



SUMNER DESIGN COMMISSION

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, March 10, 2005

6:00 p.m.

Sumner City Hall
1104 Maple Street

CALL TO ORDER

BISOM called the meeting to order at 6:22 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bisom, Bennett, Ahrens and Wolch

Members Absent: Abbott and Hansen

Also Present: Robert Holler, Associate Planner
Stephen Dorsey, Project Rep (PLN 2005-00004)
Keith Peterson, Project Rep (PLN 2005-00004)
Patrick Gemma, Pannatoni Development (PLN 2005-00007)
Steve Bell, Pacific Crest Cabinets, Applicant (PLN 2005-00007)
Bob Fadden, Lance Mueller & Associates (PLN 2005-00007)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BENNETT motioned to approve the December 16, 2004 regular meeting minutes as written. **WOLCH** seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BRIEF INTRODUCTION WITH STAFF / ROBERT HOLLER

- **New Staff member for the Commission.**

HOLLER advised the Commissioners that Ron Buckholt, Associate Planner, has taken a position with the City of Puyallup. HOLLER has taken over Buckholt's position. HOLLER told the Commissioners a little bit about himself. He has a wife and two

daughters. They live on Sumner Avenue. He and his wife love living in Sumner. He is looking forward to working with the Planning Commission.

- **What is in the pipeline for the Commission?**

In the pipeline is discussion on what works and what does not work with regard to the current Design Guidelines. We will be redrafting the Design Guidelines. The City has money for a consultant. We will not be rewriting them entirely, just giving them a fresh look. This process is expected to begin sometime in late summer or early fall. HOLLER further advised the Commissioners that there is a conference that they may wish to attend, taking place in Chehalis. It would be nice to have a couple members of the Planning Commission present at the conference.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

NEW BUSINESS

- **PLN 2005-00004 (Elizabeth Street Office Building)**

HOLLER reviewed for the Commission Staff's Report on PLN 2005-00004 (Elizabeth Street Office Building) as follows:

The subject site is located at 706 Elizabeth Street (Corner of Elizabeth and Traffic Avenue). Proposed is construction of a two-story 5,040 square foot commercial office building with a 2,620 sq. ft main floor and a 2,420 sq. ft second floor. The site improvements would include 15 parking stalls to the overall site plan, pedestrian walkways, signage, and associated landscaping. The project site is zoned General Commercial (GC).

STAFF recommended that the proposal (PLN 2005-00004) should be *APPROVED* subject to the following *CONDITIONS*:

1. *The Applicant shall install non-reflective glass in the proposed windows.*
2. *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.*
3. *A masonry wall and additional landscaping shall be required around the proposed refuse area.*
4. *The applicant shall provide a minimum of 1,275 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 the building entrance on the north elevation.*

5. *The entranceways shall have adequate weather protection that is a minimum of 5 feet deep.*
6. *Parking shall be provided for a minimum of two bicycles.*
7. *The applicant shall modify the types and quantities of exterior materials proposed to be used on the façade of the building to vary visual interest of the structure.*
8. *The parking lot entrance to the building shall be connected to the front entrance via a pedestrian walkway that wraps the northern portion of the building.*
9. *Applicant shall eliminate the pitched roof design and create a flat roof façade that more closely resembles the facades located along Main Street.*
10. *Applicant shall add additional fenestration and detail to the walls of the structure by providing banding and variation of siding between floors, pedestrian cover over the doorways, and additional detail along the lower portion of the structure.*

BISOM directed the Applicant to give a presentation on the project proposed at this time.

STEVE DORSEY, Project Representative for PLN 2005-00004 appeared. He described the proposed building as being very small, with a footprint of 2,600 sq. feet. It is different than the downtown buildings as it stands alone, and will be viewed from all directions, which is one reason this specific design was chosen. Further, this structure is next to a residential area. Their goal is that it blend with the existing residential. They have no problem with using reflective glass, and will be submitting a lighting plan. There is a trash enclosure on the plan in the area where the wall is recessed, that will be covered by a gate, which meets the screening intent. With regard to open space, they had envisioned that the front entrance would be pedestrian oriented, with bicycle racks and benches. They feel it is important that the front entrance be inviting. The ground floor of the building will contain a real estate office. DORSEY suggested that the amenities be place in that natural corner. In that regard, they have questions about 1,275 sq. ft. requirement.

BISOM asked Staff about the useable open space, and whether it is just at the corner?

HOLLER stated that the open space is located at the triangular corner on the northeast portion of the property, and that it would meet the open space requirement.

KEITH PETERSON, Project Representative for PLN 2005-00004, appeared. He added that they would further landscape and maintain the open space area. PETERSON approached Staff and the Commissioners to further discuss his landscaping plan, in association with benches, bicycle racks and other amenities in that area.

BISOM confirmed that the same was acceptable to Staff.

DORSEY went on to address Staff's Condition No. 5, with regard to weather protection over the entranceways. Proposed above the front entrance of the NE corner is a 5 ft. canopy. Further, on the west side is a canopy that is larger than 5 ft. The south entrance is an emergency exit for the emergency stairway, which will be locked on the outside at all times. DORSEY further noted with regard to Condition No. 6, that they would be putting in a bicycle rack.

BISOM suggested a bicycle locker as an alternative to a bicycle rack.

DORSEY addressed Staff's Condition No. 7 as to exterior materials. He explained that the building is small and has 7 sides and 7 corners. They attempted to create visual interest with windows, using vertical lines. They further are incorporating columns in a classic pattern around the building. It is a temple like concept. There will be an arbor above the first floor windows, with brackets jetting out from the building, creating a nice wood arbor/trellis above the windows, and further creating shade and architectural interest to the first floor windows. The north elevation has a profile example of what is proposed.

BISOM asked if the window treatments would be painted to match the other proposed detailing?

DORSEY stated that it would be pressure treated wood and would match the trim.

AHRENS asked the Applicant if the windows would be fixed?

DORSEY indicated that the windows would be fixed, and added that there would be an air conditioning system. They believe that the windows will create a nice office atmosphere. DORSEY moved on to Condition No. 8, with regard to the pedestrian walkway. They feel that a sidewalk around the north side of the building would be redundant, as the existing sidewalk is only 5 ft away from the suggested walkway. They felt that people would use the City sidewalk rather than the walkway, which would further take away landscaped space.

DORSEY continued with Condition No. 9, as to the roof. They have come up with 3 different roofs, a hipped roof, a shed roof and a pitched roof. They chose these designs as flat roofs can be a maintenance problem, especially with a small roof such as this one. Their client prefers maintaining a sloped roof. In the elevation shown, it looks more complicated than it is. It will in fact be simpler. They have a roof framing plan which shows the structure of the roof, showing that it is a very buildable concept. An example of this type of roof would be the Sumner Mortgage Company building. As you drive by that building, you do not notice the roof as you look up at it. The slopes are consistent. They would prefer to keep that design. It will look a lot better than it does in the drawings.

PETERSON added that the roof is consistent with the neighborhood and most of the other buildings in that area. The train station is across the street and it also has a hipped roof style. A flat roof in this part of town is not a good fit and will stand out. It will further be a big headache for the property owners. They would really like to avoid having a flat roof.

DORSEY moved on to Condition No. 10, additional fenestration. He explained that it is hard to visualize this from the drawings. He explained that the wall panels between the

windows are approximately 6 ft, and on the biggest side there is approximately 17 feet between the windows, however, in that space there are stairs. The building has 75 windows, which is a lot for a building that is 5,000 sq. ft. He is not sure where they would put more windows. They would prefer to keep the design as it is. The recommendation in Staff's Report is true for larger buildings with a lot of blank wall, however, not for this building. They could further break it up with a band.

BENNETT expressed that some concerns could be eliminated or lessened if it was easier to visualize the building. It would be nice to see a 3 dimensional rendering of this building. He added that he agrees that a flat roof would be a problem.

BISOM asked the Applicant to elaborate on the materials.

DORSEY explained that they would be using Hardy Plank horizontal wood siding. There would be a band below the roof and the gutter would have a smooth wood finish. They plan to have a wide wood trim around windows and the shingles will also be a Hardy Board product as well.

BISOM asked the Applicant about paint/stain?

DORSEY advised that they intend to use paint in earth tone colors, possibly using 3 colors to create more visual interest. The siding will be the lightest material, with the shingles a darker brownish color. They intend to stick with earth tones that will blend well together.

BISOM asked which elevation would be the street front?

DORSEY stated that the NE elevation would be the front. The entry of the building will be recessed with a roof canopy between the upper and lower windows.

PETERSON added that there will be double doors with windows on either side of the doors.

BISOM commented that the structure is unique in that it is a stand alone building. When there is a building with no right angles, it creates a different character. The building does fall into a gateway and therefore its design will have more impact. It will be very visible to traffic driving by. That is why there is concern about materials. Normally they would want it to fit in with the neighborhood character, but it is a gateway building.

AHRENS further explained the importance of this site in that the adjacent properties will be developed in the future, and this project will set the tone for the neighborhood.

PETERSON added that it is also an irregular shaped property.

BISOM stated that there is a lot of potential here. It is a good design. He suggested going over the project at this time in the order of Staff's Conditions.

AHRENS stated that her main concern is that, although it is an office it should reflect the residential character. This building makes a really strong statement. It looks a lot like it is on the corner of Traffic and Main, and not by the library. It may not be a good material selection for residential.

DORSEY responded that they tried to make it different than residential by articulating the building with vertical bands in an attempt to make it look more commercial. It is, however, residential in scale. It is very difficult to make a grand statement on such a small piece of property. It is difficult to make it look commercial, yet have it fit in with residential.

BISIOM suggested incorporating more masonry into the project.

BENNETT commented that the Applicant could use a nice wains coating on the southeast and northeast elevations.

PETERSON asked, if they were able to provide the Commission with more detail as to the colors and how they envision the project in a 3 dimensional format, it would then give them a better feel for the project?

BENNETT stated that that would be great.

AHRENS expressed dissatisfaction with the roofline.

WOLCH stated that he is also concerned with the roofline. He commented that he likes the residential/commercial feel of it, and he finds the columns concept interesting, however, he would like the Applicant to possibly expand on the trim to add articulation. He asked the Applicant if the columns would be painted one color?

DORSEY explained that there is trim between the windows, and further that they intend to paint it a different color. That also depends on what kind of windows they end up with.

BISOM suggested that the project be resubmitted with models but, in the mean time, the Commission could offer possibly 4 or 5 guideline suggestions. Being respectful of the design time and the amount of work already put into this project, he commented that the site plan has been handled well and that the landscape plan is more than adequate. At this time he would like to give the Applicant more direction as to the building scale it self, specifically with regard to the flat roofline. He pointed out that the Architect has responded favorably to the comments, however, items Nos. 7, 9 and 10 still need some work. The other items seem easy to resolve.

BENNETT suggested that the Applicant provide a 3 dimensional artist's rendering as opposed to an actual model.

AHRENS explained that the reason she does not like the sloped roof design is because it is next door to multi-family. She was concerned that it would look like a house surrounded by city. It is not reflective of what that area is going to be. She would be interested in seeing the project drawn with a flat roof.

HOLLER stated that most mixed-use projects have a flat roof type look, in connection with the vision for that area and the Town Center Plan. They lend themselves to a flat roof type look. Stand alone, however, might lend itself to a pitched roof. They are not married to the idea of a flat roof.

DISCUSSION was had about flat roof vs. pitched roof scenarios. It was the strong opinion of the Applicant that a flat roof would not work, and it was determined by the Commissioners that the Applicant should come back with a 3 dimensional rendering of various rooflines, to include a flat roof.

WOLCH motioned that Condition No. 1 be approved as written. AHRENS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

AHRENS motioned to approve Condition No. 2 as written. BENNETT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM motioned that Condition No. 3 be deleted, as the screening proposed is adequate. WOLCH seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM motioned to approve Condition No. 4 as written. BENNETT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DORSEY asked if a light pole would be an acceptable form of lighting?

HOLLER stated that he can talk to Public Works about that, but does not think pole lighting would be a problem, as there are similar parcels with that type of lighting.

BISOM commented that the Applicant should keep the lighting at a pedestrian scale.

BISOM motioned to approve Condition No. 4 as written. WOLCH seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

AHRENS motioned as to Condition No. 5, that it be deleted, as the Applicant has met the requirements for weather protection. BISOM seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM motioned to approve Condition No. 6 as written. WOLCH seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

WOLCH motioned that Conditions Nos. 7 and 10 be combined as they are the same, with the option that the Applicant come back with a rendering for Staff's review as

to the materials and fenestration, and that the Applicant provide a 3 dimensional rendering to better explain their intentions.

DORSEY commented that it would be nice if the concept and shape of the building could be agreed upon, and they could come up with color boards and color renderings later.

BENNETT commented that he can not see how the shape of the structure could change, however, color renderings would give it a different look.

WOLCH restated his motion as to Condition Nos. 7 and 10 being combined with the proposed additions. BISOM seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

WOLCH suggested that the Applicant add shadows and color to their drawing, and possibly do a flimsy overlay to make the building look less flat.

BISOM motioned to delete Condition No. 8, as the Applicant has met the intent and additional sidewalk is not necessary. WOLCH seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM further commented on Condition No. 9, with regard to the roofline. BISOM indicated that he appreciate the Applicant's effort here, and suggested that a flat roof not necessarily be required, but that the Applicant look at an alternative roofline.

AHRENS suggested that the Applicant consider a parapet.

BENNETT stated that he is opposed to the need for a flat roof. A sloped roof is consistent with the area.

WOLCH stated that the Applicant could work on these design issues while working on his SEPA issues. The site plan is fine and Public works can look at the storm water.

PETERSON asked Staff if all that was needed was a site plan for SEPA approval?

HOLLER stated that technically that was the case, however, the Applicant should have a plan of how they are going to handle it.

BISOM suggested that the Design Commission reconvene in two weeks for an informal study session to go over things with the Applicant before the next meeting.

HOLLER indicated that that would be acceptable to Staff.

BISOM advised the Applicant that they should attend the study session and that the Commission would be looking closer at the roofline to hopefully resolve it before the next meeting. The Applicant can work out a date for the study session with Staff.

HOLLER suggested that it might be appropriate to motion to eliminate Staff's Condition No. 9, and to come up with a new Condition.

BISOM motioned that Staff's Condition No. 9, as to the flat roof, be eliminated, and further recommended that the Applicant come back before the Design Commission, at a study session to be scheduled prior to the next meeting, for review of alternate roof designs, and further to provide more articulation to the upper portion of the building, possibly allowing the Applicant to still have a sloped roof, but with stronger articulation on the building. BENNETT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

WOLCH clarified for the Applicant that the project has not been approved yet, and that they are to come back for a study session.

The meeting was recessed for five minutes at this point.

- **PLN 2005-00007 (Rainier Park of Industry Pacific Crest Facility)**

HOLLER reviewed for the Commission Staff's Report on PLN 2005-00007 (Rainier Park of Industry Pacific Crest Facility) as follows:

Proposed is construction of a single cabinet manufacturing facility of approximately 185,000 square feet with associated parking, storm water and landscaping. The site is located between SR 167 and West Valley Highway, near 38th Street Court East. The site is currently vacant land at the southern end of Rainier Park of Industry in Sumner, Washington, and is industrial zoned.

STAFF recommended that the proposal (PLN 2005-00007) should be *APPROVED* subject to the following *CONDITIONS*:

- 1. Pedestrian links shall be indicated on the site plan and shall be either an alternative paving surface or striping to distinguish it from vehicular maneuvering areas.*
- 2. The front main elevation of the structure (south elevation) shall incorporate additional design options to comply with the orientation requirements outlined on page 3 of this staff report. This shall be in the form of material and/or color change on building façade; architectural details; or pedestrian amenities such as benches and tables.*
- 3. Weather protection shall be added for visitors and employees in the form of awnings at the main entrance. This will also help to further delineate the main entrance area.*
- 4. Any proposed chain link fencing shall be black or green color coated for aesthetic value.*
- 5. The east and west elevations shall incorporate wall modulation and architectural detailing to minimize the appearance of blank wall.*
- 6. The proposed 10 foot wide landscape screening along the eastern property line shall be increased to 25 feet per the requirements of the Design Guidelines requirements on page 89(a) and shall be bermed to 4 feet in height.*

7. *The applicant shall indicate all signage proposed including both wall and monument style for consideration by the Design Commission.*
8. *The applicant shall provide bicycle parking at a ratio of one bicycle parking stall for every 10 automobile parking stalls.*
9. *The landscape plan shall incorporate native vegetation into the required planting areas.*
10. *The total landscape area shall be increased to meet the 10 percent requirement per SMC 18.41.040.*

HOLLER further explained to the Commissioners that there is additional landscaping that has not been calculated in. As such, the Applicant may have met that requirement.

PATRICK GEMMA of Pannatoni Development appeared. He gave his presentation of the project in order of Staff's Conditions. With regard to Condition No. 1, they intend to stripe the pavement. With regard to Condition No. 2, the main elevation (south elevation), they intend to add a trademark color to the building. That will be the only place on the building that they do that, and it will be a fourth color. They have no problem with adding benches and tables. Further, the entrance is two stories and is recessed to give further relief. With regard to Condition No. 3, as the entrance is recessed 5 feet, it will also serve as weather protection as well.

AHRENS asked if the entrance was two stories?

BOB FADDEN of Lance Mueller & Associates appeared. FADDEN confirmed that the entrance was indeed 2 stories, and that it contains soffet lighting.

GEMMA continued on with Condition No. 4. No fence is proposed at this time. As to Condition No. 5, they are proposing 4 colors. If the Commission would like to see that elevation broken up more, rather than 3 sections, they could add a 4th section, along with adding extra windows to that section. Further, with regard to Condition No. 6, they do not feel a wider buffer would be better. They would rather enhance and increase the quality of landscaping.

FADDEN added that they are suggesting more evergreen trees, as opposed to sticking with deciduous trees.

GEMMA noted as to Condition No. 7, signage, they would like to request that they be able to take their sign to Staff for administrative review. It is Steve Bell's building, and he obviously wants it to look professional in appearance. With regard to Condition No. 8, bicycle parking, they have no problem meeting that requirement, and are likewise fine with Condition No. 9, however, would like to incorporate some evergreens. Further, as to Condition No. 10, after doing some math, they believe that they have met that, however, they could increase the landscaping around the office building entrances. This will be the third building designed by Pannatoni Development on the Stowe property.

BENNETT asked the Applicant if there was a reason the screening was upon the building on the south side?

GEMMA responded that there is additional screening on that side as there is another site over there. The additional buildings share access.

BISOM asked the Applicant's architect to explain in more detail the fenestration within the 100 feet.

FADDEN explained that there are 3 nodes around the building that articulate it over the length of the building. There is a landscape feature around each of the nodes. Further, coming across the front there are several landscape nodes added to the parking area. The landscape clusters correspond with those spaces. They are suggesting enhancing the nodes to create more visual breaks in the building. Further, the color will be similar to the other buildings. They would like to work with Staff on the colors.

WOLCH asked the Applicant if all the landscaping would be in the nodes, as it is now?

FADDEN stated that the landscaping would be in the islands against the building and would contain a tree and a couple of shrubs. They could possibly make them wider and add a couple of trees.

WOLCH stated that he likes the relationship between nodes as they exist, however, he would like to see them a bit more substantial.

AHRENS commented that in keeping the same rhythm, 4 nodes would be too much.

GEMMA suggested beefing up the 3 that they have now with additional landscaping.

FADDEN further suggested extending the northeast corner a little bit more to the south.

WOLCH stated with regard to signage, that it has to be approved, however, that it would not hold up the building permit.

HOLLER added that Staff's intent was to have a brief discussion as to the location of the sign. It can further be handled administratively.

FADDEN stated that they would be placing the corporate sign on south face of the building, and then another corporate sign on the East Valley side.

BENNETT asked how the sign would be lit?

GEMMA indicated that they would be externally lit signs.

BISOM motioned to approve Condition No. 1 as written, as long as it is consistent with the series of commercial buildings. WOLCH seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

WOLCH motioned to approve Condition No. 2 as written, with the additional recommendation that the developer follow through with the trade mark color, and pedestrian benches and tables. BISOM seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM indicated that, with regard to Condition No. 3, he was unclear whether the building entrances were recessed in?

HOLLER stated that it is difficult to read that off of the plans. Further, he is not sure how much the height of the recess would shield. The intent was that if the entrance way had a metal awning to delineate the entrance, it would further provide shelter. The way it is now, there is no real provision for that due to the height.

BISOM suggested that the Applicant consider an additional awning, but that it would not be required.

FADDEN suggested that rather than an additional awning, that they be open to do other forms of weather protection that fit in to that.

AHRENS motioned that Condition No. 3 be approved as written, but that the Applicant look into other forms of weather protection over the entries. BISOM seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

AHRENS commented with regard to Condition No. 4, that black chain link looks better.

BISOM motioned that Condition No. 4 be approved, in that if the Applicant uses chain link fence, that black chain link fence be used. AHRENS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

AHRENS commented that she likes the rhythm of the property. She suggested adding enough additional landscaping to meet the requirement.

BENNETT motioned to approve Condition No. 5, to accommodate the 100-foot blank wall by adding landscaping to the nodes and extending it to fall within the 100-foot requirement, and further increasing the density of the landscaping. BISOM seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM noted that with regard to Condition No. 6, the Applicant wanted to add more density as opposed to increasing the buffer.

WOLCH stated that they have no jurisdiction over the set back.

FADDEN stated that the building is set back, not the landscape.

HOLLER noted that the Applicant has met the building setback.

BISOM asked if this just applied to the one side?

FADDEN explained that the building is set back 100 feet. The required set back is only 25 feet. He suggested that to mitigate the extra parking, they could provide extra landscape buffering. He noted that whether you widen or thicken the buffer, you will still see the parking. To thicken it would be easier to mitigate as time goes on.

HOLLER asked what plantings they have on the East side of the Simmons site?

FADDEN stated that they have more evergreens. This site has more dense landscaping. In the case of the Simmons site, there is more parking. This site is otherwise consistent with Simmons.

HOLLER advised the Commissioners that in this case, they could deferred to the statement in the landscaping section that the site be landscaped to the satisfaction of the Design Commission. This site really does mirror the Simmons site. Staff would be fine with the Design Commissioners' approval.

BISOM commented that density is more important.

WOLCH motioned to approve Condition No. 6, with the amendment that the developer has the option of a 10-foot wide landscape screening with additional evergreen plantings, to mirror the Simmons site. BISOM seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM commented that he is fine with deferring Condition No. 7 to Staff for administrative review.

BISOM motioned to approve Condition No. 7 as written, but that it not be back lit, and that it further be submitted to Staff for administrative approval. BENNETT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BENNETT motioned to approve Condition No. 8 as written. AHRENS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

STEVE BELL of Pacific Crest Cabinets, Applicant, appeared. He stated that he would like to put some bike parking inside.

BISOM motioned to approve Condition No. 8 as written. The motion was seconded, and it passed unanimously.

WOLCH motioned to approve Condition Nos. 9 and 10 as written. The motion was seconded, and it passed unanimously.

BISOM declared PLN2005-00007 approved.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

STAFF COMMENTS

- **Discussion of format ideas for the revision of the Sumner Design Guidelines**
- **Brief discussion – How has it been going? Any changes requested?**

There were no Staff comments, and the above agenda items were not addressed at this meeting.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

There were no Commissioner comments.

ADJOURNMENT

BISOM adjourned the meeting at 9:28 p.m.

Sarah M. Heckman
Minutes Taker