



**CITY OF MILL CREEK
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES
January 19, 2017**

Approved March 16, 2017

DRB Members:

Dave Gunter, Chair
Beverly Tiedje, Vice Chair
D. Wayne Bisom (05:16 p.m.)
David Hambelton
Tina Hastings

Community Development Staff:
Christi Amrine, Senior Planner
Sherrie Ringstad, Planning Specialist

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Gunter called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL:

All members were present as noted above.

III. MINUTES:

A. Minutes of June 16, 2016

MOTION: Vice Chair Tiedje moved, seconded by Member Bisom, to approve the June 16, 2016 minutes as presented. The motion was approved unanimously.

IV. ELECTION OF OFFICERS:

A. Election of Chair

MOTION: Member Bisom nominated Member Gunter to serve as the Chair, seconded by Member Hastings. The motion was approved unanimously.

B. Election of Vice Chair

MOTION: Member Hastings nominated Member Hambelton to serve as the Vice Chair, seconded by Member Tiedje. The motion was approved unanimously.

V. NEW BUSINESS:

Mill Creek Commons Phase II Landscaping

Senior Planner Christi Amrine noted that the project before the Design Review Board (DRB) is landscaping for Mill Creek Commons self-storage development. Ms. Amrine explained that the Binding Site Plan was approved by the Hearing Examiner in October and this evening the DRB will be reviewing proposed landscaping. She displayed an aerial map and described the site plan. The site is heavily wooded and contains critical areas, in fact, less than 1.5 of the total 5 acres are proposed to be developed. Ms. Amrine described the overall site plan and noted that because of the creek and associated buffers adjacent to the highway, a roadway buffer is not being required. A majority of the site will be left as native plantings and the development will be surrounded by mature forested vegetation on three sides.

Ms. Amrine stated that the proposed landscaping consists primarily of landscaping around the exterior of the developed area and small landscape islands. She reviewed the design requirements contained in MCMC Chapter 17.34. Conditions of Approval have been added to require wheel stops adjacent to walkways and to require edging between the gravel walkway and the landscape beds. Ms. Amrine concluded her presentation by stating that staff finds the proposed landscape plan as conditioned to be consistent with the Code requirements and is recommending approval

Member Hastings referenced the easternmost access gate and asked if it is intended to provide access to the sidewalk from SR 527 and if the pedestrian path should connect to the sidewalk.

Olin Anderson, Talasaea Consultants, 15020 Bear Creek Rd NE, Woodinville, WA 98077

Mr. Anderson, the Landscape Architect, stated that most of the facility is accessed from the parking area, and it wasn't his understanding that pedestrian access was necessary. He also clarified that the gravel path behind Building A is not intended for pedestrian access, it is for emergency access and/or maintenance.

Member Bisom asked about the elevation change between the developed portion of the site and SR 527. Senior Planner Amrine confirmed that there is a grade change, which will reduce visibility of the development from SR 527.

David Lee, Mill Creek Commons Phase II, 12214 SE18th Place, Bellevue, WA 98005

Mr. Lee, the project applicant, confirmed that with the mature vegetation on the site and the grade change the development will be minimally visible. He added that the gravel paths behind Buildings C and A are a fire department requirement for emergency access.

Mr. Lee also stated that while the site will not be completely fenced with security fencing, they are proposing the use of vegetation that will deter access in appropriate areas. In addition the western portion of the site outside of developed area is steep and wooded, which also deters access. Phase II will be operated from the existing facility to the north. He stated that he believes a self-storage facility is a low impact use of the site.

MOTION: Member Hambelton moved, seconded by Member Bisom, to approve the proposed landscaping for Mill Creek Commons as conditioned in the staff report. The motion was approved unanimously.

Informal Review for the Public Works Shop Building Elevations, Materials and Colors and Landscaping

Ms. Amrine noted that this is an informal review for a proposed public works shop to be located on North Creek Drive just north of the Mill Creek Sports Park. Ms. Amrine presented the staff report, which included a description of existing conditions, location, and aerial map. She noted that a majority of site is encumbered by wetlands and wetland buffers and only a small area is proposed for development. Ms. Amrine explained that the project will be in two phases – the first phase will include the public works shop itself and the second phase will add a lunch room and offices. She noted that the applicant has material sample boards and there are two options proposed. Option 1 is a more natural feel accented with wood/cedar and green and Option 2 is a more industrial theme accented with gray. Staff is looking for the DRB's guidance in selecting a preferred color scheme.

Lee Driftmier, Driftmier Architects, 7983 Leary Way NE, Redmond, WA 98052

Mr. Driftmier, the project architect, explained that the building would be a prefabricated metal building with fiber cement faux wood accent material. The bottom will be concrete but is not likely to be seen from the street because of the landscaping. The metal seam roof slopes away from the street. He noted that the materials will be the same for both options, just different colors.

Member Bisom asked Mr. Driftmier to describe where the accent colors would be. Mr. Driftmier stated that they are on the two small man-doors on the north and south and on the awning above the door, which wraps to the east and comes across the east side of the building.

After a brief discussion, it was the consensus of the Board that the preference was for Option 1, the more natural color theme. In general the Board Members felt that it is a good design and a nice material selection.

Member Hastings asked if a sidewalk was proposed and expressed a concern about the placement of the generator. Mr. Driftmier said that sidewalk is a part of the second phase. As far as the generator, it was located on the southeast corner of the building because the power comes off a pole to the southeast and travels underground to the

electrical room in southeast corner of building. It is more expensive to run the power farther; thus, it is more economical to have the generator located where it is.

Chair Gunter summarized the Board comments as, the Board has expressed a preference for the Option 1 color scheme and there is a consensus that the Board likes the building design.

Senior Planner Amrine displayed a 3D visual of the proposed landscaping. She stated there will be security fencing along the front, with native landscaping proposed in front of the fence and building. She noted that the design is very conceptual as this point and is intended to solicit informal comments and feedback. The idea is to keep the native feel and integrate the proposed landscaping with the rest of the site, the north creek trail and the native landscaping in the wetland buffer. Ms. Amrine briefly described the proposed plant palette.

Mr. Driftmier added that there is an existing drainage swale along the road that will remain.

It was the consensus of the Board that the conceptual landscaping is good as proposed.

Informal Review for the Arena Sports Building Elevations, Materials and Colors, Landscaping and Signage

Member Bisom disclosed that he knows the applicant and has done work for him in the past. He stated that he doesn't think there is a conflict of interest and that he would like to participate in the discussion. Chair Gunter asked if there were any objections to Member Bisom's participation and none were expressed.

Chair Gunter noted that a citizen comment letter was received regarding this project. Several issues were raised, some that fall under the scope of the Design Review Board's review and some that do not. He stated that issues that are beyond the Board's purview include: parking, the noise study, and removal of the temporary access easement. Chair Gunter added that the Board would consider the other issues included in the letter that come under their scope of review. He noted that they will open the meeting for public comment following the staff presentation.

Ms. Amrine identified the letter the Chair was referring to as informal comments from the Rivendale Homeowners Association. She explained that the Design Review Board's scope of review includes building elevations (including exterior materials and colors), landscaping, and signage.

Ms. Amrine's presentation included a vicinity map and aerial photo, description of the surrounding land uses, and discussion of the proposed site plan. She displayed the preliminary building elevations and stated that one issue that staff has identified is modulation and whether the design meets the Code requirements.

Geoffrey Grice, Senior Associate, MG2 Architecture, 1101 2nd Avenue #100, Seattle, WA 98101

Mr. Grice, the project architect, stated that the proposed building is a simple, standard ribbed, pre-engineered metal building. He noted that the exterior was modulated as much as possible while still accommodating the business uses inside. Mr. Grice stated that the proposed color scheme meets the City's criteria of muted earth tone colors. He described the primary entrance as having a raised canopy with a glass vestibule below with a wood underside and wood beams, which meets the City's design requirement for natural materials. The base of the building is gray CMU block. Landscape is proposed around base of building, as well as steel trellises, roofed arbor areas and seating. The northeast elevation (facing SR 527) has some glazing with views through on some, depending on the use inside. Wall graphics are proposed on two sides as well as signage. He noted that the HVAC units are contained within the building.

Chair Gunter asked if there were any of the members of the public present who would like to comment.

Dan Cordwell, Rivendale Board of Directors

Mr. Cordwell stated that he lives in the Rivendale Condominiums, which is the adjacent residential development to the west. He stated that the condominiums are 3-story buildings, the top two stories of which will have views over the fence into the development. Mr. Cordwell requested that the applicant be required to add elements to the elevation facing Rivendale that would soften the appearance such as a trellis or a green wall. He asked about the roll up door that is shown on the west elevation. Mr. Crowe confirmed that this door has been eliminated. Member Hambelton asked if the egress door shown will also be eliminated. Senior Planner Amrine explained that the egress door is required by Code. Mr. Crowe added that the parking adjacent to Rivendale is primarily intended for staff.

There were no further requests to comment, so Chair Gunter opened the floor for Board Member discussion and questions.

Mr. Grice addressed the concern about the west elevation facing the Rivendale development, stating that a 25-foot landscape buffer is proposed, which will be densely landscaped and includes a berm. He added that there is also a landscape bed along the back of building. Mr. Grice explained that the building was purposefully pulled to the back of the site to keep the bulk of the parking away from the residential development.

The Board discussed the issue of screening for the Rivendale residents. Member Hambelton noted that the 52 Douglas fir proposed to be planted 8-feet on center in the buffer along the western elevation will provide an extremely dense screen when the trees mature. Potential suggestions to improve the western elevation included:

- Graphic that would mimic trees – similar to the graphic on the water tower.
- A retaining wall to raise the height of the berm.
- Including some larger trees, not all 8-foot trees.

- Low level safety lighting only – Mr. Grice confirmed that is what is proposed.
- The sidewalk along the rear of building could be eliminated and the landscape bed increased to 6 feet to accommodate larger trees and shrubs.

Corky Brown, WBLA Landscape Architects, 7413 152nd Ct NE, Redmond, WA 98052

Mr. Brown explained that the berm ranges from 8 feet on the north to 2 feet on the south on the parking lot side. On the Rivendale side the berm will appear to be about 2-3 feet high. The proposed landscaping on the berm includes Douglas fir, Cedar, Vine Maple, native shrubs, and groundcover. He believes that it will be dense but agreed that a couple of taller trees could be included; however, he added that smaller trees usually outgrow the taller trees in time.

Senior Planner asked the applicant to remove the shading of plants when the elevations are revised, so the DRB can have a clear view of the building elevations.

The Board Members discussed the issue of building modulation with the consensus being that as currently proposed it does not meet Code. Suggestions to address the modulation included:

- Increasing the size of the arbors proposed and maybe changing the color to a darker gray to create more contrast. Make it more of an architectural statement.
- Providing modulation through material and color changes, which could be done without impacting the proposed uses inside.
- Member Hastings stated that she does not like the use of the graphic on the building and asked if it would count as signage? She also noted that the scale seems out of proportion. Mr. Grice explained that the graphic is not painted; it is a durable weather-resistant material. Senior Planner Amrine said that she does not believe the graphic counts as signage but would confirm that. Member Bisom said that he doesn't mind the graphics, but suggested the applicant check the scale.
- Make sure the requirement for modulation is met for all elevations.
- Member Hambelton asked if the applicant could provide a rendering that shows the western elevation from the perspective of the Rivendale residents and includes the height of the proposed building as well as the height of the condominiums.

V. ADJOURNMENT:

Member Hambelton moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:40 p.m., seconded by Member Hastings. The motion was approved unanimously.

Submitted by:

Sherrie Ringstad, Planning Specialist