

Development Commission  
9-28-16

**CITY OF ISSAQUAH  
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

**September 28, 2016**

City Hall South  
Council Chambers

135 E. Sunset Way  
Issaquah, WA 98027

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

Richard Sowa, Chair  
Mel Morgan, Jr., Vice Chair  
Michael Brennan  
Randy Harrison  
Kevin Price

**STAFF PRESENT**

Mike Martin, Associate Planner  
Lucy Sloman, Land Development Manager

**APPLICANTS/OTHERS PRESENT**

John Shaw, American Classic Homes  
Brian Palidar, GroupArchitect

**CALL TO ORDER**

SOWA, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM. He outlined how the public hearing will proceed, including the opportunity to give public comment.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

MOVED BY MORGAN, SECONDED BY BRENNAN that minutes of the Development Commission meeting on September 7, 2016 be approved as presented. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PUBLIC HEARING: Issaquah Apartments, Site Development Permit, SDP16-00005**

**Request approval of a Site Development Permit for a 110-unit, five-story apartment building on 1.24 acres, to include two community roof decks, resident lounge, ground level court for residents, and 112 parking spaces, located at 955 7th Ave. NW.**

**Staff Presentation**

Sloman made staff's presentation, beginning with an explanation of the applicant's request that the Development Commission make a decision on the application tonight. Staff has taken no position on the applicant's request; it is up to the Development Commission as to whether they take action tonight, she stated. She continued with an explanation of tonight's public hearing, which is a quasi-judicial matter. She asked all Commissioners whether they could answer "no" to a series of questions about any reasons why Commissioners could not be fair and impartial, or had had any ex parte communications on this application. All Commissioners replied "no" to all questions. There were no objections to Commissioners' participation from any persons in the audience.

Martin continued staff's presentation. He discussed the public process that has been followed so far for this project, as well as the City Council's recent actions regarding a proposed moratorium on new development in the City. He noted that the project under review tonight is not subject to the moratorium because the applicant has filed a completed land use permit as of the effective date of the moratorium, which is September 6, 2016.

He continued with information covered in the Staff Report, including a description of the Administrative Adjustment of Standards (AAS) for this project; a site map of the proposed

Development Commission  
9-28-16

project; a brief summary of the proposed project; site photographs; a chart of the zoning district standards and how the project complies; the allowed density bonus and associated affordable housing to be provided; diagrams of pedestrian circulation and vehicular circulation on the site; parking; traffic and the traffic study done for this project; building elements, both those that comply with standards and those that do not comply and have conditions; critical areas, including photographs; the proposed AAS for tree retention; and community space requirements and how the project will meet those requirements. He concluded that the Administration does recommend approval of the project with the conditions noted.

### **Applicant Presentation**

John Shaw, Director of Multi-Family Acquisitions for American Classic Homes, Inc., introduced other members of the applicant team, including Kyle Weeks (Director of Multi-Family Development). He noted that he is a long-time Northwest resident and business owner who lives in Issaquah. He gave more information about the firm, and briefly described the time, thought, and energy that has gone into the design of this project and the good collaboration the applicant team has had with City staff.

He continued our goal tonight is to go through a presentation fairly quickly as we feel we have met the standards and conditions the City has asked. He displayed slides of the highlights of the Vale Apartments proposed for the site, and noted that this is the first project in the central City that includes both the required and elective affordable housing units under the Central Issaquah Plan regulations. He described the project's walkability; its multi-modal characteristics; the bike room that is twice as large as required; an Uber waiting area; community bicycles; property amenities, such as two rooftop decks, a community p-patch, private decks, and private patios; ground level open space; fitness center and community kitchen/lounge, and other outdoor amenities. He described the sustainability and community benefits planned for the project; the energy savings program that will be in place for the building; and an ongoing, long-term property management approach that focuses on best practices, such as composting.

Brian Palidar, GroupArchitect, 1735 Westlake Ave. No., Seattle, referred to exhibits of the site context, including photographs. He described the site access from the south and how pedestrian access will function, and noted that we are still working with staff on the details for future access. He continued with the site plan, which shows how parking wraps around the building, and the building itself screens parking from being visible from the street. He showed the planned parking on the site on a diagram. He noted the plan follows both the City's code and the maximum design in order to screen parking as much as possible from neighboring properties. Inside, he continued, the building will have a covered parking stall area and an area for waste removal that will be screened from view. He described the general building layout, including where individual units, decks, and community spaces will be located.

He said the design follows the City's requirements to break up the size of the structure and showed elevation views. He referred to the materials board the team has brought tonight for Commissioners to examine, and showed where the different materials will be used. He described the building's appearance as having a contemporary color palette, and showed renderings of the Vale Apartments from street level views. He also showed how step-back and recessing help break up the massing of the building. He said a condition was created by staff that the plan include a way to show articulation between the third and fourth levels of the building, as well as the base, middle, and top. We feel our proposed design works well and fulfills that condition, he stated, and we have also created other options for further discussion with the Commission. He showed renderings of the proposed landscaping, both for each unit, in the courtyards, and on the rooftop gardens, and showed how blank walls will be screened. He

Development Commission  
9-28-16

said we have done our best to increase the greenscape on Juniper Trail, and to make the site green, a place of respite, and have an engaging presence.

Roby Snow, The LA Studio, LLC, Landscape Architects, 15200 52nd Ave. S., Seattle, said as landscaper for the project he thinks the plan achieves a nice look and feel, with a fairly thick and multi-layered landscaping envelope all the way around the project. He said to summarize the landscaping approach, the species planted on the Juniper Trail corridor will be determined by the City, and will have an evergreen understory and perennial accents. He continued the buffers around patios will create street scenes along that walk. The central amenity space and secondary pathway to the building entrance are understated but lushly planted with accent trees, he stated, and continued with brief descriptions of pedestrian benches, opportunities for residents to greet people, and landscaping around entrances to the parking areas. He noted the perimeter is a multi-layered landscape that meets all code requirements, and gives surrounding properties privacy. He described the landscaping and trees to be used on rooftop terraces, as well as outdoor furniture and fireplaces. He also referred to a p-patch mentioned by Mr. Shaw and showed it on a diagram. He said the entry will include pedestrian seating, raised pots, and so on to accentuate a sense of arrival. He showed the area next to the stream, and said it is our intention to clean it of invasive plants, bring in native vegetation, and return it to a more naturalistic water course. He showed photos of sample vegetation to be used.

Palidar concluded the applicant team's presentation by describing how the application meets all 17 conditions, and gave his perspective on how the plan has addressed, or plans to address, each condition. He supported his comments with graphics that depict plans for rooftop decks and planters; three articulation options to achieve the modulation requested by the Commission and the City's standards; pedestrian connections; and screening and landscaping treatment of blank walls.

### **Public Comment**

SOWA opened the meeting for public comment at 8:10 PM.

John Fallstrom, 885 7th NW, Issaquah, said he has been a City resident for over 50 years, and while he is not anti-growth, he thinks growth must be managed with quality in mind. He expressed concerns about parking, and noted that Issaquah is still a car-centric town. This proposal only provides an average of one parking stall per unit, he continued, which is an urban standard and not a suburban one, and Issaquah is not yet urban. He said the nearby Atlas Apartments has already put pressure on existing parking in this area. He mentioned that King County bus routes on Gilman are infrequent and that the Transit Center is over a mile away, and said that issue should be under discussion with Metro and Sound Transit. He also expressed concern about where construction workers will park and the overall traffic that will be generated by the project. He said taken together with other recent developments in this small area, over 1,000 more residents and their guests will be using 7th Ave. NW. Gilman is often already gridlocked, he continued, and the secondary streets like 7th Ave. and Holly were not created to absorb large levels of traffic. He asked for more information about how truck traffic to and from the site will be routed, and gave examples of hazardous situations created by construction of the Gateway Apartments. He said he has heard that the Juniper Trail will need to be relocated, and asked where will bicycle and pedestrian traffic be rerouted during construction. He also expressed concern about the hours of construction, noting that the application states that construction will begin at 7 AM. He also expressed concern about possible hazards to nearby properties from potentially hazardous situations like asbestos and abandoned home heating oil tanks. He also said that the City is considering an agenda bill that addresses the need to increase the City's water supply, and asked why would the City allow this

Development Commission  
9-28-16

much development when it puts us at risk of not having adequate water. He urged the Commission to delay action on this application until the full impact of the Atlas Apartments, particularly on traffic, can be evaluated.

Michael Boyle, 323 NW Dogwood, Issaquah, said he has already submitted his comments in writing to the Commission so will just highlight a few tonight. He spoke of his concerns about the cumulative impacts of traffic from the developments going into the area around 7th Ave., and said the number in the traffic report for peak-hour trips generated by the Vale Apartments seems low to him. Even if many of the occupants use modes of transportation other than vehicles, the addition of 110 units will still result in an increase in car trips, he said. He said the signal at Gilman Blvd. will alleviate some of the strain, but Gilman is already experiencing too much traffic, and asked where will all the cars now at the choke points go. He said he thinks the assumption of one vehicle per unit is too low, particularly because the current estimate used by the City is 1.7 vehicles per household. He said he understands that this is a pilot project and an attempt to manage growth, but Issaquah is not downtown Seattle or San Francisco. We don't have convenient access to be able to use public transportation, so we are still a car-centric city, he continued. What will happen when the estimates used in this project prove wrong; where will all those cars go. He said his biggest concern is the addition of the project to new developments like those at Atlas and Inneswood; all three are high-density projects that fall within the border of central Issaquah. He said he's not opposed to growth, but it has to happen responsibly, and the projects going into this small area are moving too fast. He said he would like to see the Commission take its time, and while he understands the developer's desire to move forward, the Commission needs to take all the facts about this project into consideration.

Curtis Creager, 684 NW Holly St., Issaquah, said he has lived in the City center for 15 years, during which he has seen a lot of growth, particularly among families with student-age children. He spoke about the egregious contracts the City has entered into with construction companies that are not abiding by the law with their practices, and gave examples. The City's job is to make sure these construction crews do what they are supposed to, he said. He continued he echoes other comments made tonight; the full effect of the Atlas Apartments, for example, won't be really felt for about a year. His analysis of the traffic study indicates that there will be an increase of about 1,000 cars in just this three-block area. He said more study is needed on the effects on Holly, Locust, 5th, and 7th to really understand what the impacts will be. He said in his business, he asks his employees to do something profound for their customers; in this case, he is asking the applicants to do something profound for the community, and really create a legacy project.

Raymond Miller, 685 NW Juniper Street, Issaquah, said he is a civil engineer, and said he respects the work that the developer has done on this project. His comments, he continued, are more about what happens after the project is done. He spoke about his experience of living on the corner of 7th Ave. and Juniper, and frequently seeing cars go right through the four-way stop there without even touching their brakes. He said he is concerned about the pedestrian foot-traffic there as well as the increased vehicle traffic, and said his perception is that someone is going to get hurt. He suggested a four-way blinking light or some advance warning for motorists so that they don't just plow through the intersection without stopping. He also talked about his concerns that quantities of hauled materials are not specified in the SEPA, and because the soils there are organic and loose, there is likely to be a lot of material hauled on and off the site. He described seeing some very unsafe situations created by construction trucks for the Atlas Apartments, and said he hopes there will be some kind of traffic control during construction of the Vale Apartments. He also mentioned increased wear and tear on the roads and using the older King County Surface Water Manual rather than the updated one as issues

Development Commission  
9-28-16

that are of concern to him. Lastly, he said inadequate parking has a domino effect, whereby people who need to park in a place with inadequate parking end up displacing other people who need to park there, and so on, so everyone ends up being inconvenienced.

Emily Freet, 205 NW Newport Way, said she was glad to see so many residents here today, and would echo all the comments heard so far. She said she was impressed by the time and energy that went into planning this project. She said she is a supporter of the City growing in density, but not a supporter of what is happening in our community, including the speed with which it is happening. She said she sees problems with the projects in this area that need to be mitigated, and said she wants to urge all of us to think about why we aren't ready for this much development. We aren't ready because we don't have the infrastructure in place, she said, and gave examples. She asked where the mitigation fees will come from and exactly what they will pay for. She used the Issaquah Valley Elementary School as an example of an already-crowded facility that is not ready to take on more students. She said while this project may, strictly speaking, "check all the boxes" in terms of being technically, legally compliant with the City's regulations, is this really what we are looking for, when we aren't ready. She said with more intentional planning, she thinks projects like this can be accommodated, but not at the speed with which they are happening now.

Steve Pereira, 170 NE Dogwood, Issaquah, said he supports comments made earlier about parking concerns and the impacts of the Atlas Apartments. He said he does like a lot of the features the developer has used in this project, including ample bike parking, energy and water conservation, and so on. However, he continued, parking does not seem adequate. He said another concern he has is that mitigation fees paid by this developer for traffic impacts will not necessarily be used at this location but can be used elsewhere in the City. He also noted that capital facilities planning does not include any additional resources for police, and more police oversight will be needed as people are already speeding through the neighborhood. He also said he was concerned that the tree retention requirements are not being met, specifically by allowing the developer to remove mature trees of a large size and replace them with smaller new trees. He said the full-growth mature trees, which contribute to the City's goal of a 50-percent canopy, should be replaced by trees of the same size, in order to maintain the canopy and provide an equal carbon-offset.

Mary Lynch, 2590 Oakcrest Drive, Issaquah, said she supports the other comments given tonight. She said she agrees that this appears to be a nice building, and is way ahead of the Gateway and Atlas projects in terms of being a green, low-energy building. However, the building could have easily been mixed-use and it is not. She gave her perceptions of the history of the property, including past incidents of flooding. She commented that there is a mature Sequoia tree on the property, plus cedars and evergreens, and spoke in favor of trying to retain as many of them as possible. She noted there are no evergreen trees included in the landscaping plan; the evergreens shown are bushes, not trees. She also said she is concerned about what the adjacent Aegis Living residents will experience during the period of construction. She showed photographs of the site from different perspectives. She noted that the traffic study's assertion that the project will add only five pedestrians during peak hours is totally unrealistic. She noted that there are no sidewalks on the opposite side of the street, and questioned how children will safely be able to get to Issaquah Valley Elementary School. She noted the application does not address bus stops or school buses at all, and the traffic study does not address improving mobility. She added just because the area will have a bicycle path doesn't mean that bicyclists can get from one place to another safely. She mentioned that the trees that will be removed are trees, paid for by tax dollars, that were planted not long ago, and said let's not build something again that will be torn up in just a few years. She asked the

Development Commission  
9-28-16

Commission to slow down, look at overall mobility, the experience with construction at Gateway, and the potential impact on the community and local businesses. She said please take care of us, who pay taxes and live our daily lives with the construction and aftermath of these projects, and put our quality of life first when you make these decisions.

David Kappler, 255 SE Andrews Street, said he understands that the Commission is constrained by the regulations in the Central Issaquah Plan, and knows that the Council is concerned about how development in the central area is unfolding. However, the Commission can take on the issues of excavation traffic, including how material comes onto and out of the site, as well as parking by construction workers. He asked what will happen both during construction and when the shared use trail is renovated; how will bikes and pedestrians get through that corridor safely. He noted that pavers would be totally inappropriate for the Juniper Trail; textured concrete would be okay, but pavers would be unsuitable for bicyclists, people in wheelchairs, and so on. He said the City is undertaking a review and revisions to the Central Issaquah Plan, and said he hopes the Commission will be involved in that review. In the meantime, he urged the Commission to do whatever it can to improve this project.

Michael Boyle added he would like to publically thank Mike Martin for his helpfulness, and said Martin has been communicative and transparent in working with the public about their concerns.

Connie Marsh, business owner at 1175 N.W. Gilman Blvd., Suite B-11, Issaquah, and Issaquah resident, said she has been following the City's dealings for about 20 years, and this is the first time she can recall receiving an e-mail from an applicant stating that they hoped the Commission would take a vote to approve a project without fulfilling all the steps in the process. She said she finds it appalling, and shows that something is wrong with the City's system. The proper answer by the City to the applicant should have been, "This is the process you need to follow." She continued the City's regulations appear to allow the development that the applicant is proposing, but there is nothing special or unique, nothing "signature" about the project. It is located right next to another large apartment, Atlas, so we will have these two large apartment buildings right next to each other. She continued she doesn't think the full impacts on 7th Ave. and Locust Street, including the impacts on traffic, have been fully explored. The impacts in the traffic study are vastly understated, she said. She also noted that Issaquah is a "Tree City USA," but is willing to do an AAS to remove existing mature trees for this project, which in effect is asking the City to change its trees rather than asking the applicant to change the development. She said the geotechnical report indicates the site has wet, peaty soils and experiences flooding, and there is no mention of the sand boils just across the street. She said she doesn't think the SEPA is based on appropriate or accurate information, and that new conditions should come from a review of the geotechnical report. She said she would like to see a condition added to this project that would require a communication plan for reaching out to the neighborhood during construction. She said she is disappointed because it feels like the public can do nothing about this project.

Hearing no additional requests to speak, SOWA closed public comment at 8:54 PM.

### **Commissioner Discussion**

HARRISON said he thinks there are too many issues about this project to move it forward to a vote to approve tonight. Other Commissioners agreed. PRICE asked what was the rationale for asking for approval tonight. Martin replied staff was neutral on the applicant's request to ask for approval tonight, and asked the applicant to respond. Palidar replied the applicant team feels we have spent 14 months working on this design, and have addressed all conditions and done all the work necessary to get it approved. We have a code-compliant project, he added.

Development Commission  
9-28-16

BRENNAN said the Commission has an obligation to work with the community as well, including hearing and considering public comment, and obviously staff cannot respond to all of our questions and the comments raised tonight without additional time for research. Other Commissioners agreed. Martin said in that case, staff will prepare a Briefing Response Memo and the Commission can continue its review at the Commission's October 19 meeting.

MORGAN and HARRISON asked about the level of affordability of the affordable units, and who determines what is affordable. Sloman said the City has a code requirement that affordable units be based on a specific level, namely 80 percent, of the King County median income.

MORGAN asked for clarification about signage. Sloman said monument signage is not allowed in the central Issaquah area except under certain circumstances. Atlas Apartments, for example, was allowed a variance on sign location because its site is in a floodway. Typically staff does not ask the applicant to include information on signage as part of the SDP, but we can request the applicant to provide it and include it in the Briefing Memo, she said.

BRENNAN asked are the AAS for this project already approved or under consideration. Sloman replied they are included as part of the package the Development Commission is reviewing. BRENNAN asked so the Development Director is not making that decision. Sloman replied no, they have been consolidated and are part of the application.

BRENNAN asked what is the status of the SEPA for this project, and noted that several public comments addressed information that is missing from the SEPA. Martin replied the area of concern in the SEPA appears to be how much material will be imported and exported from the site. Based on the initial analysis, he continued, it appears that about 400 to 500 truck trips will be required. That figure is low in comparison with other similar construction projects, he said, and staff did not feel it warranted a separate condition as it would be covered under existing regulations. He noted that construction management, including construction worker parking, truck traffic, and so on are all part of the construction management plan to be submitted by the applicant. Staff will ask the applicant to be specific in showing how trucks will get in and out of the site, where construction workers will park, and so on, he concluded. We recognize that there will be some impacts on the neighborhood but we can try to address at least some aspects of those impacts through a robust construction management plan, he added.

HARRISON said a suggestion was made tonight about a neighborhood communication plan about the construction that will take place in their neighborhood. Martin said we are doing some of those things now, and the applicant is also proposing their own strategy for community outreach. He continued we have heard the public loud and clear on this issue. HARRISON said he doesn't think you can "over-communicate" in letting people know about construction in their neighborhood so they can plan for their daily activities. Sloman referred to a monthly e-mail that the Gateway development is producing, and said we can learn from that process. She said the City has undertaken new requirements for notification and hours of construction that will also begin to address some of the concerns raised tonight. Staff will address that in more detail in the Briefing Memo, she concluded.

Martin said we also heard tonight about impacts to pedestrian access during construction, and staff's expectation is that the developer will have a plan to ensure safe pedestrian access throughout the duration of the project. MORGAN said he would like the Commission to hear more how the applicant will do that, instead of just assuming that they will come up with a plan.

Development Commission  
9-28-16

MORGAN asked for clarification of pedestrian access, specifically the crosswalk across 7th Ave. Martin replied the initial proposal was to have two vehicle access points. However, it was determined that an access point can't be done safely due to a curve in the road. So staff and the applicant are working with staff from Public Works to determine where a crosswalk can be located. There will be a crossing, but the final location has not yet been exactly determined.

HARRISON noted page 88 of 162 of the SEPA states "the average weekday will generate 460 trips per day, with peak volume at 4 PM to 6 PM," and page 95 of 162 of the MDNS (Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance) refers to "460 daily trips generated with 33 in the AM peak hour and 43 in the PM peak hour." Matt Palmer, Gibson Traffic Consultants, 2802 Wetmore Ave., Everett, and traffic engineer for the project, explained the traffic measured is traffic generated over a 24 hour period. Our projections are that during a single AM peak hour between 7 and 9 AM, there will be an additional 33 trips, and in a single PM peak hour between 4 and 6 PM there will be 43 additional trips. The remaining are trips that will be generated during non-peak hours, he added. HARRISON asked are the standards that Issaquah is using for these projections national standards. Palmer replied yes, and explained how the national Trip Generation Manual is used. He said we did study the impact on nearby streets, and described the model used to make calculations about trips generated and the impact on existing traffic conditions. However, he continued, we were not asked to study impacts on Juniper or 7th Ave. Sloman gave some background on the City's "simplified concurrency" approach that went into effect several years ago. That approach looks at safety and efficiency associated with the project. It is the City's responsibility to use impact fees paid by developers to fix the overall traffic and mobility system, not the developer's, she added. Martin noted that traffic impact fees are a codified amount based on simplified concurrency adopted by the City in 2015. The fees are about \$4,800 per unit, which works out to just shy of \$500,000 for this project. Palmer noted the modeling projected less than one vehicle every 10 seconds at the intersection of Locust and 7th Ave. HARRISON said people are concerned about the assessment of these impact fees, and the application of the fees in ways that benefit traffic. Is there in fact a significant delay between the City's assessment of impact fees and the City's actual application of the fees to improve traffic, he asked. Sloman replied state law allows those fees to be spent within ten years.

MORGAN asked for more information on the tree retention language on page 22, *10.18 Administrative Adjustment of Standards*. Martin replied the applicant could retain the percentage of onsite trees from any number greater than zero but less than 24 percent with approval from the Administration; however they elected to retain zero, which triggered the need for an Administrative Adjustment of Standards. The applicant actually has identified four conifers on the site that they will make every effort to retain if possible, he continued, but because staff wanted to err on the side of caution in case that turns out to be impossible, we asked the applicant to show those trees as "not retained" on the application.

MORGAN asked the landscape architect to address the comment made earlier that there are no evergreen trees in the landscaping plan. Mr. Snow pointed out where evergreens will be included on the site, and said a tree was erroneously identified as a bush during a previous comment. He noted that Hollywood Juniper is a tree species, and that cedar trees will be used in the riparian zone. He showed on a diagram where trees will screen blank walls, and noted that 100 hedges that will grow 20 to 30 feet tall will be planted to provide a dense buffer to neighboring properties. Sloman said there will also be trees in the community space just off the center at ground level, in the indentation. BRENNAN asked does the City have a standard for trees for along the frontage of this building. Martin said certain trees do offer advantages and

Development Commission  
9-28-16

some have maintenance issues, but we haven't identified the specific trees for that area yet and are still working through the issues.

BRENNAN asked about the City's 50-percent tree canopy goal. Martin noted every area of the City has a different requirement; the 50-percent goal is citywide. Sloman noted the requirement is 25 percent for multi-family and 30 percent for single family. BRENNAN said he would like to hear more about the applicant's strategy for mitigating tree removal, the roof gardens, plans for landscaping near the stream, and possibly using a signature tree someplace on this site. Sloman said staff will address those points in the Briefing Memo. Mr. Snow added the City's official tree, Eddie's white wonder, is included in the landscaping plan.

PRICE asked for more details about the tripartite design, as outlined in condition 13, and asked which is the applicant's preferred option. Palidar replied the applicant team prefers the original proposal, as we feel it best meets the balance of the design criteria and the design itself, and showed the three options. PRICE asked did you explore changes in massing. Palidar replied yes, and explained the changes. MORGAN said he would prefer a hybrid option. He continued he likes the "1-3-1" idea, but likes the option shown at the bottom right, with the end of the building being broken up as opposed to no break, as shown in the original proposal. BRENNAN said he had a similar reaction, and suggested taking the original proposal and combining the end treatment of the option referred to by MORGAN with the original. Sloman said we can bring back alternatives for the Commission at the next meeting. She noted that the hybrid option you are describing would require an AAS, which would not necessarily be a problem, but would be a departure from the regulations now in the Central Issaquah Plan. She continued staff will work with the applicant, based on feedback received tonight, to come up with some options. Kyle Weeks, American Classic Homes, said the applicant team looked at a number of options. One of the reasons the team liked the 1-3-1 option was based on feedback from the City that its code requires having a corner element and breaking the building up into separate segments. By trying to force that change to the third floor, the design kind of departs from that requirement, but we can bring some options for the Commission's consideration. Palidar said the applicant team's view is that our original proposal did meet all of the City's requirements, and while we can present alternatives for more discussion, the team's preference is the original.

HARRISON noted the Development Commission has looked at a series of projects now for central Issaquah, and while he is not speaking for everyone on the Commission, in his mind there are some aspects of some projects now underway on which he wishes he had had more detail. He said the use of a bright blue rather than a more subtle, flat blue on the Atlas Apartments, for example, has drawn a significant amount of negative comment. PRICE agreed, and said it would be advisable that tones be subdued and as natural as possible to fit into the overall context of the City. He continued the colors on these large buildings should not look like a theme park, or a food court. Sloman said staff agrees it is important for the Commission to see the materials and colors to be used so there is no uncertainty about how the final project will look. HARRISON said the Commission's concern is that the materials and colors that were presented to the Commission on previous projects were not reflected in the final product. Palidar briefly referred to the materials board and noted where the materials shown will be used on the building.

MORGAN said vegetation is planned to break up the blank walls, but vegetation is subject to weather conditions and can die. He said this is an opportunity to use some color changes in the brick itself as well as vegetation, and not just plan for one large brick wall. BRENNAN said on the issue of blank walls, he would like to see more specifics about how they will be treated, such as with windows, change of materials, and so on. MORGAN said he is especially concerned

Development Commission  
9-28-16

about the south-facing wall as you come up 7th Ave. Sloman said another issue is the blank walls around the community spaces. She noted the concrete walls are subject to additional design standards in the City's standards, but staff wanted to hear more from the Commission before the proposed approaches to blank walls for this project were finalized.

MORGAN asked which material on the materials board will be used for the band across the top of the building. Palidar indicated it will be the grey sheet metal panel.

MORGAN said a comment was made about the use of stone pavers for the shared use route, and the difficulty people in wheelchairs and so on may have safely traveling over pavers. He referred to Condition 7 of the application. Sloman said the reference to stone pavers can be removed from the condition, and made a note of it.

MORGAN asked about the ability to add more car-charging electric stations. Palidar replied there are two possible approaches; one is to provide high-capacity charging stations now, and another is to include plans to do that in the future as they are needed. He continued the project is taking the second of those approaches.

PRICE asked what is located on the corner of the lower level. Palidar replied that is the main lobby. PRICE asked is the entrance half-way down the building clearly marked. Palidar showed where the main entrance will be located, and said the secondary access is intended for the convenience of residents, and not for guests, deliveries, and so on. PRICE asked about garbage and recycling. Palidar showed where two dedicated load zones for garbage and recycling removal will be located, and noted that chutes will be located within the building for residents to dispose of waste.

MORGAN said he sees a lot of great things in this project, and appreciates the work done by staff and the applicant. BRENNAN agreed, and said many speakers tonight expressed concern about the pace of development in the City. That is not within the Development Commission's purview, he continued, but the Council has heard the concern and has initiated a moratorium process. He said the Development Commission does not have the authority to stop a project that has the legal right to proceed; its responsibility is to review project applications to be sure they comply with the City's standards.

Sloman asked anyone interested to be sure to sign up on the sign-in sheet so they can be registered as interested parties of record and receive notice of further developments on this project.

SOWA thanked the public who attended tonight's meeting for their interest and for voicing their concerns, which he said will result in a better project. He noted that the Development Commission will meet again October 19 for additional review of the project.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS/ANNOUNCEMENTS/ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to conduct, SOWA adjourned the meeting at 10:06 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Lowe  
Recording Secretary