

## **SUMNER IMPROVEMENT BOARD MINUTES**

### **Sumner Improvement Board/Design Commission**

**Meeting Date: 08/09/01**

**Time: 6:00 p.m.**

**Location: Sumner City Hall, Council Chambers**

Attending: Chris Larson, David Bisom, John Tobias, Marshall Bennett, Gregory Hackworth, and Kandi Lovgren

Also Present: Leonard Bauer, Community Development Director Ryan Windish, Senior Planner Ron Buckholt, Associate Planner

### **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by LARSON at 6:05 p.m.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

BISOM moved to approve the minutes for July 12, 2001. BENNETT seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **1. Fred Meyer (PLN 2001-00047)**

RON BUCKHOLT presented and summarized the Staff Report to the Design Commission. The agent for this project is Barghausen Consulting Engineers. The project location is located on the northeast corner of Main Street and Valley Avenue. The proposal consists of constructing a 171,232 square foot Fred Meyer retail building, associated with two future retail building footprints of 12,500 square feet and 6,000 square feet respectively. The two smaller retail stores are proposed to be adjacent to Main Street while the Fred Meyer store is proposed to be located behind the smaller retail pads. The west elevation of the store will have frontage along Valley Avenue. The design review consists of the Fred Meyer building itself, the overall conceptual site plan, parking, pedestrian pathways, landscaping, and the two smaller detached building pads that face onto Main Street. The site consists of five parcels that are currently vacant, except for the one parcel that contains a commercial building on it. The site is relatively flat and wetlands have been identified on the parcel. This site is located in the center of town and is identified as a gateway heading west into the central business district. The project site is zoned general commercial. The proposed setbacks off of Valley Avenue are set at 25 feet. The proposed setback for the two smaller retail buildings is approximately 10 feet. The proposal is situated on two minor arterials. The proposal has a plaza and tent space on the west elevation of the Fred Meyer building adjacent to Valley Avenue. There are three proposed driveways along Valley Avenue with one driveway proposed off of Main Street. To comply with the Design Guidelines for the shopping center scenario Staff is making two recommendations. The recommendations were summarized. There is a proposed trail connecting Washington Street to Main Street along the eastern property line. Staff is recommending that this pedestrian pathway be a minimum of 10 feet width where feasible. Staff recommends that a pathway be added in the southwest portion of the site. The site plan is composed of over 90,000 square feet of open space. Some of the open space amenities include a gazebo and lawn area in the northwest portion of the site. There is a plaza near the southwest corner and there is also a trail system around the pond area in the northeastern portion of the site. The building facade recommendations were summarized. The site plan indicates elevated planters at the middle of the store along the front. The landscape planters could also function as pedestrian seating. Staff recommends that the ledges be a minimum of 12 inches in width. Staff is recommending approval of this project subject to conditions. The staff recommendations were summarized.

BRUCE KRIEGER of Barghausen Consulting Engineers appeared and introduced Terry Krause of Sienna Architecture who will assist in the presentation. Other members of the design team include Ken Andrews, Charles Mosley, and Tom Gibbons, all from Fred Meyer, and Joel Howitt also with Barghausen Consulting Engineers. They have been working over the past 8 months in a variety of settings from the two workshops, a neighborhood meeting attended by over 90 citizens, and attendance at a neighborhood church meeting by a Fred Meyer representative to discuss the plans. They have made significant changes and advances in their plans over the past 8 months towards meeting the urban design concept for development of this gateway corner. The recent meeting they had with the Design Commission on June 25, 2001, led to some additional significant changes. These changes are represented in the plans submitted for formal design review. Some of the key revisions include advancing the design of their stormwater facility pond to serve as both a functional stormwater facility as well as a true aesthetic asset. The network of pedestrian pathways in their plans are extensive. They will provide more than 3,500 linear feet of pedestrian pathways. They have addressed the compact stall parking issue; added a 1,500 square foot retail tenant space on the southwest corner, and grouped and brought forward a retail pad from Main Street so there is now an offset of 10 feet from the right-of-way. This will help accommodate the required street trees and plantings that still gives a strong building presence on Main Street. They have gone through the staff report and the conditions of approval. He made one correction to the staff report for clarification. The square footage of the Fred Meyer retail building of 171,232 is supplemented now by the addition of the 1,500 square foot retail tenant space attached to the southwest corner of the building. They also have the FM Fuel Stop facility that is represented on the plans. They are in agreement with the conditions of approval in general. They will address conditions 1, 3 and 16. He asked staff for clarification on condition #1. He wants to be clear that this condition stipulates that they are required to execute this agreement between Fred Meyer and the purchasers of properties, but that the final approval of design review won't be held up until such an agreement has been presented to the staff.

LEONARD BAUER stated that the language does state that it is contingent, but the approval itself would be granted on that contingency basis. It would not necessarily have to be actually executed prior to the approval of the written decision of the design approval. Should the condition not be met at the time indicated, then the approval could be revoked at that time.

TERRY KRAUSE, the design architect for the Fred Meyer store appeared and made a clarification regarding the staff report. On page 5, regarding building height, the staff report states that the proposed building at its highest point is approximately 26 feet. That is actually the height of the average wall at the base of the building. The highest point on the building will be at the entranceways, which are 35 feet, and the walls are modulated up and down in various heights between 26 and 35 feet. On page 6, indicates that the applicant is proposing reflective glass on portions of the west and south elevations. There was reflective glass proposed for the south elevation but not for the west side. He addressed staff's recommendation #3. They compromised and proposed something that at least appeared to be a storefront. It is still not viewed by the Commission as a real likeable solution. The workshop essentially got to the point where Fred Meyer conceded to add the additional square foot in the clear store front display windows on the south elevation and quite a ways down on the west elevation. Even though this still meets the intent of the Design Guidelines because it is not predominantly reflective glass, it is their position that since the tenant area was made of display glass for the tenant storefronts, they are going to propose to eliminate the reflective glass on this area and become part of the modulated wall. He addressed recommendation #16, the north wall elevation. They agree with this condition and they would like to propose an acceptable modulation of that wall. It will be consistent with the other elevations of the building.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

PATTI McKEE of 6206 Bock Avenue, asked about the north side of the Berry Motel. Will there be a fence there? It looks like mainly landscaping on the north side and there will be a pathway there. Is there fence to actually stop traffic from going from the parking lot directly into the motel? She is concerned about the flow of pedestrian foot traffic.

KRIEGER stated that they would not be constructing a fence along the property line.

BISOM asked about how the detention pond landscape buffer could be designed as more of recreational use as well. He asked for clarification on how this use has been changed from when it was last presented at the workshop.

KRIEGER stated that the previous plans show a basic carved out storm pond. They have provided more of a passive recreational area. They do not anticipate active recreational uses. They have been asked by staff to include some other furniture such as picnic benches and tables. They have agreed with that condition. One of the significant changes they made in landscape features is that the previous plan had a solid screen of Evergreen trees along the north side and along the south edge of the pond and they have now advanced that with clusters of Plums and Cherry trees and also clusters of Black Pines in groupings. They did retain a number of Evergreens along the south edge of the pond with the intent that they still want to help advance the screening. They have softened the edges of the inside of the pond with a number of plantings.

HACKWORTH stated that since the first time he has seen this project he has continually voiced some real concerns about the location of the service area being so prominently displayed to the north open to Washington Street. He is concerned that exposing such a significant long facade with a major service component is purely wrong from a basic site design perspective. The Design Guidelines do encourage that those service components be screened and located away and out of site from the street. This seems to be in a negative opposite direction from what the guidelines and basic planning principles suggest. Furthermore, locating an employee parking lot upon a prominent corner also is completely disrespectful for the guidelines. It is not acceptable. Storm ponds tend to be wastewater from parking lots. Unless great care is taken in the design and the quality of the landscape design they tend to be fairly ugly places. Based on the presentation, he has concerns regarding the storm ponds, service area, 400 foot long relatively blank facade, and a major parking lot all exposed to the street and stated that all are somewhat in violation of the Design Guidelines.

LARSON stated that this design does not meet the Design Guidelines. The setup is unacceptable. The building is sitting back with parking up front. Future retail pads have been added, but there is no guarantee these will be filled. The whole frontage of this building is supposed to be up on Valley and up on Main Street.

HACKWORTH stated that the perspective from Main Street looks great and is very compelling and it has all the elements that we expect to see from an application. Unfortunately, those components are not part of this application. The accurate perspective for the purpose of discussion would be a view of what this will look like without a commercial development. There really is no guarantee that this will ever happen. If they don't happen then there will be a sea of parking exposed to Main Street. This is in violation of the guidelines as a planning principle.

LOVGREN stated that this is not just a Fred Meyer to them. They do not have any guarantee that Fred Meyer will occupy that building forever. What will happen to it if it becomes vacant? It just does not fit or meet the guidelines they way it was intended.

BENNETT stated that this building has to face three fronts. Each of those elevations needs to satisfy the guidelines in terms of pedestrian friendliness. We don't want to recognize it as a Fred Meyer.

KRIEGER responded to the concerns and issues raised by the Design Commission. He is disappointed. There are a number of issues that may be misconceptions or misunderstandings. He hopes to clarify them. In regards to the screening of the service area in the back of the building, the back of the building is not going to be visible from Washington Street to the average motorist or pedestrian. The viewing of this activity will be addressed through the screening that they are proposing along the south margin of the retention pond stormwater facility. The service areas are going to be further addressed through the

modulation in addition of landscaping strips adjacent to that wall. The wall will have an architectural treatment that is similar to the materials that are used in modulation of the other three building elevations. In response to the concern raised about the future retail pads, they have discussed with staff in regards to Fred Meyer's history of selling off the out parcels. In their fleet of 150 stores, selling off and development of those parcels has typically occurred within 12 to 18 months. Once the pads were developed and built, upon vacancy Fred Meyer had an immediate tenant to occupy that space. He wants to make it clear that Fred Meyer is dedicated to building this facility here. They have made significant changes to address what they believe are genuine concerns of the Commission, citizens, and city administrators raised at previous workshops. From an economic standpoint, Fred Meyer will sell the out parcels. From a design standpoint, they are dedicated to seeing those parcels built on and their formal design review application included proposed building pad locations situated near the street to address the concerns about wanting to bring forward retail building frontages out to the immediate road edge along this auto-oriented section of East Main Street. The design concepts that have been brought forward with the architectural concepts for the front retail parcels are the best job they can do in presenting an image of building design that is compatible with the Fred Meyer store and also helping to implement design criteria in the Urban Design Manual. They wanted to advance these plans for design approval. Any developer that comes in with a plan that deviates from the guidelines would certainly have to come back to the Board for re-approval. Fred Meyer does have a letter of interest by a developer. They are moving ahead and they are looking in earnest to find someone to build on those parcels. They are dedicated to building a new retail store that fits the character of this area of Sumner and is compatible with design criteria.

Appearing was L.L. MILLS of 1531 Main Street, and asked how they planned to keep the ducks and geese out of the retention pond so there will not be droppings all over the place. How will the water be aerated?

KRIEGER stated that the issue of waterfowl control has not been addressed.

BISOM questioned the applicant about the tree heights proposed along the back of the building. The landscape plan shows a maximum of 6 feet in height. These will take an incredible amount of time to do any screening. There still is no resolution to this. Is there any way larger trees can be installed in that north side buffer?

KRIEGER indicated that would be willing to increase the caliper of the trees and the height of the Evergreens trees if the Design Commission feels that would be beneficial. There is some merit to that request.

TERRY KRAUSE reappeared and addressed the service area. He pointed out the area where the compactors and the truck docks are located and stated that they are recessed over 4 feet. It isn't just that there will be a 6 foot tree. All of these things are recessed below grade. The area is fairly deep. You won't see dumpsters sitting on the ground. You will barely be able to see the top of them from the street. The screening, landscaping, and buffer will serve to additionally screen that area. They intend to work with staff on the back of the building and the modulation to bring it more in compliance with the west or the front.

TOBIAS stated that he was concerned about the fact that they only see illustrations one meeting after they are addressed. With the questions concerning the back of the building, it would have been appropriate to be able to look at illustrations of what is being spoken of tonight. He would like to see a realistic representation. He is not concerned about dumpster screening. His concern is the view from his church and whether this building is something he can be proud of. This is not just the biggest retail building in town, this is the hallmark entry and the center of town. He wants to see all the stops pulled out.

BENNETT asked what the drawback was about having the building right up on Main Street and the parking behind the building.

A representative from Fred Meyer stated that if you look at the physical building itself with the parking building there is not any doors. There is always going to be a back of a building for service and other things.

TERRY KRAUSE stated that the building also has to function. Everyone wants to park near the entry. They don't want to park around the back of the store and walk all the way around to get in the building. It is very difficult to front a building on three or four sides. It has to load and operate.

Appearing was TERRY WALKER of 1421 Washington Street, and asked the applicant how many loading docks were necessary on the back of the building. Do you use the whole back? It seems like the building could just be turned, meet the City's guidelines, still have a huge parking lot, and you would have a one-of-a-kind Fred Meyer by having the parking in the back with entrances on both sides. You would have the street front with parking in the back. You could put your service entrance at the end of the building on Washington Street.

Reappearing was KRIEGER to respond to the previous suggestion to rotate the building. This presents another problem from a design standpoint. They have situated their building so it has a facade on Valley Avenue and if the building gets turned sideways we have opened up the entire parking area to Valley Avenue. This would create another problem.

Appearing was PAT LITZEN, who resides at 1014 Park Street, and asked if the pond was accessible to children. Is it possible that a child could ever drown in that pond and is it fenced in any way?

KRIEGER indicated that they are addressing this issue with the City Public Works Director. The city has specific design guidelines about how to design storm ponds.

Appearing was RAY CAPPS, who resides at 426 Guptil Avenue, and wanted to commend the Design Commission for taking all these things into consideration. He agrees with the type of foliage around the pond. There is a pond right across the street at the Catholic Church. There are no trees planted around that pond. A grocery store is not a destination shop and he does not want to have to push his grocery cart three blocks to put groceries into his car. It just does not make sense. With good planning and attention to detail he does not see anything wrong with having the store set back and having good parking for people. He thinks it is a good idea.

Appearing was MARTIN FLEISCHMAN, who resides at 908 Meade Avenue, and feels that the City needs this Fred Meyer store. He has resided in Sumner for 9 to 10 years and outside the city limits for 30 years prior to that. He spends no money in the City of Sumner. The City keeps telling them that the stores should be up front with picture windows on the street and he feels that is a 1920's concept. He does not know where they came up with the guidelines. It is not 1920 anymore. This city needs the tax base. The people that live here need a place to shop without having to drive to Puyallup or Bonney Lake all the time. The Commission should bend over backwards to help Fred Meyer put there store in Sumner. One should stand outside and look down Main Street - there is no architecture or no two buildings that are the same or built in the same plan. It's a "mish mosh". The only thing they have in common is a lack of parking. This proposal looks like a beautiful building. He feels Fred Meyer has bent over backwards to accommodate the City. The City should bend over backwards and accommodate the citizens.

Appearing was HAZEL FREEHE, who resides 6917 166th Avenue East, who is in favor of Fred Meyer coming into Sumner. This town is where everyone wants to come live in. You cannot buy anything here. It scares her to think that if Fred Meyer is not allowed to come in then what will come in there. She thinks it is time for Sumner to get some revenue. They can go to Fred Meyer and get a variety of things. You can't get a pair of jeans for kids here. You can't buy shoes, yarn, or get a knitting needle. It is ridiculous. The only complaint is traffic.

Reappearing was L.L. MILLS and stated this proposal looks much better than all of the warehouses out there. Those do not provide tax money but the Fred Meyer does. We cannot continue to be the arts and crafts capital of the world. It is time to start putting some businesses in here.

Reappearing was TERRY WALKER, who stated that he did not want Fred Meyer here at first. He does now think that Sumner needs a Fred Meyer. However, he does not feel Sumner should bend over backwards for anybody. We need to stick to the guidelines and need to work with Fred Meyer and come up with something that is feasible to everyone and not just move them in because we need some place to buy jeans.

Appearing was RICK AUSTIN who resides at 502 Chervenka Avenue, and stated that maybe we should just re-name Sumner and call it "Fred Meyer" and name the store "Sumner".

Appearing was DAVE ENSLOW, who resides at 159 Main Street, who stated that he supports Fred Meyer coming in. He mentioned how South Hill and Bonney Lake looks and he hopes that is not replicated in Sumner. This will be one of the most major things that is going to happen in town. He does not want to look back and regret that it looks like it belongs up in South Hill. Sumner is unique. He hopes the Commission works hard and not just let them in at any cost. Give us something better than South Hill.

Appearing was ALLEN MILLER, who resides at 1215 Wood Avenue, and stated that he and his wife were looking for a house and a certain type of lifestyle and environment to raise their family. They found this is Sumner. They have appreciated what Sumner has maintained. He hopes that balance is maintained. The reason he chose to move to Sumner was because of the history and the community that it is. He is very happy driving up to Bonney Lake right now. He would not be upset to have something closer but he wants it to be considered very carefully.

Reappearing was L.L. MILLS who questioned how Fred Meyer got this far with their design and meeting with the Commission and now there are a whole bunch of objections. The last meeting before should have worked that out. They spent a lot of money putting this proposal together.

Appearing was STEVE ALSEP, who resides at 1427 Willow Street, and he was skeptical about Fred Meyer at the beginning and he has watched the design process. He thinks the revenue would be positive. This is still a big box with a lot of asphalt in front of it. Fred Meyer has built facilities that fit within neighborhoods. Broadway in Seattle is an example. It is in a congested urban area and it fits. He encourages the Commission to think long term. It doesn't have to have a big asphalt parking lot in front of it. It can fit character of this town and it can be a real asset.

The public comment portion of the meeting was closed.

Thereupon the Commission discussed some landscape and site concern issues. BISOM commended the staff of the City of Sumner. This has been an intensive project. They have made some very thorough recommendations. Their task right now is to take in the public comments, the comments and explanations from the applicant, as well as their own concerns, and come up with a recommendation. He thanks everyone for attending. He complimented the architect and the staff from Fred Meyer. They have to represent the City and the guidelines that they are supposed to represent. He made comments on staff recommendation #6 regarding the pedestrian corridor going north/south through the site. It is a great idea and an excellent recommendation to widen the corridor through the parking area. His major concerns are items #12 and 13 which relate to the north side of the building, both screening of the detention pond and the building itself. Item 13 deals with the eastern portion of the site with Washington Court. He would like to see that the Evergreen trees and the proposed Conifer and Deciduous trees be increased in height. The minimum on the back, north and east be a 12 foot tall Evergreen tree at installation and that the caliper size of the Deciduous trees be increased from 1.75 and 2 inches to a 3 inch caliper. The north and east portions have to increase the size of the trees. The design concept for the other plantings is keeping

with the character and this will help increase the screening on those portions that they are concerned about. He made a motion to the Commission as follows:

BISOM motioned to increase the size of the trees on the north and east portions of the property. LOVGREN seconded the motion. The motion passed 6 - 0.

A representative from Fred Meyer appeared to address the issue of the additional parcel being left vacant. There seldom is excess land and they sell their parcels fast. They have never left a vacant building anywhere and only two stores have closed in Fred Meyer's history. He provided examples of stores that have sold off the parcels immediately and stated that they already have a letter of intent from a developer who is very interested in co-developing with them.

LEONARD BAUER stated to the Commission that they are to review not only Fred Meyer's building but other buildings on the street. All the parcels are being reviewed. The intention is that when the buildings have actual elevations and designs it would again come back to the Commission for specific elevation approval. In terms of the site plan, all parcels are being reviewed. In terms of the building elevations, only the Fred Meyer building is being reviewed tonight.

HACKWORTH summarized his comments by stating that the issues that he raised relative to the north service area are too large to even address in a motion for approval. He asks the applicant to consider everything that has been said and come back with a cohesive proposal for that entire section of the site, including all of the open space, parking, landscaping, and service area.

HACKWORTH motioned to have the applicant come back and address the above-stated issues. TOBIAS seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

KRIEGER addressed the Commission and stated that the Commission specifically requested they bring architectural elevations in as a part of their formal design review. They have done so with the intent that the architecture of the Fuel Stop would be reviewed and considered at this hearing.

Thereupon was discussion about the Fuel Stop elevation. KRIEGER summarized the design elements.

BISOM motioned to approve the general architectural intent of the design sketch of the Fuel Stop so that it matches the eventual elevations of the Fred Meyer structure, but they still will need additional details as the final approval permit for this project. For the site plan it meets what they are looking for. LOVGREN seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

HACKWORTH motioned that the applicant return with a revised application that addresses several of the concerns that have been raised this evening. (This motion was not seconded or voted on).

KRIEGER addressed the Commission and requested a very specific motion to provide direction for the modified plan. There have been a number of points raised tonight. He would appreciate specificity to the motion.

HACKWORTH stated that his specific concerns are the north face of the building facing Washington Street. He has already stated his concerns several times. He would like to see the applicant come back with a proposal to address those concerns on the north facade.

TERRY KRAUSE addressed the Commission and stated that Mr. Bisom's comments related to the ponds and the recreational aspects of those ponds and plantings, however, he is confused on Mr. Hackworth's comments. Do you want this to be a public place or a place to be hidden away? He feels there are conflicting opinions. He needs specifics on whether they need to make it more of a public place or more not a public place.

HACKWORTH stated that there is a great deal of open space along the edge of Washington Street. There is an opportunity to possibly better design that open space so that it is not just stormwater detention and a meandering path. It is far too open to the service area visually. Some additional screening needs to occur possibly utilizing building modulation to screen the service area. It can be used very effectively to screen the service area. These are just a general indication of his concerns.

BISOM feels that berming or mounding should be used to create the screening with the eye so it is not just a flat area back there. You would get more screening and depth. This is part of the staff recommendations. He does concur with HACKWORTH about the idea of more linear screening to separate the service area so there can be some public access and enjoyment on the outside on the north side of that space. The berming and landscape needs to be denser and more enhanced to keep the public space on the outside and do more screening and maybe look at using some building modulation to screen it. He would also like to see some additional berming for the trees so that they are planted on top of a 3 foot berm. Specific items include a closer look at the service area on the north side, much more dramatic architectural embellishment, and more precise designs. They are still hoping to get the streetscape feel with the smaller buildings. It is the north side facade that is troubling them.

HACKWORTH added another element for specificity which would be the parking itself right on the corner. There is a lot of site area there to work with and it should be distributed to several smaller areas and possibly look at the storm detention area. It may be a better design solution to underground some of that and utilize some of that open space for better use.

Thereupon was discussion about the two buildings up front and concerns with parking on Main Street.

BISOM motioned to approve the site plans for parcels 3 and 4 with the exception that two of the parking stalls be deleted to widen the landscape buffer at that location. TOBIAS seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

TOBIAS motioned that another meeting be planned to get together in order to fine tune so we can move forward and address the issues brought up tonight. LOVGREN seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

There was a brief recess at 8:10 p.m.

The meeting was called to order at 8:20 p.m.

## **2. Jack in the Box (PLN 2001-00039)**

RON BUCKHOLT presented and summarized the staff report. The site is located at 725 West Main Street. The proposal is to construct a single building to contain a Jack-in-the Box restaurant with a gross building square footage of 2,895 square feet. An auto collision repair shop currently occupies the site. The site is zoned as General Commercial and the fast food restaurant is a permitted use within that zone. The parking and loading areas are located to the back of the building oriented away from the street. Staff recommends that the installation of additional landscaping around the perimeter of the loading area be provided to enhance the screening. The overall site area totals 33,439 square feet with approximately 18,381 square feet in vehicular use. Staff recommends that the open space mitigation fees be paid for the remaining portion of the open space or that the open space requirement be provided offsite through the acquisition of property in the general vicinity. The exterior building materials will be white cement plaster with deep red metal roofing. Large windows are proposed along the all building facade and staff recommends that these windows be non-reflective. A bicycle rack is proposed near the main entrance of the corner of West Main and Bridge Street. The proposed recommended conditions of approval were summarized. Due to the close vicinity of the central business district Staff suggests that the building facade be constructed of masonry to resemble the architectural design of the downtown area.

Appearing was JOHN ELLINGSON, Senior Planner with Barghausen Engineers, and provided a background of their application process. They submitted an application in June with the preferred site plan and elevations. The building and the orientation on the site was basically a rectangular building with a driveway on the outside of the building with parking in the back. After submitting that application, they worked with staff and came back with a number of comments which are resulted in the plan being currently submitted. They have reviewed the staff report and met with staff. They concur with the recommended conditions of approval with the understanding that there are specific design elements, mitigation fees, etc., that they will be working with staff on. There still are some technical items to be taken care of. The staff report provides a thorough analysis. They have taken the rectangular building that was originally proposed and changed it to an L-shaped building to fit it up against the intersection and Bridge and W. Main Street. They were able to provide some pedestrian amenities at the corner. The other critical item to the development is the drive-thru and how to get it to work with the L-shaped building adjacent to the intersection. The layout presented provides a little more definition and more pleasing to the eye, but still provides the requisite amount of stacking space that Jack-in-the-Box needs for their operation. The access points to the site were put back as far as they could from the intersection on Bridge and W. Main. There will be a full access driveway on W. Main Street. There will also be an exit only driveway serving just the drive-thru on the back of the building. The parking is all behind the building screened with landscaping. The wall on the property line, adjacent to the Stuck River, was addressed in the staff report. Through the SEPA process they will be providing a mitigation planting plan for that side of the site. The pedestrian amenities include the pedestrian plaza at the intersection providing definition for the gateway intersection. There will be tables and benches as well as interior sidewalks and pathways throughout the parking lot. He summarized a number of architectural features planned for the building design. He feels they have provided a nice design for this designated gateway intersection and they concur with staff's recommendations for approval with the understanding that they will be working with them throughout the rest of the development process.

BISOM asked for public comment on this project. There was no public comment.

TOBIAS asked about the masonry composition of the walls. He asked if there were any illustrations available. ELLINGSTON stated that using masonry on the entire side of the building would not be feasible. They are looking at other options.

HACKWORTH stated that this does not really represent the design. It does represent the site plan and other major building elements, but not from a material and color standpoint. Everyone's first reaction to this application was that it feels foreign visually from the City of Sumner.

LOVGREN states that this project looks like Sumner meets the "Jetsons". This is a critical location with a lot of traffic and also is located right in front of the Stuck Bridge. This does not match the architectural integrity of this town.

ELLINGSON asked what specific elements they would like to see added to or subtracted from the building. LOVGREN stated that she would like to see it destroyed and burned and something new brought in. She does not like anything about it. You do not need the high flaming red roofs for people to identify it as Jack-in-the-Box.

HACKWORTH stated that architecturally this feels very inappropriate for the City of Sumner. ELLINGSON indicated that there are a number of things they can do to the exterior of the building, but they would like to maintain the form and structure of the building. It is a very important item to Jack-in-the-Box as far as an image they are trying project.

Appearing was CHRIS SMITH, construction manager for Jack-in-the-Box, and stated that they would like to request design review approval with willingness to work with staff. They can make some modifications, but they also would like to keep some identity of their own. They can use some brick treatments that are similar to the downtown area. They think they can work something out with staff.

Thereupon was discussion about the traffic flow into the site.

LOVGREN motioned to see this project again after some of the staff recommendations have been met. TOBIAS seconded the motion. The motion passed 6 - 0.

#### **STAFF COMMENTS**

RON BUCKHOLT stated that they are interviewing for the 7th member for the Design Commission. Future meetings may be held at the Sumner High School in the future.

#### **COMMISSION COMMENTS**

There were no additional Commissioner comments.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

TOBIAS motioned for meeting adjournment at 8:51 p.m. BENNETT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Lori L. McNett Minutes Taker