



SUMNER DESIGN COMMISSION

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, March 11, 2004

6:00 p.m.

Sumner City Hall
1104 Maple Street

CALL TO ORDER

BISOM called the meeting to order at 6:08 p.m.

ROLL CALL

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

Members Absent: Wolch and Hanson (*in attendance after roll call*)

Also Present: Ron Buckholt, Associate Planner
James Carleton and Wayne Carlson, AHBL, Special Projects
Managers, Applicant (PLN2004-19 & PLN2004-20)
Bo Norbjerg, Applicant (PLN2003-60)

APPROVAL OF MINUTE

BUCKHOLT had a minor correction on page 4, under his comment approximately one-third the way down the page. There are two "that's" in that paragraph, and one should be deleted.

TOBIAS motioned to approve the January 8, 2004, Regular Meeting Minutes as corrected. BENNETT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

- A) **PLN2004 –19 (Cowlitz Industrial Building)** and
B) **PLN2004-20 (Nisqually Industrial Building)**

BUCKHOLT reviewed for the Commission Staff's report on PLN2004-19 (Cowlitz Industrial Building) and PLN2004-20 (Nisqually Industrial Building). Staff prepared and presented a consolidated report with regard to these two projects. Staff's report was as follows:

The site is located on the east side of 142nd Avenue East. The project is located on an undeveloped vacant parcel. Proposed is construction of two industrial warehouse / manufacturing buildings associated with parking, storm water and landscaping. The Cowlitz Building (369,600 SF) will be phase I and the Nisqually Building (227,300 SF) will be phase II. The 30 +/- acre site is vacant and undeveloped. The site will require fill and grade work in association with this proposal. The general vicinity is industrial zoned and contains industrial uses.

STAFF recommended that proposals PLN2004-19 and PLN2004-20 should be *APPROVED* subject to the following *CONDITIONS*:

- 1. The Applicant shall install bicycle racks and/or pedestrian amenities such as benches or tables at the front entrances. The Design Guidelines require that bike racks be placed in a convenient location, typically near the entranceways at a ratio of one bicycle parking space for each ten spaces of auto parking. The bicycle racks may be located inside of the building.*
- 2. The Applicant shall locate refuse containers to the rear or side of the buildings out of sight from any public street. Adequate screening shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Design Commission.*
- 3. The Applicant shall install a total of three pedestrian links between the sidewalks along 142nd Avenue East and the main entrances to the buildings. These pathways should run parallel to the proposed driveways and be paved with an alternative surface or striped to distinguish this pedestrian area from the parking lot and vehicular activity. The pathways shall be a minimum of 5 feet in width.*
- 4. The north elevation of the Nisqually Building and the east elevation of the Cowlitz Building shall incorporate wall modulation or a landscaping element to improve the aesthetic value of said elevations. If the landscaping option is preferred, a hierarchy of plantings is required. First, suitable trees, such as columnar forms, shall be planted at a minimum of 15 feet on center within a minimum 6 foot wide planting bed at the structures foundation. Second, a planting ranging from one to six feet in height at maturity shall be planted at a minimum of six feet on center*

within the planting bed. Third, ground cover, or non-living material shall be installed to reduce the possibility of wind and water erosion.

- 5. The applicant may be required to contribute to a general trail fund in lieu of constructing the Class I trail adjacent to the White River per the Sumner – Pacific Master Trail Plan.*

BISOM directed the Applicants to elaborate on the projects at time.

WAYNE CARLSON and JAMES CARLETON, Special Projects Managers, AHBL, 2215 North 30th Street, Suite 300, Tacoma, Washington, appeared.

CARLSON thanked Staff for their fine work in reviewing their request for design review. Phase I is construction of the Cowlitz building which is a 369,600 square foot structure, and then phase II is construction of the Nisqually building which is a 227,300 square foot structure. They would like to address Staff's conditions at this time and describe the project in terms of these conditions, and specifically with regard to Item No. 4. He elaborated on how they addressed the north elevation and then how they addressed the east elevation. With regard to the area along the north elevation of the structure, a strict review of the Design Guidelines suggests that there should be a 6 foot planting bed along that north side of the building. They have a 20 foot wide strip of Western Red Cedar and Douglas Fir, which provides a very dense screen along the property line. The landscape architect was concerned that a 6 foot strip along the structure would not allow that plant material to survive, and would not provide the design concepts that the Design Guidelines are trying to accomplish. In talking to Staff, they indicated that it could be changed to the hierarchy of plantings appropriate. They do think it is important that it be a little bit away from the building so that the plants have the opportunity to survive because of the northern exposure. Along the east elevation there is a combination of three different techniques providing a richness in terms of building texture that the Design Guidelines are striving for. There are recessed building entrances, which create building modulation, as well as a hierarchy of plantings and then finally paint schemes. What was done actually replicates what the Design Commission approved for another building. He showed the various location of the elevations to the Commissioners at the site plan.

BISOM asked if the entrances occur in two locations on the first building and one location on the second building?

CARLETON stated that it occurs twice. There is a bumped out location on each end. Multiple tenants are anticipated in this building. It is designed so that it can be subdivided and then those areas can be utilized for office space. It works out having the entrances toward those ends. The front of the building has a higher level of architectural features and detail, and has more trees and landscaping. The back of the building is more simplified. It is up against the river, and as such, they went with the minimum modulation that the code would allow. There will be trees in the landscape islands throughout. It is their intent to meet the City's requirements.

BISOM asked if the Applicant eventually expected the 20 foot landscape buffer to screen the building?

CARLETON stated that they do. In addition, the trees are planted in a staggered pattern, as opposed to a straight line, which will create dense screening.

BENNETT asked Staff if that satisfies the requirement?

BUCKHOLT stated that it does meet the intent for screening and that additionally the island landscaping also meets the intent.

BISOM asked the Applicant if they had a planting plan?

CARLSON (Wayne) stated that there is a landscaping plan in the package on the "L" sheets.

BENNETT asked if there would be a facade on that portion above the roof?

CARLETON responded that the facade is fairly minor. It is approximately 2 to 14 feet above where the roof starts, minimum slope to full height. Also, in order to be above the flood plain, the building sits higher than road itself. As such, it cannot be seen from the road.

BENNETT asked if the HVAC equipment would be adequately covered?

CARLETON responded that he believed it would be.

BISOM asked Applicant about window treatments?

CARLETON noted that the window treatments would be made of wood or MDO. There will be metal bent and placed across the top of the walls. Also, the surface of the building is painted concrete to which they have included some indentations to break up the flatness. Horizontally all of the lines are reveal components in the building. The vertical points have been caulked. There is also tinted glazing to create contrast. The frames are clear, anodized aluminum frames that creates a sort of silver appearance around the frame, and then the windows are tinted. For further modulation they have recessed the entry areas.

BISOM asked the Applicant to elaborate on the color scheme.

CARLETON stated that the concept at this stage is one that is very similar to the what is across the street. It will be two tone. Their plan is to have a lighter tone for the body and a bit darker tone to accent that. The trim will be an extreme color variation that defines that building.

BENNETT asked the Applicant if they considered additional glazing to give natural light in warehouse area and further to break up the large wall in that area?

CARLETON responded that the warehouse area is mostly storage, however, they do have a skylight. Also, they have strategically placed the smoke vents, which let light into the building. There is glazing on the front (west), which is the area they intend to build out. Additionally, on the eastside (river), there are areas blocked out for future windows.

BISOM asked what the potential maximum capacity of these buildings would be? Where is the signage proposed?

CARLETON noted that the plan is that there will be four tenants, however, that can vary. The addresses are posted up high on the buildings, which is where the signage is intended. It is consistent with the other side of the street.

BISOM directed the Commissioners to discuss the project at this time. This project appears to be consistent.

MCMAHAN noted the blue banding across the first set of windows. What material is that?

CARLETON stated that the band is painted concrete.

BISOM opened the meeting for public comment.

GLEN WHITWORTH, 3625 142nd Avenue East, appeared. He is concerned that the warehouses are going to cause a tremendous drainage problem, specifically for their house, which is located right in the middle of the project. That is not show on the plan. Their house has not been purchased or acquired by this company and they are concerned with the project continuing on. It was stated earlier in the evening that the lots were vacant or previously purchased. They sit there in the middle with about a third of an acre with no idea of how they are going to continue to live. They are afraid of how this project is going to effect their living environment as they have not been acquired?

BISOM asked the exact location of Mr. Whitworth's property?

WHITWORTH stated that they are at 3625 142nd Avenue East, and the project sit on the 3600 block of 142nd Avenue East. Their house sits in the middle of that block, right across the street from Costco's warehouse. Is there an alternate plan that takes into consideration their house staying there?

CARLETON stated that there is a plan "B" that takes that into consideration. It is intended with both plan "A" and plan "B" to pool all of the storm water and pipe it to the back to be treated and eventually discharge into the river. There are multiple methods of doing that, however, they are not shown on the plan.

WHITWORTH noted that they came here to night to state their concerns as the plan does not show their property.

BISOM asked Staff for guidance on this matter.

BUCKHOLT explained that it is just design review tonight. When permits are processed there will be a civil review for storm water and an environmental review through the SEPA process. They will only process the permit if they acquire the land where they are proposing building. It is not a land use issue at this point

WHITWORTH asked if the Applicant would be required to acquire his property to continue with the plan presented tonight?

BUCKHOLT responded that they would.

BISOM advised Mr. Whitworth that his comments would be added to the record, and that if he needs more information on the project, Staff can provide it to him.

BISOM closed public comment.

BISOM asked for Commissioners' comments on the project at this time.

WOLCH commented that it seems awkward to review this project at this point, with Mr. Whitworth's property in the middle of the access. Don't they have to have permission from the property owner before the building permits are submitted?

CARLETON responded that the intention is that the piece of property in question will be acquired, however, he is not aware of the negotiation process at this point.

BENNETT asked if they have a plan "B" that will go around that property?

CARLETON stated that they do.

ABBOTT asked Staff if it goes to plan "B", does it have to come back to the Design Commission?

BUCKHOLT stated that it does.

BISOM directed the Commissioners to Staff's Recommendations at this time.

ABBOTT asked with regard to item No. 1, how many stalls are proposed?

BUCKHOLT noted that they have excessive parking. Staff is proposing 5 bicycle racks per tenant space.

CARLSON noted that the condition, as written, is agreeable to them.

ABBOTT asked how many tenants they expect to have? Is each building broken up into 4 tenant spaces?

CARLETON stated that the Cowlitz building is broken up into 4 tenant spaces, but could be less, and the Nisqually building is broken up into 3 tenant spaces, however, could be 2.

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

BISOM asked with regard to Item No. 2, does the Applicant have suggestions for locations?

CARLETON responded that there are no tenants at this time, so the locations have yet to be chosen.

BISOM motioned with regard to Item No. 2, that it be amended to require a masonry wall surrounding the containers, with a gate made of metal or steel with wood or metal slates and that the landscape screening be plant material of 4 feet tall, 3 feet on center, of an evergreen variety to soften it. McMAHAN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

MCMAHAN asked the Applicant what he had in mind with regard to Item No. 3?

CARLETON noted that it is their intent to meet the guidelines for walkways. They will stick to what is acceptable by code.

BISOM asked if the side walks will wrap around? He commented that striping or a raised application would be suitable for that.

CARLETON responded that they have let downs at the corners, and further that the striping is there, but just did not make it on this plan.

BENNETT motioned to approve Item No. 3 as written. ABBOTT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM noted that the Applicant had explained their intent with regard to Item No. 4 fairly well.

CARLSON (Wayne) approached site plan to further show how item No. 4 was addressed. Their intent is to plant Douglas Fir and Western Red Cedars for a full screen. They are spaced 8 feet on center and will be 6 feet tall.

BISOM asked if there would be any berming or raised height to the planting area?

CARLETON noted that they intent to create a slight berm in that area, however, he does not have the final civil plans for that at this time. They will abide by whatever the twenty foot buffer requirements are. The landscape plan just shows the planting.

WOLCH asked if the planting would run east to west at the perimeter on both sides?

CARLSON (Wayne) stated that it would.

BISOM asked if there would just be pavement next to building?

CARLETON stated that there would be pavement next to the building on the north side, however, on the south side there will be landscaping up against the building in the office areas.

BUCKHOLT added that on the east property line of the proposed site there is the White River, which has a 200 foot, undisturbed buffer.

BISOM commented that if there is full screening with the 20 foot buffer, then there is no need for planting next to the building.

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

BISOM asked Staff to clarify Item No. 5.

BUCKHOLT responded that the details have not been sorted out yet. They will be sorted out at the SEPA process.

WOLCH stated that he would like to add the condition that there should be a dense buffer between the property lines (at the neighboring houses) and the buildings.

BISOM noted that the Applicant would be required to resubmit their plan to the Design Commission if that becomes necessary, as it will change the site plan. Further, those concerns have been noted by the property owner.

WOLCH commented that he is not use to reviewing things when the developer does not have the ownership option. Assuming the zoning has changed, it may be a difficult fit. These are huge buildings. Are they just one level?

CARLETON responded that they are.

BENNETT motioned that Item No. 5 be submitted to Staff for approval. BISOM seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM asked for clarification as to the lighting plan.

CARLETON stated that there would be two lights at the entrances and lights running along the front with 75 foot spacing. There will also be lights in the recessed areas and in the loading dock areas.

BISOM recommended that Staff review the landscape buffers of the other buildings on 142nd for consistency. In similar situations there are generally 3 to 4 foot landscape buffers.

BUCKHOLT noted that it is required to have a berm that is 4 feet in height.

BISOM declared Projects PLN2004-19 and PLN2004-20 approved.

OLD BUSINESS

The meeting was recessed for approximately two minutes.

- A) **PLN2003-60 Norbjerg 4-Plex** (*Discussion as to possible alternatives to satisfy the community character requirement in terms of scale, bulk, height, etc (SMC 18.12.050(J)(2)).*)

BISOM re-opened the meeting for old business.

BUCKHOLT recapped that at the January regular Design Commission meeting, project number PLN2003-60 / Norbjerg 4-Plex was approved. The Design Commission, being an advisory board, approved the project with conditions. The Director of the Community Development Department had second thoughts on those recommendations and would like to send it back to the Design Commission for further review. A memo from the Director, John Doan, has been provided, basically asking the Commission to consider the following two items:

- 1) In light of the character of the surrounding developments, are their alternative building designs and configurations and/or architectural treatment that would further break up building's bulk?
- 2) Would a detached bungalow type development be feasible to achieve both the developer's and the City's goals?

Those are the two items that the Director would like the Commission to further evaluate. There is basically the choice of modifying the previous recommendation or tabling the project for more study.

BISOM opened the meeting for public comment at this time, limiting the comments to 5 minutes. Following public comment, there will be a study session on this item, at which time the public is welcome to stay, however, they cannot comment.

CAPRICE HAMILTON, 1111 Willow Street, appeared. This project is in her back yard. She has great concerns as far as looking out her bedroom window, her French doors, her

picture window and seeing other people in her back yard vicinity. She does have a lot of other concerns that will probably be addressed later in discussion as this progresses. She read a letter into the record as follows:

Dear Design Review Committee: I oppose the building at 317 Alder Street. I have been a resident of Sumner for 15 years and I have 4 more years on Valley Avenue. I decided to move after eleven years because of the growth and the traffic problems on Valley Avenue. Where I currently reside now I enjoy the wildlife as I sit on my deck and unwind from a stressful day and I would be most disappointed to have the quiet and serene view that I have now be replaced with twelve or more people. We have been challenging the contractor for several years to build something that would complement our single family community and not detract from it. And the idea of a multi-plex is not complementary to our community. At the Town Meeting February 17th it was stated that there is a high turn over for renters and you have a 72 unit condominium complex going up by the 410 plaza, and on both sides of Main Street, out taking a drive, you have apartments and houses both for rent. I don't see anything that we would need with another multi-plex in our community. If you haven't seen 317 Alder Street, please take a moment and stop by. Look at the lot, the beautiful tall pine trees and the surrounding houses, and ask yourself if a large multi-plex would look right in this small lot. My answer is no. I think it would be just completely out of place and it would take away from our single family community. Thank you for your time.

MARSHA LINDBERG, 322 Alder Avenue, appeared. She lives directly across the street from the proposed site. She is a senior citizen, recently retired and has lived here for almost 21 years. She moved into this neighborhood so that her children would have a neighborhood. It was mentioned by the developer, as she read in the newspaper, that he would diversify our neighborhood. She was not asked if diversification was something that she wanted in her neighborhood, and she does not think too many of the people who live in her neighborhood were asked if diversification was something that they wanted. Her home is all she has. It fortunately has appreciated in the 20 years that she has lived there. She has put a little money into her house and has work on her property inside and out. As she gets older, her house is all that she has. This developer does not really care if her house will depreciated because of what he is proposing to erect. She does not know if any of the Commissioners care that her property might depreciate, but she does. We are looking for your approval of a family dwelling where someone can purchase and live and become part of our neighborhood, not an influx of people moving into a multi-dwelling. Thank you for your time.

BECKY OLIVER, 309 Alder Avenue, appeared. She lives south of the proposed development. One of the things he wants to do is landscape. She provided pictures of the developer's landscaping at other sites to the Commissioners. She is concerned about this site. She read the Comprehensive Plan and there are some things in there that kind of concern her. One of them is the Community Character Strategy. There was a workshop on how to maintain and improve Sumner's character, and she is not sure that adding a

giant building next to single family homes is supportive of the Community Character Strategy. She does not know how he even got this far as the Conditional Use Permit is based on four things, one being “does it fit into the scale, scope, height...” This is so giant it doesn’t fit in the neighborhood. She is worried about parking. One of the house in the area that has renters has approximately five cars there consistently and they only have two bedrooms. Off street parking is two per unit. That is two times four units. That is 8 parking spaces. She does not know where those parking spaces are going to come from. She is also worried about the transient nature of renters and further the traffic that will be generated from it. This will devalue their property that they have spent since 1989 trying to improve. She is also worried about the water pressure. She is concerned about drainage and noise. How can one person put up four houses in one spot, when putting up two was previously denied? This shows no respect for the neighbors. It also notes in the Comprehensive Plan that our sense of community is our greatest strength. How can we have a community with transient renters? Under the Goals, Policies and Objectives of the Comprehensive Plan, we are to provide for orderly development in the Sumner community and to ensure that more intensive developments do not adversely impact an adjacent area. This developer is going to benefit at the expense of everybody around his property. It will devalue our property. In the LDR district it states that it allows for small scale multi-family dwellings. This is not small scale, it is large scale. She encourages everyone of you to go drive down the street and look at that lot and look at those homes and ask yourself if that fits in with the neighborhood. Thanks for your time.

JUDY WESTOVER, 323 Alder Avenue, appeared. Her concerns are similar to that of Becky Oliver’s. She is concerned with parking, traffic and people moving in and out. The houses in that area are bungalows and single story homes. Her property is only 59.3 feet across and 248 feet deep. He will be angling his project, putting the front part across her property. Privacy means a lot to her. She has owned this house for over 40 years. She tried to discuss this with the Mr. Norbjerg earlier. She suggested bungalows style buildings, similar to those around Sumner. She felt that it would fit right in with the neighborhood. Needless to say, he was not too happy about it, and he told her that if she did not agree with him building two houses on his lot, he would putting up four-plexes, and that he would get it passed. Further, she was in her back yard and there was a young man back there who asked her about some trees that were cut down that were Dennis’ trees. She had not cut them down – they were Christmas trees being harvested. He got very irate with her and then he threatened her, swore at her and called her some dirty names. She asked if she should call her attorney and get a restraining order. She ended up just turning around and walking away. She called her attorney about it. This has caused a lot of problems in that neighborhood. She raised four kids there. She would like her neighborhood to stay the way it is, however, she understands with progress that it will not, but would hope it is taken into consideration what is going to be put in at that long, narrow property.

GLORIA SCHULER, 1003 Willow Street, appeared. She could not believe it when she received notice that the four-plex was going in. If two house were not going in, how can a four-plex go in. She believes it is all about whatever sells. He will not be living there. He is going to sell and get out. This neighborhood is not his business. She has lived here

all her life. This City is going down because business is controlling it. Families are not controlling it anymore. Families do not have a say and they should, especially in our own neighborhoods. On the end of Willow Street, a retirement home was suggested in that area approximately 20 years ago and was voted down. Corless was going to then put in an eight-plex and it was voted down. But he loves Sumner, because he grew up in Sumner. Well that got voted down, so he put the most hideous houses in there at the weirdest angles. These things pass because Sumner needs money.

VICTORIA MILLES, 303 Alder Avenue, appeared. She just moved into the neighborhood. They thought, "This is our dream home." She moved here because it is a beautiful, family oriented community. That is what they liked about it. When her neighbors told her about the proposed structure she was disappointed. That is what she just she moved away from. She moved away from apartment buildings. They do not want that in our community. She moved here because she has grandchildren who will be growing up here. She really would like them to have a community with single family homes. It is such a good community. If there is something like what is proposed here, it will draw derelicts and more crime. These are the things she moved away from. She does not want it.

BISOM closed the public comment portion of the meeting and adjourned for a three minute recess.

BUCKHOLT began the Study Session with regard to PLN2003-60 Norbjerg 4-Plex by briefly describing the site. He passed materials out to the public to assist them in following along.

MCMAHAN asked for a brief review of the project as she was not at the last meeting.

BO NORBJERG, applicant, appeared. He was originally attempting to short plat, but the minimum width requirement was 60 feet. He went in for a variance, to which Staff's recommended approval of the variance, however, the Hearings Examiner turned it down. So he went with the option of building four units in that zoning. You are allowed to have one of those per City block. He drew up the plans and came up with a design. He also received approval from the Design Commission. He thought in the end it was a good plan. The City was looking for some diversity - some multi-family units. They will be condos that are owner occupied and therefore address the renter concern that the neighbors have. He cannot afford to keep it as a rental property. As far as the windows looking in other yards, he tried to minimize that through his design. He could further reduce the windows, however, the Commission would have to approve it.

BUCKHOLT provided the Commissioners with further background information and photos at this point. Photos No. 1 and 2 are the subject site. Photo No. 3 is looking at the Alder Street streetscape. Photos Nos. 5 and 6 are pictures of single family dwellings on Alder to give a feel for the flavor of the street, and there is a photo of a dead on shot of the property.

WOLCH asked what the Hearings Examiner's rational was? Was it just the one foot area in question, or were there other conditions?

BUCKHOLT stated that the rational was setting a precedent for not meeting minimum zoning standards.

NORBJERG commented that it is not a requirement for a conditional use permit. The Design Commission did approve it. After that the hearing was set and then cancelled. It was not approved by John Doan. The hearing was cancelled after it was published and now the project will be delayed. He is not too happy about it, but there is nothing he can do about it.

BUCKHOLT noted that he was on vacation at the time of the cancellation.

NORBJERG added that he felt the Director had prior knowledge of the project. In the mean time the moratorium was being discussed.

BISOM stated that the case in point is that this stems from comments from neighbors and City officials. The Applicant may want to down scale some in response to that. In looking at it closely, the letter of the law does potentially allow for diversity with larger structures, but common sense says, "How does that really fit in?"

NORBJERG stated that the photos do not give a realistic view and further elaborated using the pictures for the Design Commissioners. There is a diversity of buildings in that area. He is looking at how he can make this project reasonably feasible and still please everybody. He feels the project, as proposed, is a good project. When looking at the site plan it is not really what you are seeing.

BISOM commented that it is a solid, massive structure.

NORBJERG noted that one requirement is that there be two garage spaces per unit. The parking requirement is one of the reasons he has more bulk. He could make it a story and a half with a little less area upstairs.

BISOM asked the Applicant if there is any way he could make it a one story building in the front, with the other two units being two stories? That would bring down the scale and would create a gap in the massing of the structure.

NORBJERG commented that the upstairs could be limited with a portion of it being two story.

BENNETT asked how many other multi-family buildings are in that neighborhood?

NORBJERG responded that there is one triplex that is a block behind. It is split up in two.

BISOM advised that the Design Commission is an advisory board. They can make their recommendation, however, there has been public comment and Staff concerns. They are trying to make things fit and meet the guidelines.

NORBJERG responded that he understands the position of the Design Commission, however, the City has handled this project in the wrong fashion.

BISOM stated that one possibility is that they will ask the Applicant to come back with another option for another meeting. There are no two story buildings in that area. The scale does not fit.

HANSON stated that he agrees with the Applicant in terms of the process and how it has been handled. Our charge is to look at the proposal by the Applicant and to make recommendations of betterment, and then pass it on with our recommendation. What appears to be happening here is that the Applicant has decided to go forward at the Design Commission's recommendation. A lot of the things being discussed here tonight are not our obligation. We are not obligated to say the zoning is wrong, the conditional use is wrong, the location is wrong or that parking is wrong or that it brings in transients. When we looked at this, we asked the Applicant whether this would be apartments or condos. He stated that it would be condos. We discussed alternative building designs. In viewing the site, I remember thinking that it would be big, but would look nice. We also looked at specific landscaping objectives and offered suggestions with regard to fencing designs. These things were all taken into account as advise for the Hearings Examiner and the Planning Department.

BUCKHOLT stated that what the Director wants to accomplish tonight is to step back and take a look at a few more options that might more meet the character of the neighborhood.

HANSON stated that it is the Hearings Examiner's position to deny it if he chooses. The Applicant is taking that chance if he does not want to look at other plans as an option. We approved it. The Hearings Examiner's job should not be put back in the Design Commission's lap.

BUCKHOLT noted that is why it is being discussed tonight. He provided various examples of other structures that he retrieved on-line that might better fit the area.

NORBJERG asked if he could put four single houses there and still have it be a condo project? He would not have a problem with that.

BUCKHOLT stated that changing the roof line may be a good idea also.

McMAHAN advised that we need to make very sure that the Applicant is aware of what steps he needs to take at this point. Was he previously advised that he needed to come up with other options prior to this meeting? It is awkward coming in at this point.

BISOM stated that they are trying to be responsive to public comment as well. This is something we need to come back to after more research. We need to reduce the mass. Is separating the buildings an alternative?

BUCKHOLT responded that it is an alternative.

BENNETT commented that if it were lower and wider it could work. Can it be expanded wide enough to increase the foot print?

DISCUSSION was had about expanding the footprint of the structure.

HANSEN stated that you can have 15 feet in between each of the buildings.

BUCKHOLT noted that it has to have 30 feet at the rear per the LDR zoning.

BISOM noted that the units should face Alder. Looking at the side of the unit is not appealing. It would be nicer to look at the front.

DISCUSSION was had with regard to changes made to the previous plan not reflected on the plan presented this evening.

MCMAHAN asked when Staff works with the Applicant is it required that they update the plans after a recommendation has been made?

BUCKHOLT responded that they are required to update the plans.

WOLCH confirmed that the Applicant was required to come back with a full landscape plan?

BISOM commented that he is leaning toward recommending that it be done and then addressed it at another meeting.

NORBJERG asked when he would need to provide is revised plans for the next meeting?

BUCKHOLT noted that generally it would be three weeks prior, however, they will accept it two weeks in this instance. We should, however, give the Applicant some specific direction for what we are looking for. We would like to see detached , bungalow type / cottage style homes, and to take the additional living space off the garage portion of the structure. Those are things that we can address here hopefully.

BENNETT advised the Applicant to look into the option of increasing the footprint as an alternative for picking up the space that is being lost.

NORBJERG stated that he would personally like to separate the buildings rather than take away space.

HANSEN commented that separate buildings would add modulation.

WOLCH noted that the space between four units might be too small. He suggested possibly rotating them, having the first one fronting the street in a little more traditional manner. The Applicant could keep the two in the middle the same and then rotate the back unit toward the alley. There would then be an argument that they are consistent with the area.

NORBJERG addressed the proposal at the site plan (out of view of minutes taker).

DISCUSSION was had about rotating the buildings.

WOLCH suggested possibly reorienting the entrance to the garage.

BISOM commented that it would be a good alternative if the first unit was a smaller scale. They are trying to keep street appeal. He would also recommend landscape screening to soften it and make it fit in.

NORBJERG stated that he would play around with it a little bit and see what he comes up with.

BENNETT commented that splitting it apart and having stand-alone condos, would be to the Applicant's advantage.

BISOM commented that it would look like single family homes, however, they would own five feet around the structure and then they would also have a common area.

BENNETT suggested also separating it at the center.

HANSEN asked if the driveway can be counted as parking space?

BUCKHOLT responded that it cannot be counted as parking space in Sumner.

BISOM motioned that we request the Applicant to revise the site plan to allow him to separate the building units and potentially having the street unit orientation directed to the street, with a duplex in between and a separate unit in back, and to allow it to be separated to diminish the overall scale of the structure, and further keeping the same character that was previously approved at the last meeting. Further, Applicant has the option to separate the duplex into two units. HANSEN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM suggested that the Applicant come back with one or two other alternative options as well for presentation.

MCMAHAN added that the facades, as discussed, should be the same with the different layouts.

BISOM closed the study session at this time.

STAFF COMMENTS

- A) **Discuss & Review Possible Amendments to the Mixed Use (Commercial / Residential) Chapter of the Design Guidelines**

This agenda item was tabled to the next meeting.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

MCMAHAN asked Staff for a copy of the Zoning Code and Regulations for the Commissioners to assist in future review of projects.

ADJOURNMENT

BISOM adjourned the meeting at 8:37 p.m.

Sarah M. Heckman
Minutes Taker