



SUMNER DESIGN COMMISSION

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, December 11, 2003

6:00 p.m.

**Sumner City Hall
1104 Maple Street**

CALL TO ORDER

BENNETT called the meeting to order at 6:12 p.m.

ROLL CALL

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

Members Absent: Bisom

Also Present: Ron Buckholt, Associate Planner
Applicant (PLN2003-69)
Mike Luna, Land Planner with Sadler/Barnard & Assoc., Inc.
Sam Suznevich, Applicant (PLN2003-68)
Janice Suznevich, Applicant (PLN2003-68)

APPROVAL OF MINUTE

TOBIAS motioned to approve the November 13, 2003 Regular Meeting Minutes as written. ABBOTT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR / 2004

TOBIAS motioned to retain BISOM as meeting Chair for 2004. ABBOTT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

A. PLN2003-69 Walnut Grove Multi-Family

BUCKHOLT presented Staff's report on PLN2003-69 Walnut Grove Multi-Family as follows:

The site is located 15221 Elm Street. Proposed is construction of a 13 residential dwelling units within 3 separate structures on a 0.75-acre site in a High Density Residential (HDR) zone. The three structures consist of a five-plex and two four-plexes. The proposal appears to incorporate a block grid arrangement, as the structures are oriented to a primary pedestrian street (Elm Street). Parking is provided by single car garages for each dwelling unit with additional parking in the front of each garage. Parking access is provided by private driveways. The site is currently vacant and undeveloped. The vicinity of the proposal consists of mainly residential land uses.

Staff recommended project number PLN2003-69 be APPROVED subject to the following CONDITIONS:

1. *The applicant shall incorporate lawn, low groundcover and trees within the rear yard building setback area of the subject site.*
2. *The side and rear elevations on all proposed buildings shall have additional architectural detailing and variation. The side and rear elevations shall incorporate material and window variation and wall modulation in the form of covered patios, awnings, gables, dormers and bay windows. Furthermore, said elevations shall incorporate diversity along the facades and not repetition.*
3. *The parking for the project shall be in conformance with SMC 18.42.*

BENNETT directed the Applicant to address Staff's report and to discuss the project at this time.

MIKE LUNA, Land Planner, Sadler/Barnard & Associates appeared with the Applicant.

LUNA agreed with Staff's recommendations. The only recommendation that they wished to address was with regard to parking. They plan to have a 6-foot fence surrounding the property, and with regard to landscaping, they will be keeping the pear trees (listed as apple trees on the site plan). As to the six shrubs per side on the eastern side of the four-plex, they are considering moving every other shrub and spacing them out in the back of the back yards of the five-plex, in addition to planting Foxwood. This would create more room for children to play. They would like to limit the amount of trees because of the underground detention vault and would like to keep the site low maintenance. They intend to keep the Spruce at unit number 10 and the Fir tree at the

end of the Fire Department turn around. They agree with Staff's recommendations as to architecture. They intent is to have windows on the side in the upper area of the stairs to let in more light. In the back of the four-plexes proposed is a 3-foot balcony, where the existing main windows are, to add the living space in the summer and to add a covered area in the winter. They would like more variation around the windows and will be adding more detail. As for the 5 by 10 bus stop out front, they will be adding a cover and a train station like sign.

TOBIAS asked whether the Applicant intended to keep the Pine tree at the left of the driveway?

LUNA indicated that they would be getting rid of that tree for Fire Department access.

HANSEN asked the Applicant if they were intending to keep the two Pear trees in the back yard?

LUNA responded that it is their intent to keep them.

HANSEN suggested possibly adding some Japonicas in the back to provide a buffer on the west commercial site.

LUNA reiterated that their intent is to provide a 6-foot fence that will hopefully act as a buffer. The idea is to create more room for children to play.

HANSEN noted that adding 3 Japonicas by the fence would provide a buffer and would still leave some yard.

McMAHAN commented that the issue may be beyond the Design Commission, however, adding the Japonicas would be a benefit for screening and looks.

HANSEN asked the Applicant why the trees next to the front yard units are so close to the units as opposed to out toward the street?

LUNA noted that they are going for a wider, open-air look, but they can move them. They were also considering taking a tree and moving it 5 to 10 feet from the fire hydrant to give it a nicer look.

HANSEN was concerned with the trees being too close to the buildings in that they would need to be cut back or cut out. He suggested that having them next to the street would give a bigger yard effect.

McMAHAN further added that it would also soften the pavement to have those trees planted closer to the street.

HANSEN motioned to approved Staff's Condition No. 1 as written, and in addition that there be a Japonica placed in 3 of the back yards to provide a buffer effect, and

that the Pansies and Snowdrifts be planted near the street. McMAHAN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BENNETT asked for Commissioner's comments as to Condition No. 2.

McMAHAN asked the Applicant to go over his ideas on additional architectural detailing and variation proposed on the side and rear elevations.

LUNA stated that he has yet to review the sample materials. They agree that the back of the building needs some work. On the back of the building where the garages are, they would like to have the same curved top to the garages as on the four-plexes. Further, on the back of the four-plexes, they are also considering making the small windows above the garages, which are kitchen windows, into garden windows, which they feel would add a bit of dept. Also, above every other sliding glass door they have discussed constructing a tip out balcony and/or bay window for variation. They may possibly round the windows as in the front. On the steps going up inside the building they are proposing an octagon window or a bay window in that area to let a lot of light inside the building. They have yet to connect with the architect and felt it would be more productive to discuss the plan with the Design Commission first to give their architect more direction.

BENNETT asked about the deck proposed above the slider in the location of the living room window.

LUNA responded that they are proposing construction of a 3-foot wide deck with a slider on top and then alternating that with bay windows.

McMAHAN asked if the Applicant had considered adding a cover over the sliders as in the front to add architectural interest? It would help a lot in matching the second story and would be a big asset with the weather, and would further break it up.

LUNA indicated that that is something they had taken into consideration.

HANSEN concurred with McMAHAN's suggestion. HANSEN asked the Applicant why they did not break up the back portion similar to the front? It is clear in the front that the units are separate. He suggested possibly a change in color or materials similar to the front to break up the units in the back. HANSEN further asked the Applicant if the deck in the front was continuous?

LUNA responded that the deck in front is broken up.

BENNETT suggested window coverings/a hip roof over the bedroom windows to be brought out a few feet past the gutter line to further break up the front.

McMAHAN suggested deferring to Staff on this as there are a lot off sections to address.

LUNA stated that they are going for a two-tone effect on the top that will be 2 or 3 shades lighter than the rest of the building to further break it up.

McMAHAN suggested different colors for each individual unit. It can make a project look much different in that each unit looks more like an individual home.

McMAHAN motioned to approve Staff Condition No. 2 as written, and in addition to add to the back elevation gables over the living room windows and shutters to carry through with the front elevation. That Applicant further explore different materials and also the colors possibly being different for each specific unit in the front and rear elevations. That Applicant consider putting a roof line over the sliding glass doors on the back elevation. Also to consider a balcony on the top floor, windows on the side elevation and varying materials. In addition, to consider a hip roof to extend out a couple of feet past the fascia line of the upper roof to break up the front, and a hip roof over the windows upstairs to be a few feet past the fascia line and to consider the possibility of posts coming down at an angle.

At Staff's suggestion McMAHAN added to her motion that if the Applicant and Staff can not agree as to the changes in the above motion, that it should come back before the Design Commission for further discussion and review.

McMAHAN added Staff's suggestion to her motion. TOBIAS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

McMAHAN motioned to approve Staff's Condition No. 3 as written. HANSEN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

B. PLN2003-68 Suznevich Commercial

BUCKHOLT presented Staff's report as to PLN2003-68 Suznevich Commercial Building as follows:

The subject site is located at 614 Harrison. The proposal involves construction of a two-story 7,983 square foot commercial office building. The site improvements would include an additional 24 parking stalls to the overall site plan, pedestrian walkways and associated landscaping. The subject site has been previously developed with a two-story office building, landscaping and parking that will remain on the eastern half of the property. The western half of the property is vacant and undeveloped. The proposed new building will be located on the western portion of said property. The site is located across the street from the Sumner Train Station. The subject site is fronted by three streets, Traffic Avenue, Harrison Street and Hunt Avenue. The majority of the properties in the vicinity have commercial land uses. Single family homes are located to the west of the proposed site. The project site is zoned General Commercial (GC).

Staff recommended proposal PLN2003-68 be APPROVED subject to the following CONDITIONS:

1. *The Applicant shall increase the number of shrubs in the landscaped areas based on the 'one shrub per 20 sq. ft. of landscape strip' requirement.*
2. *The Applicant shall install non-reflective glass in the proposed windows.*
3. *The Applicant shall provide a detailed lighting plan for approval by the Community Development Director. The plan shall address parking lot lighting and pedestrian lighting at building walkways and entrances.*
4. *A masonry wall and additional landscaping shall be required around the proposed dumpster pad to visually enhance the screening.*
5. *The north elevation shall incorporate a pedestrian entrance and open space plaza area with pedestrian amenities such as benches, tables, elevated planters with seating ledge, bicycle racks (for a minimum of two bicycles), and weather protection.*
6. *The applicant shall provide a minimum of 1,400 sq. ft. of usable open space. The applicant shall create a pedestrian open space plaza that is accessible via walkway and is useable with pedestrian amenities such as benches, tables, elevated planter boxes with seating ledge and bicycle racks. The preferred location of the open space area shall be located near a building entrance on the north elevation, as mentioned in Condition # 5. The entranceway shall have adequate weather protection.*
7. *The back elevation (west elevation) shall incorporate additional architectural detailing and interest by means of wall modulation, awnings, and roof overhangs in order to minimize the appearance of blank wall.*
8. *The applicant shall clarify the types and quantities of exterior materials proposed to be used on the façade of the building.*
9. *The applicant shall install 4 more trees within the parking lot area to satisfy the parking lot and site screening requirements.*

BENNETT directed the Applicants to address Staff's report and to discuss the project at this time.

SAM and JANICE SUZNEVICH, Applicants, appeared to discuss the project.

SAM SUZNEVICH (*hereinafter SS*) commented that they felt that the plan is consistent with what the City is trying to do with the urban village idea. For the exterior materials they are going to go with board and bat and cedar siding, similar to the siding on Top

Foods. They own the other building next to this project and they will eventually be replacing that siding as well. His intent is to tie the two in together, and as such they do not want to put a lot of money into stucco and are considering wood siding. The problem they have run into with the sight is that there is not a lot of room, being 100 feet by 110 feet, and with the alleyway between the buildings it seems to be a natural tie into access around the building. They feel that Staff's recommendations are fine with the exception of the north elevation where they are 5 feet from the sidewalk, making that the front. They feel that it is more logical to have the main access on the eastside of the site. The part of town they are discussing is different then that of the central business district as there is the freeway and a lot of rental houses. It is not a very upscale area. They do not expect a lot of pedestrian traffic as they are more of a destination location.

JANICE SUZNEVICH (*hereinafter JS*) added that there are a lot of transients in that area. Further, they do not expect that their building will house retail, but expect possibly offices, maybe attorneys, title or escrow companies and the like.

SS stated that they have designed the building to dress up the east side as the entrance, as that side is very visible and is a gateway from Traffic.

BENNETT noted that the plan for West Sumner will change that area completely over the years to come.

BUCKHOLT added that they are putting together a plan to make that area more pedestrian oriented.

JS asked what kind of pedestrians would be attracted to their building? At this point, anything, i.e. planters, that have been used to decorate the building have been stolen.

SS stated that they do not have room for 1,400 square feet of open area. If they have to abide by that condition they may want to sell it, possibly to the City for the Train Station.

ABBOTT asked Staff if there was an option for the Applicant?

BUCKHOLT stated that the Applicant could pay a mitigation fee.

SS stated that he is just looking for some kind of compromise.

DISCUSSED at this time was clarification of the elevations. The following was established: The front elevation is the north elevation (which is on Harrison); the back elevation is the south elevation; the right elevation is the west elevation; and the left elevation is the east elevation (Applicant's proposed front).

SS added that they are further trying to accommodate parking, which they feel is important in that area.

BENNETT suggested the possibility of making the building smaller to further accommodate parking.

SS explained that he has already made the building smaller than he wanted. They would prefer not to make it any smaller. By the time they put in the elevators and everything else it may not be worth it for them.

HANSEN asked Staff about the parking requirements and if 38 spaces are necessary.

BUCKHOLT explained that the requirements are close to standards at this time. For the new addition 20 spaces are required, they are proposing 25 spaces and therefore are exceeding the parking requirement.

JS commented that parking is a premium in that area. They need more parking.

SS added that other people will be parking in their lot. If there is no parking available, people may not want to rent. The alley is owned by the City, and they are proposing purchasing that land to get 5 more parking spaces.

ABBOTT asked Staff if review of this had started at the City level yet?

BUCKHOLT explained that it had gone through SEPA review and Design review only at this point.

McMAHAN asked about access to the south. Does the sight to the south need to be accessed through the easement?

SS explained that it does. The access serves both buildings.

HANSEN asked Staff about landscaping. What is the landscape height requirement on Harrison? What is the building setback requirement?

BUCKHOLT noted that it would be 10 feet wide per the Design Guidelines, so there is some flexibility there. The building setback requirement is 5 feet.

ABBOTT suggested possibly having a variance on the set back.

BUCKHOLT stated that for a 5 foot variance there needs to be a hardship, and there is no hardship here.

SS stated that there is more room in the area they are proposing as the front, which is off the east side. It is the logical location for a main access, as it is a clear shot from the City. If the entry is on the north side, people would then have to walk around from the parking to the front.

WOLCH asked Staff if the Applicant could leave the main entrance off the parking, if they mitigate for open space. They could have the main entrance off the parking and have a secondary entrance on Harrison, and then possibly construct a big arbor where the sidewalk meets Harrison.

JS suggested that they could also do that with landscaping.

TOBIAS suggested doors that bear a resemblance to main entrance doors on Harrison and asked if that would satisfy the City as so far as the appeal of the frontage on the street?

BUCKHOLT noted that the presence must be there on the street side to meet the Design Guidelines.

JS asked why the nature of the business does not change that requirement?

McMAHAN explained that they look at it from the point of view that the Applicant may not always own the building and do not just based it on who they intent to lease it too.

TOBIAS asked if there were entry doors on both sides, but the one of the east side did not have the presence of the one on the north side, or it were the same as the northern door, would that satisfy the City?

BUCKHOLT stated that it would.

SS further expressed concern that if they have two entrances that it would leave another unlocked door that transients may gain access through.

TOBIAS suggested that the doorway go directly into one of the offices to act as their main door.

JS asked about the picnic table requirement?

BUCKHOLT explained that the bike racks are a requirement, but the other things are not. The suggestions as to the entrances would work if they dress it up adequately.

McMAHAN commented that they should possibly review the plans to the veterinarian clinic as she recalls that they had a similar issue with that plan.

JS asked what the mitigation fees would be?

BUCKHOLT stated that he did not know what the mitigation fee would be at this time.

TOBIAS suggested with regard to the doors to the east that there be two doors, but that one side be active and the other passive.

SS thought that that was a good idea.

ABBOTT suggested that the Applicant should further explore the issue of open space to see if the fees are feasible, and then bring it back to the Design Commission with a revised plan showing the entrance on the north side.

McMAHAN asked if it would meet the intent of the Guidelines for open space if the building envelope was reduced?

TOBIAS suggested reducing the building by 3 to 4 feet on Harrison to eliminate the need for the open space requirement? The Applicant would then only be losing 3 feet from the interior line.

McMAHAN expressed concern that they would then lose modulation.

HANSEN stated that if the building envelope was 5 feet smaller on the north side on Harrison, the Applicant would have 1,600 square feet of open space and they would have adequate space for the recommendations of Staff and it would provide for the future. The Applicant would lose 310 square feet of building interior on both floors for a total of 620 square feet.

SS again expressed concern about reducing the size of the building.

HANSEN suggested as a possible design option, making the building top larger, which would add space and replace the lost architectural details.

TOBIAS felt it would also attract people to the east entrance.

SS stated that they would like to keep the wall modulation and asked if they could split the difference by 3 feet?

McMAHAN commented that she feels the Applicant has a lot of decisions to make and that it is difficult to know how to proceed without that missing information.

SS stated that he is fine with the mitigation on open space.

TOBIAS motioned to table Staff recommendations Nos. 5 and 6, until such time as Staff has had the opportunity to meet with Applicants and apprise them of the costs of mitigating open space. BENNETT seconded the motion.

HANSEN asked Staff's feeling on the motion.

BUCKHOLT asked the Applicants if they would be willing to reduce the square footage of the building to meet the open space requirement?

SS thought that they could work that out with Staff.

HANSEN suggested working on the issues tonight and approving them with the options discussed and to have the Applicant work with Staff. If there is a problem it can come back before the Design Commission.

TOBIAS motioned to rescind his motion. McMAHAN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HANSEN motioned that Staff's Conditions Nos. 5 and 6 be issues that are worked on with the suggested options made by the Design Commission, that the Applicant and Staff work together to see how those options can be worked out in an amended design. ABBOTT suggested adding to the motion that it is to meet the intent of the Design Guidelines as to leave options open. HANSEN incorporated ABBOTT's suggestion in his motion. BENNETT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HANSEN motioned to approve Staff's Condition No. 1 as written. McMAHAN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

WOLCH motioned to approve Staff's Condition No. 2 as written. McMAHAN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BENNETT asked with regard to Staff's Condition No. 3 whether a lighting plan was needed?

BUCKHOLT noted that the Design Commission does not really deal with lighting issues.

ABBOTT motioned to approve Staff's Condition No. 3 as written. WOLCH seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HANSEN asked the Applicants if they agree with Condition No. 4?

SS noted that that would be in the back where there are houses. He would think that cedar fencing might look better, but they are fine with the recommendation.

HANSEN motioned to approve Staff Condition No. 4 as written.

ABBOTT expressed concern about the location of the dumpster and access to it. Typically there would be a curb and requirements from the local garbage haulers for their trucks to access it. It may have to be moved.

SS stated that they would deal with that.

McMAHAN suggested that they also work that out with Staff.

BUCKHOLT suggested moving the dumpster to parking stall No. 1. The Applicant would then gain more open space in doing that.

HANSEN added to his motion the Staff Condition No. 4 be approved as written with the condition that if the dumpster area cannot be provided at the current location, that other plans be provided meeting the intent of the condition. BENNETT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HANSEN motioned that Staff Condition No. 7 be approved as written, with the following additional language: The back elevation shall incorporate additional architectural detailing and interest by means of wall modulations, awnings and roof overhangs “to the approval of Staff in order to minimize the appearance of blank wall.”

SS commented that the building shrinks with additional wall modulation. He would hope that would be the last option. They are not dealing with a huge area.

WOLCH advised the Applicant that they have options with wall modulation as to the combinations they choose to use.

HANSEN commented that something needs to divide the structure at that elevation to make it consistent with the rest of the structure. It does not have to be all of the suggested modulations, it just has to be something that gives it the same kind of character as on the rest of the structure.

McMAHAN suggested that the Applicant work that out with Staff.

BENNETT suggested a belly-band as potential modulation.

HANSEN amended his motion to add “an interest by means such as wall modulation, awnings and roof overhangs, in order to minimize the appearance of blank wall and that these are examples of things that can be used to make that occur, rather than it be required to do all of those things.

BUCKHOLT added that a candoleaver would be applicable to the setback.

McMAHAN motioned that Staff work with the Applicant on Condition No. 7, which reads that the back / west elevation shall incorporate additional architectural detailing and interest such as wall modulation, awnings and roof overhangs in order to minimize the appearance of blank wall. HANSEN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

WOLCH motioned in further clarification of the motion as to Condition No. 7, that the “right elevation” is referring to the “west elevation”. ABBOTT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HANSEN asked with regard to Condition No. 8, what is meant by quantities?

BUCKHOLT explained that that is in reference to the percentage of different materials used.

SS explained that they are just going with board and bat and cedar siding all the way around. They were contemplating a metal roof to tie in with the train station. They will do that if the projected does not become too expensive.

HANSEN motioned that Staff's Condition No. 8 be approved as written. WOLCH seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HANSEN asked with regard to Condition No. 9 if there was a proposed location?

BUCKHOLT stated that there are two proposed locations by stall 19 and two by stall 29.

HANSEN asked the Applicant what is proposed between parking stalls 20 and 38?

SS explained that on the front of the building now there are two heat pumps. That is a real visible side as you come into town. They were going to put up a cedar fence with a couple of climbing trees coming up on either side of it.

HANSEN suggested that the Applicant to indicate that on their plan and to further note what plants they intent to use.

HANSEN motioned that Staff's Condition No. 9 be approved as written. McMAHAN suggested in addition that it be recommended that it be locate by stalls 19 and 29. HANSEN incorporated that into his motion. ABBOTT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

ABBOTT asked the Applicant about storm drainage. His only concern in that regard is that they may be over their threshold for detention. It may be something they have to work on.

SS stated they have a company waiting to do that. He was told that they can put in an underground system. They have had a geo-tech report. He further stated that he appreciates that the Design Commission has volunteered their time. He thinks it will be a big improvement.

McMAHAN commented that the roof being reflective of the Train Station is a good idea that she hopes they decide to go with.

OLD BUSINESS

A. PLN2003-64 Auburn Commercial (Bldg. B)

BUCKHOLT explained to the Commissioners that the reason this item is on the Agenda is to advise them of the changes to the project and that it has been administratively approved. There is no action necessary. It is just for the Design Commission's information.

STAFF COMMENTS

Discuss, Review & Possible Amendments to the Multifamily Chapter of the Design Guidelines

McMAHAN motioned to table discussion as to Agenda item No. 7(A) *Discussion, Review & Possible Amendments to the Multifamily Chapter of the Design Guidelines* until the next meeting. BENNETT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

McMAHAN suggested e-mailing the materials on this Agenda item to the Commissioners to be reviewed in advance for the next meeting.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

There were no Commissioner comments.

ADJOURNMENT

BENNETT adjourned the meeting at 8:36 p.m.

Sarah M. Heckman
Minutes Taker