



SUMNER DESIGN COMMISSION

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, April 13, 2006

6:30 p.m.

Sumner City Hall
1104 Maple Street

CALL TO ORDER

BISOM called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bisom, Bennett, Hansen, Wolch and Whipkey

Members Absent: Ahrens, and Abbott

Also Present: Robert Holler, Associate Planner
Larry Lundell, Peterson Brothers, PLN2006-00022
Kathy Hartgrave, Civil Engineer, PLN2006-00022
Mel Maertz, Connell Design, PLN2006-00036 24th St Hotel Site
Sean Parsons, Landscape Architect, PLN2006-00036
Dan Mitzler, Developer, PLN2006-00036
Alan Poe, Sumner Plains LLC, PLN2006-00038
Sumner Plains Industrial
George Humphrys, Developer, PLN2006-00038

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

WHIPKEY motioned to approve the February 16, 2006 regular meeting minutes as written. **BENNETT** seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

1) PLN2006-00022 Petersen Brothers

HOLLER reviewed for the Commission Staff's Report as to PLN2006-00022 Peterson Brothers as follows, and noted that the Applicant will further discuss the change in the site plan with regard to their changed access location.

Proposed is construction of a business park with six industrial warehouse/manufacturing buildings (buildings A-F) with associated parking, stormwater and landscaping. The site is located on the south side of 24th Street East across from the previously approved Petersen Industrial Park. The site is currently being filled for construction and previously contained vacant land. The general vicinity is industrial zoned and is in the process of being developed. The project site is zoned Light Manufacturing (M-1) and is evaluated by the Light and Heavy Manufacturing section of the Design and Development Guidelines.

STAFF recommended that proposal (PLN2006-00022) should be *APPROVED* subject to the following *CONDITIONS*:

- 1. Staff recommends that the color banding be continued around the perimeter of all structures for a uniform appearance.*
- 2. Staff recommends that adequate screening shall be provided for the refuse containers.*
- 3. Staff recommends that additional sidewalks and pedestrian pathways shall be installed to connect the public sidewalk with each proposed building similar to the project on the north side of 24th that mirrors this project. The sidewalk and pathways shall be a minimum of 5 feet in width and shall have material change to distinguish it from the vehicular surface.*
- 4. Staff recommends externally illuminated signage for the site and structure.*
- 5. Staff suggests that the applicant can satisfy the intent of the bicycle standard by providing a minimum of two bicycle parking stalls per proposed building. The bicycle racks shall be located near the main entrances of all buildings.*

BISOM directed the Applicant to review the project at this time.

LARRY LUNDELL, Peterson Brothers, engineer, Tacoma, appeared. He noted that there is very little change between this and the original submittal. They were working with the adjoining property owner for access, however, that did not work out. At that point they changed the plan, but were ready for that and already had an alternate plan. Now access will be right off the street. The other change is that they squared up the back

of the building. They did not submit a handout outlining the changes as the plan has really not changed much from the original handout.

BISOM asked the Applicant to elaborate on the parking and landscaping.

LUNDELL stated that they lost some parking in the front, however, they picked it up in the back.

HANSEN asked about the six trees shown in the original handout. They do not seem to be on this new submittal?

LUNDELL stated that he would go over that in more detail while going over Staff's recommendations. With regard to Staff's noted concerns, their intent is to stick with the same look as across the street. They did not do a band on the railroad side as the tracks are elevated. They would like to be consistent in their treatment on this building.

BISOM commented with regard to the banding that although there is no real public view, the people from the train would see that side of the building.

LUNDELL responded that any landscaping they would do would end up below the berm, limiting its potential to be seen. Also, the window treatments are high so that they can be seen above the tracks. They wanted a similar look as on the other building. With regard to the refuse, they have complied with that and it is also similar to that of the previous project. Also the same are the utilities and the pedestrian circulation. They will have a color change in the concrete as with the other project. With regard to signage, they will be doing one, however, that is a separate submittal. The parking areas will be on 24th street, and they will be adding some planters and permanent trees and bike racks to that, again, to match the other project.

KATHY HARTGRAVE, civil engineer, Tacoma, appeared. She commented that one thing noted in Staff's report was direction of the drainage. Their intention is to maintain quality and quality control in an underground facility, with underground detention tanks and vaults. The drainage will head to the south of the project, which will match up with the other projects to the south. What they are proposing is in compliance with the City of Sumner.

BISOM addressed Staff's recommendations at this time, and asked if there were any suggestions as to Staff's recommended Condition No. 1.

HOLLER noted that Condition No. 1 is more of a suggestion from Staff.

HANSEN asked whether a band would satisfy the requirement?

HOLLER indicated that bike racks would help to satisfy that requirement.

LUNDELL noted that bike racks and the pedestrian amenities satisfied that requirement on the other site, in lieu of wall modulation.

HANSEN approached the site plan to discuss the difference in the trees.

BISOM asked the Applicant if he intended to use Sweet Gum trees?

HANSEN noted that the Sweet Gum trees have been replaced by red cedars. He felt that it would be necessary to have some type of higher screen on the west side, whether it be other islands on the west side, or cedars coming up above the railroad track, as there will be uses not similar to those on the west side.

BISOM made reference to the location of the dumpster and asked whether it had any bollards?

HARTGRAVE indicated that it did have bollards.

BISOM commented as to the view from the commuter train. He suggested a little softening in that area, possibly some trees in the location of the parking, consistent with the other projects. Although the tracks hide some of that view, it is a commuter train and people from the train will have a view of it. A couple of trees would soften and screen that area.

PETERSON noted that the problem with planting in that area is that the trains spray poison back there. He feels that it would be difficult to successfully grow anything in that area. He does not believe that there would be a problem with the ones 40 feet in on the other site.

WHIPKEY asked why the Applicant would stop the banding at the second bay? Is it because that is all that will be seen?

LUNDELL confirmed that the banding would not really be seen in that area because of the train tracks.

BENNETT supported softening that area, as it would be seen from the train and industrial areas tend to be the worst areas to travel through. As far as spraying is concerned, it may kill some plants, but the railroad would be responsible for those.

LUNDELL stated that they would consider some affective method of softening that side.

HANSEN stated that he would like to see the same Cedars on that side.

LUNDELL suggested planters at regular intervals as a way to soften that area.

BISOM asked the Applicant the vertical distance from the curb to the building?

LUNDELL stated that it is 24 feet.

BISOM noted that with parking it would be about 34 to 35 feet. With the ballards and the fire hydrant, there could be a curb and a couple on trees inside one of those spaces. He suggested taking out a couple of stalls for more landscaping.

LUNDELL added to that the suggestion of a half moon of landscaping.

BISOM felt that that would take some of the edge off of that area, however, there might not be enough room for a full planter.

LUNDELL noted that the planter's width is not fixed. It increases from the south to the north.

BISOM commented that, because of parking, there might need to be a little more room.

LUNDELL stated that that is why they pushed the parking back. They will review a half moon planter on either side of the fire hydrants. He believes that it will give the look that the Design Commission wants.

HANSEN stated that he feels that the Applicant could get approximately 18 trees in that area.

LUNDELL stated that it would be more like 12 to 14 trees.

BISOM expressed concern about the plantings because of the elevation.

BENNETT stated that he would prefer to see the band continued around the building.

HARTGRAVE noted that the client would prefer to do the blue banding, as opposed to planting the additional trees.

PETERSON (of Peterson Brothers) also noted that there are no passenger trains that run on that track.

BENNETT motioned to approve Staff's recommended Condition No. 1 as written. WOLCH seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HANSEN motioned to approve Staff's recommended Condition No. 2 as written. WHIPKEY seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM made note with regard to Staff's recommended Condition No. 3 that the Applicant has suggested a similar concrete banding as a material change, and further motioned to approve Condition No. 3 as written. HANSEN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

WHIPKEY motioned to approve Staff's recommended Condition No. 4 as written. BISOM seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

With regard to Staff's recommended Condition No. 5, discussion was had about adding picnic tables. HOLLER suggested doing something similar to the other side of the building.

BISOM motioned to approve Staff's recommended Condition No. 5 as written, with the addition of picnic tables. WOLCH seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM asked the Applicant with regard to the planting change, was it intentional when they changed the trees from deciduous to evergreen?

HARTGRAVE stated that they changed that when they changed the access point. The landscape architect felt that it was cleaner and easier to maintain evergreens in that area. Their intent, however, is to satisfy Sumner's planting regulations.

BISOM asked if the plantings on 24th were the same as originally submitted?

HARTGRAVE stated that they are similar, however, they are not exactly the same. He may have changed those due to the change in access point as well.

BISOM stated that those are his only two issues. Deciduous trees give more of an open feel, which is preferable. In combination with Hansen's suggestion, he would suggest maybe a half dozen trees on the west side.

HARTGAVE approached the site plant to discuss an alternative location for the deciduous trees.

BISOM explained to the Applicant that they are just providing some guidance. He thinks that the overall plan is good, and is similar to the project to the north. He would agree with Hansen's suggestion to have taller trees to the west, possibly Compiler trees.

BISOM motioned to add a new recommended Condition No. 6, recommending that the landscape plan be resubmitted, and be changed to include 6 additional trees boarding the building on the east side, and that those trees be a Sweet Gum Tree as submitted originally. BISOM also encouraged as many evergreens as is reasonable on the west side to soften that area. BENNETT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM declared plan PLN2006-00022 approved.

BENNETT asked the Applicant if these units would be sold or if they would be rentals?

PETERSON stated that they would be rentals.

2) PLN2006-00036 24th Street Hotel Site (Retail)

HOLLER reviewed for the Commission Staff's Report as to PLN2006-00036 24th Street Hotel Site as follows:

Proposed is construction of a retail development site that includes 2 hotels, a restaurant, and three retail buildings. This review covers the site plan, landscape plan, and 2 retail buildings. The site improvements would include parking, stormwater, landscaping and sidewalk improvements. The subject site is the southwest corner of 24th Street East 24th Street & 136th Ave East. The subject site consists of a single vacant parcel that is undeveloped. The site is located along the southwest corner of 24th Street East, east of the State Route 167 corridor. The properties to the east of this subject site (across the railroad tracks) are zoned industrial. The project site is zoned Interchange Commercial (IC), which is intended to provide for retailing and other commercial services that are easily accessible from the freeway, yet are not located near residential districts. Such commercial developments primarily rely on the automobile as their principal source of access. This project will be reviewed under the GC portion of the City of Sumner's Design and Development Guidelines. In the Guidelines the commercial development chapter is categorized into three subheadings, the Interchange Commercial (GC) district being one. The designation Interchange Commercial primarily refers to development in the commercial zone located in the vicinity of the 24th / 28th street interchange of SR-167, and the annexation area south of SR-410. Commercial development in this area will cater more to the automobile by nature of the site location than commercial development in other parts of the City. Projects going through design review shall be given this consideration when the following guidelines are referenced for design criteria, as some elements may not apply to commercial development in the interchange area.

STAFF recommended that proposal (PLN2006-00036) should be *APPROVED* subject to the following *CONDITIONS*:

1. *Staff recommends that the applicant incorporate useable open space and incorporate it near the proposed restaurant building consisting of pedestrian amenities such as tables and benches for the possibility for outdoor seating for the restaurant.*
2. *The pedestrian walkways through the vehicular maneuvering areas shall be distinguished with a material change in the pavement.*
3. *Staff recommends that the storefront façade windows do not continue down to the floor, but rather that the windows shall begin 12 – 30 inches above the finished floor elevation.*
4. *Bicycle racks are recommended to be placed near the main entrances into the buildings throughout the site. The total number of bicycle racks shall be one bicycle space for each ten vehicular spaces.*
5. *The pedestrian walkways through the vehicular maneuvering areas shall be distinguished with a material change in the pavement.*
6. *Staff recommends that seating benches shall be placed throughout the site, including in 2 locations along the meandering walkway through the parking area.*

BISOM directed the Applicant to review the project at this time.

MEL MAERTZ, Architect, Connell Design, appeared. He stated that Staff covered the project well. When going into the project they drew up the two hotels for the site. It is to be a destination location. They would like to have amenity development around it. It has a close proximity to SR167 and the interchange and is an ideal site with great visibility. They pushed the development to face the buildings away from the interchange, and pulled all the parking inboard away from the perimeter. It will be consistent with the feel of Sumner. They raised the level of the site a couple feet, which is something Staff may not have know. Part of the project aligns 36 Avenue East, which would be an ideal location for a future fast food restaurant. They do not have a timeline on the development, as it will be submitted as a separate package. They agree with Staff's recommended conditions, however, one thing they have issue with is the storefront sidewalk. The glass comes down to the sidewalk, giving a lot of light and flexibility to how the merchandize there is spaced. They have solid panel locks in the location of the doors. The idea of outdoor dining spaces is good. They are also looking into material changes for walkways. They will be using a hardy siding, as it is a long lasting, low maintenance material. They are proposing a metal roof, and clear glass for the storefront windows, along with clear anodized aluminum frames.

SEAN PARSONS, landscape architect, Seattle, appeared. They intend to provide a mixed vegetative cover to screen the dumpsters and utility areas, but to allow visibility into the site. They felt that pedestrian seating would be nice along the east west boarder. They will be adding various materials to this concept, and will be putting in ornamental grasses. The streetscape will allow for street trees, and they will use a hedge material to separate the car rails.

DAN MITZLER, developer, appeared. He is working with Dave Gallagher. He noted that they should be submitting the hotel for review at the June meeting. They are in the process of working on the extended stay building, and are aiming for more meeting space on the ground floor. They are waiting for more feed back on that issue. The only thing unresolved in this developing project is the restaurant and the fast food establishment. They would like both hotels open by the second or third quarter of 2007. They are looking forward to working with Mr. Peterson in keeping the projects compatible.

BISOM commented that it is nice to see such a good presentation. He has been on the Design Commission in Sumner for 10 years, and this is a long way from that. He also express appreciation that the landscape architect was in attendance. He enjoys the contemporary look of the buildings with nice materials.

BENNETT asked the Applicant if buildings "A" and "B" are the same building?

MAERTZ stated that both buildings have a similar look. The front of "A", however, is facing south, and the front of "B" is facing east.

BISOM commented that he likes the colors, and that there appears to be quite a bit of landscaping. He asked whether, on the elevation with the indentations, if those were support blocks or accent pieces?

MAERTZ stated that that is an architectural feature that is unique to them. They created them to be potential sign brackets, yet they have the flexibility to either hold signs or just to otherwise create a nice visual interest.

HANSEN commented that he likes the project, and asked if the landscape plan would also be implemented in phases?

PARSONS stated that the intent would be to provide a perimeter landscaping, and then to landscape along with the different phases. Most of the landscaping, however, would be going in at this time.

HOLLER added that the Applicant would also be paving and put in parking in phases as well. They will work with Staff on that.

BISOM expressed concern with the different maturity levels of the trees if they are planted in phases.

MITZLER stated that they expect that from start to finish will not be that long, and therefore the maturity level would not be much different. What will really drive the development is the hotels, which will start this summer and fall, and are expected to be open next year. There will be a reasonable amount of space for building, and they will be landscaping around the perimeter and paving as far as they need to. They are trying to leave some space open for actually working on the hotels, as that can take quite a bit of staging. They would like to keep the lower half of the center parking area available for staging the construction. MITZLER added that they also do not want to finish that part of the parking until absolutely necessary. They plan to keep that area fenced and secured to ensure the materials are protected. It will eventually be landscaped and irrigated. There is a logical way to go about it, yet still have a nice appearance.

HANSEN commented, in relation to the windows on the street, that he would concur with the architect because of their location. He asked if the suggestion with regard to the windows was following any specific criteria (re: Condition No. 3)?

BISOM commented that that is something that is subjective. There are plenty of other elements that added interest to this project.

BENNETT commented that he believes this is a good design. With regard to the windows, he suggested some sort of brick at the base as sort of an accent piece. He noted that lower windows can get pretty dirty, and it also may be a safety issue as well. With regard to using clear glass, he would suggest low eves in that area, as it has a southern exposure. He also recalled from the design of Fred Meyer, that they put plastic behind

the windows, as they did not want to use glazing, and it looked awful. He would recommend that the tenants not do that.

HOLLER reiterated that it is just a suggestion, but that it was pretty much a unanimous comment for the exact reason stated. Ferrelli's is an example of a low window with a low wall at the base of it.

BISOM commented that the context with this project is a little different, and that he does not see the conflict here. It is an overall very handsome project.

WOLCH commented that the project has a really excellent design. He likes the way it is done with the windows as they are. He would want projects like this to be as flexible as possible. He had a question with regard to the site plan as to the meandering path. Have there been any thoughts of aligning the path with the entrance to the extended stay?

MAERTZ felt it would take away from the equilibrium of the site. They wanted something more centered from the parking areas to the two separate buildings, and that was accessible to people in parking lot.

BISOM felt that the connection between the restaurants is nice, and commented that textured concrete would be great. He liked the trees tying the spaces together as well. He noted that the planting plan has a nice selection, and with regard to phasing, he thought they might consider doing a contract growing, where a nursery continues to grow the plants until they are needed, so that they would have the same level of maturity. He suggested possibility planting a few taller Columnar tree to give it a little more scale. It is all very well done. He asked the landscape architect if, on the eastside of the hotel, they were considering a narrow planting area?

MAERTZ stated that they are considering seasonal planting in that area. It would be a planter that they replant two to three times a year.

BISOM suggested accent lighting to carry that through, and pedestrian lighting to give it a nice ambiance there.

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

BISOM motioned with regard to Staff's recommended Condition No. 2, that it be approved as written with the suggestion that the Applicant be encouraged to use colored / stamped concrete materials, and to not just stripe that area. BENNETT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM motioned to reject Staff's recommended Condition No. 3, and to go with what is presently proposed by the Applicant. WOLCH seconded the motion and it passed by majority, with BENNETT opposed.

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

Staff's recommended Condition No. 5 was deleted as it was a duplicate to Staff's recommended Condition No. 2.

HANSEN motioned to approved Staff's recommended Condition No. 6 as written. WOLCH seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM declared project PLN2006-00036 approved.

BENNETT departed the meeting at this time.

3) PLN2006-00038 Sumner Plains Industrial

HOLLER reviewed for the Commission Staff's Report as to PLN2006-00038 Sumner Plains Industrial as follows:

Proposed is construction of six small industrial warehouse/manufacturing buildings. The buildings are approximately 12,000 to 34,000 square feet in size. The proposal is associated with parking, stormwater and landscaping. The site is located at 3025 142nd Avenue East (SE corner of 142nd & 32nd). The site is situated near the southeast corner of 142nd Avenue East and 32nd Street East. The general vicinity is bounded by 32nd Street East to the south, 142nd Ave to the west, and generally surrounded by industrial zoning to the north, east, west and south and residential to portions of the site to the north. The residential zoned land contains existing residential homes, while the industrially zoned land contains vacant land. The project site is zoned Light Manufacturing (M-1) and is evaluated by the Light and Heavy Manufacturing section of the Design and Development Guidelines. As described in the Sumner Comprehensive Plan, these designations are intended to provide appropriately located areas for various commercial services, manufacturing enterprises, manufacturing establishments and research developments that enhance the City's economic base.

STAFF recommended that proposal (PLN2006-00038) should be *APPROVED* subject to the following *CONDITIONS*:

- 1. Staff recommends that bicycle racks shall be located near the front entrance of the buildings. As an option, the applicant may locate some of the bicycle racks inside the building.*
- 2. A detailed lighting plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval since the site borders residential zoned property.*
- 3. Staff recommends externally illuminated signage throughout this project.*
- 4. If chain link fencing is to be used, staff recommends it be black coated for aesthetic value.*
- 5. A detailed lighting plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. The lighting plan shall demonstrate that all light generated on site shall be contained to*

the maximum extent to prevent light from flooding on to neighboring residential properties.

6. *Staff recommends that the landscaped area adjacent the residentially zoned parcels be bermed to a height appropriate to maximize planting density. NOTE: All plantings shall meet the requirements of SMC18.41 for caliper and container size.*

BISOM directed the Applicant to review the project at this time.

ALAN POE, Poe Engineering, Sumner Plains, LLC, Auburn, appeared. He had a few questions of Staff and the Planning Commission with regard to Staff's recommended Condition No. 6. Is that a standard?

HOLLER stated that the caliper for trees is in the Landscape Code, however, it looks as though the Applicant has already met that.

BISOM noted that the Applicant already has larger sizes which are what was needed. The landscape plan has good elements to it.

POE asked with regard to Staff's recommended Condition No. 4, whether Staff is looking for a solid screen fence with slating, or whether it could be wood?

HANSEN suggested either going in the direction of some kind of coated chain link, or some type of wood fencing, but not galvanized chain link with slates.

HOLLER noted that this recommended Condition was directed toward outdoor storage. They would suggested black coated chain link.

WOLCH asked the Applicant what the intent was of the 40 foot, offset cedar fence?

POE approached the site plan to further explain the fence. He noted that it is depicted on the landscape plan. It is a solid line of fencing that jogs up to the residential.

HOLLER added that it is similar to the Panattoni site plan.

BISOM commented that that breaks it up a bit. He asked the Applicant to explain the different facades in relation to the different entrances. One thing he would like to encourage is weather protection for entries.

POE explained that all the main entries are recessed four feet.

HANSEN noted that there are three colors proposed. Is all the trim between the slates going to be the same three colors? Is that going to be green?

GEORGE HUMPHRYS, developer, appeared. He noted that the color depicted on the site plan is more of an example, but not necessarily the color. They will be going with a more rich color palate, with some reds and chocolates.

BISOM commented that the color of the building makes a difference, especially with a building this long. He asked with regard to building "B" whether the east and west elevations noted on page A2 of the site plan, are back to back?

POE stated that rear of building "A" has roll up doors that would face the west elevation of building "B", and would have wrap around glass. Further, the glass on corner of the south elevation would continue around to the west, which would be an office area. The back of building "A" will maintain a retail feel, to preserve the street frontage, even though it is an M1 use. It will also have wrap around glass on the corners. The east side of building "B" is a dock high truck well and is modulated. The eastside of building "B" would have bands. Building "C" has windows that go up and down. They would paint the band is a 5 foot dimension. It would be an accent. That is more the direction they are going with Building "F", as they would like it to look more like the east elevation of building "C".

BISOM noted that the recommendation is directed toward continuity of the buildings, however, not everything will need to be painted the same.

POE stated that, with the industrial park theme, it is a more uniform theme, then for example a condo project. Some of the buildings will need to be a little different, as they are built for individual use and may need to suit those purposes. If they are pre-sold, they could choose the paint for example.

HUMPHRYS added that they would like to create a neighborhood feel, but that will probably be driven by the users.

HANSEN asked Staff what the height limit is in that area?

HOLLER indicated that it is 35 feet. Per Staff's report, the tallest building is 23 feet, but building "C" is 27 ½ feet.

POE commented as to drainage, that the plan just shows that it will be directed away from the building on elevations "D", "E" and "F". The recess wraps around the corner of those buildings. They are proposing a 16-inch concrete square, and then a recess of glass that goes around the corner for detail.

HANSEN asked the Applicant whether it could be seen from 32nd Street?

BISOM asked the Applicant whether they had outdoor enclosures?

POE indicated that there are a couple large enclosures on the north of building "B", and at the present time the enclosures are not shown on buildings "C", "D" and "F", but that those could be incorporated. He noted that one of the stalls could be converted into a screen in that area.

BISOM suggested masonry block or some other more heavy material that would match the construction.

POE asked if that would be in lieu of plantings?

BISOM stated that they could use plantings to soften it also.

HANSEN stated that he would like to see the colors that are chosen submitted back to Staff for review, and that if there is then any concern, that it be resubmitted to the Design Commission for review.

WOLCH commented that he liked the built up concrete, as opposed to metal. He asked if there was a rationale for all of the little buildings? Is it more flexible than a large building?

HUMPHRYS responded that it is more flexible. It caters to owner businesses. The market will support this type of development as there is a need for it.

HOLLER added that these kind of buildings do cater to a niche market.

HUMPHRYS noted that the demographic is good to have change in that direction. There is definitely a need for the smaller business space in the Sumner area.

BISOM motioned to approved Staff's recommended Condition No 1 as written. WOLCH seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HANSEN motioned to replace Staff's recommended Condition No. 2 with Staff's recommended Condition No. 5, and then to delete Condition No. 2 of Staff's Report. BISOM seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

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

HANSEN motioned to approve Staff's recommended Condition No. 4 with the change that it is indicated that it applies to additional fencing within the development, and that the perimeter fence must be wood. WOLCH seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HANSEN motioned to approve Staff's recommended Condition No. 5 as written. WOLCH seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM motioned to clarify with regard to Staff's recommended condition No. 6 that per SMC 18.41, the Applicant has a few larger trees. BISOM wanted to make it clear to the Applicant that they be required to keep the size plantings listed on the plans, and that the sizes be maintained in the buffer areas for screening and

separation, and to further approve Staff's recommended Condition No. 6 as written. WHIPKEY seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM motioned to suggest to the Applicant as to some of the pedestrian doors on the back of the site, that they incorporate canopies or awnings on those entrances, in addition to the alcoves on the front entrances, so that all unprotected doors have some sort of canopy or covering. HANSEN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

WHIPKEY motioned that the Applicant submit to Staff for review the plans for dumpsters for buildings "C", "D", "E" and "F". BISOM seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM motioned to encourage the Applicant to put in picnic tables near the employee entrances, along with benches. WOLCH seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

WOLCH commented that it looks like the Applicant put a lot of effort into landscaping the buffer between the site and the residential. He also commented that he likes the off set fence. It is important for a project to fit in and to work things out with the neighbors.

BISOM declared project PLN2006-00038 approved.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

STAFF COMMENTS

There were no Staff comments.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

BISOM asked Staff what is happening with Casey's Caboose restaurant?

HOLLER stated there was improper service on the property owner, so they had to start the process all over again. In the mean time the City Attorney advised them that the City was just going to take them straight to Court. After that they applied for a demo permit. Demolition started yesterday. Staff is not sure at this time what the property owner is proposing for that site.

BISOM asked Staff what is on next months docket?

HOLLER indicated that nothing is on the docket as of yet. The hotel will not be ready for review until June. City Council is talking about raising the height limit in that area. That may require a code amendment.

DISCUSSION was had about recent land use applications.

HOLLER stated that there are no commercial applications in at this time. There has been a lot of interest in the Red Apple Site. At least 4 or 5 developers have already contacted Staff. Some of them are already working on their proposals.

ADJOURNMENT

BISOM adjourned the meeting at 9:03 p.m.

Sarah M. Heckman
Minutes Taker