members regarding the staff topics for discussion, 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, and that the annotated & signed motion will be made available within five working days.
- Next agenda item announced.

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

Other

- Chair asks board members 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.

Board Retreat – Topics for Discussion

The following topics (in **black**) were posed to members of the Board. Individual Board members written responses are in **blue**. This compendium is not offered to limit discussion to only those items provided in writing, but only to provide a guide the conversation around these topics.

There have been follow-up one-on-one conversations between the Chair and members of the Board, and some items discussed in those conversation will be included in the Board Retreat conversation.

Topic One: Board Member Experience

What is working for you as an individual board member and what can be improved upon. Our board dynamics should foster a culture of trust and respect, where all individual points of view can be openly expressed. Is this your experience and if not, how can we (me, staff, board, process) improve upon our dynamics to get there?

Mark Brower

- I feel well prepared for each meeting (thanks to staff). This is really important to me.
- I thoroughly enjoy and continually learn from the diversity and perspectives from each of our Board members. I also feel that our round-table process, Kathy's inclusive leadership style, and our professional culture/respect for one another results in excellent input and advice/recommendations from each of our valuable perspectives.

Drew Kleman

- I was not able to participate as a board member in a typical, in-person meeting prior to joining the DRB. I'm interested to know how that experience differs from our current virtual meetings, better/different/other, from other board members.
 - Related: were the in-person meetings more conducive to deliberation and board discussion? Do the virtual meetings hinder that discussion any? Perhaps my expectations are different than (sic)
- As like any new process, it takes some time to figure out the kinks. I feel like the board meetings are moving smoothly. I very much appreciate the rigor instituted to allow each board member time to respond.
- Applicant presentations: applicants should be expected to present regardless of Workshop or Recommendation meeting. I recall one applicant stating something like... "you're all familiar with this project..." which I was not. It was on me to speak up (I did not). On the same token, the applicant should realize that this is their opportunity to describe and show (images!) changes since the Workshop, how they are addressing the DRBs suggestions, etc.
- Images go much further than a paragraph description. Could the DR materials allude to this – giving applicants a clearer direction to provide more images, and keep descriptions to a minimum – and provide bulk descriptions where only necessary?

Anne Hanenburg

Everyone's unique role on DRB is clearly defined and acknowledged by fellow Board members and staff. It appears clear to the majority of applicants coming before the Board, but perhaps less-so to the public.

There may be ways to improve upon the public's understanding of DRB and the individual roles comprising the Board.

The diversity of the Board is well-balanced.

Since conducting meetings remotely, the following changes have been positive:

- Reviewing 1 project per meeting.
- Kathy's implementation going down the list of Board members to ask questions, solicit input, help craft motions has been very effective and concise.
- Moving Board business to the end of the meeting.

Ted Teske

I think the current pandemic-modified meeting system is going well. Having a single review to focus on during the meeting helps keep us focused and keeps the meetings as short as possible. I commend Kathy for running the meetings in an efficient and timely manner.

As to the matter of board dynamics, I am pleased with the current situation, I think we have a good group of people who have enough professional and public service experience to make our discussions meaningful and comments relevant to the Applicant's projects. I have been encouraged by our current board's willingness to ask hard questions of applicants and push back on responses that lean on status quo or value engineering as a rationale for decisions. I also like how the current make-up of the board is willing to ask hard questions related to City processes and guidelines that hinder our ability to meet our board's mission. I personally don't feel pressure from other board members that would inhibit my ability to express my point of view on topics.

Topic Two: Board-Staff Engagement

Is there an explicit understanding and agreement between board and staff on their respective roles? Are there ways staff can better serve board members and board members can better serve staff? I see this in regard to meeting preparation, actual meeting process, and follow-up.

Mark Brower

- Again, in general, I feel that we are well prepared for each meeting, in large part due to the excellent Applicant packages and Staff Reports that are carefully managed by staff. Thank you!
- I would love to hear a bit more in our meetings about the projects that are going through administrative reviews. Doesn't need to be in depth, but a highlight of the project and how the Board responded to the applicant. Perhaps this can be a brief portion of the Chair Report and also serve to bring these into the public record?

Drew Kleman

- Each board member comes from an area of expertise. From my seat, I see some board members staying in those lanes and others stretching out. Has this always been the case? I'm curious - and don't have an opinion either way. I like our collaborative nature (and I do steer outside my lane sometimes).

Anne Hanenburg

Staff communication is exceptional. We routinely receive email updates, as well as updates during the Board business portion of our meetings.

I'm personally grateful to Dean and Taylor for their efforts during C-19 to hand-deliver applicant packets in advance of meetings. Thank you both!!

Clarity of staff's role during Board discussion and crafting of motions is needed. Staff's role is one of support. They are responsible for taking notes and answering Board questions during Board discussion – but not influencing, directing, or perceiving to direct the Board's discussion. Similarly, crafting motions and the language within the motion is the sole responsibility of the Board.

Ted Teske

I think the groups do understand our roles and the critical one staff provides at our meetings is to advise the board and add context to our discussions as it relates to City codes, guidelines, and approval processes. That is very helpful so we can maximize the effectiveness of our decisions and make sure they can be implemented to the full extent allowed.

I am always happy to hear how the board can improve either our communication with staff or the action approving authorities that receive our decisions, so I'd be happy to take suggestions from staff on that point.

The, for one, appreciate the deeper background materials that have been included with the packets. The pre-development meeting notes especially are insightful because it shows what issues planning staff have already identified as needing attention from a code perspective. If including them directly make the packets too long or unwieldy, just providing a link to them would be great.

Another issue I can think about is related to follow up. I think it has been mentioned before, but it would be nice to know how our decisions are implemented in the final permitted plans issued by the City. Often times our decisions are unanimous and thus should be conditions of permit approval, but

I don't know that we see how those conditions are included in the final approved plans, or that someone is making sure those plans are followed in actual construction.

Lastly, as I have said before, it would be nice to see what kind of administrative DRB approvals are being brought to the Board Chair and approved. Perhaps that could be something included in the meeting minutes or if we really want to be bold, perhaps those approvals and their associated materials could be included on the DRB website for public view.

Topic Three: Project Packet

Are the packet materials fully effective? Are there documents or notations that can be added or removed? In this regard, I would like us to think beyond our own lens and consider our full audience.

An example: I am non-technically trained. I do not know what information to skim past and what to read in its entirety. As such, I read the full packet cover-to-cover. I believe I represent the general public in the choice to read everything or step away due to the packet's vastness. From my lens, I would opt to remove documents and notations that are not explicitly relevant to DRB purview and process.

But this is only my point of view. What documents and notations are critical to your point of view? If deemed necessary, what should stay, what should go, what should be added?

Mark Brower

- Staff reports are very thoughtful and complete. I appreciate staff's consideration in identifying potential "topics for discussion" in the report. A question I have (and maybe this is better suited for a committee meeting with applicant's to discuss process improvements), is that by providing the staff report to the Applicant, we often receive comments back on the potential "topics for discussion". Sometimes these applicant responses generate additional staff comments. It feels like there is an in-depth dialogue occurring prior to the Board meeting on topics that are potential/suggested by staff. One can appreciate this dialogue in that it may save time for our Board Meeting, but one can also look at this as lots of extra work for the Staff and Applicant for topics that may not actually hit the mark with the Board?
- In terms of the Standard Board Review Checklist requirement of Applicants. I think we are right on the money with requirements for Step 1 (Collaborative Meeting), and we have been generally receiving packets that provide us with a great basis of context and concept design to provide thoughtful recommendations. For Step 2 (Recommendation Meeting), we might consider including stormwater management with the Grading Plan? Stormwater management can shape the landscape in a very positive or negative way and there are more tools than ever before in the BMP toolkit. It may compliment the Planting Plan requirement and provide the basis for continued innovations and improvements in our community projects.

Drew Kleman

Generally, I am a proponent for information that is clear and direct. I believe that the Workshop and Recommendation material requirements could be clarified and bolstered. In my year on the board, I have seen greater dialogue between an Applicant and the DRB when Workshop materials are more robust. In turn, this fosters a better relationship between all parties and, from what I have experienced, lead to more successful Recommendation meetings and ultimately more successful projects. On the other hand, Workshop materials that minimally meet intake requirements leave me wanting for more and I feel are not as successful in collaboration.

Workshop

- I would like to see Workshop requirements include more architectural information. I have seen the more successful DRB / applicant dialogue (and subsequent Recommendation meeting follow up) when more information is available at the Workshop stage. I would like to see concept designs (plan, elevations, bulk massing, sections), perspectives from the street looking at the building (bulk massing, other) from a variety of positions. I would believe that the board could provide the applicant more feedback at this stage when

provided this collateral for review – and provide more beneficial to the applicant, project, and ultimately our community.

- Workshop material “not required but preferred to include” might include materials concepts
- Workshop intake material might also include a list of design/zoning code criteria the applicant is required to address – and ideas of how they are starting to think about those areas. This could then carry over into the Recommendation meeting when more firm information is available, as a consistent component to the applicant’s packet.
 - Applicants have listed these criteria but more as a list / copy of the code language and not necessarily how they are addressing the requirement.
- Since applicants’ packets are publicly available, could the DRB and staff consider identifying and making aware to other applicants exemplar Workshop and Recommendation meeting packages? This may help start to create parity across packets and set the bar for what the DRB expects.

Staff reports

- Supplemental material is good to have in case a board member wants to reference. Could staff parse out select material into separate PDF packages? This would help with the “scrolling” through the document.
- Use of hotlinks is great! Could they be used more?
- The packets can be dense – which can lead to skimming. Could staff create a summary page with the applicant’s packet, topics for discussion, etc. (consolidated) that lists the review criteria / applicable codes? High level is great. Then supplemental document(s) could be created that list everything else.
- Images, diagrams, pictures, or other visual means should be prioritized over written descriptions.

Recommendation meeting

- From my seat, an applicant should be prepared to show how their project meets the design criteria, especially when there are explicit code requirements through Downtown Design Guidelines, zoning requirements, other. For example, Design Standards Implementation has a list of items to address (windows, base middle top, articulation, etc.). I would like to see the Recommendation meeting application packet list those criteria that the project is to address and how they, the applicant, feel they are meeting that criteria. This could take some burden off of staff and the DRB....as well as put the onus on the applicant. My hope is that this would give applicants the stage to speak to their work (more than they do) and take ownership of the process (meeting code requirements).
- Elevations – one of the prior applications we saw elevations that were not helpful (to me) in relaying the project’s design. in this case, 3D perspectives or other means would have been more successful in relaying that info. (In the meeting, I recall the applicant stating that elevations were part of the packet requirements...). In another meeting, elevations were provided that had no context. I would like to see language added that requires elevations but also recommends applicants to provide additional collateral such as building sections, wall sections, axons, and particularly 3D perspectives from the ground plane, that may better relay the project’s design and features.
- Dean – under Recommendation meeting “building design”, what does “Schematic Floor Plans – when/if germane to achieving a design objective” mean? I’d like to see floor plans a requirement for the recommendation meeting.

- Are shadow studies required in certain areas of the city? If not, consider adding to the Recommendation meeting materials (may apply to certain areas like downtown and/or buildings over a certain height).

Design Departures

- Until a more robust system is in place for design departures, could language be added to the DRB materials that clearly states how the DRB would like to receive that information? If an applicant is requesting a design departure, the onus should be on them to clearly state why they feel they can't meet the requirement, what options they looked at to meet that requirement, and how their proposed design is better than the requirement. The level of design development for a design departure should also be elevated. Or perhaps there is more involvement by the DRB when a design departure is requested (as part of staff meetings). I don't have a solution but would like to see discussion on this topic, if possible.

Anne Hanenburg

The majority of applicant packets are thorough, illustrative, and detailed. Similarly, staff's report is always thorough and references applicable comp plan and design guidelines pertinent to the project. This is helpful.

What isn't helpful is receiving voluminous packets containing unnecessary information i.e., Pre-Dev notes, boilerplate City planting / construction details, etc.

Project packets need to be streamlined to contain only information necessary for reviewing the project. In the past, applicant packets rarely exceeded 30 pages. But we are receiving packets in excess of 100 to 200 pages at times. This requires tremendous amounts of time to review, and actually results in a disservice to the applicant when Board members may be incapable of thoroughly reviewing all the documentation provided. There has to be a better way, for the applicant, as well as the Board and staff. We need to consider what is required of applicants to provided vs. what is requested above-and-beyond that which may actually be needed.

Ted Teske

I appreciate the thoroughness of our packets lately, I enjoy the added context and background information. I too am not a technically trained architect or planner, but having the extra information there for those that are I think is helpful. For example, as I mentioned before, I enjoy the inclusion of Pre-Development Meeting notes when available. While portions of the notes may not seem directly related to DRB's purview, many times things like utilities and fire code do end up determining issues related to design and engagement with the public realm. I think if including these makes the packets too unwieldy, then having a linked list of these documents in the packet could be a good substitute.

Sometimes I find myself skimming the applicant packet when they include pages of responses to our Advisory Actions in their packet if those same text passages are included in the staff report. So if staff is going to be including these responses in text format, I think we could remove those duplicative pages from the Applicant submission. I think the board appreciates when the Applicants provide good elevations and street-level scenes that help show how the projects work from a human scale and perspective. We're generally good at letting Applicants know if we want to see more of that type of thing from them.

One area that has a lot of variability in our Recommendation Meeting packets is the inclusion of details related to site hardscape materials and treatments and specifics on ancillary site elements like lighting, benches, trash cans, etc. Sometimes we ask applicants to provide very detailed descriptions and depictions of these things, and other times we don't hardly mention it at all. I

would like to see more consistency in this area so we're evaluating these projects equally. If we are asking for that level of detail from some applicants, we should be asking for it of all applicants.

One issue I have with how materials are presented to us is when an applicant submits new materials the day of or even the moment of the meeting. When they start throwing up new renderings or site plans on the screen as their latest design, it's sometimes hard to assess it effectively since the board hasn't had the time to consider them and they don't necessarily stay on the screen long enough for us to make a comparison to what was received in our packet. I think we are usually able to work through these situations and still provide relevant feedback, but I hope we can encourage Applicants to not use this method of presentation regularly.

Design Review Board - Meeting Minutes Draft

December 15, 2020

Online via WebEx

Meeting called to order at 5:30 PM by Kathy Lang

Attendance:

- *Board Members Present:* Chuck Horgan (Arts Commission Liaison), Drew Kleman, Chad Schmidt, Ted Teske, Kathy Lang (Chair & CA Liaison), Mark Brower (Vice-Chair)
- *Board Members Not Present:* Anne Hanenburg, Grant Keller
- *Quorum Present:* Yes
- *Staff Members Present:* Dean Gunderson, Taylor Berberich, Stephanie Bishop

Kathy Lang moved for the suspension of certain meeting rules due to the COVID-19 teleconference; Mark Brower seconded. Motion Carried. (6-0)

Changes to Agenda:

- None

Workshops:

** Mark Brower recused himself, as his firm is engaged with GGLO on the project.

- **206/214 Riverside Apartments - Recommendation Meeting**
- Staff Report: Taylor Berberich
- Applicant Presentation: Carissa Franks & Mark Sindell (GGLO)
- Kathy Lang closed public comment
- Questions asked and answered
- Discussion ensued

Based on review of the materials submitted by the Applicant and discussion during the December 15, 2020 Recommendation Meeting the Design Review Board recommends the approval of the project subject to the following conditions:

1. The Applicant is *strongly encouraged* to consider alternative materials in lieu of the corrugated metal cladding occurring within the pedestrian zone.

Please see the following Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies: LU 2.1 Public Realm Features, LU 5.5 Compatible Development, DP 2.6 Building and Site Design, and DP 4.2 Street Life.

Please see the following Downtown Plan Strategies: 2.2 BUILT FORM AND CHARACTER, and 2.4 OPEN SPACE, PUBLIC REALM AND STREETSCAPES.

Please see the following Downtown Design Guidelines: B-1 Respond to the Neighborhood Context, B-3 Reinforce the Urban Form and Architectural Attributes of the Immediate Area, B-4 Design a Well-proportioned and Unified Building, and C-3 Provide Active Façades.

2. The Applicant *shall* provide a refined and articulated parapet expression at, and appropriate to, the metal panel building masses to meet Design Guideline A-2: Enhance the Skyline. The parapet at the metal panel clad portions of the building does not need to match the parapet at the brick clad portions of the building.

Please see the following Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies: LU 2.1 Public Realm Features, LU 5.5 Compatible Development, DP 2.6 Building and Site Design, and DP 4.2 Street Life.

Please see the following Downtown Plan Strategies: 2.2 BUILT FORM AND CHARACTER, and 2.4 OPEN SPACE, PUBLIC REALM AND STREETSCAPES.

Please see the following Downtown Design Guidelines: A-2 Enhance the Skyline, B-1 Respond to the Neighborhood Context, C-3 Provide Active Façades, and B-3 Reinforce the Urban Form and Architectural Attributes of the Immediate Area.

3. The Applicant is *encouraged* to work with Spokane Arts regarding the location of a potential cultural trail amenity/viewing frame.

Please see the following Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies: LU 2.1 Public Realm Features, LU 5.5 Compatible Development, DP 2.5 Character of the Public Realm, and DP 2.6 Building and Site Design.

Please see the following Downtown Plan Strategies: 2.2 BUILT FORM AND CHARACTER and 2.4 OPEN SPACE, PUBLIC REALM AND STREETSCAPES.

Please see the following Downtown Design Guidelines: A-1 Respond to the Physical Environment, B-1 Respond to the Neighborhood Context, B-3 Reinforce the Urban Form and Architectural Attributes of the Immediate Area, C-2 Design Façades at Many Scales, C-3 Provide Active Façades, and D-3 Respect Historic Features that Define Spokane.

4. The Board appreciates the strong building corner at Browne and Riverside shown in the Applicant's packet, and *strongly encourages* the City to consider providing additional pedestrian refuge areas in the form of modified bulb-outs at the corner.

Please see the following Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies: LU 2.1 Public Realm Features, LU 5.5 Compatible Development, DP 2.6 Building and Site Design, and DP 4.2 Street Life.

Please see the following Downtown Plan Strategies: 2.2 BUILT FORM AND CHARACTER, and 2.4 OPEN SPACE, PUBLIC REALM AND STREETSCAPES.

Please see the following Downtown Design Guidelines: B-1 Respond to the Neighborhood Context, B-3 Reinforce the Urban Form and Architectural Attributes of the Immediate Area, C-1 Promote Pedestrian Interaction, and D-8 Design for Personal Safety & Security.

Chuck Horgan moved to approve the recommendations as presented; Ted Teske seconded. Motion carried unanimously. (5-0, with Mark Brower recused)

** Mark Brower rejoined the group at 7:40 PM.

Board Business:

Approval of Minutes:

- Minutes from the December 9, 2020 meeting approved unanimously.

Old Business:

- None

New Business:

- Kathy Lang received an invitation to the virtual Steering Committee meeting being held this coming Friday, December 18th, from 10 AM to 4 PM. Chuck Horgan advised he could potentially attend. Kathy may be attending and will ask that an invitation be sent to Dean.

Secretary Report - Dean Gunderson

- There will not be an applicant for the January 13th meeting. It will be a board retreat/workshop to go over procedural reviews and any questions board members may have about anything the board does. Dean asked that any topics board members would like added to the meeting be sent to him by January 6, 2021 to be added to the agenda that will be sent out the Friday prior to the meeting.
- The ending of our contract with UrbsWorks is coming up. Dean asked that any board members with recommendations or comments on the final documents they will be receiving. Dean will have a

close-out meeting with them on Friday. The actual crafting of the guidelines will be done by the DRB in the beginning of the year. Those will be passed on to Plan Commission for recommendations, and then everything will be sent to City Council for adoption by resolution.

Chair Report:

- Kathy Lang gave the board an update on everything gathered (from donations) for a family in need of some extra assistance this holiday season.

Meeting Adjourned at 7:58 PM

The next Design Review Board Meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 13, 2020.

DRAFT