



SUMNER DESIGN COMMISSION

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, September 8, 2005

6:30 p.m.

**Sumner City Hall
1104 Maple Street**

CALL TO ORDER

BISOM called the meeting to order at 6:39 p.m

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bennett, Ahrens, Wolch, Bisom and Abbott

Members Absent: Whipkey and Hansen

Also Present: Robert Holler, Associate Planner

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BENNETT motioned to approve the July 14, 2005, regular meeting minutes.
AHRENS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

- PLN2005-00053 (Citation Management – Retail Project)

HOLLER reviewed for the Commissioners Staff's report on project PLN2005-00053, (Project Representative: Jeff Hogan – Citation Management Group, Inc.), as follows:

The subject site is located at 903 Valley Avenue – One parcel South of East Main Street. The proposal involves the demolition of the existing barber shop and single family dwelling and redevelopment of the site to include two buildings - one two story retail/office building of approximately 2,400 square feet and one fast food restaurant of approximately 2,400 square feet - totaling 4,800 square feet. Project includes two buildings fronting Valley Avenue, parking to the side and rear of the buildings (27 spaces total), two driveways one of which will be a dedicated cross access corridor per the East Main Street Design Strategy, shared parking agreement with Branks Eatery located to the Northeast of the site, landscaping, and stormwater. The subject site is zoned general commercial. The site is currently developed with a barber shop and single family dwelling on commercial property. The majority of the properties in the vicinity have a mixture of commercial and residential uses. The project site is zoned General Commercial (GC), which is intended to provide for retailing and other commercial services that serve the large market area surrounding the Sumner community. In this respect, GC district regulations are intended to accommodate conventional commercial development that is typical to urban areas such as shopping centers, commercial malls and office complexes.

STAFF recommended that the proposal (PLN2005-00053) should be *APPROVED* subject to the following *CONDITIONS*:

- 1. Staff recommends the East elevation entrance of the retail/office building be entirely removed or replaced with an entrance along the West elevation since this will encourage customers who park their vehicle in the parking lot to walk to the sidewalk along Valley Avenue in order to enter the building.*
- 2. To adequately meet SMC18.42.055 requirements to make the stub out visually obvious to abutting properties that a tie in may be required, staff recommends the parking stalls and landscaping located at the end of the cross access corridor be removed.*
- 3. Staff recommends a pedestrian pathway be constructed between the Branks Eatery located to the Northeast of the site since parking on that site will be shared.*
- 4. Staff recommends pedestrian accesses that cross the south and north driveway to adjoining parcels be concrete or other alternative surface.*

5. *Staff recommends the proposed open spaces along the buildings be equipped with outdoor seating.*
6. *Staff recommends that these elevations be enhanced with a mural signage to provide pedestrian interest.*
7. *A bicycle rack is recommended to be placed near both structures on the south elevations. The bicycle rack shall provide one bicycle space for each ten vehicular spaces.*
8. *Staff recommends that pedestrian lighting be located on the structures to provide lighting for evening patrons and that the walkway between the two structures be illuminated with lighting located on the buildings.*
9. *Staff recommends that signage for this project is externally illuminated and of a design that compliments the architecture.*
10. *Staff recommends that the trees located along the north property line be relocated as the north access is to be dedicated as a shared access.*

HOLLER concluded Staff's report.

BISOM directed the Applicant to respond to Staff's comments and/or give his presentation at this time.

JEFF HOGAN, Citation Management Group, Inc., 5129 Monta Visit, appeared. He has been working over the last couple years on different projects. He thinks that this project will complement Sumner. He is in agreement with most of Staff's recommendations, however, he would not like an illuminated sign. It would be his preference to light the letters individually. The Applicant passed out a sample of the materials he would be using on this project. He feels this is the kind of feel everybody is looking for in Sumner. He tried to orient the site plan so everybody could walk up and down Valley with no problem. That is why he widened the sidewalks. Further, he planted along the residential neighborhood side of the site to buffer that. The garbage is in a hidden location. This site is the last thing on Valley.

BISOM asked the Applicant if he planned to have a fence on the east side?

HOGAN stated that he did plan to have one, however, the City asked that it be taken out.

HOLLER commented that a fence was not required there, and that he would prefer that there not be a fence there.

BISOM confirmed that fencing would then just be on the residential properties to the east?

HOGAN confirmed that.

AHRENS asked the Applicant how the office portion of the building would work. Would there be a couple of tenants? Would they be upstairs?

HOGAN stated that he designed the structure so that it could go either way. It is designed for one to three tenants.

HOLLER noted that Staff would like to see the entrance moved to the other side of the building.

BISOM commented that it is a snappy looking building. He noted on the material board that there are two roof colors proposed?

HOGAN clarified that the roof would be green, and the canopy would be red.

BISOM asked if there was any weather protection proposed over the two entrances? It is hard to read that on the elevation.

HOGAN stated that on the tower there will be black metal canopies that come out about five feet.

BISOM asked if that would also be true for the other building, building "A"?

HOGAN stated that it would be the same, green roof, red canopy, etc.

AHRENS asked why the Applicant chose the specific location for the monument sign? Is that where the City wanted it?

HOGAN stated that he thought it fit nicely in that location, and that it is really the only location for it.

BISOM asked if there would be a sign for building "A" on the east elevation?

HOGAN stated that there is a sign at the back.

AHRENS asked the Applicant, if Wendy's were the tenant, would they then use a typical Wendy's sign?

HOLLER explained that it would be similar to the sign on East Main. The question is, how does it complement the architecture. The sign is more determined by the applicant in terms of size. With the shops on Valley and Main, the developer had first say. The signage was more to meet his requirements of what the City would allow. The code does not go into whether the sign complements the building. It goes more into size and lighting.

BISOM stated that the Commissioners can discuss the intent of sign, however, the details of the sign would have to be deferred to Staff. BISOM commented that if the sign was too close to the street, it would block the sight-line of the double in/out access.

HOLLER stated that the exact location of the sign would have to be in a position to not be in the view triangle.

BISOM stated the main thing here is to give the Applicant some feed back. The sign may need to be moved to the east to allow for better visibility. BISOM noted that on the last page of Applicant's presentation, elevation sketches, that it has very nice detail. The sign can be worked out with the tenant. He does, however, feel strongly about back-lit signs. A front-lit sign is something that is going to be required. Back-lit signs are just too bright.

HOLLER noted that that is something that is changing in the sign code. Staff has already had some discussions with Council in terms of signage.

BENNETT asked if the sign code has changed since the Fred Meyers site?

HOLLER stated that internally-lit cabinet signs are now not allowed. City Council would like all signs to be externally illuminated, however, Staff feels that internally illuminated signs can be done well if they are creative. In terms of design review, Staff would like to get it on the record that it is something to consider. If you have nice architecture and an ugly large sign, it defeats the nice architecture.

BISOM summarized for the Applicant, that the point is that they want the sign to be compatible with the architectural design.

BISOM reviewed Staff's recommendations at this time. He noted that the comment was made about changing the elevation on eastside of the Valley, to give it more identity to streetscape.

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

BISOM asked Staff to review Condition No. 2.

HOLLER noted that as part of the building permit, the cross access corridor would be dedicated as a cross access corridor.

BENNETT asked if the property next to it would be able to use it?

HOLLER stated that they would. It allows for better use of the adjoining property.

BENNETT asked if there was an easement there?

HOLLER stated that it is a recorded easement. Staff would like to relocate a small amount of the landscaping. They would rather see the effort go to the rest of the site than in that area, as eventually that landscaping will need to be removed.

AHRENS noted that, when coming out of the restaurant, you would have to walk through the grass to get to the parking area? The landscaping is nice, but you would have to walk through the grass?

BISOM asked if AHRENS was suggesting a sidewalk parallel to the parking lot?

AHRENS approached the site plan to further address her concern. She noted that if a pathway were added to that area, the Applicant would lose parking.

BISOM suggested that the Applicant add a little access to the parking area to the far north, and further that he do striping similar to the other pathways on the plan.

HOGAN noted that the only issue he has with that is that he would like people to walk around that area.

AHRENS stated that they would then have to walk up into the easement.

BISOM noted that traffic would be coming in that way as well.

ABBOTT commented with regard to Condition No. 2, that the Applicant could use the parking stalls in the area of the cross access, while it is being developed.

ABBOTT motioned to approve Condition No. 2 as written, and in addition that the parking stalls are not required to be removed until development is completed on the easterly parcel. WOLCH seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

ABBOTT asked, as to Condition No. 3, if this would require that the Applicant construct a pedestrian pathway now?

HOLLER stated that it would only be a temporary situation.

BENNETT commented that as it is, the walkway would be going to nowhere.

HOLLER stated that without the landscaping, the connection would be there because the parcels overlap on the northeast. HOLLER approached the site plan to further illustrate his point.

ABBOTT asked if there were any proposed improvements to the Branks site as part of this project?

HOLLER stated that there are not. It would be like Fred Meyer with all the parking areas combined. HOLLER noted that that Condition could almost be eliminated as it is part of the code anyway.

BISOM motioned that Condition No. 3 be deleted from Staff's report. BENNETT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM moved on to Condition No. 4, as to the sidewalk paralleling Valley (north/south)

BENNETT noted that it would look just like the sidewalk going up and down Valley.

BISOM asked if there would be any alternative paving, or just a concrete apron?

BENNETT commented that it should all be concrete, as you would not want asphalt there.

HOGAN stated that there is an error in the drawing. They intend for it to all match up.

ABBOTT motioned that Condition No. 4 be approved as written, with the further clarification that the accesses on Valley Avenue have a concrete apron. BISOM seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM moved on to Condition No. 5, as to outdoor seating.

ABBOTT asked the Applicant where he proposed to put outdoor seating?

HOGAN stated that there are two places that outdoor seating could go. One place would be the northwest corner of the building by the 12 feet of sidewalk, or on the southeast corner of the second building.

BENNETT suggested that the breezeway would be another potential location.

BISOM noted that location of seating would be kind of tenant driven.

HOGAN stated that their proposed locations were probably just left off of the site plan.

AHRENS motioned to approve Condition No. 5 as written. BENNETT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HOLLER stated, as a side note, that now that Valley and Main have been removed from the truck route list, Starbucks has commented that it is much nicer for there customers to sit outside. It gets used a lot more.

BISOM moved on to Condition No. 6, as to a mural sign.

DISCUSSION was had about potentially placing a sign between the two buildings. Further a mural sign in that area to break up that façade was discussed.

BENNETT suggested that the Applicant workout the details of this condition with Staff.

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

WOLCH asked with regard to Condition No. 7, if one bike rack would be sufficient?

HOLLER stated that his thought was a standard, bolted down bike rack, at each structure.

AHRENS motioned to approve Condition No. 7 as written. WOLCH seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM stated, in relation to Condition No. 8, that pedestrian lighting would be a good idea. He noted that a couple of the elevation appear to have sconce lighting of some type.

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

AHRENS asked the Applicant what the little signs were separating the drive through and the parking area?

HOGAN stated that they were menu boards.

WOLCH commented that a monument sign would not be appropriate for the small size of this center. He suggested signage on the building as opposed to a monument sign.

HOGAN stated that all the tenants like the signage, which is why they did it that way.

BISOM suggested recommending that the monument sign be as minimum scale as possible, as it is large for that location. This project will add to the area, however, a bulky sign may pull away from that.

BISOM motioned as to Condition No. 9, that it be approved as written, but with the strong comment that it be reduced in size and set back to allow for open sight-lines, and further keeping the stone base and having it externally lit. ABBOTT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BENNETT asked Staff if the Applicant has met the minimum requirements for trees?

HOLLER stated that the Applicant is over the minimum requirement.

BISOM commented that it would be nice to have another street tree on Valley Avenue, and suggested that the Applicant reallocate the 6 trees as it is possible, rather than planting trees that will be removed.

BISOM motioned to approve Condition No. 10, adding the language that the trees be “relocated as appropriate”, and encouraging the Applicant to move one of those trees to Valley Avenue, making it two trees instead of one on Valley. BENNETT seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM suggested an additional motion as to adding a sidewalk and striping at the north end of drive-through.

AHRENS motioned to create Condition No. 11, in addition to Staff’s recommended conditions, as follows: The Applicant should incorporate a sidewalk on the north end of the drive-through, utilizing the east to the parking lot, and that the driveway of the drive-through should be striped the same as it is on the other end of the building. BISOM seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BISOM declared project PLN2005-00053 (Citation Management – Retail Project) approved.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

COMMISSIONER’S COMMENTS

There were no Commissioner comments.

STAFF COMMENTS

HOLLER asked the Commissioners if they had all received a copy of the new Comprehensive Plan. It was determined that Hansen and Whipkey had not. HOLLER will provide a copy to those two Commissioners.

HOLLER passed out memos on Casey's Caboose. He suggested that the Commissioners review the memo for the upcoming meeting. The Design Commission must hear it and approve that it is unfit, before the Building Official can declare it an unfit site. This is a similar process as happened with the Beach House Tavern. The Applicant would like to rebuild on that site, however, they are having a hard time finding the property owner, and the insurance company needs a statement from the owner. The City Attorney and Director are dealing with it. HOLLER noted that the Design Commission seconds as the Sumner Improvement Board in these matters.

AHRENS further noted, as she will not be able to attend that meeting, that as a temporary need, a sidewalk should be considered in that area. It needs to be reconfigured, as it is dangerous.

HOLLER stated that this would allow for a temporary sidewalk. He further noted that there are no setbacks on those properties.

BISOM confirmed the other Commissioners' attendance at that meeting.

A representative for Branks appeared, asking for a copy of Staff's report on the project reviewed at this meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

BISOM adjourned the meeting at 7:54 p.m.

Sarah M. Heckman
Minutes Taker