

Development Commission
4-6-16

**CITY OF ISSAQUAH
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
MINUTES
April 6, 2016**

City Hall South
Council Chambers

135 E. Sunset Way
Issaquah, WA 98027

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Randy Harrison, Chair
Michael Brennan
TJ Ginthner, Alt.
Essie Hicks
Mel Morgan, Jr.
Richard Sowa
Carl Swedberg, Vice Chair

STAFF PRESENT

Peter Rosen, Environmental Planner
Christopher Wright, Project Oversight Manager

APPLICANTS/OTHERS PRESENT

James Brown, Wattenbarger Architects
Jerry Liang, VP, Sunrise Assisted Living
Todd Wyatt, Attorney, Carson & Noel
Martin Keller, Civil Engineer
Tom Deming, Habitat Technologies
Brian Beaman, Icicle Creek Engineers
Kurt Gahnberg, Transpo Group

CALL TO ORDER

HARRISON, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM.

Christopher Wright explained that a last-minute change to the agenda has resulted in a delay in holding the public hearing scheduled for tonight on **Riva Townhomes, SDP 15-00004**. The public hearing is being postponed to a yet-to-be-determined date in the future. He said some issues came up late this afternoon that both staff and the applicant want to work through before bringing the project to the Commission for final review, public testimony, and a recommendation. HARRISON gave additional information about how the evening's review process of the Sunrise Assisted Living Site Development Permit will proceed.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

HARRISON noted that approval of the March 2, 2016 meeting minutes has been deferred to the next meeting.

MOVED BY MORGAN, SECONDED BY SWEDBERG that minutes of the Development Commission meeting on March 9, 2016 be approved as presented. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOVED BY MORGAN, SECONDED BY BRENNAN that minutes of the Development Commission meeting on March 16, 2016 be approved as presented. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

PUBLIC HEARING: Sunrise Assisted Living Site Development Permit, SDP 15-00006
Application to construct an 82-unit, 5-story, 96,500 square-foot assisted living building with 50 below-building parking stalls and two surface stalls located at the intersection of SE Issaquah-Fall City Road and SE Black Nugget Road.

Staff Presentation

Peter Rosen made staff's presentation, beginning with background on the Sunrise Assisted Living project. He noted the Development Commission reviewed and recommended approval of this

Development Commission
4-6-16

project back in 2007, but the permit to proceed expired after three years with no construction activity, so the project is coming forward again as a new application. Since then, he noted, there have been some changes in Issaquah's code, specifically that (1) stream buffers associated with steep slopes cannot be reduced, and (2) the code now includes tree retention requirements that were not in the code at that time.

He continued with the information in the staff report on Development and Design Standards, noting that the project is subject to standards that are specific to assisted living facilities. He continued his presentation on information on the environmental review, access/street improvements, parking, utilities, tree retention, and Appendices A, B and C. He briefly described the Administrative Adjustment of Standards (AAS) in Appendix B. He also referred to the recommended conditions at the end of the Staff Report.

He continued with a brief description of the Sunrise Assisted Living Facility building; the site location; the status of the property, which is currently uninhabited and heavily forested; the surrounding and adjacent properties; and the zoning, which is Multifamily Medium (MF-M) and Single Family Small Lot (SF-SL). He displayed diagrams of the property location; views of the site coming up and down Issaquah-Fall City Road, and north of the intersection with Black Nugget Road. He also described the critical areas and buffers on the site, including a very steep slope on the east side of the property; the location of the North Fork of Issaquah Creek; the steep slope buffer; the review process for determining a buffer reduction; SEPA conditions for an existing observation deck; and the proposed 15-foot building setback from the stream and an AAS to reduce it to a minimum of five feet in one area. He noted the developable area of the site is 1.09 acres out of a total of 2.32 acres. He continued with more information about the buffer averaging process the applicant has used.

MORGAN noted the diagram labeled A-2 that Rosen is displaying on the overhead screen is not the same as diagram A-2 in the agenda packet, and asked for an explanation. Rosen replied the applicant did modify some of the plans after receiving conditions from the SEPA review, and said he will ask the applicant team to speak to that in their presentation. HARRISON asked Rosen to show the differences between the two diagrams on the overhead so that Commissioners are clear about what is being proposed. Rosen showed the line representing the steep slope buffer, and said you can see that the observation decks intruded into the steep slope buffer and the steep slope itself in the original design. The applicant modified the design somewhat so that the observation decks still project into the steep slope buffer, but not as much, and not into the steep slope itself. He continued his presentation using diagrams illustrating the use of buffer averaging.

He continued with a description of how the project meets Development Standards, and noted that the MF-M zoning applies because slightly more than 50 percent of the site falls into MF-M. He explained how the proposal meets Development Standards for setbacks, parking, impervious/pervious surface coverage, and tree retention, as well as for assisted living facilities criteria and the "green sheets" checklist. He noted that the applicant is requesting an Administrative Adjustment of Standards (AAS) for building height. He explained that an applicant must meet one of two provisions in order to qualify for the City to consider a building height adjustment AAS, and said this project has exceeded the City's pervious surface standard, which is one of the two ways. He noted that the applicant is proposing 52 parking spaces, which meets all parking standards.

He continued his remarks on how the proposal meets standards for circulation (page 10 of 17) and tree retention (page 12 of 17). He noted that the applicant has proposed adding 29 additional mitigation trees, which are not required, to address the tree retention shortfall caused by the

Development Commission
4-6-16

developable limitations of the site and the need to provide egress/ingress. The applicant is also proposing invasive plant removal and enhancement of native plants in the stream buffer.

Rosen continued with a description of how the proposed building design meets all standards for assisted living facilities, including barrier-free standards, community space requirements, and parking, as well as design criteria (building modulation, roofline variation, varied building materials). He noted a materials board is included as an exhibit in the agenda packet, and the applicant can speak to more details about materials in their presentation.

BRENNAN said in looking at the proposed landscaping for the frontage of the site, where there is a road profile that is six lanes wide, it looks like a very narrow landscaped strip is proposed here. Rosen replied yes; a 10-foot wide landscape strip is planned between the roadway and the sidewalk, and showed the landscaping configuration on a diagram. He said it will be planted with street trees. HARRISON asked what species of street trees will be used. Rosen replied it will be planted with deciduous trees, and said he can get more detail for the Commission on that. HICKS asked what kind of trees are going to be replaced, and what is the applicant proposing be used to replace the trees being removed. Rosen replied all plantings will be deciduous on the east side, which is all street buffer. The replacement mitigation trees will include vine maples, cedar, and Douglas fir.

SWEDBERG said the steep nature of the slope is a concern in terms of stormwater management, and asked for more details about the proposed “tight line” stormwater approach. Rosen explained how tight lining will pipe stormwater down the steep slope to a pad where the pipe will end and the water be dispersed. He said the applicant team’s civil engineer can address that, and noted that one of the SEPA conditions included a recommendation for use of a tight line stormwater methodology. He added the proposed methodology will be reviewed in the construction permit phase of this project.

Applicant Presentation

Todd Wyatt, Attorney, Carson & Noel, 20 Sixth Ave. N., Issaquah, introduced the members of the applicant team. He said for the record, he would like to make two clarifications. First, the applicant for this project in 2007 was a different company, not Sunrise Assisted Living. Second, the applicant team has requested that the City review the basis of impact rates that could apply to this project. The City has used nursing homes as the category in which Sunrise Assisted Living would fall in terms of assessing impact fees, and we are an assisted living facility and not a nursing home, he stated. He added that request will be made during the construction permit phase, and if the project is approved, resolving the impact fee assessment could result in a delay in starting construction. HARRISON asked staff to comment. Rosen replied the City’s impact fee categories don’t address every land use, and the one that is most similar to this project is the nursing home category. However, the City is open to looking at how impact fees are determined and is able to make adjustments. HARRISON asked is the applicant’s time frame acceptable to the City. Rosen replied yes.

Jerry Liang, Vice President for Corporate Finance, Sunrise Senior Living, Inc., 7902 Westpark Drive, McLean, Virginia, described the history of Sunrise as a company and gave examples of other Sunrise properties in the Northwest. He said the objective of Sunrise’s properties is to provide a high-quality, residential, home-like living experience for elderly clients by removing institutionalization and promoting activity, dignity, and socialization. He described the typical client as being 85 years old and needing help to accomplish activities of daily living. He explained how Sunrise facilities differ from skilled nursing facilities. Sunrise employs about 30,000 employees

Development Commission
4-6-16

worldwide, he noted, and said we are excited to bring Sunrise to the Seattle market and to Issaquah specifically.

James Brown, Architect, Wattenbarger Architects, 2100 12th NE, Suite 100, Bellevue, clarified the question raised earlier in the meeting about the discrepancies between the site plan on display tonight and the version in the agenda packet. He said the displayed version contains our response to one of the SEPA conditions of approval. We tried to proactively update our plans to comply with SEPA, he stated, and the result that you are viewing tonight is a better illustration of what we have planned to comply with SEPA conditions. He continued with a brief overview of the Sunrise Assisted Living project, including a description of the site and constraints of the site, including the addition of a bike lane and tree retention requirements to comply with City requirements. He said the building will be five stories and slope into the site, such that you can see three levels from the street intersection and five levels as you move up Issaquah-Fall City Road. This helps minimize the mass of the building, he added, and showed on a diagram how the building will blend into the site.

He continued the first floor will contain community spaces and some residential units; the second floor will be primarily residential with some amenity space. Floors three and four will be dedicated to clients needing higher levels of care, such as memory care, and will have dedicated dining and amenity spaces as residents will not be wandering off those floors. He described the observation decks that will serve to allow residents on the upper floors to have a sense of being outdoors. He described how screening for mechanical equipment will be in the roof itself. He said the design will probably be sufficient to screen any equipment on the roof, and if necessary we will revise our screening plans during the project's construction permit phase.

He continued with more information on the design, including conversations with the City's Office of Sustainability. He said we will explore the use of impervious paving; probably not on the roadway, but on the sidewalk and other paved areas. He continued other sustainability features will include the use of low VOC paint and materials, use of LED fixtures, and exploring the use of solar-heated hot water. He showed other renderings not in the agenda package of the proposed building design, views, perspectives from the east and north, and the use of natural materials to help the building blend into the natural setting and minimize its impact. He showed renderings of the building modulation and how the design will give the building character, specifically with the use of contemporary Northwest architecture elements. He said the objective is to keep the building as visually active as possible while using natural materials and creating an appropriately familiar and comfortable feel for residents. He showed a view from the intersection of SE Issaquah Fall City Road and SE Black Nugget Road, and said the visual impact from that perspective will be minimal.

He concluded by saying the applicant team feels we have exceeded all of the City's standards for assisted living facilities. This is intended to be a home for our residents, neighbors, and families, he stated. We are providing about 10,000 square feet of community space and the City's requirement is 4,000 square feet, he noted. Similarly, we are almost doubling the minimum requirement for outdoor active space, he continued. In summary, Sunrise is committed to providing the highest level of quality living for our residents.

Martin Keller, Civil Engineer, 455 Rainier Blvd N., used a diagram to show how the tight lining methodology will work to control stormwater. He explained that a vault will be located under the building for water detention, then the water will be metered out down the slope. Near the stream, a system to dissipate energy will be used, either rock-filled gabion baskets to dissipate flows or a catch basin type of structure. Water will then slowly seep over to the nearby stream. SWEDBERG asked how difficult will it be to build that on such a steep slope. Keller replied the pipe for a catch basin system can be bored, or if gabion baskets are used, they can be built by hand. That level of

Development Commission
4-6-16

specificity is yet to be determined, he noted. SWEDBERG asked how large a pipe would be required. Keller replied likely an 8- to 12-inch pipe, and is likely to be a fused, one-piece pipe without joints.

HARRISON asked about the consequences of the stormwater system on Issaquah Creek, which is a salmon bearing stream. How high up that creek do Coho salmon go, he asked. Rosen said he is not exactly sure where all the spawning areas are located, but just a bit north of the site on the North Fork there is a waterfall of some size, and the classification of the creek changes and is no longer considered a fish stream. He said he does believe that Coho get up that far, however. HARRISON asked so this flow would not be disruptive to the spawning cycle. Rosen said the fact that the outflow is metered and is coming out of the stormwater flow would indicate that no, it would not be disruptive.

Tom Deming, Habitat Technologies, 606 East Main, Puyallup, said he has been working with previous owners on this site since 2002-2003. He added there is some spawning in this area right up until the waterfall located upstream. He said a lot of the stream is for juvenile Coho, and spawning areas are isolated in spawning gravel strips. The fact that the creek has fish and habitat is why we are talking about how this stormwater discharge will be put into place and meet all environmental requirements. He noted the proposed solution will be above the water mark and require HPA (hydraulic project approval) by the State Department of Fisheries. They will ensure we are meeting the most applicable stormwater management manual requirements, he continued. He explained how the tight line system will work and ways to do it without impacting the side slope. He said another option is to talk with the neighboring property (Lakeside Industries) about possibly using an old road structure for this purpose. If that's not possible, then we can put in a structure at the bottom of the site that will meet the criteria of not impacting the stream.

Mr. Wyatt added SEPA stormwater management requirements are addressed in Condition 9 (page 15 of 17) and a final determination will be made at the construction permit stage.

PUBLIC COMMENT

HARRISON opened the meeting for public comment at 8:09 PM.

Elizabeth Maupin, 100 Big Bear Place NW, Issaquah, said on the issue of parking, the plans call for staff parking and one parking stall for every two units, but nothing for visitors. She said the applicant has stated they want the residents of Sunrise to be connected to the community, and to help ensure that happens, it seems like there should be adequate space for visitors to park at the facility.

Hearing no additional requests to speak, HARRISON closed the meeting for public comment at 8:11 PM.

Commissioner Discussion

MORGAN asked the applicant to speak to the adequacy of parking, including staff and visitor parking, the number of residents expected to drive, and so on. Mr. Liang replied the average age of our residents is 85, and almost no residents drive. Our residents live in our facilities because they have needs that generally speaking prohibit them from driving. He continued we are not an independent living facility. Generally speaking, he concluded, the parking is fully sufficient for the facility's visitors and staff. SWEDBERG said it appears that 11 parking stalls are dedicated for staff, and said that number doesn't seem to take into account all the cooks, administrative people, a van driver, caregivers, and so on that would be onsite. He asked do you use a standard guide to

Development Commission
4-6-16

determine the appropriate parking level. Mr. Laing replied yes; staffing is a combination of both fixed and variable staff.

Kurt Gahnberg, Transpo Group, 11730 118th Ave. NE, Kirkland, explained that the code dictates the number of stalls to be provided per room plus stalls for staff and visitors. The 11 spaces for staff are not the only spaces available to them, and in actuality the facility has 52 total spaces for visitors, staff, and possibly a resident or two who are in the very early stages of physical or memory impairment. HARRISON asked based on your experience elsewhere, are you confident that the planned parking is adequate for this facility. Mr. Liang replied yes; it is fairly consistent with what we have experienced elsewhere, and in fact represents a slightly higher parking requirement than other jurisdictions.

BRENNAN said on the elevation views that were displayed but are not in our packet, it was not entirely clear to me how the materials are integrated into the building design, including the timber elements. Brown referred to the diagrams, and said the design calls for a fair amount of stone. We are trying to strike a balance with the design and materials, lending a Northwest character that is contemporary but also appropriate for, and familiar to, seniors. He described the design, siding, and products to be used. MORGAN referred to the materials sheet in the agenda packet, and asked Brown to identify where the materials listed there will be used.

HARRISON noted the packet doesn't appear to include all the design elements in the renderings being shown tonight, and the Commission wants to be sure we are clear about what is being proposed. He continued he understands that the Commission doesn't address color choices, for example, but we would like to be sure that what we are being shown tonight is as close as possible to what the finished project will look like upon completion. Brown replied we are continuing to update our design as we get feedback from the City, and what you are seeing displayed tonight represents our latest thinking. There will be an additional level of detail as the design is completed, such as accent pieces, additional lighting, and so on. He continued our intent is to stay within an earth-toned palette that will blend into the natural environment—beiges, browns, and so on. MORGAN referred to the yellow material on the materials board. Brown replied that would be painted lap siding, either HardiePlank or synthetic lap siding. MORGAN asked where would it be used. Brown replied it would be used sparingly on vertical elements, in limited areas.

BRENNAN said the roof configuration doesn't feel very strong, and referred to the use of accents there. What is the thinking there, he asked. Brown replied the thinking was to use the heavy timber accents sparingly at the top of the building, and to avoid a heavy image of roof supports. He showed on a diagram the three locations where the timber accents would be used, as well as the gable of the roof that will provide mechanical screening.

HARRISON asked is it correct that no bare cement will be visible on the building. Brown replied yes; it is hard to see on this diagram, but the materials will carry all the way to the ground. In addition, landscaping will prevent views of a large section of the stone wall.

MORGAN asked Brown to "zoom in" on the view of the upper section of the entry, and asked questions about the canopy element. Brown replied the canopy element is horizontal, and extends about eight feet. MORGAN commented that in looking at the plans, it is a large building broken into two parts, but the cap element above the entry at the roofline appears more like the end of the building and not the entry. It doesn't seem to announce that "this is the entry to the building." Brown said we have looked at that as well, and described options that have been discussed. We are considering some modest adjustments to help distinguish the entry. MORGAN asked does the design have to slope off the roof. Brown replied the design does help tie the

Development Commission
4-6-16

roofline to the fourth floor, and explained how it helps span the two-story entrance. However, he continued, we could consider other ways. HARRISON asked what is right behind the entrance. Brown replied it is clear space. He added the building has a two-story lobby, open on the first two floors, and the space diminishes as you go up, where the building starts to recess.

BRENNAN said he too is struggling with the entry and its prominence. It seems to blend in and not be an architectural feature. He said he understands that the drawings are coming fairly early in the development process so there isn't a lot of good detail that will eventually be required for construction design. However, he continued, it seems there is an opportunity here to explore giving the entryway more presence and help break up the building's mass. Mr. Liang said your points are well taken, and this design will continue to evolve. He added the entrance element is critical to us as well, and referred to the very prominent drive-up entrance and porte cochere features at other Sunrise facilities. He said he agrees that making sure the entry is prominent is an important component of the design.

MORGAN suggested looking at the porte cochere feature at Bellewood Retirement Living as a good example. Mr. Liang thanked him for the suggestion.

HARRISON said he agreed with other Commissioner comments that this is an opportunity to create a welcoming, identifying entrance to the building.

MORGAN said his recollection of the previously approved application for this site was that the upper floors in the southwest corner were reduced in exchange for exceeding the zoning limits on building height. BRENNAN agreed; his recollection was also that the height was allowed to exceed the zoning limit in exchange for setback of the upper floors. Brown said his firm did the initial floor plans for that application, and agreed that an AAS was sought to increase the building height by reducing the footprint of the upper floors. This application, he continued, has chosen to take the pervious surface approach in seeking an AAS for additional height.

MORGAN asked Brown to show where trees will remain on the south side of the site, and asked what is the caliper of the trees that will remain in place. Brown referred to the Arborist's Report, and said some are quite large, around 20 inches, so they are significant in size.

SOWA asked is the builder required to pursue LEED certification. Rosen replied they are not required, but the City does provide some incentives to do so.

HARRISON described how the Commissioners will proceed through the "green sheets," indicating "Acceptable" or "Not Applicable" to each item (Appendix A) as it is displayed on the overhead projector. It was determined that the landscape plan for the project was completed by the applicant and submitted as part of the project record as Exhibit 3, but was not included in the materials sent to Commissioners. As a result, HARRISON asked Brown to add detail to the green sheet items that pertain to landscaping as they go through the green sheets. HICKS asked are the details in the landscape plan available to interested members of the public. Rosen replied yes, the plan will be available on the City's Web site.

During the discussion of the green sheets, Commissioners made the following comments, observations, and remarks.

MORGAN mentioned the importance of lighting requirements adjacent to critical areas. Rosen agreed, and said the code specifically stipulates lower foot candle requirements near critical areas.

Development Commission
4-6-16

BRENNAN asked about materials to be used for hardscape in back of the building. Brown explained the paving system that is planned. HARRISON asked to achieve the desired level of pervious surface, are you planning to use any pervious pavers anywhere. Brown replied no, the plan will meet the requirements without pervious pavers.

HICKS asked what kind of material will be used for the decking in back. Brown replied it will be a brown, synthetic wood product, which is available from several different manufacturers. We will be sure the material used can be properly maintained and cleaned, with no slipping hazards. HICKS asked what is the height of the railing around it. Brown we think memory care residents will enjoy that space but will not be unescorted when doing so. We do envision a railing 36 inches high, he continued, and explained some of the constraints of the boardwalk.

Brown gave details about plant materials to be used and where plantings will be planted on the site. HICKS noted that some non-native species, such as Japanese holly, are specified in the plans. Brown said a few non-native species have been selected to provide some initial color and variety. Rosen added that the outside stream buffer will also have some non-native ornamental plantings. He reviewed the plant palette, particularly the ornamental plantings in front of the building, and said the variety in types, flowering periods, and textures will create a rich palette. For safety reasons, he continued, the project arborist reviewed all trees on site, and some on site are already deemed hazardous in the arborist's view.

HARRISON asked about signage for the facility, which is always a topic of interest. Brown replied we have proposed a location for signage, but signage is subject to a separate signage review process.

HARRISON noted that the last section of the criteria checklist in Appendix A (Multi-Family) is missing in the version in the agenda packet given to Commissioners and needs to be added for the record. Staff made a note of it.

MOVED BY MORGAN, SECONDED BY GINTHNER that, based on the application and submitted plans, the Development Commission move to approve the Sunrise Assisted Living Site Development Permit, SDP15-00006, subject to the conditions, exhibits, and appendices in the Staff Report dated April 6, 2016.

MOVED BY BRENNAN, SECONDED BY GINTHNER that SEPA Mitigation Condition 11 on page 15 of 17 of the Staff Report be amended as follows:

The applicant shall mitigate for potential impacts on public services and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The City may approve a voluntary payment in lieu of other mitigation. ~~The current mitigation fee is \$0.04932/SF for general government and \$0.13562/SF for the police mitigation fee, and \$120.72/bed for the bicycle/pedestrian mitigation fee.~~ The mitigation fees will be established and assessed by the City with issuance of building permits and the actual fee amount will be the adopted fee in effect at the time of permit issuance. Applicant objections to the voluntary payment should be made during the SEPA comment period.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOVED BY MORGAN, SECONDED BY BRENNAN that a new Condition 12 be added to the Construction Plan Conditions that the architectural siding elements shall be extended to within a foot of ground level in all locations. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Development Commission
4-6-16

MOVED BY MORGAN, SECONDED BY HICKS that a new Condition 13 be added to the Construction Plan Conditions that the architectural features above the main entry shall be more prominent and focus solely on the entry, with the intent of creating an obvious and inviting main entry as well as breaking up the bulk of the building. The revised design shall be approved by City staff and the Development Commission chair. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

HARRISON asked for further discussion or amendments on the main motion. Hearing none, the MAIN MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY as amended at tonight's meeting.

MOVED BY BRENNAN, SECONDED BY MORGAN that the Development Services Department be directed to prepare Findings of Fact that affirms the Development Commission's decision to approve the Site Development Permit for Sunrise Assisted Living, SDP15-00006, subject to the conditions, exhibits, and appendices in the Staff Report dated April 6, 2016 and as amended at tonight's meeting. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

OTHER BUSINESS/ANNOUNCEMENTS/ADJOURNMENT

HARRISON referred to an earlier e-mail sent to Commissioners about getting recommendations for code modifications and so on to the attention of Council. He said he would be discussing Commissioners' thoughts with them individually. He expressed appreciation to the applicant team for their openness to answer questions from the Commission tonight, and said he is looking forward to seeing the final product.

With no further business to conduct, HARRISON adjourned the meeting at 9:31 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Lowe
Recording Secretary

(Note: Alternate Members participated in, but did not vote on, decisions at tonight's meeting as there was a quorum of Regular Members present.)