

**APPROVED**

**CITY OF EDMONDS  
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD  
*Minutes of Regular Meeting***

**August 18, 2010**

---

Board Member Kendall called the August 18, 2010 meeting of the Architectural Design Board to order at 7:04 p.m., at the City Council Chambers, 250 - 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, Edmonds, Washington.

**ROLL CALL**

**Board Members Present**

Valerie Kendall, Chair  
Rick Schaefer, Vice Chair  
Lois Broadway  
Steve Bullock  
Bryan Gootee  
Michael Mestres  
Bruce O'Neill (arrived at 7:10 p.m.)

**Board Members Absent**

**Staff Present**

Mike Clugston, Planner  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Approval of the minutes was deferred to the Board's next meeting.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**VICE CHAIR SCHAEFER MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED. BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

There was no one in the audience who expressed an interest in addressing the Board during this portion of the meeting.

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

There were no items on the consent agenda.

**MINOR PROJECTS:**

No minor projects were scheduled on the agenda.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS:**

**File Number PLN20100048: Application by America's Diner for painting the exterior of the old Denny's restaurant at 8431 – 244<sup>th</sup> Street Southwest (CG zone)**

Mr. Clugston presented the Staff Report and noted that the building is located at the corner of 244<sup>th</sup> and Highway 99 at the old Denny's site. He explained that this is a post-event permit because the exterior and roof of the structure were repainted during the week of June 28<sup>th</sup> with the new colors of America's Diner. He further explained that while permits of this type are usually reviewed administratively, staff was not comfortable with the color combinations used and felt the ADB could provide additional perspective. He noted that a separate sign for the site was approved earlier in the year by staff.

Mr. Clugston referred to Attachment 3, which shows what the building currently looks like, and Attachment 4, which indicates the new colors of the facades and roof. Attachment 5 is a photograph of what the Denny's roof looked like in 1999, which was the last time the site underwent design review. He noted that the roof was then a light-green, metal standing-seam roof, whereas the one that was recently painted over was asphalt shingle of a similar color of green.

Mr. Clugston advised that staff feels the current look of the building, particularly with the painted red roof and matching trim and trim caps, is excessively bright. In response, staff provided some alternative looks (Attachment 6) that may be better suited for the site while still using the colors preferred by the applicant. He said that, at this time, staff recommends the Board deny the proposed color arrangement. It is hoped the ADB can work with the applicant to achieve a more desirable final appearance for the building that satisfies the intent of the code and Comprehensive Plan. To support his recommendation, he specifically referred to the following:

- ECDC 16.60.030. The language in this section states that "*buildings shall convey a visually distinct base and top.*" As the building is painted, there is a lack of differentiation between the roof and the trim. A different color roof or different color trim and trim cap would provide better differentiation.
- ECDC 20.12.070. Since the project is located within the Highway 99 Corridor and zoned CG, district-based design review is required. Section 20.12.070.B.2 requires that "*staff must find that the proposal is consistent with the zoning code (Chapter 16.60) and the policies applicable to the district found in the Comprehensive Plan.*" In addition, the Design Guidelines Checklist (Attachment 7) identifies a number of criteria that are to be ranked based on a given project. For this particular application, Item C.4 would be the most important. It states that an applicant must "*use durable, attractive and well-detailed finish materials.*" The current color scheme is not attractive, nor well-detailed; and it is questionable whether painting an existing asphalt-shingle roof would be durable. As the roof weathers, granules from the shingles could come off, taking the applied color with it and leaving the roof blotchy and faded.

Vice Chair Schaefer recalled that somewhere in the existing code is language that discourages bright and garish colors. He asked if this code language would be applicable to this application. Mr. Clugston answered that this standard is in the general design standards (ECDC 20.11), but the current application must be reviewed based on the district-based standards (ECDC 20.12).

Board Member Broadway inquired if the code requires design review when roofing materials are significantly changed. She noted that a major change occurred when the standing-seam roof was replaced with an asphalt-shingle roof. Mr. Clugston referred to Attachment 5, which indicates that the standing-seam roof was in place at least until 1999. However, the more recent photographs (Attachment 4) illustrate an asphalt-shingle roof that is painted green. Board Member Bullock observed that the previous property owner must have obtained a permit when the roofing materials were changed. Staff would have had to issue a determination that the change was acceptable, or the application would have come before the ADB for review. Mr. Clugston replied that staff cannot find anything in the file to indicate that the roofing change was reviewed by staff, and no permits were issued for the change.

Board Member O'Neill asked who prepared Attachments 5 and 6. Mr. Clugston answered that Attachment 5 is a photograph of the site when it was used previously used as a Denny's Restaurant. Staff prepared Attachment 6 using Microsoft paint to alter a photograph of the existing building. The intent was to provide options for the Board to consider.

**Thomas Anthony Zimmardi, Zimmardi and Sons**, was present to represent the applicant. He said he had no information to indicate that the roof used to be a standing-seam design. Prior to painting the roof red, the asphalt shingles were painted green. The applicant, America's Diner, has purchased several structures in the area that were previously Denny's Restaurants. Earlier in the year, City staff granted approval of the applicant's sign, which uses the same colors that are found on the building. While the City staff has indicated they are opposed to the red roof, he noted that the Shurgard facility that is located in the area has a bright orange roof. He read the following statement from his attorney regarding the staff's recommendation:

*"Our criticism of the August 11, 2010 Staff Report is that the staff "feels" the red roof is excessively bright. However, this contradicts ECDC 16.60.005, Purposes A,C,F and H.2. What the denial does not consider is the failing Denny's Restaurant, which needs the bright red upgrade to America's Diner to provide high economical benefits to the City. Actually, this upgrade is in compliance with the City of Edmonds Comprehensive Plan for the Highway 99 Corridor (See Pages 43, 46 and 48).*

*Following the general theory of neighborhood-based design for the Highway 99 Corridor, this is a clean restaurant upgrade. The red roof is needed for marketing. The Board should be pro business as the law provides, and should not be anti-business based on the personal preferences and speculation feelings of the staff. The ordinance and Comprehensive Plan do not support these types of arbitrary decisions. The staff's criticism is too restrictive on the owner, particularly for the Highway 99 Corridor rather than downtown Edmonds."*

Mr. Zimmardi noted that staff offered a few options as potential solutions to the issue, and the applicant may be willing to work with them to come up with an acceptable design. He pointed out that because the City previously approved the applicant's sign, it was assumed that the same colors could be used on the building, too. He said the applicant would like to keep the red roof and blue trim to match the sign that was previously approved by staff. He pointed out that the shingle paint can last up to 10 years, and it would cost the applicant about \$2,300 to alter the color at this point. Board Member Broadway asked if Mr. Zimmardi is confident the applicant would agree to work with staff to alter the building colors, and Mr. Zimmardi answered no.

To clarify his position as the applicant's representative, Mr. Zimmardi explained that the applicant currently owns several former Denny's Restaurant buildings, and he has converted them into America's Diners. Neither the applicant nor his attorney were able to attend the hearing, so he agreed to attend in their place.

Board Member Broadway asked Mr. Zimmardi to share his experience related to the durability of painted asphalt roofs. Mr. Zimmardi answered that he relies on the specifications provided by Sherwin Williams, the paint supplier. He pointed out that painting the roofs can hold older asphalt shingles together and extend their life. He noted that the roof on the subject building was replaced sometime after 1999, so it is still in good condition.

Chair Kendall observed that, with this application, there is a lot of room for opinion. However, she said it is disconcerting that the building was painted prior to City approval. She said that before she received notice of this review, she happened to drive by the structure and the red roof jumped right out at her.

Board Member Gootee pointed out that making a determination of whether or not a color is garish or too bright is a judgment call. He requested further clarification from staff about how the Board would make this determination. Mr. Clugston referred to ECDC 16.60.030.D.1, which calls for a differentiation between the roof and base of the building. He concluded that while there is some obvious differentiation on the existing building, there ends up being a lot of red because even the trim caps and wing walls are painted red.

Board Member Broadway agreed that the issue of color is subjective. Although she personally thinks the red roof is an extremely bold color; from a business point of view, it did exactly what it was intended to do as Chair Kendall drove by. She noted that IHOP's entire identity is based upon a bright blue roof. She said her greatest concern with the application

is that the paint was applied to asphalt shingles, which is not the intended way to maintain asphalt roofs. She is most concerned that, regardless of color, the paint will eventually wear off and the roof will become blotchy.

Board Member O'Neill inquired about the warranty offered by Sherwin Williams on the paint that was used for the roof. Mr. Zimmardi answered that Sherwin Williams offers a 2-year warranty, and he agreed the roof should be painted every two to three years. He said he has a maintenance agreement with the applicant to maintain the building into the future. Again, he reminded the Board that the roof has already been painted green twice, and before it was painted recently, it was covered with mold. He noted that the Collision Center, located just around the corner from the subject building, has a bright purple painted roof. He noted that there are numerous businesses in Edmonds that have red roofs or large red stripes on their buildings.

Vice Chair Schaefer said that, color aside, he already sees shadows in the red painted roof because it looks like the green was never adequately covered. He questioned the durability of the roof treatment. Chair Kendall observed that durability was not a specific issue raised in the Staff Report. Vice Chair Schaefer recalled that the Staff Report refers to Item C.4 in the Design Guidelines Checklist (Attachment 4) which states that materials must be durable, attractive and well-detailed. He asked if the Board's recommendation would be limited to color, and Mr. Clugston answered no.

Board Member O'Neill questioned staff's use of ECDC 16.60.030.D.1 as a basis for denial since the current design has a clear distinction between the building and the roof. Rather than color, he suggested the real issue is related to durability of the roof application, which is only guaranteed for two years. He said he is also concerned that the building was painted without first obtaining a permit. He suggested the applicant start the permit process again and work with staff to come up with a solution that meets the zoning requirements. Mr. Clugston explained that the applicant has applied for design review post event. The project would normally have been an administrative decision: but given the current color combination, staff decided to bring the application to the Board for additional guidance. Board Member Mestres asked why design review for projects of this type is typically done administratively. Mr. Clugston answered that design review for projects within the Highway 99 Corridor that do not require SEPA review can be done administratively as per code. In this case, staff has reviewed the application and recommended denial. Board Member Bullock added that when staff denies an application, it must come before the Board for review.

Mr. Zimmardi said the applicant apologizes for starting the project without design review approval. He did not think it was required because he was not making any architectural changes. When he learned that a permit was required, he immediately approached staff to start the process.

Chair Kendall expressed her belief that the changes outlined by staff in Attachment 6 would improve the building's appearance. She expressed concern that there is nothing to break up the expansive red roof. In addition, the design simply lacks enough detail to even make the building appear interesting. She understands the issue is subjective, and she would be willing to regard her fellow Board Members' opinions on the matter, but she expressed her belief that the current color scheme does not do the restaurant a good service, and the staff's recommendations are superior in appearance.

Board Member Bullock expressed his belief that it is within the Board's purview to make subjective decisions, and that is why they have seven members to use their professional expertise and knowledge of the code to make good decisions that are not always spelled out in the code. He said he is also uncomfortable with the current color scheme, as well as the choice to use paint on an asphalt-shingle roof. He said he is not so much concerned about the color of the roof, but the lack of detail in the final product. He expressed his belief that the current proposal does not meet Item C.4. of the Design Guidelines Checklist (Attachment 7), which requires that durable, attractive and well-detailed finish materials be used. He further said the massing of red hides all the details that are on the building. The argument that there are a lot of other buildings with red roofs doesn't support approval of the application because they are different shades. The applicant is proposing a bright, vibrant red, and most of the other buildings use more earth tone reds. He said he would support the staff's recommendation for denial of the current color scheme and would like the applicant to work with staff to come up with an acceptable solution that can be approved administratively.

Board Member Mestres voiced concern about the Board rubber stamping a project that has already been done since this could set a bad precedent. Projects should not already be completed when they are presented to the Board for design review. Board Member Bullock agreed, but explained that situations come up when property owners do not obtain the required permits before starting a project. Regardless of the applicant's intent, they are trying to go through the permit process at this time, and the first step is to obtain ADB approval. The next step will be obtaining a building permit to implement whatever is approved. The applicant is trying to meet the permit requirements, and the Board should judge the application based on whether or not it complies with the City's code. Chair Kendall summarized that the Board holds no bias towards the applicant because they proceeded without design review by City staff. The application has been brought to the Board because staff denied the proposal.

Mr. Clugston referred to Attachment 3, which is a photograph of the existing site with a red roof, as well a red trim and trim cap. Attachment 5 is a photograph of the old standing-seam roof that used to be on the building prior to approximately 1999. It is gray in color with red trim and is more code compliant than the existing colors. He referred to the examples prepared by staff (Attachment 6), which are intended to soften the massing of the red roof and result in a more attractive finished product. The sample options provided by staff would still allow the applicant to use the America's Diner colors of red, white and blue. He asked the Board to provide direction on what color combinations would work best.

Board Member O'Neill asked staff to elaborate on why the current color scheme (Attachment 3) is not code compliant. Mr. Clugston said staff does not believe the current scheme is consistent with the criteria in ECDC 16.60.030 because it does not provide a visually distinct top and base. More differentiation could be provided. In addition, staff does not believe the current scheme is consistent with Item C.4 of the Design Guidelines Checklist, which states that the finish materials should be well detailed and durable

Board Member Gootee emphasized that he is pro business and wants to work with the applicant to keep the project going. Mr. Zimmardi previously stated that the applicant would be willing to work with the staff's suggested options. He said he would prefer the option depicted on the first page of Attachment 6, where the roof is gray and the trim caps and coping are painted red. This option would satisfy the following objectives:

1. The building would be more attractive and the boldness of the red color would be decreased.
2. It will add to the durability of the roof because it would add an additional coat of paint for the color.
3. It would be a cost-effective solution.

**BOARD MEMBER GOOTEE MOVED THE BOARD APPROVE FILE NUMBER PLN20100048 BASED ON THE DESIGN OUTLINED ON THE FIRST PAGE OF ATTACHMENT 6, WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS:**

- 1. THE APPLICANT WOULD BE ALLOWED TO ADD THEIR LOGO COLORS ON THE EAST PLINTHS.**
- 2. THE HEAD FASCIA COULD BE INCREASED TO A GREATER DEGREE OF RED THAN SHOWN IN THE DESIGN IF THE APPLICANT SO CHOOSES.**

**BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**File Number PLN20100052: Application by Swedish Hospital for a sign package at 21601 – 76<sup>th</sup> Avenue West (MU Zone)**

Mr. Clugston presented the Staff Report and explained that this proposal is the first part of an overall sign package for the new Swedish Hospital (formerly Stevens Hospital). The applicant is requesting to replace the existing sign (Attachment 4b) on the west tower with a new sign (Attachment 5) near the top of the northeast corner of the West Tower facing Highway 99. The proposed sign would have internally-illuminated white lettering and a logo typical of the Swedish Medical Center corporate theme.

Mr. Clugston explained that a sign package is required for the Swedish Hospital site because the total number of signs would exceed the maximum number allowed per ECDC 20.60.025.A. He reminded the Board that they may review signage in excess of what is allowed by the code as part of a sign package. He advised that while the project would be phased, review and approval of the first phase would allow the hospital to have at least some signage in place when the naming change takes place in early September. In addition, the applicant is proposing to replace the faces on two monument signs.

Mr. Clugston reviewed that the subject property is located in the Medical Use (MU) zone, and signs standards are the same as those for the Neighborhood Business (BN) zone. General design review is required because of where the site is located within the Highway 99/Medical Activity Center. Prior to approving the application the Board must find that the proposal is consistent with the criteria found in ECDC 20.11.030, the Comprehensive Plan, and the zoning code. He reviewed that the design criteria applicable to the proposed sign package includes:

- ECDC 20.11.030.A.2, which states that “*colors should avoid excessive brilliance or brightness except where it would enhance the character of the area.*” The proposed signage would use white and blue colors, which are typical of the Swedish Medical Center corporate theme.
- ECDC 20.11.030.A.5, which states that “*all signs should conform to the general design theme of the development.*” The sign package would ensure that all signs on the site follow a similar design theme appropriate for the development at the site.

Mr. Clugston advised that the site is limited to one square foot of sign area for each lineal foot of wall containing the main public entrance to the primary building or structure located on a separate legal lot. However, because there are multiple buildings on the site and the hospital has multiple entrances, the maximum total permanent sign area was difficult to determine. Because the eastern most façade of the main hospital building contains both a public entrance and emergency entrance along a wall of approximately 400 lineal feet, this distance was used to determine the total permanent sign area could be approximately 400 square feet to be divided among the buildings on the entire site. If the applicant finds going forward that this sign area is insufficient, a code amendment to either the applicable portions of the site or the medical use zone code may be appropriate given the unique nature of the site.

Mr. Clugston further advised that the total number of signs permitted on the site is three. The exact number of signs on the site is uncertain at this time, but there will surely be more than the three being reviewed as part of this permit. This makes the other signs nonconforming with respect to the number, but it is anticipated the next phase of the sign package will address the remainder of the signs on the site, which would bring the signs into conformance. He concluded that the proposal is consistent with the applicable zoning code requirements and the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. He recommended the Board approve the sign package for Swedish Hospital with the conditions outlined in the Staff Report.

Board Member Broadway observed that the Staff Report makes note of an alternative way to measure sign area that would reduce the square footage of the signs proposed in this package and preserve square footage for future signs. Mr. Clugston advised that the sign area would be recalculated using a letter-by-letter approach, and this would result in a total sign area of about 95 square feet as opposed to the 142 square feet identified in the staff report.

Frank Gonzales, BB&T Sign Services, was present to represent the applicant. He explained that Stevens Hospital would convert to Swedish Hospital in early August, so the existing signage needs to be replaced. The proposed sign would be smaller in size and located at approximately the same elevation as the existing sign. The existing sign is 269.47 square

feet in total sign area, and the new sign would be 84.6 square feet. However, he acknowledged the total area of the old sign was measured using a different method. He summarized that while the proposed sign would be different, it meets all of the criteria in the sign code. Vice Chair Schaefer emphasized that the measurements of the existing signage has nothing to do with how much signage the applicant would be allowed going forward. Sign area is based on wall area

Vice Chair Schaefer asked about the scope of subsequent phases of the overall sign package. Mr. Gonzales answered that the next phase would include a number of monument and directional signs, and they currently have an architect working on the project. Vice Chair Schaefer asked if staff is tracking the total sign area as the various phases of the design package move forward. He cautioned that it would save the applicant time and money if they are able to avoid the need to request additional sign area. He suggested the applicant attempt to stay within the limits allowed by the code by using very effective signage. Mr. Clugston said the Staff Report notes that the subject property is unique and there may need to be changes in the code as the applicant moves forward with their sign package. The applicant may consider requesting a code amendment to set up specific standards for the MU zone and the ADB could approve an additional 50 percent of sign area. The Board agreed that it would be difficult to approve a 50 percent increase in total sign area at this time. They would like the entire sign package to be worked out before the applicant approaches the Board with a request for additional sign area.

**BOARD MEMBER BULLOCK MOVED THE BOARD FIND THAT THE APPLICATION COMPLIES WITH THE CITY CODES AND APPLICABLE DESIGN CRITERIA. HE FURTHER MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE FILE NUMBER PLN20100052, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- 1. THE APPLICANT MUST OBTAIN A BUILDING PERMIT FOR THE PROPOSED WALL SIGN.**
- 2. THE MONUMENT SIGN ADJACENT TO 76<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE WEST SHALL REMAIN ENTIRELY ON PRIVATE PROPERTY.**
- 3. AS REBRANDING OF THE SITE PROCEEDS AND OTHER SIGNS ARE UPDATED, SWEDISH MUST APPLY TO THE DESIGN BOARD TO EITHER AMEND THE SUBJECT SIGN PACKAGE OR APPLY FOR A NEW SIGN PACKAGE THAT INCLUDES ALL SIGNAGE PROPOSED FOR THE ENTIRE SITE.**

**BOARD MEMBER GOOTEE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**CONSOLIDATED PERMIT APPLICATIONS (No Public Participation):**

No consolidated permit applications were scheduled on the agenda.

**ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:**

There were no administrative reports by staff.

**ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBERS COMMENTS:**

Chair Kendall shared her cell phone number so Board Members could contact her if they find on short notice that they are unable to attend or will be late for a meeting.

Board Member Bullock announced his resignation effective at the end of September.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:27 p.m.