FIRE STATION 92 BUILDING ASSESSMENT REPORT

Proposed Council Action:
Receive report. Accept project timeline and direct staff to return to Council with financing plan for preliminary design and land use issues.

DEPARTMENT OF Fire (Chris Tubbs)
COUNCIL LIAISON Mike Cero  Mike Grady  Steve Litzow
EXHIBITS 1. Vicinity Map
2. Comparison of Potential Zoning Designations

APPROVED BY CITY MANAGER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMOUNT BUDGETED</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROPRIATION REQUIRED</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION
At the 2008 Planning Session, the City Council directed staff to advance the assessment process of Station 92 and conduct an analysis in 2009. City staff has completed this analysis and the findings and recommendations are below.

TIMELINE
City staff created a timeline of events that would be needed if Council were to choose replacement of Station 92. The intent of this timeline is simply to capture the steps necessary for this type of project, and the sequence in which they would logically occur, and to illustrate where we currently are in that timeline. This timeline is not intended to predict or dictate Council’s time frame but is merely a reference to aid in the decision making process.
The 2009 analysis is best framed in these four questions:

1. Is the current location of Station 92 the best location for a replacement facility?
2. Are there any limitations or restrictions with the current site that could impact a replacement facility?
3. What do we believe the maximum size and price range to be?
4. Do we consider a remodel or new construction?

The intent of this agenda bill is to focus on the findings in the analysis Council directed, and to bring forth our conclusions and recommendations, based on these findings.

SITE LOCATION

The City’s GIS staff assisted in the study of station location. Response time polygons were plotted using the existing site. The analysis included Station 92’s response polygons separately, as well as the overlap with Station 91. The data validates previous studies which have concluded that the current site is the most reasonable location for Station 92.

The current site also has several advantages from a “neighborhood compatibility” standpoint. The site is located on a designated “collector arterial.” Developed commercial properties (the south QFC shopping center and the Storage Court Self Storage) lie to the south and west. To the north is Pioneer Park and to the east is a Puget Sound Energy substation. The nearest residential uses are located along SE 69th Place, more than 300 feet to the south, beyond the shopping center and Storage Court. See Exhibit 1.

SITE LIMITATIONS

The City contracted with TCA Architects to conduct an assessment of the current site. In order to accomplish this evaluation several assumptions were made. They included:

- We will continue to need a fire station at the south end.
- We will continue to staff the station with 3 personnel.
- We will continue to need to house 3 apparatus.
- We will need to meet all Federal, State and Local regulations.
- The 1991 Lawhead study has information relevant to this assessment (this was a structural and programmatic analysis of Station 91 and Station 92 completed in 1991).
- The current site is the best location based on internal analysis.

Fire Station 92 is a 4,680 square foot facility located on a 15,000 square foot lot currently zoned R9.6 Single-family Residential. It is a legally non-conforming structure under the zoning code (we could not build the existing facility on this property today under current zoning). A new building or significant modifications to the existing building would face serious barriers under several R9.6 zoning requirements (including parking, gross floor area, setbacks and allowable impervious surface requirements). These limitations cannot be overcome without a change in the zoning designation or multiple variances being patched together.

Rezoning the Fire Station 92 site from the “R9.6” designation to the “P Public Institution” designation should be considered. Public Institution zoning is an appropriate designation for this property for several reasons:

- The site has been designated as appropriate for “Public Facility” use by the Mercer Island Comprehensive Plan (Land Use Plan).
- The Fire Station 92 site is surrounded by non-residential uses (Pioneer Park to the north, PBZ-zoned commercial to the south and west, utility substation to the east).
- The existing fire station has demonstrated that such a facility can operate in this location without creating significant neighborhood or land use concerns.
- The “P Public Institutions” zoning designation would provide sufficient flexibility to allow for reasonable redevelopment of Fire Station 92.

Exhibit 2 provides a summary comparison of zoning options for the Fire Station 92 site.

**FACILITY SIZE AND PROJECTED COSTS**

The 1991 Lawhead study included a programmatic assessment of Station 92 and concluded that a replacement facility would need to be about 8,000 square feet in size in order to meet all regulatory requirements and programmatic and operational needs of the Fire Department.

The City asked TCA Architects to assess space needs and requirements, but not conduct a full programmatic review. TCA employed two methodologies to arrive at an estimate of facility size. Based on the assumptions of the continued need for Station 92 and no changes to our current service model, TCA reviewed the scaling at Station 91 and translated that to Station 92. For example, a dorm room at Station 91 is 110 square feet. It is therefore reasonable to assume a dorm room at Station 92 would be similarly sized. Station 92 does not have identical space needs as Station 91 so only those work spaces needed at Station 92 were included in this calculation.

TCA also assessed their estimate by looking at other fire stations with similar demographics and needs. The assessment concluded that the 8,500 square foot size is a reasonable estimate. Based on an estimate of 8,500 square feet, and given today’s fire station unit construction costs, it is estimated that the project would cost between $4 million and $5 million.

**REMODEL VERSUS NEW CONSTRUCTION**

The City was also interested in assessing the option of remodel in addition to studying the construction of a new facility. The 1991 Lawhead study reviewed this at a cursory level in 1991 and TCA reviewed that in their recent analysis. Station 92’s structural and seismic systems have significant deficiencies. The internal mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems have outlived their useful service life. The programmatic and operational needs have changed significantly since the station was first constructed in 1962.

A remodel would require significant reinforcement of the existing structure. This would reduce the existing space further. A remodel would restrict design and programmatic options resulting in a facility that doesn’t meet the mission of the Fire Department. TCA has concluded a remodel would likely be cost prohibitive.

**CONCLUSIONS**

We have concluded that the current location of Station 92 is the correct location to build a replacement facility.

Replacement of Station 92 at its existing site would require modifying existing zoning requirements for the site. We have concluded that a rezone from “R9.6 Single-Family Residential” to “P Public Institution” would be the most appropriate proposal.

We have also concluded that new construction would likely be the most cost efficient path and would best meet the requirements and needs identified in the 1991 Lawhead study and the 2009 TCA report.

We have also concluded that the replacement facility would not exceed 8,500 square feet in size and that the total cost of the project would be between $4 million and $5 million.
RECOMMENDATION

Fire Chief

MOVE TO: Accept the findings and recommendations in this report, approve the preliminary project timeline and direct staff to return with a financing plan for 2010 design phases.

Alternative: Revise proposed timeline or other findings and recommendations as determined by Council.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R9.6</th>
<th>PBZ</th>
<th>P1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use allowed?</strong></td>
<td>Requires CUP (Planning Com.)</td>
<td>Yes, allowed outright</td>
<td>Yes, allowed outright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height limit</strong></td>
<td>30’</td>
<td>36’</td>
<td>36’ or 3 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setbacks:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>20’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>25’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>20’ (MICC 19.02.010(C)(1)(a))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td>1 space for every 200 sq.ft. gfa</td>
<td>1 space for every 200 sq.ft. gfa</td>
<td>1 space for every 200 sq.ft. gfa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impervious surface limit</strong></td>
<td>40% (45% w/deviation)</td>
<td>None specified.</td>
<td>None specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum gross floor area (gfa)</strong></td>
<td>45% of lot area (15K X .45=6750)</td>
<td>None specified.</td>
<td>None specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special landscaping requirement</strong></td>
<td>35% minimum</td>
<td>Required yard must be landscaped</td>
<td>None specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open space minimum</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Minimum of 15% of PBZ</td>
<td>None specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comp Plan amendment req’d?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Code Amendment required?</strong></td>
<td>Text amendment required</td>
<td>Rezone required</td>
<td>Rezone required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other discretionary action?</strong></td>
<td>Code text amendment (Plng Com)</td>
<td>PBZ Site Plan amendment and consistency review, Consultation and Recommendation, Design Approval (Design Comm.)</td>
<td>Consultation and recommendation (Design Comm.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variances (H.E. or Plng. Com.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation and recommendation (Design Comm.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compliance with CH 19.12 Design Standards required?</strong></td>
<td>No (not a “regulated improvement”).</td>
<td>Yes, per MICC 19.04.010(G)(1)</td>
<td>No (not a “regulated improvement”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selected Design Standards that may be problematic</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Min. 35% of lot landscaped (MICC 19.12.040(B)(4)(a)(i)); 20’ partial screen adjacent to “public way;” 10’ partial screen adjacent to commercial use; 20’ full screen adjacent to public park (MICC 19.12.040(B)(7))</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Code official/city engineer/design commission may grant variance.
2 Code does not specify how to treat fire station access drive within required yard.
3 This requirement appears to be applied to PBZ as a whole.
4 MICC 19.04.010(D)(7) allows deviation for some development standards in the PBZ Zone where deviation would “advance stated purposes of PBZ.”