

## City of Spokane: *Design Standards and Guidelines for Centers and Corridors*— 2014 review and revisions with 2015 updates

Current 2002 standards language w/page reference	Proposed 2015 standards language w/page reference (based on initial stakeholder input)	Rationale for proposed changes Policy intent reference	general stakeholder comments / Staff suggestions from 2/25	Changes made from 2/25 draft to 3/25/2015 Draft
Cover page date	Cover page date will be revised as applicable			
<p><b><u>Guidelines Application (Front Matter—p 2)</u></b></p> <p>These Initial Design Standards and Guidelines for Centers and Corridors are applied within the CC1, CC2, and the optional CC3 zoning categories found on the Official City of Spokane Zoning Map. All projects must address the pertinent standards and guidelines. A determination of consistency with the standards and guidelines will be made by the Planning Director following an administrative design review process.</p> <p>Some of the guidelines contained in this document use the word “shall” while others use the word “should”.</p> <p>Regardless of which term is used, each guideline must be addressed by an applicant. The City will expect to see how the design of a project has responded to every one of the guidelines.</p>	<p><b><u>Guidelines Application (Front Matter—p 2)</u></b></p> <p>These Design Standards and Guidelines for Centers and Corridors are applied within the CC1, CC2, and the optional CC3 zoning categories found on the Official City of Spokane Zoning Map. All projects must address the pertinent standards and guidelines. A determination of consistency with the standards and guidelines shall be made by the Planning Director following an administrative design review process.</p> <p>Some of the guidelines contained in this document use the word “shall” while others use the word “should”.</p> <p>Regardless of which term is used, each guideline must be addressed by an applicant. The City will expect to see how the design of a project has responded to every one of the guidelines.</p>	<p><b>Purpose</b>  <i>The purpose of refining the design standards for CC1 and CC2 is to better implement the Comp Plan’s policy intent for pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use development, while understanding the need to buffer the impact of more intense development on adjacent single-family residents and the surrounding neighborhood.</i></p> <p><b>Policy Discussion:</b> Centers and Corridor design standards are critical to the development of mixed-use areas, which require more careful consideration of pedestrian environment and treatment of buildings. “Shall” statements are absolutely mandatory. Some of the “should” statements have been changed to “shall” throughout the document to ensure consistency of center &amp; corridor development standards and to support the intent for a pedestrian-</p>	<p><b>Comment A:</b> Add a note to Guidelines Application that says: “Note: A Design Departure will also require a Type II or Type II process (17G.030.030).</p> <p><b>Staff Discussion:</b> Adopt suggestion</p> <p><b>Comment B:</b> Work on the Centers &amp; Corridors is appreciated and time for public review and comment is appreciated. We need more time. We have good guidelines as is and changes should be very carefully considered.</p> <p><b>Comment C:</b></p> <p>Not in favor of “should” to “shall” – believe leaving “should” gives important flexibility in site development. “Shall” should only be used when writing a specification to ensure product or</p>	<p><b>Design Departure is now amended to refer to 17G.040 adopting Centers &amp; Corridors design review into the purview of Design Review Board for those categories designated by “R” “Requirement”</b></p> <p><b>Using Design Departure (17G.030) in earlier draft required more cost to applicant and time; using 17G.040 will still provide notice to the Neighborhood Council in the affected area, but will not provide mailed notice within 400 feet or sign.</b></p>

Current 2002 standards language w/page reference	Proposed 2015 standards language w/page reference (based on initial stakeholder input)	Rationale for proposed changes Policy intent reference	general stakeholder comments / Staff suggestions from 2/25	Changes made from 2/25 draft to 3/25/2015 Draft
<p>The “shall” statements, with such wording, are absolutely mandatory and offer relatively little flexibility unless choices are provided within the statement itself. All projects must include these elements as described.</p> <p>However, guidelines that use the word “should” are meant to be applied, but with some flexibility. They indicate that the City is open to design features that are equal to, or better than, that stated - so long as the intent is satisfied. The applicant assumes the burden of proof to demonstrate how a proposed design meets this test and determination will be made by the Director.</p> <p>Finally, it should be noted that there are other codes and ordinances that govern development in centers and corridors, such as the Building Code and Public Works Standards.</p>	<p>The “shall” statements, with such wording, are absolutely mandatory and offer relatively little flexibility unless choices are provided within the statement itself. All projects must include these elements as described.</p> <p>However, guidelines that use the word “should” are meant to be applied, but with some flexibility. They indicate that the City is open to design features that are equal to, or better than, that stated - so long as the intent is satisfied. The applicant assumes the burden of proof to demonstrate how a proposed design meets this test and determination will be made by the Director.</p> <p>For those Standards and Guidelines that have been designated “Requirement (R),” an applicant may seek relief through Chapter 17G.030 Design Departures.</p> <p>Finally, it should be noted that there are other codes and ordinances that govern development in centers and corridors, such as the Building Code and Public Works Standards. The most restrictive code shall apply.</p>	<p>oriented environment.</p> <p>Changes to this section clarify that “shall statements” are absolutely mandatory unless choices are. (See further discussion of the Design Review Board below).</p> <p>There are other codes and ordinances beyond those in the Design Standards that apply to Center and Corridors. If there is inconsistency between two codes, <u>the most restrictive code shall apply.</u></p>	<p>objective compliance. Please make as much use of the Design Review Board as possible. We have professionals on that committee that can interpret whether the intent of the code is being met or not. No need to bind hands with the term “Shall”.</p> <p><b>NOTE:</b> In order for the DRB to provide input and interpretation, it can either review all designs or just those projects wishing to make design departures.</p>	

Current 2002 standards language w/page reference	Proposed 2015 standards language w/page reference (based on initial stakeholder input)	Rationale for proposed changes Policy intent reference	general stakeholder comments / Staff suggestions from 2/25	Changes made from 2/25 draft to 3/25/2015 Draft
<p><b><u>Buildings along the street (p 4)</u></b></p> <p><b>GUIDELINES:</b></p> <p>1. New development should not have only parking between buildings and the street. In shopping centers, buildings shall be placed along the sidewalk so that at least 15% of the frontage of the site consists of building façades.</p> <p>2. Buildings placed along sidewalks shall have windows and doors facing the street (see “Façade Transparency”) and shall incorporate other architectural features (see “Ground Level Details” and “Treatment of Blank Walls”).</p>	<p><b><u>Buildings along the street (p 4)</u></b></p> <p><b>GUIDELINES:</b></p> <p>1. New development shall not have parking between buildings and the street. Buildings shall be placed along the sidewalk so that at least 50% of the frontage of the site consists of building façades.</p> <p>2. Buildings placed along sidewalks shall have windows and doors facing the street (see “Façade Transparency” and “Prominent Entrances”) and shall incorporate other architectural features (see “Ground Level Details” and “Treatment of Blank Walls”).</p> <p>3. When the site contains a corner, the building shall be placed to the corner.</p>	<p><b>Intent:</b> <i>To ensure that at least some part of the development of a site contributes to the liveliness of sidewalks.</i></p> <p><b>Policy Discussion:</b> Changes to this section <u>would not allow parking between buildings and the street. It would also require that 50% of the frontage of the site consist of building façades.</u> This will ensure a livelier pedestrian environment by placing parking in the rear and ensuring some building frontage along the street, making pedestrian access more direct and enhancing the liveliness of the street activity.</p> <p>Finally, this adds a new guideline: <u>When the site</u></p>	<p><b>Comment A:</b> Suggest thinking about using a simpler (less descriptive of building size) standard to replace “50% build to street” what if the requirement is to build the “longest edge of building possible to street” or “greatest street orientation possible”</p> <p><b>Comment B:</b> Maximum Setback</p> <p><b>Comment C:</b> 50% in CC1 only?</p> <p><b>Comment D:</b> Suggestion to add text to Buildings Along Street, Statement #3: “3. When the site contains a corner, the building shall be placed to the corner <u>of the intersection.</u>”</p>	<p><b>Change to revert to “15% build to street” for Shopping Centers (this is current design guideline).</b></p> <p><b>Change to add the provision “30% build to street” for other sites. This is less than earlier draft to allow necessary flexibility for different site size and configurations.</b></p> <p><b>“Should” to “Shall” change is retained.</b></p>

Current 2002 standards language w/page reference	Proposed 2015 standards language w/page reference (based on initial stakeholder input)	Rationale for proposed changes Policy intent reference	general stakeholder comments / Staff suggestions from 2/25	Changes made from 2/25 draft to 3/25/2015 Draft
		contains a corner, the <u>building shall be placed to the corner</u> . The purpose of this new guideline is to discourage placing parking on the corner and ensuring a livelier, safer pedestrian environment.	<p><b>Comment E:</b> Adopt suggestion</p> <p><b>Comment F:</b> Make sure there is some way to accommodate “reasonable use” in case the development standards are too strict.</p> <p><b>Comment G:</b> 25% would work better Also consider: <u>“When the site contains a corner, the building shall be placed to the corner except when 2 principal or minor arterials or a principal or minor arterial and a collector arterial meet.”</u> There are situations that make it impossible to site a building at the corner and meet all of the other requirements when you must push the building to the corner.</p> <p><b>Comment G:</b> Concern over entrance on a corner – for example the Perry St Brewery entrance is not on the corner, but it interacts with the street</p>	

Current 2002 standards language w/page reference	Proposed 2015 standards language w/page reference (based on initial stakeholder input)	Rationale for proposed changes Policy intent reference	general stakeholder comments / Staff suggestions from 2/25	Changes made from 2/25 draft to 3/25/2015 Draft
			<p>well – this should not be a requirement. Not in favor of the “build to the corner” – like “entrance on a corner” this can be a big problem for a site – should be encouraging good development but still encourage development. Just visited Snoqualmie and their ‘new town’. Only about half of the corner buildings actually had corner entrances. They also had VERY ample sidewalks with plenty of space for outdoor seating and interaction with the streetscape. Some of our sidewalks are too narrow to be forcing building to the sidewalk or even corner entrances because of how compact it makes the space.</p> <p>NOTE: the intent of the proposed change is to ensure some part of building fronting the street, but to also allow for plazas or other public realm improvements between building and street. May need to be</p>	

Current 2002 standards language w/page reference	Proposed 2015 standards language w/page reference (based on initial stakeholder input)	Rationale for proposed changes Policy intent reference	general stakeholder comments / Staff suggestions from 2/25	Changes made from 2/25 draft to 3/25/2015 Draft
			<p>reworded to clarify.</p> <p><b>Comment H:</b> Consideration: make sure you look at FAR and how that works with the 50% requirement. The Whole of the Code needs to be considered so we don't completely bind a property owner's hands and make their parcel unusable under new language</p>	
<u><b>Landscaping as Transition Mitigation for Centers and Corridors</b></u>	<p><u><b>Landscaping as Transition Mitigation for Centers and Corridors (p 4a)</b></u></p> <p><b>GUIDELINES:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Buffer Zones:</b> CC1, CC2, and CC4 zoned properties except where buildings are built with no setback from the property line shall include an eight-foot wide planting area of see-through buffer, including street trees between development and adjacent residential neighborhoods that are next to or directly behind as prescribed</li> </ul>	<p><b>Intent:</b> <i>To provide a transition between higher density development and lower density residential near Centers and Corridors through landscape design to buffer impacts from lighting and sound.</i></p> <p><b>Policy Discussion:</b> This adds a new section to include <u>an eight-foot wide planting area of see-through buffer, including street trees between development and adjacent residential neighborhoods</u></p>	<p><b>Comment A:</b> Concern about the 8 foot buffer on small sites. For example, maybe the "extra 3 feet" of landscaping would be better used in front of the building. I would not make it an either/or. I was merely saying that if 8 feet is used in the back it means the building has to be pushed further toward the street, possibly eliminating the ability to</p>	<p><b>No changes have been made to the 8-foot perimeter landscape buffer language.</b></p> <p><b>Note: Current standard is 5-foot perimeter landscape buffer</b></p> <p><b>See changes to SMC 17C.200.040 for this code change proposal.</b></p>

Current 2002 standards language w/page reference	Proposed 2015 standards language w/page reference (based on initial stakeholder input)	Rationale for proposed changes Policy intent reference	general stakeholder comments / Staff suggestions from 2/25	Changes made from 2/25 draft to 3/25/2015 Draft
	<p>in SMC 17C.200.050. The owners of adjacent properties may agree to consolidate their perimeter plantings along shared boundaries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Additional Landscape Features:</b> Developers are encouraged to include elements throughout the site that improve the health of trees and plantings, berms, improved storm water management, or artistic features that improve the pedestrian environment.</li> </ul>	<p>that are next to or directly <u>behind</u>. The purpose is to provide a transition between higher-density development and lower-density residential through better landscape design to buffer visual and noise impacts.</p>	<p>do landscaping in front.</p>	
<b><u>Parking lot landscaping</u></b>	<p><b><u>Parking lot landscaping (p 4b)</u></b></p> <p><b>GUIDELINES:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The parking lot landscape should reinforce pedestrian and vehicle circulation</li> <li>• Low walls, berms and raised planters, and architectural features shall be used to define entrances to parking areas and buffer parking lot from adjacent residences. Landscape islands shall be provided</li> </ul>	<p><b>Intent:</b> <i>To help reduce the visual impact of parking lots through landscaped areas, planted berms, trees, trellises, and/or other architectural features that compliment the overall design and character of developments.</i></p> <p><b>Policy Discussion:</b> This adds a new section that provides requirements for parking lot landscape features in order to help</p>		<p><b>Standards already exist in 17C.200, Landscape &amp; Screening</b></p>



Current 2002 standards language w/page reference	Proposed 2015 standards language w/page reference (based on initial stakeholder input)	Rationale for proposed changes Policy intent reference	general stakeholder comments / Staff suggestions from 2/25	Changes made from 2/25 draft to 3/25/2015 Draft
	such that there are no more than eight contiguous parking stalls along a corridor	reduce the visual impact of parking lots. <u>Low walls, berms and raised planters, and architectural features shall be used to define entrances to parking areas and buffer parking lots. Landscape islands shall be provided such that there are no more than eight contiguous parking stalls along a corridor.</u>		
<b><u>Sidewalk encroachments (p 5)</u></b>  <b>GUIDELINES:</b> Temporary sidewalk encroachments are allowed. Café seating, planters, ramps, stairs, and sandwich board signs which are located on the sidewalk shall be located in such a manner as to leave a pathway at least 4 feet wide that is free of obstructions.	<b><u>Sidewalk encroachments (p 5)</u></b>  <b>GUIDELINES:</b> Temporary sidewalk encroachments are allowed. Café seating, planters, ramps, stairs, and sandwich board signs which are located on the sidewalk shall be located in such a manner as to leave a pathway at least 4-6 feet wide that is free of obstructions.	<b>Intent:</b> <i>To ensure that there is a minimum clear, unobstructed walking route along sidewalks.</i>  <b>Policy Discussion:</b> <u>Changes the clear pathway from a 4-6 foot minimum</u> , which is consistent with other city standards.		<b>Change made. No comments received.</b>  <b>This is to be in compliance with standards otherwise stated in the SMC</b>
<b><u>Lighting (p 6)</u></b>  <b>GUIDELINES:</b> 1. Lighting shall be provided within parking lots and along pedestrian walkways.  2. Lighting fixtures shall be limited to heights of 24 ft. for	<b><u>Lighting (p 6)</u></b>  <b>GUIDELINES:</b> 1. Lighting shall be provided along public sidewalks and along pedestrian walkways. Preferred spacing for lighting is 50 feet on center and 3 feet from face of curb.  2. Lighting shall be provided	<b>Intent:</b> <i>To ensure that site lighting contributes to the character of the site and does not disturb adjacent development.</i>  <b>Policy Discussion:</b> This change clarifies that lighting <u>shall be provided along public sidewalks within parking lots and along pedestrian walkways to contribute to the</u>	<b>Comment A:</b> Need to quantify the statement (in other words – how much is	<b>This proposed change to the code has been withdrawn.</b>  <b>No changes are proposed.</b>



Current 2002 standards language w/page reference	Proposed 2015 standards language w/page reference (based on initial stakeholder input)	Rationale for proposed changes Policy intent reference	general stakeholder comments / Staff suggestions from 2/25	Changes made from 2/25 draft to 3/25/2015 Draft
<p>parking lots and 16 ft. for pedestrian walkways.</p> <p>3. All lighting shall be shielded from producing off-site glare, either through exterior shields or through optical design inside the fixture, so that the direction of light is downward.</p>	<p>within parking lots.</p> <p>3. Lighting fixtures shall be limited to heights of 24 ft. for parking lots and 16 ft. for pedestrian walkways.</p> <p>4. All lighting shall be shielded from producing off-site glare, either through exterior shields or through optical design inside the fixture, so that the direction of light is downward.</p>	<p>character and safety of the site. <u>Preferred spacing for lighting is 50 feet on center and 3 feet from face of curb.</u></p>	<p>required):  “2. Lighting shall be provided within parking lots”.</p>	
<p><b><u>Screening and noise control of services (p 7)</u></b></p> <p><b>GUIDELINES:</b></p> <p>1. All service, loading and trash collection areas shall be screened by a combination of decorative walls of masonry, wood, vinyl, and planting.</p> <p>2. Loading and service areas should not face any residential district, unless no other location is</p>	<p><b><u>Screening and noise control of services (p 7)</u></b></p> <p><b>GUIDELINES:</b></p> <p>1. All service, loading and trash collection areas shall be screened by a combination of decorative walls of masonry, wood, vinyl, and planting.</p> <p>2. Loading and service areas should not face or be adjacent to any residential district, unless no other location is possible.</p>	<p><b>Intent:</b> <i>To reduce the impact of service, loading and trash storage areas.</i></p> <p><b>Policy Discussion:</b> This change clarifies that loading, trash or service areas <u>should not face or be adjacent to any residential district</u> to reduce the impact of these activities. These activities should happen directly behind a building and shall be</p>	<p><b>Comment A:</b> Propose adding: “The Refuse Department shall have authority to waive this requirement.”</p>	<p><b>No change to draft</b></p>

Current 2002 standards language w/page reference	Proposed 2015 standards language w/page reference (based on initial stakeholder input)	Rationale for proposed changes Policy intent reference	general stakeholder comments / Staff suggestions from 2/25	Changes made from 2/25 draft to 3/25/2015 Draft
possible.		appropriately screened.		
<p><b><u>Curb cut limitations (p 9)</u></b></p> <p><b>GUIDELINES:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A curb cut for a nonresidential use should not exceed 30 feet for combined entry/exits. Driveway width where the sidewalk crosses the driveway should not exceed 24 feet in width.</li> <li>2. The sidewalk pattern shall carry across the driveway.</li> <li>3. Adjacent developments should share driveways, to the greatest extent possible.</li> <li>4. Vehicular access should be designated so that traffic is not directed through an abutting residential zone.</li> </ol>	<p><b><u>Curb cut limitations (p 9)</u></b></p> <p><b>GUIDELINES:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A curb cut for a nonresidential use should not exceed 30 feet for combined entry/exits. Driveway width where the sidewalk crosses the driveway should not exceed 24 feet in width.</li> <li>2. The sidewalk pattern shall carry across the driveway.</li> <li>3. Adjacent developments should share driveways, to the greatest extent possible.</li> <li>4. Vehicular access should be designated so that traffic is not directed through an abutting residential zone.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Intent:</b> To provide safe, convenient vehicular access without diminishing pedestrian safety.</p> <p><b>Policy Discussion??</b></p>	<p><b>Comment A:</b> Suggestion to add text to Guidelines #1: "A curb cut for a nonresidential <u>or multifamily residential use</u> should not exceed 30 feet for combined entry/exits. Driveway width where the sidewalk crosses the driveway should not exceed 24 feet in width.</p> <p><b>Comment B:</b> Currently there are no amendments to this section. No objection to this change if it offers clarification.</p>	<p><b>No changes were proposed to this section.</b></p>
<p><b><u>Pedestrian connections in parking lots (p 10)</u></b></p> <p><b>GUIDELINES:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Within parking lots containing more than 30 stalls, clearly defined pedestrian connections should be provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Between a public right-of-way and building entrances</li> <li>•Between parking lots and building entrances</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<p><b><u>Pedestrian connections in parking lots (p 10)</u></b></p> <p><b>GUIDELINES:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Within parking lots containing more than 30 stalls, clearly defined pedestrian connections should be provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Between the primary public right-of-way and building entrances</li> <li>•Between parking lots and building entrances</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<p><b>Intent:</b> <i>To create a network of safe and attractive linkages for pedestrians.</i></p> <p><b>Policy Discussion:</b> Requires a clearly marked pedestrian way between <u>the primary</u> public right-of-way and building entrances. This allows safer pedestrian entry and movement through parking lots.</p>	<p><b>Comment A:</b> On page 10 Guideline 1- Please add a bullet point to <i>require pedestrian connections between adjacent transit stops and building entrances.</i></p> <p>On page 10 Guideline 3- Please include <i>language</i></p>	<p><b>Additional changes suggested by STA to include pedestrian linkages to transit have been added to the draft language.</b></p>

Current 2002 standards language w/page reference	Proposed 2015 standards language w/page reference (based on initial stakeholder input)	Rationale for proposed changes Policy intent reference	general stakeholder comments / Staff suggestions from 2/25	Changes made from 2/25 draft to 3/25/2015 Draft
<p>Pedestrian connections can be counted toward the amount of required landscaping.</p> <p>2. Pedestrian connections shall not be less than 5 feet wide.</p> <p>3. Pedestrian connections shall be clearly defined by at least two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•6 inch vertical curb.</li> <li>•Textured paving, including across vehicular lanes.</li> <li>•A continuous landscape area at a minimum of 3 feet wide on at least one side of the walkway.</li> </ul>	<p>Pedestrian connections can be counted toward the amount of required landscaping.</p> <p>2. Pedestrian connections shall not be less than 5 feet wide.</p> <p>3. Pedestrian connections shall be clearly defined by at least two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•6 inch vertical curb.</li> <li>•Textured paving, including across vehicular lanes.</li> <li>•A continuous landscape area at a minimum of 3 feet wide on at least one side of the walkway.</li> </ul>		<p><i>that requires pedestrian connections to maximize directness of travel between pedestrian origins and destinations so that pedestrians do not have to go out of their way to use the provided connection.</i></p>	
<p><b><u>Drive-through lanes (p 11)</u></b></p> <p><b>GUIDELINES:</b> Access and stacking lanes serving drive-through businesses shall not be located between the building and any adjacent street.</p>	<p><b><u>Drive-through lanes (p 11)</u></b></p> <p><b>GUIDELINES:</b> Any lanes serving drive-through businesses shall not be located between the building and any adjacent street.</p>	<p><b>Intent:</b> <i>To ensure that the streetscape environment is lively and not overwhelmed by the presence of automobiles.</i></p> <p><b>Policy Discussion:</b> Clarifying that any lanes serving drive-thru businesses shall not be located between the building and the adjacent street. (According to discussions with Planning Staff and those who were involved in developing these standards, this was the original intent).</p>	<p><b>Comment A:</b> Consider adding: "Any lanes serving drive-through businesses shall not be located between the building and any adjacent street, <u>except when no other design options are available.</u>"</p> <p><b>Comment B:</b> Consider: "No lanes serving drive-through businesses shall be located between the building and any adjacent street."</p>	<p><b>No changes to draft proposed.</b></p>

Current 2002 standards language w/page reference	Proposed 2015 standards language w/page reference (based on initial stakeholder input)	Rationale for proposed changes Policy intent reference	general stakeholder comments / Staff suggestions from 2/25	Changes made from 2/25 draft to 3/25/2015 Draft
<p><b><u>Transition between commercial and residential development (p 12)</u></b></p> <p><b>GUIDELINES:</b> Code provisions require lower heights for portions of buildings that are close to single family residential zones. In addition, any side of the building visible from the ground level of an adjacent single family residential zone shall be given architectural treatment using two or more of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>architectural details mentioned under "Ground Level Details"</li> <li>pitched roof form</li> <li>windows</li> <li>balconies</li> <li>if building is on the Spokane Register of Historic Places, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for rehabilitation historic design guidelines shall apply.</li> </ol>	<p><b><u>Transition between commercial and residential development Requirement (R) (p 12)</u></b></p> <p><b>GUIDELINES:</b> Code provisions require lower heights for portions of buildings that are close to single family residential zones. In addition, any side of the building visible from the ground level of an adjacent single family residential zone shall be given architectural treatment using three or more of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>architectural details mentioned under "Ground Level Details"</li> <li>pitched roof form</li> <li>windows</li> <li>balconies</li> <li>if building is on the Spokane Register of Historic Places, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for rehabilitation historic design guidelines shall apply.</li> </ol> <p>Deviation from using three of these architectural treatments must meet the intent of this section and requires a recommendation of approval by the Design Review Board.</p>	<p><b>Intent:</b> <i>To ensure compatibility between the more intensive uses in centers and corridors and lower intensity uses of adjacent residential zones by incorporating design elements that soften transitions and protect light and privacy for adjacent residents.</i></p> <p><b>Policy Discussion:</b> To protect adjacent residential quality of life, taller buildings in CC1 need to have <u>three or more</u> design elements such as <u>windows, balconies, architectural details, pitched roof form</u> that keep adjoining commercial activity from negatively impacting nearby residential activity. ***WE MAY NEED TO ADD MORE ARCHITECTURAL TREATMENTS HERE...</p> <p>The Planning Director may approve a deviation from including three or more of the design elements only when the design is reviewed and recommended by the Design Review Board as still meeting the intent of this section. This allows some flexibility in design, while still meeting the goals of minimizing impact to</p>	<p><b>Comment A:</b> Transition between commercial/residential, recommend additional treatments: examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building stepbacks or projections on upper levels</li> <li>Curved or articulated surfaces</li> <li>Recessed entries</li> <li>Roof Lines, use of pitches or shapes</li> <li>Cornices</li> <li>Building ornamentation (texture, pattern)</li> <li>Overhangs &amp; soffits</li> <li>Dormers, balconies and porches that clearly define street facing entries to residential properties,</li> <li>Building fenestration</li> <li>Fenestration detailing (store front or multi-paned windows for residential units), projection of trim or recessed openings to create shadow and detail.</li> <li>Awnings and marquees at street level</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment B:</b> Transition between Commercial and Residential Development –</p>	<p><b>No additional changes proposed to this section from the previous draft version.</b></p>

Current 2002 standards language w/page reference	Proposed 2015 standards language w/page reference (based on initial stakeholder input)	Rationale for proposed changes Policy intent reference	general stakeholder comments / Staff suggestions from 2/25	Changes made from 2/25 draft to 3/25/2015 Draft
		adjoining properties.	Question: If 3 architectural details mentioned under "Ground Level Details" are used – then are this guideline met? <b>Comment C:</b> Desire to add more elements to this guideline. Seek DR guidance on this.	
<b><u>Treatment of blank walls (p 13)</u></b>  <b>GUIDELINES:</b> Walls or portions of walls where windows are not provided shall have architectural treatment wherever they face adjacent streets or adjacent residential areas (see guidelines for Façade Transparency). At least four of the following elements shall be incorporated into these walls a. masonry (but not flat concrete block) b. concrete or masonry plinth at the base of the wall c. belt courses of a different texture and color d. projecting cornice	<b><u>Treatment of blank walls (p 13)</u></b>  <b>GUIDELINES:</b> Walls or portions of walls where windows are not provided shall have architectural treatment wherever they face adjacent streets or adjacent residential areas (see guidelines for Façade Transparency). At least four of the following elements shall be incorporated into these walls a. masonry (but not flat concrete block) b. concrete or masonry plinth at the base of the wall c. belt courses of a different texture and color d. outward projecting cornice e. projecting metal canopy	<b>Intent:</b> <i>To ensure that buildings do not display blank, unattractive walls to the adjacent street or residential areas.</i>  <b>Policy Discussion:</b> This change clarifies that a projecting cornice (an architectural treatment that adds character to a building) should be outward facing.	<b>Comment A:</b> Façade Transparency No changes are currently proposed but adding the category "residential" to the listed "commercial" in Guideline #2 and #3 may be helpful in the case of multifamily buildings  <b>Comment B:</b> Some argument from multi-family housing builders that these projects aren't "commercial" even though a "commercial permit" is required.	<b>No new changes to draft.</b>

Current 2002 standards language w/page reference	Proposed 2015 standards language w/page reference (based on initial stakeholder input)	Rationale for proposed changes Policy intent reference	general stakeholder comments / Staff suggestions from 2/25	Changes made from 2/25 draft to 3/25/2015 Draft
e. projecting metal canopy f. decorative tilework g. trellis containing planting h. medallions i. opaque or translucent glass j. artwork k. vertical articulation l. lighting fixtures m. an architectural element not listed above, as approved, that meets the intent.	f. decorative tilework g. trellis containing planting h. medallions i. opaque or translucent glass j. artwork k. vertical articulation l. lighting fixtures m. an architectural element not listed above, as approved, that meets the intent.			
<b><u>Prominent entrances (p 14)</u></b>  <b>GUIDELINES:</b> 1. The principal entry to a store / building shall be marked by (a) ornamentation around the door, and (b) at least one of the following: • Recessed entrance (recessed at least 3 ft.) • Protruding entrance (protruding at least 3 ft.) • Canopy (extending at least 5 ft.) • Portico (extending at least 5 ft.) • Overhang (extending at least 5 ft.)	<b><u>Prominent entrances (p 14)</u></b>  <b>GUIDELINES:</b> 1. The principal entry to a store / building shall face the street or intersection corner and be marked by (a) ornamentation around the door, and (b) at least one of the following: • Recessed entrance (recessed at least 3 ft.) • Protruding entrance (protruding at least 3 ft.) • Canopy (extending at least 5 ft.) • Portico (extending at least 5 ft.) • Overhang (extending at least 5 ft.)	<b>Intent:</b> <i>To ensure that main building entrances are easily identifiable, clearly visible, and accessible from streets and sidewalks.</i>  <b>Policy Discussion:</b> This change requires the principal entry to a store/building to <u>face the street or intersection corner</u> to support pedestrian safety and provide a sense of place.		<b>No new changes to draft.</b>
<b><u>Massing (p 16)</u></b>  <b>GUIDELINES:</b> 1. Buildings should have a distinct “base” at the ground level, using articulation and materials such as stone, masonry, or	<b><u>Massing Requirement (R) (p 16)</u></b>  <b>GUIDELINES:</b> 1. Buildings shall have a distinct “base” at the ground level, using articulation and materials such as stone, masonry, or decorative	<b>Intent:</b> <i>To reduce the apparent bulk of the buildings by providing a sense of ‘base’ and ‘top.’</i>  <b>Policy Discussion:</b> Buildings <u>shall</u> have a distinct base at	<b>Comment A:</b> Like the word “shall” staying here to enable the design team to use different styles. Would recommend in the (3) very large buildings to use a dimension – a lot of times 30	<b>Guideline #3 has been reworded.</b>



Current 2002 standards language w/page reference	Proposed 2015 standards language w/page reference (based on initial stakeholder input)	Rationale for proposed changes Policy intent reference	general stakeholder comments / Staff suggestions from 2/25	Changes made from 2/25 draft to 3/25/2015 Draft
decorative concrete. 2. The “top” of the building should be treated with a distinct outline with elements such as a projecting parapet, cor- nice, or projection.	concrete. 2. The “top” of the building shall be treated with a distinct outline with elements such as a projecting parapet, outward projecting cornice, or projection. 3. Very large buildings should be designed to suggest a series of smaller buildings to add articulation in keeping with the adjacent neighborhood character.  Deviation from these guidelines must meet the intent of this section and be approved by the Design Review Board.	the ground level and that the top of the building <u>shall be</u> treated with a distinct outline in order to be in scale and character with the surrounding neighborhood. Also, <u>large buildings should be designed to suggest a series of smaller buildings</u> to add character and articulation.  Deviation from these guidelines can be allowed by the Planning Director, but must be reviewed and recommended by the Design Review Board as still meeting the intent of this section (reducing the apparent bulk of the buildings by providing a sense of base and top). This allows some design flexibility.	feet as a max distance for a wall facing the public way to need articulation and sometimes there is a depth or statement that there needs to be a jog or projection. The will squash the applied trim or joints etc argument  <b>Comment B:</b> Massing Still having trouble with new guideline #3 – how would this be implemented – needs to be quantified. “Large buildings should be designed to suggest a series of smaller building to add articulation in keeping with the adjacent neighborhood character.”  <b>Comment C:</b> Seek DR guidance on this.	
<b><u>Roof form (p 17)</u></b>  <b>GUIDELINES:</b> Buildings shall incorporate one of the following roof forms: • pitched roofs with a minimum slope of 4:12 and maxi- mum slope of 12:12, especially to highlight major en- trances. • projecting cornices to create a prominent edge when viewed	<b><u>Roof Form Requirement (R) (p 17)</u></b>  <b>GUIDELINES:</b> Buildings shall incorporate one of the following roof forms: • pitched roofs with a minimum slope of 4:12 and maxi- mum slope of 12:12, especially to highlight major en- trances. • outward projecting cornices to create a prominent edge when	<b>Intent:</b> <i>To ensure that roof lines present a distinct profile and appearance for the building and expresses the neighborhood character.</i>  <b>Policy Discussion:</b> This change clarifies that a projecting cornice (an architectural treatment that adds character to a building) should be <u>outward facing</u> .	<b>Comment A:</b> To clarify you have two options: One is a pitched roof and one is a flat parapet with a cornice? If that’s the case, then this works for all buildings	<b>A dimensional standard to the outward projecting cornice has been added. Now states: “Outward projecting cornices of at least 6 inches to create a prominent edge when viewed against the sky.”</b>



Current 2002 standards language w/page reference	Proposed 2015 standards language w/page reference (based on initial stakeholder input)	Rationale for proposed changes Policy intent reference	general stakeholder comments / Staff suggestions from 2/25	Changes made from 2/25 draft to 3/25/2015 Draft
against the sky.	viewed against the sky.  Deviation from these guidelines must meet the intent of this section and be approved by the Design Review Board.			
<b><u>Historic context considerations (p 18)</u></b>  <b>GUIDELINES:</b> 1. New development should incorporate historic architectural elements that reinforce the established character of a center or corridor. The following elements constitute potential existing features that could be reflected in new buildings: •materials •window proportions •cornice or canopy lines •roof treatment •colors 2. When rehabilitating existing historic buildings, property owners are encouraged to follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*. •if original details and ornamentation are intact, they should be retained and preserved. •if original details are presently covered, they should be exposed or repaired. •if original details are missing, missing parts should be replaced	<b><u>Historic context considerations (p 18)</u></b>  <b>GUIDELINES:</b> 1. New development shall incorporate historic architectural elements that reinforce the established character of a center or corridor but still remain a product of their own time. . The following elements constitute potential existing features that could be reflected in new buildings: •materials •window proportions •cornice or canopy lines •roof treatment •colors 2. When rehabilitating existing historic buildings, property owners are encouraged to follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*. •if original details and ornamentation are intact, they should be retained and preserved. •if original details are presently covered, they should be exposed or repaired. •if original details are missing,	<b>Intent:</b> <i>To ensure that infill and rehabilitation, when it is adjacent to existing buildings having historic architectural character, is compatible with the historic context within the neighborhood.</i>  <b>Policy Discussion:</b> Our architecturally rich neighborhoods are unique. The historical quality can be preserved and enhanced by new construction that respects this heritage. This change requires that new development <u>shall incorporate</u> historic architectural elements through elements such as building materials, window proportions, cornice or canopy lines, roof treatment or color.	<b>Comment A:</b> Historic Context Considerations No specific text changes proposed – but some concern – see discussion.  <b>Comment B:</b> “I like the edits and the “shall” along with using one of the items in the list. That gives flexibility to the designer and also mandates the proposed building has a similar element to its neighbors.”  <b>Comment C:</b> Question from current planning staff if there is anything different if this is in a historic district. What if the area is without historic context that wants to be continued? For example, Lincoln Heights has limited historic properties in place. CM Waldref has expressed wanting to increase historic elements options in Guideline #1.	<b>Planning Staff agree with the edits except for the “Should” change to “Shall”. Planning Staff and Historic Preservation Staff feel that the use of “should” is more flexible due to the variety of sites and situations. And is more reflective of the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.</b>  <b>Staff would like Plan Commissioners input.</b>

Current 2002 standards language w/page reference	Proposed 2015 standards language w/page reference (based on initial stakeholder input)	Rationale for proposed changes Policy intent reference	general stakeholder comments / Staff suggestions from 2/25	Changes made from 2/25 draft to 3/25/2015 Draft
<p>to match the original in appearance. Remaining pieces or old photos should be used as a guide.</p> <p>3. If a proposed building is not adjacent to other buildings having a desirable architectural character, it may be necessary to look at contextual elements found elsewhere within the area.</p> <p>* a copy is available at the 3rd floor of City Hall or on the Internet at <a href="http://www.nps.gov">www.nps.gov</a></p>	<p>missing parts should be replaced to match the original in appearance. Remaining pieces or old photos should be used as a guide.</p> <p>3. If a proposed building is not adjacent to other buildings having a desirable architectural character, it may be necessary to look at contextual elements found elsewhere within the area.</p> <p>* a copy is available at the 3rd floor of City Hall or on the Internet at <a href="http://www.nps.gov">www.nps.gov</a></p>			
<p>Comment items not currently in the draft.</p>			<p><b>Comment A:</b> This item not in draft – but architects are having trouble meeting transparency requirements and meeting new energy code requirements – energy code is discouraging windows – this might be an opportunity to look at that.</p> <p><b>Comment B:</b> Make sure that buildings can still be “operational” – buildings need to have loading facilities – “back of the front” activities such as refuse containment</p>	

Current 2002 standards language w/page reference	Proposed 2015 standards language w/page reference (based on initial stakeholder input)	Rationale for proposed changes Policy intent reference	general stakeholder comments / Staff suggestions from 2/25	Changes made from 2/25 draft to 3/25/2015 Draft
			and pick up. <b>Comment C:</b> Ground signs should not be limited. <b>Comment D:</b> Consider making the Pedestrian Street Standards stand out better in the document.	
Page 25, Ground Level Details This section is limited to “Standards and Guidelines for site on Pedestrian Streets”		Staff have heard interest in updating the elements to include some more current and “modern” architectural treatments. This is a minor amendment to add an additional element that helps link indoor and outdoor/street environments.		Additional element added to Ground Level Details: “rolling doors/windows”