



MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, May 12, 2005

6:00 p.m.

**Sumner City Hall
1104 Maple Street**

CALL TO ORDER

BISOM called the Meeting to Order at 6:09 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bisom, Ahrens, Abbott, Hansen and Whipkey

Members Absent: Bennett and Wolch

Also Present: Robert Holler, Associate Planner
Brian Stowe, Stowe Construction (PLN2005-28)
Kathy Craft, Craft Architects (PLN2005-28)
Jason Hubbell, Barhousend Engineers (PLN2005-28)
Chuck Girtz, Quality Stamping & Machining (PLN2005-31)
Stephen Dorsey, Architect (PLN2005-31)
Bob Foster, Project Manager Canterwood Homes (PLN2005-33)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

HANSON motioned to approve the April 14, 2005 regular meeting minutes as written. ABBOTT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

NEW BUSINESS

- **PLN 2005-00028 (American Port Services)**

HOLLER noted that the elevations have changed in the site plan since the issuance of Staff's report, and that the Applicant will review those changes for the Commissioners after Staff's report. HOLLER reviewed for the Commission Staff's Report on PLN 2005-00028 (American Port Services) as follows:

The site is located north of the Simmons Mattress facility and located within the Rainier Park of Industry off of West Valley Highway. Proposed is construction of one industrial truck terminal building totaling approximately 80,000 square feet with associated site landscaping improvements. The site has SEPA approval and the use is permitted outright in the M1 zone. The site is currently vacant land adjacent the West Valley Highway and SR-167 in Sumner, Washington. The site is primarily flat and has been prepared for construction through the SEPA process. The general vicinity is zoned industrial. The site is bounded by M1 properties to the north, south, and the hillside of Edgewood to the west. The site is bordered by SR-167 to the east. The site directly to the north is currently utilized as a model airplane flying field. The site is north of the Simmons Mattress facility.

STAFF recommended that the proposal (PLN 2005-00028) should be *APPROVED* subject to the following *CONDITIONS*:

1. *Any proposed chain link fencing shall be black coated for aesthetic value.*
2. *Staff recommends that a designated link be provided from the parking area to the main entrance to the building and that the pedestrian link be an alternative paving surface to distinguish it from vehicular maneuvering areas.*
3. *Staff recommends that some wall modulation, windows, or architectural treatments be added to the east and west elevation to enhance those elevations; such as extending the end nodes, adding visual interest to the east elevation that faces SR-167, and enhancing the west elevation area with the loading door. The north and south elevations have large expanses of loading doors and it is recommended that they be visually enhanced with a varying parapet to provide a visual break-up given the length of the structure.*
4. *The applicant shall add some weather protection for visitors and employees at the main entrance per the design guidelines.*
5. *Staff recommends the use of only externally illuminated signage for the site and structure.*

- 6 *Staff recommends that the landscaped areas on the eastern property line be bermed to 4 feet in height and increased in planting density as indicated by 50%. The tree plantings shall be a mix of 25% deciduous and 75% evergreen trees to be planted in a minimum of two rows.*
- 7 *Staff recommends that the building perimeter sections along the west and east elevation be landscaped to enhance the site and appearance of the structure as much as possible.*
- 8 *It is recommended that the applicant work with staff to provide a mix of seven (7) internal and external bicycle parking on site to maximize its use.*

BISOM asked the Applicant to make a presentation at this time.

BRIAN STOWE, Applicant appeared. Since the original concept they have added a node on the east end. This project was brought before the Design Commission once before. Since that time, a cross deck was added. This is not a public site, and only trucks will be allowed on this site, which is what makes it different. There is no sign requirement, however, they would like a sign by the road to be consistent with other signs and to indicate to trucks where the building is. The Applicant will make a separate application for the sign. To the north and south there are wetlands, and to the north is a large group of trees. The property cannot be seen, unless you are right up next to it. The south side of the property is open prairie, with approximately 7000 feet of wetland across it. There is no view of the adjoining properties. On the west side is West Valley Highway, which is at least 75 to 100 ft from the property's edge, and is where the parking will start. Further, the site is at a lower elevation, and there is quite a bit of landscaping on the west side as a part of the existing Rainer Park.

AHRENS noted that there are only 36 parking spaces. Will there be no occupants? If there are occupants, will they have to walk onto the site?

STOWE responded that the only parking will be off site.

KATHY CRAFT, Craft Architects, appeared. She advised the Commissioners that part of the parking arrangement has to do with Homeland Security issues.

BISOM commented that there should be a sidewalk to the site.

CRAFT explained that they are providing a pedestrian walkway. People will be checked in at a small office leading to the site.

BISOM asked if the proposed sidewalk would run parallel to the entrance driveway.

CRAFT indicated that it would.

AHRENS asked if the containers on site would be stacked?

STOWE stated that they would not.

AHRENS asked if the site would be consistently full of containers and trucks?

STOWE stated that there is a beacon on all the trucks, which lets them know where the trucks are at all times. There will be no stacking, as this facility does not take them off the trailer

HANSEN asked if there would be 535 of these units on the site at all times?

CRAFT responded that they would be coming and going.

HANSEN expressed concern about the open space. Is there anyway it can be broken up? He suggested landscaping to break up the parking area.

STOWE felt that truck drivers would just run over any landscaping within the parking lot, which would make it look worse. They took that into consideration and beefed up the curbing, similar to Safeway. If the trucks hit the beefed up curbing, it will not break.

CRAFT added that they also have landscape boulders to further break it up.

HANSEN comment that he appreciates the changes made to the site, however, noted that the truck drivers should have no problem maneuvering around landscaped spaces. He suggested three landscaped areas on each side, creating an island.

JASON HUBBELL, Barhousend Engineers, appeared. He noted that currently there is a 55-foot landscaped strip on the east side of the property line, and a 4 ft berm. Those can be increased. They can do a good job of screening these units from view. An internal island would not add much screening, and the bulk of the perimeter is landscaped.

HANSEN stated that he is concerned about the storage units on the north and the south. Those units will be seen from the south. That area should be broken up.

STOWE stated that they really do not want to do that, as it defeats the purpose and they have massive plantings along the wetlands. There will be a lot of landscaping to the north and south.

BISOM commented that as long as the perimeter is screened, that it may have to be enough. The site is more contained and further is a limited access facility. He would like to see a little bit more though. BISOM asked the architect to elaborate on the added node.

CRAFT stated that the criteria was revised from when they originally submitted the plan, to include storage in a portion of the building. They have met the modulation requirement, and have added more landscaping to break up east side of the building.

Those additions may not be used as storage. With these additions, they were also able to incorporate some modulation and meet those requirements. They further made some paint changes along the east elevation, added reveals, windows and other modulation.

AHRENS asked specifically about the changes to the east elevation.

CRAFT noted that they added long narrow reveals and made some color changes.

BISOM asked about awnings or overhangs? Is there an awning over the entryway?

CRAFT stated that there is an awning on the right elevation. It is a canopy that wraps around the entrance and further around to the west elevation for additional modulation. They also changed that elevation by adding reveals and a texture change as well. Further, around the guard shack, landscaping was added for additional screening in that area. As to the structure design, sheer bracing was required for seismic purposes. They added exterior projection concrete panels along the face of the building to approximately 12 feet.

AHRENS asked if that would be 12 feet on center, or 12 feet out.

CRAFT stated that it would be 12 feet out.

BISOM asked if there would be a man-door there?

CRAFT stated that there would be, and that they also added a steel canopy.

BISOM asked if the panel would be a contrast or slight contrast?

CRAFT stated that they can contrast it to tie in the ends of the building and to add shadow lines.

CRAFT provided additional sets of revised site plans to the Commissioners for their review.

BISOM stated that he appreciates the changes that the Applicant has made. He commented that the node on the far east side is functional and yet gives it more of an entrance feel on both ends of the building. It is an interesting element. BISOM asked, with regard to landscaping, for a detail of the plantings to the west of the entry?

CRAFT stated that their landscape architect is on a cruise, however, she can explain the planting plan. She noted that the landscape drawings note an extra requirement of mixing deciduous and evergreens. To that end, 75 percent of the trees are Cedar, Douglas Fir and Aspen. The flowering trees are Ash and Flowering Pear, which are planted at the parking area and along the perimeter. There are Quaking Aspen in the picnic areas. They are also proposing flowering shrubs, in addition to broad leaf evergreen shrubs. She

noted that the landscape architect has done a good job of grouping and massing the plantings.

ABBOTT asked if the evergreens were placed on center?

CRAFT stated that they appear to be about 10 foot on center.

HUBBELL noted that the landscaping in that area is pretty dense near the first parking stalls off of the north east parking area.

ABBOTT asked if the Applicant felt that they could landscape further on the north?

STOWE noted that there are massive Willows in that area, and a lot of trees that grow naturally there, coming down from the creek side. He noted that there are additional plantings in that area as part of the open space plan that are north of the fence line.

HUBBELL added that on the north side is an existing drainage ditch, which they will be planting around as part of their wetland mitigation plan.

ABBOTT motioned to approve Staff's Condition No. 1, as to the black coated chain link fence, as written. HANSEN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM asked the Applicant with regard to Staff's Condition No. 2, if the sidewalks were 4 or 5 feet in width?

STOWE stated that they would be 5 feet.

BISOM motioned to approve Staff's Condition No. 2, as to a pedestrian link, and requested that the solution for the same be reflected in the revised site plan, and that the change be approved by Staff. AHRENS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HANSEN motioned as to Staff's Condition No. 3, regarding modulation, that the building be approved as redesigned. BISOM seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

AHRENS motioned as to Staff's Condition No. 4 on weather protection at the main entrance, to approve the added changes per the submitted 4/7/05 drawings. WHIPKEY seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM motioned as to Staff's Condition No. 5 on signage, that Staff work with the Applicant on that condition, and that it be approve as written. ABBOTT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM motioned as to Staff's Condition No. 6 regarding landscaping, that it be approved as written. WHIPKEY seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HANSEN suggested with regard to Condition No. 6, the addition of landscaped islands by the storage areas.

BISOM noted with regard to Staff's Condition No. 7, that the landscape plan shows an increase in plantings.

ABBOTT motioned to approve Staff's Condition No. 7 as to landscaping along the perimeter of the west and east elevations, as written, as the revised landscape plan provides the necessary landscaping. BISOM seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM motioned on to Staff's Condition No. 8, as to internal and external bicycle parking, that the Applicant should work with Staff to coordinate those locations, and to approve Staff's Condition as written. WHIPKEY seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM declared project PLN 2005-00028 (American Port Services) approved.

- **PLN 2005-00031 (Quality Stamping & Machining)**

HOLLER reviewed for the Commission Staff's Report on PLN 2005-00031 (Quality Stamping and Machining) as follows:

The site is located at 1907 137th Avenue East in Sumner. Proposed is construction of a single manufacturing shop / office building of approximately 20,000 square feet with associated parking, storm water and landscaping. The site is currently the site of the existing facility. This new facility will be an expansion of the business on the same site. The general vicinity is industrial zoned and contains industrial uses. The project will be sharing the existing stormwater facility for Stripe Rite, which is located just to the north of the proposed building.

STAFF recommended that the proposal (PLN 2005-00031) should be *APPROVED* subject to the following *CONDITIONS*:

- 1. Staff recommends the applicant continue some of the façade treatments utilized on the front of the structure to the remaining three elevations including color variation, windows, or the varying parapet to add architectural interest.*
- 2. Any additional chain link fencing if used on site shall be black coated for aesthetic value.*
- 3. The site plan shall be revised to indicate the proper screening for the parking area.*

4. *Staff recommends that a pedestrian link be installed to connect the parking area to the front entrances of the building. The pathway should be an alternative paving surface to distinguish it from vehicular maneuvering areas.*
5. *Staff recommends that externally illuminated signage be used on this project.*

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

CHUCK GIRTZ, Owner of Quality Stamping and Machining appeared. He noted that they are just expanding the business. He is in agreement with Staff's recommendations. He is concerned with putting in windows. He would be reluctant to put in windows by the railroad tracks. He is trying to minimize noise by keeping the west wall as solid as possible. The chain link recommendation is fine and would be consistent with the other site. He does not feel that a lot of screening of parking on the west side would accomplish anything. The railroad tracks are high on that side of the road, which is higher than any screening would be. Further, additional screening in that area would cut them off from the additional property. It would be a waste of money as there would be no gain to screen that area. As to the pathway, there is not much of one, but he can change that. He is landscaping the areas on the south west corner, changing that area into a sidewalk for easy access leading to the entrance. He has no problem with the signage requirement. His concern is with regard to screening of the parking lot on west side, when there is nothing to screen it from.

AHRENS asked the Applicant if he would be submitting a redesign, showing the facade modifications, for approval?

GIRTZ stated that he would be bringing back the changes for review, however, he does not know if it will need to come before the Design Commission again.

HOLLER noted that Staff is comfortable with that.

BISOM suggested giving the Applicant further direction. He noted that the Applicant's preference is to do more painting and coloring rather than more facade modulation.

GIRTZ stated that he moved the building back to a 50-foot set back for the road, and that he cannot really jet out on the building in that area without being required to move the whole thing.

ABBOTT asked Staff how wide the right of way would be?

HOLLER stated that that would vary. The east property line goes up in a saw tooth pattern. The right of way is small at southern end. The further north you go, there are more and more properties encroaching. That road would be a straight shot to the north.

GIRTZ noted that one factor to take into consideration is the existing cell phone tower. The tower sits between the existing building and new building, and 30 feet off of the property line. It shows how close the road comes in at that point to the cell tower.

HOLLER added that the cell tower location has been a problem in the past.

AHRENS commented that she likes the change in color scheme to the west, however, she is concerned about the east.

GIRTZ responded that the area to the east is all semi containers, and that there is no view of that area.

AHRENS stated that it may be seen when the road goes in.

GIRTZ stated that what they will see is his building on one side and semi containers on the other side. To see the building, they would have to be right up next to it. He would, however, like to dress up that area with an attractive paint screen.

AHRENS noted that it is important to maintain a level of quality for all projects. She asked the Applicant if the east elevation had an awning?

STEVE DORSEY, Architect appeared. He indicated that there was an awning.

AHRENS suggested having two color tones around the entire building. She further suggested that the front elevation be a slightly different color tone than the other elevations, similar to other industrial buildings.

GIRTZ stated that he did not have a problem with that suggestion.

BISOM asked if it was possible for the Applicant to added windows to the east elevation?

GIRTZ stated that they would be windows that nobody would be looking out of. They are manufacturing airplane parts in that building, and do not want ground level windows for security purposes, as they would have to alarm them.

ABBOTT commented that it would, however, add natural light to the work space for the employees.

GIRTZ stated that they would probably not be kept clean. They building would have good lighting for the machinist and tool workers. Their biggest problem is with security, on the ground level especially. It would open it up for vandalism.

BISOM stated that he is just looking to add more architectural interest.

AHRENS suggested landscaping the north wall in lieu of adding architectural details.

GIRTZ stated that landscaping there would be a good idea, however, 137th will be going away in the future, and he would like to leave that space open for future access to storm water detention and to 138th when it goes in. The trees could be taken out, however, he does not think it makes sense to put them in if they are just going to have to come out. He suggested natural grass, which would be nice for the ducks and would be a place for people to sit during break.

HANSEN asked how the site would be accessed to the north when 138th goes through?

BISOM noted that it is shown on the site plan.

HOLLER stated that Staff had a similar discussion with the fire department. They are concerned about future access as well. Their desire is, after 138th goes in, that room is left for fire trucks to loop round in that area. That is why the northern edge is left vacant as a future access around the building. Further, the storm water facility at this site is substantial, and it has plantings around it.

BISOM stated that he will most likely recommend a more detail landscape plan for Staff's review, however, he understands the concern with the change of roadway in the future. If more input is needed, it can come before the Design Commission again.

DORSEY noted that they have already put together a landscape plan. He provided the same to the Commissioners for their review. They expect to further landscape the east side between the new road and the building, when the new road goes through.

ABBOTT asked if the new road would allow for landscaping?

GIRTZ stated that it would, however, it would be a matter of how far the road comes in. It would not be able to come in too far because of the cell phone tower.

BISOM asked Staff how they could guarantee the landscaping requirement would be met, when it could be 8 to 10 years before the new road is done? He suggested smaller plantings in the mean time between the parking and the property line.

GIRTZ stated that he is not opposed to plantings, however, at this time there is a 6 foot high fence separating the storage area. Nobody can see past that fence.

HANSEN asked Staff if they had some sort of flagging system, that would notify them of the future landscape requirement once the new road was in?

HOLLER suggested making a general recommendation that could be added to the building permit as a condition. Further, adding a driveway would trigger that requirement.

AHRENS motioned on Staff's Condition No. 1, as to façade treatments, to approve it as written, and that said changes be submitted for Staff's review. BISOM seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

ABBOTT motioned to approve Staff's Condition No. 2 as to black coated chain link fence, as written. AHRENS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HANSEN asked with regard to Staff's Condition No. 3, how that Condition could be met with the building where it is? Can they move the storm water detention?

HOLLER stated that the building is locate to sufficiently allow for single access. It would not necessarily be room enough for a two lane driveway.

HANSEN noted that the pond is on a separate property, and suggested changing the height of some of the plantings on the other property.

GIRTZ stated that part of his agreement with the other property owner is the addition of a chain link fence on the property line, and that there be black slates in the fence.

BISOM motioned on Staff's Condition No. 3, as to landscaping and proper screening to remove the requirement of the 4 foot buffer on north side of property, and further that the plantings on the east portion of the property be dense and be planted in increments as 138th is added. As to the landscape plan, BISOM motioned to increase the plant sizes as follows: that the 10 Zelkova 'Green Vace' 1 inch in caliper be increased to a 2 inch caliper; that the 8 Castus Hybridus 'White Rock Rose' 1 gallon plantings be increase to 2 gallon plantings; and that 10 Evergreen trees be planted, in addition to the Cedar and Douglas Fir, and that they be approximately 6 to 8 feet tall. Further, that the plan should be submitted for Staff's review and approval.

HANSEN suggested that in addition to that motion a notation that the Applicant be required to further landscape the east side of the property upon receiving a permit to build a driveway in association with the completion of 138th.

BISOM included that in the motion.

ABBOTT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

ABBOTT commented with regard to Staff's Condition No. 4 that he is concerned that there is no sidewalk on 137th.

GIRTZ noted that 137th is already abandoned to the south.

BISOM noted that a link within the parking lot is the intent.

GIRTZ suggested that the landscaping at the southwest corner of the building be turned into a sidewalk to provide access to the building from parking lot, and that the landscaping would provide visual access at the south west corner.

BISOM stated that he does not want to lose landscaping in the front.

GIRTZ then suggested sliding the landscaping to the south. He would prefer not driving a forklift over the sidewalk.

BISOM suggested moving the plants away from the building to add a sidewalk next to the building and not losing any planting space.

GIRTZ stated that he can work with Staff on that.

BISOM thought the Applicant could work with Staff on that as long as the plantings remained the same thickness.

HANSEN motioned to approve Staff's Condition No. 4 as to a pedestrian link, as written, and further that the landscaping as presented tonight, remain the same density and be moved out to allow for the walkway, and that it be submitted for Staff's review and approval. BISOM seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM motioned to approve Staff's Condition No. 5, as to signage, as written. AHRENS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM declared project PLN 2005-00031 (Quality Stamping and Machining) approved.

- **PLN 2005-00033 (Canterwood Homes re-design)**

HOLLER reviewed for the Commission Staff's Report on PLN 2005-00033 (Canterwood Homes re-design) as follows:

Both lots of the proposed site are located within the Sumner Place subdivision in Sumner, Washington. Proposed is construction of 8 residential dwelling units within 2 separate structures on 2 separate lots within the Sumner Place subdivision. Both lots are designated for 4 units each through the Conditional Use Permit process associated with the Preliminary Plat. The row-houses are proposed to be situated on lot 1 and lot 12. The preliminary plat and conditional use permit for the 4-plexes have been approved by the City Hearing Examiner. This project is a re-design of the original proposal, which mirrored the Sumner Square multifamily project to the north. The re-design is a ground related, "row-house" design intended to better integrate with the style of single family homes that the applicant has built within the subdivision. Both sites are currently vacant lots with existing street improvements. Lot 1 is 9,489 square feet and Lot 12 is 13,945 square feet. The vicinity of the proposal consists of mainly residential land uses: North:

Neighborhood Commercial (NC) (multifamily); East: Low Density Residential (LDR); West: Low Density Residential (LDR); and South: Low Density Residential (LDR).

STAFF recommended that the proposal (PLN 2005-00033) should be *APPROVED* subject to the following *CONDITIONS*:

1. *The structure on lot 12 shall be revised with the garage access only located on the rear of the structure and the front (where the garage door was located) shall be replaced with a wall façade to include windows and detailing similar to the remainder of the structure. The main pedestrian access of lot 12 shall remain off of the primary street and shall not be moved.*
2. *Street access to the rear garages shall be via a single drive access off of Daffodil Street.*
3. *Both lots shall incorporate full landscaping to blend with the existing streetscape.*
4. *Color variation shall be used to differentiate between the townhouse units in each structure utilizing paint themes used on the single family homes. Each structure should utilize a different color scheme and/or pattern.*
5. *Lot 12 shall incorporate pedestrian access to the front doors of each unit similar to that of lot 1.*
6. *Lot 12 shall make use of the remaining rear portion of the site for resident yard space and shall include amenities such as benches, tables, and significant landscaping.*
7. *The site plans of both structures shall be revised to indicate the building meeting the required setbacks.*

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

BOB FOSTER, Project Manager, Canterwood Homes, appeared. He stated that he is fine with all of Staff's recommendations. Their only concern is with lot 12 and the recommended design change. They were hoping to keep that out in the field.

BISOM asked the Applicant about the proposed color scheme?

FOSTER stated that the color scheme would be similar to the development. It would vary to make it look less like apartments.

BISOM asked if these would be condominiums or rentals?

FOSTER stated that they would be rentals. They are designed to look like townhouses. They will be using shake and Hardy Plank.

BISOM noted the variation in windows as well.

HOLLER advised the Commissions that one thing that Staff wanted to get at with the row house scenario, is getting away from a flat facade. Staff would like to see it set back at varying angles.

BISOM asked Staff if the porches on east and west have to go?

HOLLER stated that the porches are fine, it is the wrap around that has to go.

BISOM asked if it were possible to add an element with a trellis that does not connect to the structure?

HOLLER suggested possibly a cantilever seating area that comes out in the living room or dining room areas. It would help break up the facades.

AHRENS suggested a roof with brackets.

HOLLER added that eaves can also over-hang. When it is attached to the ground it cannot overhang. Further, up on the second side, there can be a bay on that side, and over a window on the bottom they could do a trellis. Architectural elements are okay, it is just when it is attached to the ground with a roof, it is not.

BISOM stated that he understands what is trying to be accomplished here, but felt that it is fighting what we are trying to achieve.

ABBOTT asked whether, on lot 12 where there is access off the rear, the building is going to be flipped around.

HOLLER stated that the building would stay as proposed, with the garage doors as a facade.

DISCUSSION was had with regard to the conditions over the site plan.

AHRENS noted that it is exactly like the other building, except skinnier.

ABBOTT asked why the building is not being flipping around?

HOLLER noted that it is because they do not want the primary access to come off the rear. Picking up the building and turning it around would make the back of the structure face the street, which would not look good. If that can be handled by a code change or a field change then it would be fine.

HANSEN asked with regard to the amenities required for lot 12, if those would be solely for the residents of lot 12, or if it would also be for the rest of the community?

HOLLER stated that it had not yet been discussed, however, it could end up being a pocket park situation.

BISOM thought a pocket park would be a good recommendation, and suggested that the corner may need more detailed plantings.

HOLLER stated that the Applicant has provided a landscape plan that was approved for the original 4-plex. The orientation is not the same, however, the landscape plan does indicate what the proposed landscaping would be like. The original proposal also included detached carports, which have now been made part of the structure. In terms of the perimeter landscaping, it would still be the same.

DISCUSSION was had over the site plan as to the location of the alley.

BISOM motioned with regard to Staff's Condition No. 1, as to lot 12, that said condition should be approved as written, with the understanding that the car park alley will be in the back to minimize conflict with the school, and that said changes be submitted to Staff for review and approval. HANSEN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HANSEN motioned to approve Staff's Condition No. 2, as to street access to the rear garages, as written, and that it not connect to Daffodil Court. BISOM seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM motioned on Staff's Condition No. 3, as to landscaping, that the previously written landscape plan be revised and submitted to Staff to reflect the site changes, and that a more detailed planting plan be discussed. AHRENS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

ABBOTT motioned to approve Staff's Condition No. 4, as to color variation, as written. HANSEN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HANSEN motioned to approve Staff's Condition No. 5 regarding pedestrian access, as written. BISOM seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HANSEN motioned to approve Staff's Condition No. 6 regarding pedestrian access to lot 12, as written, with the additional wording that a pocket park be added and that it be submitted to Staff for review and approval. ABBOTT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

AHRENS motioned with regard to Staff's Condition No. 7 as to the site plan reflecting the meeting of the setbacks on both sites, that the structures further be revised to meet the required setbacks in lieu of the wrap around porches, possibly

adding cantilevers wrapped around the base, as well as trellised and cantilever covered roofs, and that it be submitted for Staff's review and approval. HANSEN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM declared project PLN 2005-00033 (Canterwood Homes re-design) approved.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

STAFF COMMENTS

- **Possible upcoming projects.**

HOLLER noted that there is only one item on the agenda for next month. Other stuff possibly in the pipeline would be a project across the street, possibly an auto garage; and a possible project at Washington Market the on corner of Parker and Main. That would be the street adjacent to the vet clinic. There has been talk about redeveloping that site.

HANSEN asked about the downtown conference?

HOLLER stated that he is preparing a memo in that regard. He noted that the downtown conference was a lot of fun. There was a lot of discussion about signage. They are looking at the sign code and how to better communicate that to applicants. It was nice to meet others with similar concerns.

HANSEN also noted that he was able to obtain a picture of Centralia as it existed in 1987. This picture was used when they would redo buildings.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

There were no Commissioner comments.

ADJOURNMENT

BISOM adjourned the meeting at 8:42 p.m.

Sarah M. Heckman, Minutes Taker