



SUMNER DESIGN COMMISSION

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, August 14, 2003

6:00 p.m.

**Sumner City Hall
1104 Maple Street**

CALL TO ORDER

BISOM called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bisom, Bennett, Tobias, McMahan, Abbott and Hansen

Members Absent: Wolch (notified)

Also Present: Ron Buckholt, Associate Planner
Pat Shamblin, Applicant

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ABBOTT motioned to approve the July 10, 2003 Meeting Minutes. McMAHAN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

A) PLN2003-50 Shamblin Multi-Family

BUCKHOLT reviewed for the Commissioners Staff's Report and Recommendations with regard to PLN2003-50, Shamblin Multi-Family, as follows:

The site is located at 1411 McMillan. The project proposed is construction of a multi-family dwelling (duplex) in a medium density residential zone. The site currently is developed with a single family home. The single home will remain in conjunction with the proposed duplex. The site also contains some accessory

structures, i.e. garage and storage sheds, that will be demolished to make room for the proposed duplex.

STAFF recommended that project number PLN2000-50 be APPROVED subject to the following CONDITIONS:

- 1) *The proposed duplex shall conform to the following building setbacks per the Design Guidelines: front: 15 feet; side: 6 feet; and back : 25 feet.*
- 2) *Porch shall be incorporated on the west elevation of the northern unit (facing towards McMillan Avenue).*
- 3) *A wrap around porch shall be incorporated on the southern unit. The porch shall have alley exposure and weather protection.*
- 4) *The side elevations (north and south) shall incorporate more glazing and material change to minimize the appearance of blank wall. NOTE: The use of bay windows and shutters may also enhance these elevations.*
- 5) *Staff recommends that the east and west elevation incorporate a variety of material on the façade treatment to create more architectural interest and minimize blank wall.*
- 6) *Applicant shall indicate the number of bedrooms in each proposed unit in order to determine conformance with the parking standards per SMC 18.42.*

COMMISSIONERS had the following comments/questions:

BISOM asked whether, with regard to item No. 3, “wrap around porch” meant that the porch would continue to wrap around?

BUCKHOLT described the porch; it would be on the west and south elevations on the corner and would extend around the corner to create visual interest in that area.

BISOM asked whether there would be enough of a setback for that on the right elevation.

BUCKHOLT stated that it would be enough of a setback. Further, on the right side there will be an open unit with a standing porch area.

HANSEN had a question regarding the front yard setback. With the porches there will the appropriate setback be met in that area?

BUCKHOLT explained that the site plan is not exactly on scale.

HANSEN asked whether it was necessary for the driveway to be 15 feet? It seems a bit excessive.

BUCKHOLT explained that it was a requirement per the public works standards.

ABBOTT asked whether the porch was inside or outside the setback?

BUCKHOLT stated that if it is on grade, it can encroach into the setback. If it is more than 30 inches above grade, then it has to be in conformance with the setback.

PAT SHAMBLIN, Applicant, appeared. In response, he commented that they expect to be at grade, or within 18 inches of grade.

BENNETT asked Staff if there would be an access to the side porch, and is the porch going to extend all the way to the center window?

BUCKHOLT stated that there would be an access and they would extend it to just before the center window.

DISCUSSION was had with regard to the proposed uses of the surrounding properties.

SHAMBLIN explained that immediately adjacent to the property would be single family.

ABBOTT commented that with the setback from the single family on the side, 6 feet is low.

BUCKHOLT stated that the property was probably nonconforming.

BISOM directed the Applicant to add to Staff's presentation at this time.

SHAMBLIN stated that he did not have a presentation, and that he would do whatever is required of him.

BISOM explained the Design review process and asked the Applicant if he had had a chance to go through the guidelines at this point.

SHAMBLIN stated that he had gone over this with BUCKHOLT. They came up with a couple of ideas that he felt would be easy to add. He has no problem with any of the proposed changes.

BISOM stated that they would at this time discuss architectural details and Staff recommendations.

BISOM asked the Applicant about fencing. Is a new fence proposed or will the old fence be replaced?

SHAMBLIN stated that the only proposed fencing is around the dumpster for screening.

BENNETT asked if a dumpster location had been determined at this point?

SHAMBLIN stated that a location had not been determined, however, the alley would be the easiest location for pickup.

HANSEN commented that the setback in the area of the porch is his biggest concern. He further was concerned with how close the building is to the west structure, which is why he suggested making the driveway a little smaller.

BUCKHOLT stated that 15 feet is the minimum for driveways for multi-family.

HANSEN asked if the Applicant had drafted his own landscape plan or if he had the plan done.

SHAMBLIN stated that the plan had been professionally done.

HANSEN commented that a number of plants would be lost due to the porches. He suggested landscaping to the east and in front of the porches. There should be some designation as to porch width with regard to landscaping. It appears to be close to the house, however, the plan is not to scale.

BISOM commented that the landscape plan could use some work. His concern is the right elevation. It does not appear to meet the guidelines as to architectural interest. There definitely has to be something done to the upper portion, whether it be bay windows or adding a window to the bedroom. He also suggested adding a dormer. It needs to be broken up.

SHAMBLIN asked about possibly using different materials, *i.e.* shake.

BISOM commented that shake or stain could be used. A dormer would really be helpful in that area.

BENNETT noted the attic vent sticking out.

BISOM suggested adding detail to or around the attic vent.

BENNETT suggested adding another window to the upper bedroom, or possibly a larger one. He further suggested snap-in windows.

SHAMBLIN stated that his designer has been backed up with work. He has carried a lot of his ideas from his own house design over to this project.

BISOM suggested maybe adding simply shutters for additional color and accent. Additionally, one of the units could be another color to give it more detail.

SHAMBLIN indicated that he could make those changes.

BISOM asked Staff where they would propose locating a dumpster.

BUCKHOLT stated that he would prefer the dumpster to be in the northeast corner of the lot.

DISCUSSION was had about various preferred dumpster locations and whether having a dumpster on site and/or individual garage cans would be the more logical option for this project. The Applicant indicated that a dumpster would be more cost effective for him and would ensure that the garbage was picked up. It was determined that if a dumpster was to be located on site that it would be adequately screened and landscaped and would be located in the northeast corner.

BENNETT motioned to approve Staff Recommendation No. 1 as written. Abbott seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BENNETT motioned to approve Staff Recommendation No. 2 as written, and further that Staff approve the final porch drawing/design. McMAHAN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM motioned to approve Staff Recommendation No. 3 as written. McMAHAN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION was had with regard to Staff's Recommendation No. 4. HANSEN commented that he would like to see the Commissioners' suggestions and Staff's recommendation incorporated into a motion; the suggestions being *i.e.* gables on the side elevation and separation of the stories with different materials. It was also determined that a band outlining the top of the gable on each side would be appropriate. BENNETT suggested that it be reviewed by Staff.

HANSEN motioned as follows as to Staff Recommendation No. 4: The side elevations, north and south, shall incorporate gables over the top windows similar to the gables on the west elevation. Applicant will include a band across the top of the gables to separate the gable from the various sides, and further will change the material and/or the direction of the material and then submit said changes to Staff for final review and approval. BISOM seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BENNETT motioned as follows as to Staff Recommendation No. 5: The Applicant shall incorporate window awnings and shutters on the north and south elevations, and shall incorporate color variation with trim, molding and the like. ABBOTT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM motioned to approve Staff Recommendation No. 6 as written. BENNETT seconded the motion at it passed unanimously.

BISOM had suggestions regarding plantings and plant sizes and discussion was had accordingly.

BISOM made the following motion/recommendation:

The Applicant shall revise the planting plan and plant list as follows:

On the eastside of the property, along the driveway, the Applicant shall install an evergreen hedge running north and south along the driveway and wrapping around the upper right and north corner as to partially screen the driveway. The hedge should be a 3 foot high Laurel, or similar in nature, and should further be four foot on center. The Flowering Cherry trees should then be moved closer to the hedge to allow for more open lawn area. To the north of the building: The lawn should be eliminated in that tree area. One gallon ground cover of the Applicant's choosing, 24 inches on center, should then be installed in that area. Also added to that area should be 3 Vine Maples and 5 shade plants further eliminating the lawn in that area. *(The plant list indicates that the Vine Maples should be 7 to 8 feet in height, and that the Flowering Cherries should be 12 feet in height with a 2 inch caliper.)* It is suggested that the Applicant further install a Flowering Sierra *(2 inch caliper)* with white flowers and a nice canopy; a Flowering Pear; a Cypress *(approximately 5 to 6 feet in height)*; outer looping Laurels *(24 inches in height)*; an Emerald Green Abrubody (sp?) to frame the doors *(approximately 4 to 5 feet in height)*; a Mountain Endramada (sp?); and Knick-a-nic (sp?) ground cover *(1 gallon)*.

McMAHAN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BUCKHOLT stated that the dumpster location needed to be established.

BISOM initially motioned that it be recommended that the dumpster be located in the northeast corner, or in the alternative at the west of the structure. DISCUSSION was had about the possibility of eliminating the dumpster for individual garbage cans, and the motion was modified as follows:

BISOM motioned that a dumpster not be recommended on site and suggested that individual cans be used within the unit, eliminating the need for a dumpster. BENNETT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

ABBOTT asked the Applicant about storm drainage.

SHAMBLIN explained that the storm drainage would be tide into the drainage on the street.

BISOM declared the project approved.

OLD BUSINESS

A) Review & Discuss Possible Amendments to the Urban Design Concept Plan

BUCKHOLT asked for input with regard to the first chapter of the Urban Design Concept Plan.

Pages 1 – 28 of the Urban Design Concept Plan were discussed as follows:

BISOM suggested expanding the list of examples, as buildings have now been completed under the guidelines. There are one or two examples of mixed use, the railroad station and Fred Meyer should be referenced and maybe a nice multifamily or two. Further, it would be nice to have a paragraph stating the scope of the guidelines.

BUCKHOLT asked which industrial projects the Commission may want to reference.

BISOM suggested the terracotta/architectural detailing building. It would be good to show real examples of projects that have been successfully carried out under the guidelines.

HANSEN asked if the City had a formal color pallet?

BUCKHOLT stated that it does not.

HANSEN thought that it might be helpful to establish a formal color pallet for the future. A description of the color would not then be necessary.

ABBOTT suggested requiring Applicants to add more color to their submittal packets.

BISOM commented that, in theory, the first portion of the guidelines are well done and have a good theme to them.

BISOM asked Staff what the Design Commission's charge is in relation to the signage review process. They have reviewed a couple of projects at this point.

BUCKHOLT explained that signs are typically reviewed by Staff. It is encourage not to have internally lit signs. That language can be strengthened. The preference is to have back-lit signs to keep that old character of down town Sumner. They would further like to go with the monument signs verses the pole signs to keep them closer to the ground.

BISOM suggested adding a statement about the type of signage being suggested.

BUCKHOLT asked whether the Design Commission would like to review signs or leave it to Staff?

BISOM suggested that the Design Commission review signs for bigger projects.

HANSEN commented that the sign code tends to block creativity. It may inhibit someone from making a sign that might be characteristic to the City. He suggested that signs that go outside the guidelines/ordinance come to the Design Commission for review. They could go through Design Review rather than seeking a variance. It can be encouraged by Staff to promote creativity.

BUCKHOLT asked the Commissioners if they had any comments or changes on Street Scope.

ABBOTT stated that he felt that WOLCH had earlier expressed good ideas with regard to “gateways”. Gateways are important as they are the major connections to the City.

At this point in the meeting a member of the Design Commission of Bonney Lake appeared. She had questions with regard to the design review process in Sumner as a whole, as they are just establishing their Design Commission.

BISOM addressed her questions and explained the Design Review process. He suggested that she contact Staff for addresses of projects that have been through design review and to obtain a copy of materials regarding the design review process. The process makes a better project that fits the community.

BUCKHOLT stated that he would provide a copy of the requirements on policy and procedure to her via e-mail to Bonney Lake Staff.

McMAHAN stated that along with other obvious updates, that East Main and Valley Ave. on Page 9 needs to be updated. Costco and Fred Meyer need to be added. Fred Meyer is a good project to incorporate into the actual guidelines. It would be interesting to show the first proposal and the finished proposal as they are really different. She also thought it would be nice to incorporate pictures, and maybe testimonials of applicants whose projects have been through Design Review.

BISOM added that maybe the applicant could fill out a quick questionnaire as to the design review process on how it can be changed, streamlined or improved.

BISOM suggested maybe taking digital picture of the site before and after in addition to the aerial photos. He also suggested contacting the Historical Society to obtain photos/documentation. Things are really changing and it is interesting to see.

BUCKHOLT stated that that is something they could incorporate in the future.

BISOM commented on the last section, Page 27, implementation. “How we are going to achieve the vision” could be expanded and a little more detail could be added.

BUCKHOLT agreed.

HANSEN asked if the secondary streets on Page 18 were designated? Are we asking for the sidewalks to be 8 to 10 feet? That seems excessive.

BUCKHOLT stated that he would check the public works standards, however, he thinks it is 5 to 6 feet for secondary streets.

HANSEN asked with regard to sidewalk bowls on Page 19, are these still planned for the City?

BENNETT thought that the City had already gotten rid of them.

BUCKHOLT stated that he would check on that.

HANSEN asked whether improvement of the pedestrian alley on Main Street was still planned, as noted on Page 22. It is an excellent idea.

BUCKHOLT stated that it was still part of the plan as redevelopment occurs.

HANSEN encouraged on Page 23, the phrase “but are not limited to” in relation to street trees for arterioles.

BUCKHOLT stated that that portion has been updated in the zoning code already as to tree designation.

BISOM asked for a copy of the updated Landscape Ordinance.

BUCKHOLT indicated that he would provide it.

McMAHAN suggested adding reference to the East Main Street Design Strategy in the parking section on Page 25, for consistency.

McMAHAN further suggested firming up the gateway section. The Fred Meyer situation showed that it might be helpful. Maybe the gateways should be smaller.

BUCKHOLT agreed and asked McMAHAN to send in her suggestions with regard to gateways.

BISOM suggest that when the 167 on-ramp is finished that some sort of signage be added; possibly “Welcome to Sumner” at the gateway, in addition to some nice landscaping.

McMAHAN thought it would be nice to have some public involvement on what the standards might be for gateways. She stated that she would send Staff a copy of the materials used in establishing Auburn's theme for their gateway.

ABBOTT suggested involving the Art Commission.

HANSEN asked whether Staff wanted them to e-mail their comments in.

BUCKHOLT thought it would be a good idea if they did.

STAFF COMMENTS

- A) **Discuss and Review Possible Amendments to the CBD / General Commercial / Neighborhood Commercial Chapters of the Design Guidelines at the September 11, 2003 Regular Meeting**

This Agenda item was not discussed. There were no staff comments.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

There were no commissioner comments.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 8:06 p.m.

Sarah M. Heckman
Minutes Taker