

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

August 4, 2010

Board Member Kendall called the August 4, 2010 meeting of the Architectural Design Board to order at 7:00 p.m., at the City Council Chambers, 250 - 5th Avenue North, Edmonds, Washington.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Valerie Kendall, Chair
Rick Schaefer, Vice Chair
Lois Broadway
Bryan Gootee
Michael Mestres

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Steve Bullock (excused)
Bruce O'Neill (excused)

STAFF PRESENT

Mike Clugston, Planner
Kernen Lien, Planner
Brian McIntosh, Parks, Recreation and
Cultural Services Director
Karin Noyes, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER MESTRES MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JUNE 2, 2010 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY MOVED THAT THE AGENDA BE ACCEPTED AS PRESENTED. VICE CHAIR SCHAEFER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

No one in the audience expressed a desire to address the Board during this portion of the agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA:

There were no items on the consent agenda.

MINOR PROJECTS:

File Number PLN20100045: Application by Grace Architects for painting the exterior of the South Mall portion of Old Milltown at 203 – 5th Avenue South and a request for two additional signs at that portion of the site (BD-1 Zone)

Mr. Clugston presented the Staff Report, noting that the color samples provided in Attachment 2 were not a good representation of the applicant's proposal. He provided actual color swatches for the Board's review. He referred to Attachment 8, which shows a view of the South Mall at Old Milltown as it currently exists. Attachment 3 illustrates what the façade would look like after painting. He advised that in addition, the applicant is proposing to repaint an existing sign and add a new tenant directory sign on the Maple Street elevation. He explained that the site has already

exceeded the maximum number of signs allowed per ECDC 20.60.025.A, which permits three signs per site or one per individual subtenant. However, as per ECDC 20.60.015.B, the Architectural Design Board may review signage in excess of that allowed by code for unique sites such as Old Milltown. He referred to Attachment 7, which shows the existing sign on the Maple Street elevation, and Attachments 5 and 6, which illustrate the location and design of the proposed new signs. He noted that the proposed new painted sign would include the Ace Hardware logo, with an arrow and the word “parking” to direct customers to the parking area located on top of the building. He expressed his belief that the proposal appears to meet the sign requirements as identified in ECDC 20.60 with respect to size, location and color.

Mr. Clugston reminded the Board that specific design standards for the BD-1 Zone are found in ECDC 22.43. While there are no specific standards related to building color, there are standards related to signage. The code states that simple graphics should be used to reduce the need to have large expanses of lettering, and the proposed painted sign appears to meet this requirement. He observed that while Attachment 3 indicates where the colors would be applied on the 5th Avenue façade, the Board should ask the applicant which colors, if any, would be applied on the parking lot side of the façade. Based on his comments, he recommended the Board approve File Number PLN20100045 with the conditions noted in the Staff Report.

Vice Chair Schaefer asked staff to elaborate on the unique elements of Old Milltown that would warrant an exception to the number of signs allowed on the site. Mr. Clugston explained that the entrance to the ACE Hardware business is located on top of the parking deck. The building’s owner has indicated that customers often question where the entrance to the parking area and ACE Hardware business is located. If the ACE Hardware business were located on the ground floor of the building, the proposal for additional signage would not be warranted. However, in this case, it can be difficult for customers to find their way around the site and additional signage would help the situation.

Once again, Mr. Clugston explained that the current sign code allows each stand alone site to have up to three signs. For multi-tenant sites, each subtenant is allowed only one sign. The additional signage requested by the applicant would not be allowed unless the Board approves an exception. At this time, ACE Hardware has the three signs allowed by the code, and each of the ground floor tenants on the southern portion of the site are allowed to have one sign. Any additional signage on the site must be approved by the Board. He noted that the City is in the process of updating their sign code to allow more flexibility. As proposed, each subtenant would be allowed up to three signs.

Kaylon Roberts, Grace Architects, Seattle, said that Mr. Clugston summarized the proposed project well. To answer staff’s question, he explained that the parking lot side of the 5th Avenue façade would likely be painted to match the color used on the front. Board Member Broadway suggested that rather than painting the back side to mirror the façade, her preference would be paint the back side with a single-neutral color. Mr. Roberts agreed that it would be appropriate to paint the back side the same color as the upper portion of Old Milltown.

Board Member Mestres observed that the proposed new paint would cover the antique look of the existing store fronts and sign, which may raise concerns by some members of the public. He suggested the applicant consider the option of placing a mural on the wall where the “parking” sign is proposed to be located. He noted that there is currently a mural program in the City, and two murals have already been painted in other locations in the downtown area. The idea is becoming popular amongst the citizens, and this wall would be an excellent candidate. Perhaps the mural could identify the ACE Hardware business, but also reference what the building was previously. The mural could also clearly identify the parking area. He expressed his belief that a mural would further beautify the City and also draw people to the area, which is the goal of the businesses located at Old Milltown.

The Board discussed that the design guidelines do not provide specific standards for paint color. They agreed the proposed façade colors would be appropriate and would meet the intent of the design guidelines.

Chair Kendall observed that the façade on Maple Street is a highly visible wall as one enters the downtown area. She agreed with Board Member Mestres that this would be an excellent location for a mural. Board Member Mestres noted

that the existing and proposed signs would not be highly visible, and a mural would be more pronounced. To some extent, it may make the Board more amenable to a variance on the number of signs allowed, as well. Chair Kendall emphasized that requiring a mural would be a departure from the application before them, but she agreed it would be a good recommendation.

Mr. Lien explained that the Edmonds Mural Society is responsible for the two murals that have already been placed in the downtown area. They intend to do five murals each year, based on a theme. They also provide funding for the mural projects. He suggested that requiring a mural that includes signage for a business may not be allowed because murals are classified as wall graphics rather than signs for the businesses. He suggested the Board contact the Edmonds Mural Society for more information.

Board Member Broadway expressed her belief that imposing a community goal for murals on a private property owner would be inappropriate and would not really address the need for additional signage. If the applicant is willing, one alternative would be to offer the real estate to the Edmonds Mural Society for consideration in future years. This would allow the wall mural to be consistent with the prevalent theme of the Edmonds Mural Society. Mr. Lien briefly described the Edmonds Mural Society's process for selecting mural locations. He explained that the society is a private organization that must apply to the City for wall graphic permits for each mural. He advised that the code was recently amended to help staff review mural applications.

Vice Chair Schaefer said he can see the need for a good wayfinding sign to clearly identify the ACE Hardware business and their parking area. While he felt a wall mural in this location was a good suggestion, he felt it would be inappropriate for the Board to include it as a requirement of approval. Instead, it should be suggested as a good idea, particularly given the history of the site.

Chair Kendall summarized that the Board agreed a mural requirement should not be included as part of a formal motion for approval. However, the Board would be in favor of the applicant contacting the Edmonds Mural Society to discuss the potential of placing a mural on the wall at some point in the future.

Board Member Gootee expressed his belief that the proposed new painted sign represents an improvement over what is currently on the wall. While he felt it was appropriate to provide some type of wayfinding sign to direct customers to the parking, he suggested that perhaps the arrow and the word "parking" are not really necessary. Enlarging the logo and removing the arrow and lettering would make the sign appear more classy and professional and would serve the same purpose. People would intuitively know where the parking is located based on the logo alone. Board Member Broadway disagreed. Just using the ACE Hardware logo would imply that ACE is located in the Quiznos space. The arrow is an essential part of the sign. Board Member Mestres agreed that the arrow is an important function of the sign, and the existing wall graphic has served the same purpose for decades. Vice Chair Schaefer agreed that the arrow and wording are necessary elements of the sign. He noted that the sign is intended to provide information to people driving to the business. Board Member Broadway agreed and observed that it would be counterintuitive for a driver going by to think they can park on the roof of the business. Chair Kendall sided with Board Member Gootee. She inquired if the upper parking lot is reserved for ACE Hardware customers or if other tenants utilize the parking space, as well. Mr. Clugston was unable to answer this question. The majority of the Board supported the proposed sign, with the arrow and word "parking."

Board Member Broadway suggested the directory sign would not serve its purpose in the proposed location given the current location of the mailboxes. Mr. Roberts advised that, at this time, the applicant does not have plans to move the mailboxes. Board Member Broadway asked if the directory sign is intended to serve all tenants in Old Milltown or just those in the lower portion. Mr. Roberts answered that it is intended to serve the six spaces in the South Mall. Board Member Broadway noted that the South Mall is accessible from 5th Avenue. If the sign is intended to serve these businesses, it should be visible to people walking down 5th Avenue. If the intent is to provide direction to customers who come to the site by vehicle, perhaps the rooftop parking area would be a better location. Mr. Roberts agreed to discuss this change with the property owner.

Board Member Gootee observed that this is a difficult site, and he supports the directional sign in the location proposed, particularly since the Board does not have a specific recommendation as to a better location. Chair Kendall agreed and suggested it would be inappropriate to postpone approval until the applicant could come up with an alternative location. Board Member Broadway asked if the sign is intended to provide direction to both vehicular and pedestrian traffic. Mr. Roberts answered affirmatively. That being the case, Board Member Broadway observed that, as proposed, the lettering on the sign would not be visible to vehicular traffic that travels by the site at 20 miles per hour. If it is intended to serve drivers when they get out of their cars, a better location would be in the rooftop parking area. Board Member Gootee pointed out that the sign could not be made larger because of current City codes that limit size.

VICE CHAIR SCHAEFER MOVED THAT THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD APPROVE FILE NUMBER PLN20100045 WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE APPLICANT MUST OBTAIN A SIGN PERMIT FOR THE PROPOSED SIGNS FROM THE BUILDING DIVISION.**
- 2. A SEPARATE STREET USE PERMIT SHALL BE OBTAINED FROM THE ENGINEERING DIVISION PRIOR TO INSTALLATION OF THE PROPOSED BUSINESS DIRECTORY SIGN.**
- 3. A SEPARATE RIGHT-OF-WAY CONSTRUCTION PERMIT WILL BE REQUIRED FOR ANY VEHICLES OR STAGING OCCUPYING THE RIGHT-OF-WAY.**
- 4. CATCH BASINS IN THE VICINITY OF AND DOWNSTREAM OF THE SUBJECT SITE SHALL BE PROTECTED FROM POSSIBLE PAINT RUNOFF. ANY RUNOFF FROM PAINTING OPERATIONS WITH RELEASE OF CONTAMINATED WATER INTO THE STORM SYSTEM WILL BE CONSIDERED AN ILLICIT DISCHARGE AND WILL BE SUBJECT TO FINES OF UP TO \$500/ DAY.**
- 5. SUGGEST THE APPLICANT RECONSIDER THE DIRECTORY SIGN'S LOCATION.**

BOARD MEMBER MESTRES SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

File Number PLN20100045: Application by Grace Architects for new storefronts, awnings and planters at the Upper Dayton portion of Old Milltown at 201 – 5th Avenue South (BD-1 Zone)

Mr. Clugston advised that the applicant is proposing to create three individual storefronts at the Upper Dayton portion of Old Milltown by installing new aluminum storefronts, awnings and planters while improving the sidewalk and drainage (see Attachment 1). He referred to Attachment 2, which is a current photograph of the Upper Dayton storefronts, and Attachment 3, which is a rendering showing the proposed updated look. He noted that the colors are proposed to match those used on the portion of Old Milltown at the corner of 5th and Dayton. He also referred to Attachment 4, which is a plan view of the Upper Dayton storefronts and a general site plan. Attachment 5 includes elevations along the Dayton and Upper Dayton lengths of Old Milltown.

Mr. Clugston explained that because the property is located within the BD-1 zone, the proposal must meet specific site development standards. He reviewed that ECDC 16.43.030.B requires that the ground floor must be designated commercial storefront for the first 30 feet of the parcel. It states that the building may be broken up into multiple frontages so that each entry/ground floor combination is within seven inches of the grade of the sidewalk and that the existing building may be added onto or remodeled without adjusting the existing height of the ground floor to meet the specified minimum height as long as the addition or remodel does not increase the building footprint or its frontage along a street by more than 25 percent. It requires that each commercial space located on the ground floor within the designated street front shall be directly accessible by an entry from the sidewalk. Mr. Clugston advised that there is no indication in the application as to whether the ground floor commercial space requirement would be met, but specific uses would be verified through review of a business license or building permit. He said the applicant is proposing to

create three storefronts that appear to be at sidewalk level, and each store front would have an individual entry. No additional square footage is proposed.

Mr. Clugston advised that several BD-1 zone design standards must also be met. He reviewed each of the applicable design standards as follows:

- ECDC 22.43.040 requires that ground floor facades incorporate five elements that provide visual interest as identified in Section B. The current proposal includes bulkheads, transom or clerestory windows and planter boxes. While awnings are included in the design, they are a required element and would not count as a ground level detail. The applicant must provide two additional ground level details, which could include hanging baskets, decorative lighting, tile work, medallions or a similar element as approved by the ADB to meet the intent of the code.
- ECDC 22.43.040 requires that awnings and canopies be open-sided to enhance visibility of business signage. It also requires that they be consistent in character, scale and position. The awnings shown in Attachment 3 are closed-sided and cannot be approved. Similarly shaped standard awnings without returns would be acceptable, as would those that are on the façade of Old Milltown at 5th and Dayton. The proposed awnings would use the same wine color as those at the corner of 5th and Dayton, as well.
- ECDC 22.43.050 requires that ground level facades of buildings that are oriented to streets must have transparent windows with a minimum 75 percent transparency between an average of 2 and 10 feet above ground. The proposed storefronts appear to satisfy the requirement.

Mr. Clugston advised that because the proposal is consistent with the applicable zoning code requirements and the policies and goals of the Comprehensive Plan, staff recommends the Board approve the proposed storefronts, awnings and planters with the conditions outlined in the Staff Report.

Board Member Gootee expressed his belief that the proposed changes represent a significant improvement over what currently exists, as long as all engineering and Development Code requirements can be met.

Kaylon Roberts, Grace Architects, Seattle, was present to represent the applicant. He explained that the proposal is for new aluminum storefronts in the three openings of the Upper Dayton portion of Old Milltown. Along with that, canvas box-framed awnings would be added to the storefronts. The Lower Dayton portion of the storefronts would have concrete bulkheads under the windows. Space would be provided to accommodate double doors at some point in the future, but single doors would be installed at this time with a panel of infill glass.

Mr. Roberts advised that the awnings would be open on the side to meet the requirement found in ECDC 22.43.040. In addition, rosettes, similar to those on the lower portion of Old Milltown, would be added on each of the concrete bulkhead sections, and these would qualify as one of the five required architectural elements. They also propose two wall-mounted light fixtures between the three storefronts as another architectural element. He summarized that their goal is to bring the storefronts to the level and character of Old Milltown proper.

Vice Chair Schaefer agreed that the proposed rosettes and lighting would tie this section of the building to the anchor building. At the request of Board Member Gootee, Mr. Roberts provided a colored rendering showing the additional architectural elements, the proposed color of the storefronts, and the open-ended awnings.

Vice Chair Schaefer pointed out potential issues associated with the meeting the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements given the slope of the sidewalk. Mr. Roberts said the applicant intends to meet ADA and other engineering requirements.

BOARD MEMBER MESTRES MOVED THAT THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD APPROVE FILE NUMBER PLN20100046 WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- **THE APPLICANT MUST OBTAIN A BUILDING PERMIT FOR THE PROPOSED REMODEL.**
- **TWO ADDITIONAL GROUND LEVEL DETAILS (FOR A TOTAL OF FIVE) MUST BE PROVIDED ACCORDING TO ECDC 22.43.030.**
- **THE AWNINGS MUST COMPLY WITH ECDC 22.43.020. THE APPLICANT WILL WORK WITH STAFF TO ENSURE THAT CODE-COMPLIANT AWNINGS ARE SELECTED AT BUILDING PERMIT.**
- **ANY FUTURE SIGNAGE FOR THE UPPER DAYTON STOREFRONTS MUST MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOUND IN ECDC 22.43.040.b(8) – (13) AS WELL AS ECDC 20.60.**
- **THE PROPOSAL DOES NOT INCLUDE USE OF THE CITY RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR STAGING AND MATERIALS. SHOULD IT BECOME NECESSARY TO USE THE RIGHT-OF-WAY DURING THE PROJECT, A SEPARATE RIGHT-OF-WAY CONSTRUCTION PERMIT WOULD BE REQUIRED.**

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS:

File Number PLN20100044: Public hearing on Interurban Trail. The City of Edmonds is proposing to construct a 1.37 mile paved recreational trail that will connect the Mountlake Terrace, Lynnwood and Everett Interurban Trails to the north with the Shoreline Interurban Trail to the south. A portion of the project includes the construction of Ballinger Station Plaza on the east side of 76th Avenue West along McAleer Way that will include a cement plaza, steel shelter, kiosk, water fountain and trash receptacle.

Mr. Lien advised that the proposed trail would extend from the east edge of Mathay Ballinger Park northward along 74th Avenue West to 228th Street Southwest. An additional trail section would extend north from 244th Street Southwest to intersect with the main trail improvement section at McAleer Way (See Attachment 9). He said State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review was required for the Interurban Trail Project, which triggers the requirement for a public hearing before the Architectural Design Board. However, apart from the trail itself, the only real improvements for the Board to review are those at the intersection of 76th Avenue West and McAleer Way known as the Ballinger Station Plaza. No other landscaping or street furniture is proposed for other reaches of the Interurban Trail within the City of Edmonds. He explained that, as proposed, the Ballinger Station Plaza would include a shelter with a bench and historical interpretive panels, information kiosk, drinking fountain, lighted bollards, and associated landscaping. Basket-weave paving is proposed for the plaza and the associated 76th Avenue West crossing. He noted that the bollards are intended to protect the existing driveways that serve the residents along 74th Avenue West. He provided a drawing to illustrate what the proposed project would look like.

Mr. Lien explained that the Ballinger Station site is located completely within the City of Edmonds right-of-way and the City does not have landscaping regulations that apply to City projects within the right-of-way. The closest landscaping regulations from ECDC 20.13 is Type III, which is intended to provide visual separation of uses from streets and visual separation of compatible uses so as to soften the appearance of streets, parking areas and building elevations. It calls for evergreen and deciduous trees, with no more than 50 percent being deciduous. The trees must be a minimum six feet in height and be planted at intervals no greater than 30 feet on center. He referred to Attachment 3, which illustrates the proposed landscaping for Ballinger Station. It appears to approximate Type III Landscaping, with the exception that no evergreens have been proposed. He noted that general design review site treatment guidelines states that landscape treatment shall be provided to buffer the development from surrounding property where conflict may result and that all screening should be effective in the winter as well as the summer. In addition, the objective of the City's Comprehensive Plan Urban Design Element for landscape buffers is to create a visual barrier between different uses and maintain privacy of single-family residential uses. He expressed staff's belief that planting only deciduous trees may result in insufficient screening in the winter. If 50 percent were evergreen, a year-round buffer would be provided.

Mr. Lien referred to Page 1 of Attachment 2, which identifies a number of elements (street furniture) associated with the project. He explained that design guidelines in ECDC 20.11 state that street furniture should be compatible with the existing planned character of the nearby area, and more guidance is provided in Appendix A of the City of Edmonds Streetscape Plan (Attachment 13). He noted that while the proposed trash receptacle (Attachment 5) and drinking fountain (Attachment 6) are not identical to those in the Streetscape Plan, they both appear to be similar in design. In addition, it appears from the Streetscape Plan that street furniture is supposed to be black, and all structures associated with the Ballinger Station Plaza would be painted black, as well. He noted that as per code requirement, all structures would be less than 15 feet in height.

Mr. Lien referred to the design guidelines in ECDC 20.11, which state that exterior lighting shall be the minimum necessary for safety and security. All lighting must be low-rise and directed downward onto the site. In addition, all lighting standards and patterns must be compatible with the overall design theme. He noted that the only lights associated with the project are the lighted bollards (Attachment 7), which comply with the design guidelines. There will be no street lighting along the trail.

Mr. Lien concluded that the proposed landscaping associated with the project provides a buffer between the Interurban Trail and neighboring residential development. However, staff feels the landscape buffer should include some evergreen trees in order to be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan, Type III Landscaping in ECDC 20.13, and design guidelines in ECDC 20.11. Staff believes the proposed street furniture is consistent with the design guidelines in the Streetscape Plan and ECDC 20.11. He reviewed that ECDC 20.11.030.C.1 indicates that community facilities and public or quasi-public improvements should not conflict with the existing and planned character of the nearby area. Staff does not feel the Interurban Trail Project and the Ballinger Station Plaza will conflict with the character of the area. Instead, it will be an improvement over existing conditions. He recommended the Board approve the proposal with the conditions outlined in the Staff Report.

Board Member Broadway inquired if any provisions have been made to provide signage to alert vehicles moving north and south of the crossing. Mr. McIntosh answered that the Transportation Master Plan identifies the need to provide some type of warning at the intersection where the trail crosses 76th Avenue West. However, they are not certain what the solution will be. The proposed bollards would help slow traffic down, and trail markings would be provided on 76th Avenue West to make vehicular traffic aware of bicycle traffic. In addition, signage would be placed throughout the trail to alert bicyclists and pedestrians as they approach vehicular intersections. Board Member Mestres pointed out that on the portion of the Interurban Trail that goes from Lake Union to Kenmore there are stop signs on each side of streets that cross the trail. He suggested this approach would make the Edmonds crossings safe, as well.

Vice Chair Schaefer asked where the nearest bus stop to the trail is located. Mr. McIntosh answered that from the plaza looking west, a bus stop is located just a few feet from the left hand side of the plaza. Mr. Schaefer agreed there needs to be some rigorous safety constraints for the crossings to address potential conflicts between pedestrians, bicycles and vehicles.

Vice Chair Schaefer emphasized that the scope of the Board's review is limited strictly to the Ballinger Station Plaza portion of the project. While SEPA review was required for the entire project, the remaining areas are not within the Board's purview. Mr. Lien clarified that because no other design is associated with the project, the Staff Report focuses on the Ballinger Station Plaza. The only additional Board consideration would be related to potential landscaping along other lengths of the trail. However, staff does not believe there is space for landscaping along the 74th Avenue portion of the trail. He described how the right-of-way that would be used for the Interurban Trail is lined with fences with no space for additional landscaping. He noted that portions of the trail would also run along the back yards of residential properties.

Vice Chair Schaefer agreed that Type III Landscaping would be the most appropriate standard for the project. However, he agreed with staff that at least 50% of the trees should be coniferous. He asked if staff has in mind specific species of coniferous trees that would grow large enough to provide screening but not too large as to pose a safety hazard in the

future. Mr. Lien answered that the Streetscape Plan identifies various species that could be considered. Vice Chair Schaefer expressed concern that if the trees are located between the trail and the shelter, they need to be concerned about how wide they will grow and how much they will screen the shelter. It is also important to consider maintenance requirements.

Carol Chapman, Edmonds, said that she has lived on her property overlooking the Interurban Trail for many years. She expressed concern that residents living on 74th Avenue West must back out of their driveways, and this could result in a safety hazard. She said she was glad to hear that no lighting would be provided along the trail since they are concerned that the trail not be used when it is dark. She suggested that more study is needed before the project is approved. The area is beautiful, and she invited Board Members to visit. The area is very tranquil, with people walking with their pets and children. It has always been a quiet place, and they don't want to see too many bicyclists.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Vice Chair Schaefer referred to the map and noted that the portion of the trail along 74th Avenue West would be striped as a bicycle lane, along with curbs and gutters. Mr. Lien explained that 74th Avenue West is a very narrow street, and .9 miles of the trail would be a shared-use facility with 14-foot lanes on the left for vehicular traffic and 6-foot lanes for bicycles and pedestrians. Vice Chair Schaefer asked if there are driveways on the right hand side where the bicycle lane would be located. A member of the audience answered that there is one driveway on the east side that provides access to multiple homes. Vice Chair Schaefer asked if this driveway backs into traffic, and a member of the audience answered no. Vice Chair Schaefer summarized that the driveways that are limited to backing into the street are located on the west side. That means they would back onto the street portion rather than the Interurban Trail.

Chair Kendall asked the Board to comment on whether the proposed landscaping would adequately buffer the residential properties. Mr. McIntosh advised that City staff has met several times with the two property owners who would be impacted by the proposed plaza, and they are very supportive of the project. The existing fence would be replaced with a six-foot cyclone fence similar to what is used in other City parks. The black furniture, garbage receptacle and water fountain would have an older look to give the feeling that you are still in the 1930's, and Shoreline has tried to do the same with their amenities. This is important, particularly at this site, because of its connection with history. The graphics inside the shelter would provide a history of the community.

Board Member Gootee pointed out that no signage has been proposed to identify the Ballinger Station. Mr. McIntosh referred to Page 3 of Attachment 3 and noted that a sign would be placed on top of the shelter to identify the plaza.

Vice Chair Schaefer pointed out that the Staff Report does not talk about landscaping requirements for the remaining portion of the trail. It is important that the record is clear that the Board has considered its responsibility to SEPA. Much of the trail would be channelized onto existing streets, so no additional landscaping would be provided.

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY MOVED THAT, BASED ON THE ANALYSIS IN THE STAFF REPORT, THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD APPROVE FILE NUMBER PLN20100044, AN APPLICATION TO CONSTRUCT A 1.37 MILE PAVED RECREATIONAL TRAIL, INCLUDING THE CONSTRUCTION OF BALLINGER STATION PLAZA, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. AT LEAST FIFTY (50) PERCENT OF THE TREES ALONG THE SOUTH SIDE OF BALLINGER STATION PLAZA AND BETWEEN THE DRIVEWAY AND THE INTERURBAN TRAIL PORTION LEAVING BALLINGER STATION SHALL BE EVERGREEN SPECIES.**
- 2. APPLICANT IS REQUIRED TO SUBMIT A SEPARATE RIGHT-OF-WAY CONSTRUCTION PERMIT FOR ALL WORK PERFORMED WITHIN THE CITY RIGHT-OF-WAY. THE PROJECT WILL BE REVIEWED FOR COMPLIANCE WITH STORMWATER MANAGEMENT, EROSION CONTROL AND CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS UNDER THE RIGHT-OF-WAY PERMIT.**

3. THE APPLICANT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR SEEKING AND OBTAINING ALL OTHER REQUIRED LOCAL, STATE AND FEDERAL PERMITS.

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:

It was noted that the Board's next meeting is scheduled for August 18th.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.