



February 26, 2020

**WORKGROUP MEETING #4**

**City of Maple Valley Downtown Design Standards & Guidelines**

**Attendees:**

Syd Dawson – City Council	Tim Morgan – Economic Development Manager
Erin Weaver – City Council	Amy Taylor – Senior Planner
Jonathan Miller – Planning Commission	Jeff Taraday – City Attorney
Dave Pilgrim – Planning Commission	Candace Tucker – Planning Commission
Jeff McCann – Property Representative	Daren Crabill – NBBJ
Laura Philpot – City Manager	Kim Selby – NBBJ
Tawni Dalziel – Public Works & Community Development Director	Gerrard Allam -NBBJ

**Excused:**

Matt Torpey – Community Development Manager

**Meeting Summary & Intent:**

Revisit Parking & Proportional Compliance  
Introduce Building Design & Streetscape Elements

**Public Comment:**

- No members of the public attended therefore there was no public comment.

**Purpose & Schedule:**

- Study purpose & schedule, to-date
- Review of last meeting’s discussion, staff work session

**Parking:**

- Workgroup wanted to know what the values of parking reductions, maximums and minimums were in last version. Is there a monetary number that NBBJ could provide as an example.
- A zero stall minimum is an incentive to keep development costs down. The value of zero is in the tradeoff against other new requirements downtown zoning is proposing. Market demands will still drive some parking demand at least in the short term, but this provides maximum flexibility
- Important to keep retail & restaurant maximum ratios similar to encourage a mix of ground floor uses.
- Parking requirements could be modified in the future if needed.
- Shared parking already exists in the code.

**Bike Parking:**

- Two kinds of bike parking – public parking on sidewalks and, secure bike parking for tenants. Typically has key card access for showers and lockers.
- Shower/locker areas typically included in commercial development. It is up to the developer to determine the design and placement of these lockers.



- Showers may be single stall unisex showers.
- These showers and indoor bike storage and lockers are considered an amenity for building occupants particularly due to trail access to downtown.
- **Action:** NBBJ to review requirements and possibly increase bike stall requirement.

**Proportional Compliance**

- Percentages and/or dollar amounts are yet to be determined. Draft code will include both; next workgroup meeting will include examples for discussion.
- Proportional compliance is determined based on the value of the development/renovation.
- Current code excludes interior renovation/ tenant improvements.
  - Should this be excluded?
  - Updates often trigger life safety/code projects in addition to scope of renovation work.
- Proportional Compliance is a way to bring non compliant buildings into compliance.
- Assessed value should be of building only, not building + land.
- What is the middle ground/requirement?
  - Could be related to improving pedestrian elements?
- If core and shell are completed and are sitting vacant how does proportional compliance possibly help prevent future TI mistakes?

**Building Design:**

- Could one single use that took up the entire 24’ minimum as 1 floor? If so, could this use be engineered to be configurable and adaptable to become a “true” 2 story in the future if the use changed?
  - 24’ and 2 stories or
  - 24’ without requiring 2 stories – preferred (as shown)
- **Action:** The 260<sup>th</sup> right-of-way (ROW) west of the 260<sup>th</sup> and 236<sup>th</sup> intersection should be considered as a Secondary Connection and not a Primary Connection, for that portion of the street. Purpose is to allow garage access, if built in that location.
- Need to define building height and what is permissible beyond the height limit: rooftop amenities, mechanical/elevator equipment, patios, roof gardens, railings, wind turbines, photovoltaic panels, etc.?
  - Mechanical equipment is exempt from height limit, but must be screened.
  - Occupiable space of rooftops is encouraged and included as a Guideline. Building codes will administer those spaces, not this document.
  - May want to dis-allow wind turbines.
- Building height near trail, within 200’ of residential should be limited to 35’.
  - Concern is views from neighbors and/or trail
  - Designate trail as a kind of secondary connection with special requirements(?)
  - What can you see or not from the west? Need to screen equipment, disallow blank walls, etc. Example Syd’s “rim lots” have HOA requirements and higher expectations for landscape screening because of visibility.
  - NBBJ to perform building study on parcel adjacent to the trail to examine what would be the developable area with 200’ setback from the trail.

- S-07 & S-08 Two standards are confusing and need revising for clarification. Graphic examples should better reflect stepbacks and/or be cropped to not indicate other design elements we are not allowing.
  - S-08 “different” is too squishy. Needs to be worded more clearly. Goal is higher quality materials?
  - Agree podium should be differentiated.
- Workgroup expressed desire to include a list of materials that would be allowed and disallowed to be a part of the building design.
  - Encourage use of wood, regional materials (i.e. Timber, Clay bricks, etc).
  - Pacific Northwest and Maple Valley regional style or character.
  - Timeless look, not dated to specific decade of architectural style or materials
  - Articulated through building design and site furniture, signage
  - Does Maple Valley have a visual identity or a feeling/active branding?
  - Should it be a specific list or requirement for a mix of materials, example 2-3?
  - Interest in joint planning commission / city council meeting to do image exercise, similar to what was done for legacy site
  - Add placeholder language for City to further develop.
- **Action:** Need to define ground level depth.
- Entrances along ground floor should allow flexibility for have entrances that are either recessed or that are set flush to the building.
- Reword S-10 to better communicate this standard.
  - Define top, middle and bottom of building
  - Should we add “an intent” to each standard to explain the why?
- S-14 – intent is to create visibility in and out of ground floor uses.
  - Some display is okay.
  - Signage plastering windows should not be allowed.
  - Discussed 60% minimum; agreed on percentage for commercial/service uses, not residential.
  - Discussed size and shape of windows. Assume development and different uses will achieve variety of designs without requiring variety.
  - Provide better examples.

### **Sustainability**

- The current building codes allow LEED Silver to be easily achievable and was agreed that this is the minimum standard to be allowed in the downtown district.
- Cost of LEED Silver selections was estimated at 3-5% initial cost increase over meeting current codes.
- Workgroup asked how the guidelines could be incentives and it was mentioned that the guidelines need not cost the developer a significant amount of money and that city staff must push the guidelines to be incorporated.
- Need to clearly indicate good and bad examples for staff to enforce, especially future (or current) staff who were not involved in these discussions.

### **Open Space:**

- An incentive for a developer to develop a public open space within their property is needed based on the draft language presented.
  - The workgroup did not feel comfortable in allowing for extra height as an incentive
  - Size of 10,000 SF compared to small City-owned triangle parcel.
  - Should be contiguous area and not located on opposite sides of street.
  - Should be more stringent on location.
- The incentive of allowing the setback to occur at level 4 and allowing a 3-story podium was suggested. This would allow the developer more development capacity without impacting the overall building height limit. Also creates some variety.
- Discussed possibility of allowing multi-family as an incentive however cannot address uses given current ban on multi-family in city.
- Workgroup wanted to know what type of activities would be in the open space and who would own, operate property. Would it have to be dedicated to the city?
- Table the topic for now, may insert into document once multifamily decision is made.

**Streetscape:**

- The workgroup realized that the streetscape treatment will greatly influence the look and feel of the downtown district.
- The examples provided by NBBJ were merely showing the range of how this treatment could be implemented.

**Other:**

- There is concern that multi-family will not be allowed in the downtown district which would dramatically alter the likelihood of project implementation in any significant way due to lack of office demand in the near term.
- Intersection of Highway 169 and 260<sup>th</sup> is being considered for a signaled light to allow full turn movements.
  - Other Secondary Connections intersecting Highway 169 will either be pedestrian only or Right-In/Right-Out. Additional study needed.
- Conceptual regulating plan helped visualize the theoretical number of blocks that could be developed. Need to help workgroup visualize how many buildings that might accommodate or what the potential capacity would be.

**Next Steps:**

- Final draft of Design Standards and Guidelines will be circulated to workgroup ~3/20
- Next workgroup meeting on 3/30 to review comments and questions on draft document.
- Final planning commission /public open house meeting to be scheduled.