



SUMNER DESIGN COMMISSION

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, October 14, 2004

6:00 p.m.

Sumner City Hall
1104 Maple Street

CALL TO ORDER

BENNETT called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Abbott, Ahrens, Wolch, Bennett and Hansen

Members Absent: Tobias and Bisom

Also Present: Ron Buckholt, Associate Planner
Forrest D. McNabb, C.P.E., Applicant (PLN 2004-106)
Jason Hubbell, Engineer
Ivana Halvorsen, Barghausen Consulting Engineers, Inc.
Guy Cuskelly, Project Supervisor (*in audience*)
Brian Stowe, Land Owner (*in audience*)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

AHRENS motioned to approve the September 9, 2004 regular meeting minutes as written. ABBOTT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no Public Comment.

NEW BUSINESS

A) **PLN 2004-106 City Beverages**

BUCKHOLT reviewed for the Commission Staff's Report on PLN 2004-106 City Beverages, as follows:

The site is located between SR 167 and West Valley Highway, near 38th Street Court East. Proposed is construction of a single industrial warehouse/distribution building of 116,000 square feet with associated parking, storm water and landscaping. Also, the site plan indicates a future expansion wing to the proposed building, a truck maintenance building and an area designated for future truck parking. However, building elevations were not provided to evaluate those components and they will have to be reviewed at a later date. Secondly, the proposal is situated in Phase III of an approved preliminary plat, however final plat has not yet been granted. No development permits will be granted until final plat is issued. The site is currently being filled for construction and previously contained vacant land. The general vicinity is industrial zoned. The subject site was previously used for agricultural purposes. The project site is zoned Light Manufacturing (M-1) and is evaluated by the Light and Heavy Manufacturing section of the Design and Development Guidelines.

STAFF recommended that the proposal (PLN 2004-106) should be *APPROVED* subject to the following *CONDITIONS*:

- 1. The landscape plan shall indicate that the 25 foot wide landscaped buffers along 38th Street Ct. E. shall be bermed to a minimum height of 4 feet.*
- 2. The customer and employee parking shall comply with the parking regulations stated in SMC 18.42.*
- 3. The pedestrian link shall be either an alternative paving surface or striping to distinguish it from vehicular maneuvering areas.*
- 4. The front elevation (south elevation) shall incorporate one additional design option to comply with the orientation requirements outlined on page 3 of this staff report. The applicant's choices would be material and/or color change on building façade; architectural details; or pedestrian amenities such as benches and tables.*
- 5. The east elevation shall incorporate some wall modulation and architectural detailing to minimize the appearance of blank wall.*
- 6. The applicant shall indicate all signage proposed including both wall and monument style for consideration by the Design Commission. Signage*

shall be reviewed in terms of character, style and size in relation to the scale of the building and surrounding developments.

7. *Per Sumner Municipal Code 16.56.100, the site plan shall be revised to accommodate the 100 foot undisturbed buffer from the Type III stream located in the southeast corner of the subject property.*
8. *All proposed chain link fencing shall be black or green color coated for aesthetic value.*
9. *The applicant shall comply with all previous Hearing Examiner Preliminary Plat conditions and SEPA mitigating measures.*

BENNETT welcomed the Applicant and directed him to elaborate on the proposed project at this time.

FORREST McNABB, Applicant/Project Representative, appeared. He reviewed the proposal at the site plan and expressed his concerns as follows. He noted that some changes have been made since the last submittal, however, they were just clean up. City Beverages plans to consolidate three of their facilities into this facility. Nothing is produced at this facility. It is only sales and distribution. They have no objections to Staff's recommendations, however, they have some questions as to the east elevation. This project is a five-year plan as seen by the "future proposed expansion". In this project, they avoided the use of metal panels as metal panels do not look good. No roofing is proposed as there will be piping on the roof bringing cold air into the facility. At the end of the east elevation is a battery charging room. Future doors are proposed in this area, along with windows. The face of the building is a two and a half inch thick concrete face panel. The concern is that they do not want to penetrate this wall system. The doors shown are fire-access doors, not entrance doors. There is also a three-quarter inch reveal.

AHRENS asked if anything could be attached to the concrete panels?

McNABB stated that they do not want to fracture that system. He suggested doing something with paint. The owner originally was not happy with the line painted at the top of the building. They took the reveal off of the office building, so that it would look different than the main building. He advised that penetrating the face panel would create structural issues.

WOLCH asked if the Applicant had thought about extending the landscaping from the truck parking to create a screen?

McNABB stated that they would consider that, and commented that it would create more buffer?

BENNETT commented as to the proposed future development. That is not something that can be dealt with at this time. What the Design Commission can deal with now is what is proposed to be built now under the present guidelines. He agreed that landscaping may be an option for that elevation.

AHRENS added that the landscaping could also be planted up against the building.

BENNETT explained to the Applicant that the goal is to satisfy the guidelines. He suggested possibly doing some sort of stucco with a design on top of the concrete face to give it fenestration. Stucco would not penetrate the wall. It is important to do something with that wall, as it is facing 167 and as it is in the industrial park. When it is done that way, the value will be increased also.

McNABB stated that they are looking for direction from the Planning Commission. He suggested possibly painting windows on that elevation. It can be done really nicely, shadowing it with paint. He suggested coming up with a couple of sketches and then coming back to the Design Commission.

WOLCH stated that windows would be good in addition to landscaping. He commented that landscaping would be essential and suggested that it be extend all the way across that elevation.

McNabb expressed concern about it being on 167. They do not want moisture up against the building.

AHRENS asked if the Applicant owned the building on the other side of the drive?

JASON HUBBELL, Engineer, responded that the area in question is their storm water facility. He noted that there may also be room to put it on the far side.

DISCUSSION was had about the retention berm, and possibly moving the landscaping and raising the pond berm to the west side and then landscaping in that area, further blocking a lot of the building.

McNABB noted that the challenge with regard to that is that they want people to see the building. They do not want to screen it too much. He asked if they are looking for more architectural features?

BENNETT explained that they are looking for a combination of the two (architectural features and landscaping).

AHRENS noted that 167 is not above the building at that point, and in fact is very level with it. She suggested planting lower plants, interspersed with higher plants. She added that she does not like the idea of painting fake windows.

McNABB stated that Budweiser has high standards that they expect to be adhered to. They want to build a quality building.

AHRENS commented that the building is interesting for a warehouse. She asked if the Applicant had thought about adding more panels?

McNABB stated that there will be more panel on this structure, along with more vertical joints. They expect that there may be twice as many panel joints when they are done.

AHRENS asked if there was a little peak to the roof, as it appears to be flat on the smaller version of the site plan.

McNABB noted that there is a peak.

BENNETT commented that paint can be very affective if it is done right. He also reiterated that stucco is a good idea.

WOLCH suggested adding freestanding canopies in front of doors that can be moved.

ABBOTT added that the canopies would give it some depth.

BENNETT also noted that it would not be very expensive.

McNABB commented with regard to changes to that elevation, that they have very little exposure south of 167, which is why their sign is on the north side of it.

BENNETT asked for a motion requiring the Applicant to come back with changes, per the above suggestions, to Staff for approval, and not necessarily coming back before the Design Commission.

McNABB noted that they have taken care of most of the other issues addressed in Staff's recommendations.

WOLCH motioned to approve Staff's recommended condition No. 5, that the east elevation be revised to include architectural detailing or landscaping to minimize the appearance of blank wall. Further, that the Applicant resubmits the revisions to Staff for review. Said options would be additional landscaping, variations in paint color, canopies, and windows in the battery room. ABBOTT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

With regard to condition No. 1, HUBBELL noted that there is additional landscaping around the driveways and in the parking areas.

ABBOTT motioned to approve condition No. 1 as written. AHRENS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

IVANA HALVORSEN, Project Planner with Barghausen Consulting Engineers, Inc., appeared to address condition No. 2 for the Applicant. The site plan includes parking on the western portion of the site. The main entry has a pedestrian courtyard and entrance features, including sidewalks. The parking ratio requires the warehouse to provide 41 parking stalls, the office space to provide 128 parking stalls and truck maintenance to provide 8 parking stalls. In addition to that, the expansion would require 25 more parking stalls. This site plan provides for 257 parking stalls, which is over the minimum parking required for customer and employee parking. Further, there is also future truck parking and proposed parking on the west elevation. This would bring it to 5 additional parking stalls over the “maximum”. The employee count at this time is 244, and as such, 257 stalls are necessary.

ABBOTT asked Staff if they had the authority to allow more stalls?

BUCKHOLT stated that they would be doing a parking check when the plan goes through zoning review when the permit is submitted.

WOLCH motioned to approve condition No. 2 as written. ABBOTT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HUBBELL discussed condition No. 3. He noted that there is a concrete pathway through the landscaped area that connects up with the sidewalks.

BENNETT noted that one thing the Design Commission likes to see with regard to pathways, is a different material used for the walking areas. Suggested in the past has been washed aggregate or concrete as opposed to asphalt.

McNABB stated that with regard to stamped concrete, they are concerned that people will catch their heels on the groves in the stamped concrete.

HANSEN noted that the concrete did not completely continue through?

HUBBELL suggested landscaping to separate the sidewalk from the other asphalt surfaces. The landscaping can be on either side of the sidewalk.

AHRENS agreed that landscaping was a good idea.

BRIAN STOWE, landowner, suggested from the audience that the area be striped to create the designed separation.

BENNETT stated that a stripe would satisfy the requirement, however, a material change looks better.

McNABB commented that, from a structural point of view, he would not want to put an actual sidewalk in the asphalt. He noted that the path will be next to a curb, which they may choose to stripe as well.

HUBBELL added that the current landscape planter is a minimum 8 to 9 feet, and that next to that is the pathway, which is also a minimum of 8 to 9 feet. They have eliminated some parking to accommodate the landscape-planting strip.

AHRENS noted that if the sidewalk were raised, the Applicant would have to put in ramps at either end.

HUBBELL commented that with the asphalt at the same elevation as the parking, and with the planters on either side, ramps would not be needed. The asphalt will have a softer feel to it with the addition of plantings.

ABBOTT stated that if the path was centered, with landscaping on both sides, it would satisfy the intent.

ABBOTT motioned to approve condition No. 3, with the additional comments that the path be made of asphalt, and that it be centered between landscape strips of 6 feet on either side of the path. HANSEN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

McNABB addressed condition No. 4, as to the south elevation entry. He asked, if the color were changed, could that be to the entire lower office area?

BUCKHOLT stated that it could, and suggested that the Applicant also incorporate pedestrian amenities on the northwest corner.

McNABB stated that they could add benches, similar to the ones at the City's building. Further, benches could be added to other locations.

AHRENS agreed that benches would be a good idea. She asked the Applicant where he proposed to put the bike racks, noting that the required amount of bike racks would be 25.

McNABB stated that there are bike racks proposed at this time, however, they are hidden by the trees. They intend to distribute the required amount of bike racks throughout the site.

HUBBELL added that the bike racks will probably be divided into four separate locations.

ABBOTT motioned to approve condition No. 4 as written, further including benches in the northwest plaza area as discussed. HANSEN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BENNETT asked Staff to further explain condition No. 6.

BUCKHOLT stated that the Simmons building, which is the only other building in that area, has a monument sign, as well as an 8 by 8 sign on the east elevation of their building.

McNABB stated that they are not proposing a sign on West Valley Highway. They do, however, intend to have a monument sign, which they will submit in their signage package. They are looking into having signs at all entrances. They intend to comply with the sign ordinance.

BUCKHOLT explained that, per the new ordinance, the Design Commission must give their blessing as to the signs proposed. The limit to the size of the signs on the building is based on the linear distance of the building.

McNABB reiterated that they intend to comply with the sign ordinance, and that they do not intend to do anything tasteless.

ABBOTT noted that it is hard to review the signs, when none have been provided.

BUCKHOLT asked how the Commissions felt about the existing wall signage, and if they felt it was to scale?

BENNETT commented that the wall sign on the east elevation appeared to be appropriate.

WOLCH too stated that the wording looks proportional, however, he recommended that the symbols in the front be a little smaller as they seemed fairly large.

WOLCH motioned to approve condition No. 6 as written, provided that a more detailed version of the proposed signs be provided to Staff for further review. AHRENS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BUCKHOLT asked for an additional motion as to the size of the signs, and whether the Design Commission feels the signs are proportional.

DISCUSSION was had as to the size of the existing lettering on the building in comparison to the size of the wall. Noted was the presence of overhangs, possibly affecting the appearance of the letters, by making them look larger than they are.

AHRENS commented that the lettering should also not be too small.

WOLCH amended his motion as to condition No. 6 to include that the “A” and the “CB” on the west elevation of the building be scaled down to be proportional to the size of the panel that it is on, and that it be no larger than 6 feet in height, and further that it be submitted to Staff for approval. ABBOTT seconded the amended motion and it passed unanimously.

HUBBELL addressed condition No. 7. He noted that currently there is existing storm water detention along the eastern property line. In addition to that, there is open space outside of the detention facility that will provide the necessary buffer. When the survey is completed, it is believed that the ordinary high water mark will meet the required 100 feet. There is also open space beyond the facility. Further, along the edge of the site plan, it is labeled as open space. Part of that would be the detention facility, the remainder being additional open space. The ordinary high water mark is very close to the edge, and it will easily accommodate the 100-foot requirement. All measures will be taken to meet that requirement.

HANSEN asked Staff why the Design Commission would review storm water detention?

BUCKHOLT explained that they are just making sure it is not missed. The Design Commission can review it for landscaping purposes.

HANSEN asked if it would interfere with landscaping on the east side?

BUCKHOLT stated that he did not believe it would.

HANSEN motioned to approve condition No. 7 as written. ABBOTT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HANSEN noted that, with regard to condition No. 8, his preference is that the fencing be black.

McNABB stated that they would have no problem with that. He asked if barbed wire would be okay for security purposes in certain areas?

BUCKHOLT stated that he would discuss that with the Director.

HANSEN commented that, from a design standpoint, he would be opposed to barbed wire, and would ask that it not be used.

HANSEN motioned to approve condition No. 8, with the addition that the fencing be coated a flat black, and that there be no barbed wire on top of it. ABBOTT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BUCKHOLT noted that condition No. 9 is just a blanket condition.

HANSEN motioned that condition No. 9 be approved as written. AHRENS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

McNABB noted that the Staff Report was in error in that it stated Panattoni Development Company as the project representative.

BUCKHOLT responded that he would make that change to the Staff Report.

BUCKHOLT went on to advise the Commissioners that the only thing Staff is asking from the Design Commission with regard to signs, is approval of the size and scale of the design. Staff will review the signs further.

DISCUSSION was had about the challenges of the new sign ordinance.

BUCKHOLT further advised that not all recommendations made by Staff, in Staff's Reports, need to be worked over. Some of the recommendations are just for the record, and for the Applicant's information.

WOLCH suggested that maybe Staff should separate the recommendations that do not need to be addressed in detail, possibly putting an asterisk by said recommendations.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no Unfinished Business.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no Correspondence.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

There were no Commissioner Comments.

STAFF COMMENTS

- A) **Discuss and Review Possible Amendments to the Single Family Residential (Traditional Community Design Option) Chapter of the Design Guidelines.**

This agenda item was not addressed.

BUCKHOLT advised the Commissioners that the trip to Portland would be an all day thing, and that they needed to contact Sally as to whether they would be able to attend. He further noted that Mark Hinshaw would be in attendance on the trip.

HANSEN commented that he hopes that somebody from the Design Commission can make it as he has attended that trip in the past, and it is a worthwhile trip.

ADJOURNMENT

HANSEN motioned to adjourn the meeting at 7:27 p.m. AHRENS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Sarah M. Heckman, Minutes Taker