

APPROVED

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

March 16, 2011

Chair Kendall called the 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
Bryan Gootee
Michael Mestres
Bruce O'Neill
Tom Walker

Board Members Absent

Rick Schaefer, Vice Chair (excused)
Lois Broadway (excused)

Staff Present

Jen Machuga, Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER MESTRES MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2011 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

No changes were made to the agenda.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

There was no one in the audience.

CONSENT AGENDA:

There were no items on the consent agenda.

MINOR PROJECTS:

File Number PLN20110004: An application by Rick Utt on behalf of Elliot Shaw for design revisions to the building permit (BLD20080790) for the partially completed building, formerly known as the Greenberg Building. The site is located at 155 – 3rd Avenue South in the Downtown Business (BD2) zone. However, the current building permit (BLD20080790) was vested to the former development and design requirements of the Community Business (BC) zone.

Jen Machuga presented the staff report, which was identified in the record as Exhibit 1. She explained that the property is located at 155 – 3rd Avenue South in what is now the Downtown Business 2 (BD2) zone. The mixed-use project was approved by the ADB in 2003, and the Hearing Examiner granted a variance for the use of the ground floor as a parking

garage. Building permits were subsequently issued for the project. However, at the time of the original ADB and variance reviews and building permit approval, the site was located within the Community Business (BC) zone. She advised that the building permit for the subject development is currently active and vested to the code requirements for the BC zone that were in affect at the time of the permit approval.

Ms. Machuga explained that during construction, certain elements of the building were not constructed per the approved building permit plans, and the building has been unfinished for a numbers of years. Ownership of the building changed last year, and the new owner, Elliot Shaw, wishes to complete construction. Because the new owner is seeking to modify some design elements and make changes to the approved landscape plan, design review and a revision to the approved building permit plans is required.

Ms. Machuga pointed out the following aspects of the current building construction that are inconsistent with the design plans approved in 2003 by the ADB:

1. The size of the windows is smaller than what was approved in the plan. The style is different, as well.
2. The brick columns on the building are constructed differently than the approved plans. In particular, the column on the south façade does not extend to the same elevation as the other columns. The applicant is proposing to place caps on the columns to finish them off.
3. The wing wall in the southwest corner of the building is not shown in the approved plan. Staff is recommending removal of this wing wall to open up the building at the corner and to give further relief to the south façade.
4. The applicant is proposing to amend the landscape plan by changing the street tree species to one that is consistent with the City's approved street tree plan. The applicant is also proposing to change a few shrubs to a similar variety and size.

Ms. Machuga provided pictures of the current building. She referred to a picture of the western façade of the building to illustrate the wing wall that is required to meet the fire code. However, she noted that the wing wall in the southwest corner of the building is not required and is not shown on the approved plan. Staff is recommending this wing wall be removed. She referred to Page 11 of the applicant's submittal (Attachment 8), which is the building elevation that was originally approved by the ADB in 2003. She noted that the wing wall in the southwest corner was not part of the design approval. There were supposed to be railings in this location instead.

Rick Utt, Cornerstone Architecture, 6161 Northeast 175th Avenue, Kenmore, WA, was present to represent the property owners, Elliot and Sonya Shaw. Mr. Utt submitted two potential design schemes (C.1 and C.2), which were identified in the record as Exhibit 2. He said he was hired by the property owner to go through this unusual process of asking for design review of an existing structure. He agreed with staff that some elements of the current building are inconsistent with the design plan that was originally approved by the ADB. He suggested that rather than reviewing past history, the Board should focus their attention on what it would take for the existing building to comply with the design requirements.

Mr. Utt said the property owner would prefer to retain the wing wall rather than tear it out. He provided drawings to illustrate what was originally approved and what was actually constructed. He pointed out that the original design provided modulation of the roof lines. However, during construction, it was found that the building would exceed the building height requirement for the BC zone. The previous owner was required to remove a portion of the top of the building (southeast) to comply with the height requirement. He advised that the columns on either side of the entrance are actually the same height. However, because the original roofline had to be lowered on a portion of the building, they appear to be different heights. He observed that both columns line up evenly with the upper windows. The difference is in the height of the parapet, itself. He suggested that raising the column to address the disparity could be awkward. He said he likes the two taller columns in the center of the southern façade because they frame and call attention to the building entrance. The property owner would prefer not to reduce the columns to the height of those at the corner.

Chair Kendall clarified that the column issue can be compared to a situation of trying to hang a picture on a crooked wall. She questioned if the column to the west of the entrance should be made taller to provide the optical illusion that it is the same height as the column to the right. Board Member Gootee pointed out that if the applicant were to remove the wing wall in the southwest corner of the building, perhaps the remaining portion of the wall could be altered to address the column situation. Mr. Utt again stated the property owner would like to avoid having to remove the wing wall, if possible. Member O'Neill expressed his belief that adding caps on the columns would provide a positive change to the completed project. He suggested that perhaps the caps would allow the columns to appear more even. Mr. Utt agreed that adding caps to the columns would improve their appearance and help address the Board's concerns.

Board Member O'Neill recalled that staff is recommending changes to the building to make the design more symmetrical, yet removing the wing wall in the southwest would make the western façade less symmetrical because there is a wing wall on the northwest corner, too. Mr. Utt explained that the wing wall in the southwest corner was built to provide wind protection for the balcony. He suggested an alternative to removing the wing wall would be to provide daylight options that could be closed and/or shuttered for wind protection. Board Member Gootee referred to Scheme C.1 (Exhibit 2) and noted that removing the wing wall would make the building more symmetrical and would not be an impractical requirement to impose on the applicant.

Board Member Mestres noted that the windows used during construction are different in style and size than those approved in 2003 as part of the original building permit. Ms. Machuga agreed and added that the windows identified in the plan that was approved as part of the building permit are actually smaller than the original submittal that was approved by the ADB. Mr. Utt pointed out that although the existing windows are different than what was approved, they are still consistent with the design code requirements.

Board Member Mestres pointed out that because some elements of the construction are not consistent with what was originally approved by the ADB, they should require some changes to the design to show they made an effort to bring the building back to what was originally approved in 2003.

Board Member O'Neill requested more information about the railings that would be placed above the existing balcony parapets. Mr. Utt advised that steel railings would be placed on top of all the existing balcony parapets. Elliot Shaw, owner, added that the railings would extend up 8 inches, with a 1.5-inch cap on top.

Once again, Board Member O'Neill pointed out that if the wing wall in the southwest corner is removed, the western façade would not be symmetrical. Mr. Utt explained that the wing wall in the southwest corner is probably the most prominent. If the Board's goal is to provide symmetry throughout the entire building, they could add wing walls at all four corners. However, this would be a costly solution for the applicant. Board Member Gootee pointed out that adding wing walls at all corners would make the building appear too boxy, which is not the intent of the original design.

Board Member O'Neill observed that what is really missing from the building are capitals to terminate and bond the columns to the building. Mr. Utt said the capitals proposed in the original plan were supposed to be concrete, which would be somewhat prohibitive now. The applicant is now proposing a simple and economic solution of sheet metal column capitals. However, he acknowledged that this solution would not raise the height of the column to the west of the entrance.

Board Member Gootee suggested that Scheme C.1 (Exhibit 2) would be a good solution and represents a design that the ADB would likely approve regardless of past history. He said he is interested in reaching a compromise that does not require the property owner to go through an inordinate amount of changes. The design identified in Scheme C.1 appears to be symmetrical and pleasing and would be a good solution to address the staff's concerns, as well.

Board Member Mestres asked what color the metal column caps would be. Mr. Utt answered that they would stay with the same color scheme that currently exists on the building. The caps would match the current building trim. Board

Member O'Neill inquired if the proposed cap would intrude into the setback area. Mr. Utt answered that he did not believe that would be the case.

Board Member Gootee recalled that in the past, there have been situations where the drawings approved by the ADB are different than what is actually constructed. He suggested the Board require the applicant to submit a rendering to illustrate the colors and finishes so the expected end product is clear. Ms. Machuga explained that because of the nature of the proposed changes, the applicant would be required to submit new drawings that are consistent with what the ADB approves. Board Member Gootee pointed out that the building is essentially constructed, and the applicant has identified the changes that would be made. He suggested it is within staff's purview to make sure the additional features and details are in keeping with the plans approved by the ADB.

Ms. Machuga asked if the cap on the column to the west of the southern entrance would be extended all the way up to the roof trim. Mr. Utt answered that it would not, and some of the stucco would still be exposed. Ms. Machuga suggested that perhaps the applicant could pull the brick up so the stucco is no longer visible. Mr. Utt suggested that another option would be to cover the exposed stucco with trim board. The Board agreed that the height of the column to the west of the entrance should not be changed, but the exposed stucco above the column should be covered with trim board. The Board also concurred that the wing wall in the southwest corner should be removed, and that the windows could remain as they currently exist.

Ms. Machuga reviewed that the proposed changes to the landscape plan are minimal. One change would make the street tree variety consistent with the City's approved Street Tree Plan, which is appropriate. The other change would replace some species with another of similar size and variety. She said staff supports the landscape plan changes as proposed.

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL MOVED THAT THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD APPROVE THE PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE APPROVED BUILDING DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING DESCRIBED IN FILE PLN20110004 WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE WING-WALL MUST BE REMOVED FROM THE SOUTHWESTERN CORNER OF THE BUILDING AND METAL RAILINGS INSTALLED ON TOP OF THE EXISTING BALCONY PARAPETS.**
- 2. THE BRICK COLUMN ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE ENTRANCE ON THE SOUTHERN BUILDING FAÇADE SHALL REMAIN THE HEIGHT IT IS WITH THE STUCCO ABOVE THAT COLUMN TO BE COVERED WITH SIDING OR FACIA. A DECORATIVE CAP SHALL BE ADDED TO ALL COLUMNS.**
- 3. IF CHANGES ARE TO BE MADE FROM THE BUILDING PERMIT PLANS APPROVED UNDER BLD20080790, A REVISION TO THE BUILDING PERMIT MAY BE REQUIRED BY THE BUILDING DIVISION.**
- 4. REVISIONS TO THE BUILDING SHALL BE LOCATED WITHIN PRIVATE PROPERTY, OR SEPARATE REVIEW AND APPROVAL TO AMEND THE EXISTING ENCROACHMENT PERMIT (RECORDED UNDER AFN 200508301346) SHALL BE REQUIRED.**
- 5. A RIGHT-OF-WAY CONSTRUCTION PERMIT WILL BE REQUIRED FOR ANY WORK THAT REQUIRES STAGING OR USE OF THE CITY RIGHT-OF-WAY.**
- 6. THIS APPLICATION IS SUBJECT TO THE APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS CONTAINED IN THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE (ECDC) AND BUILDING CODE, AND IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH THE VARIOUS PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE ORDINANCES.**

BOARD MEMBER MESTRES SECONDED THE MOTION.

BOARD MEMBER GOOTEE OFFERED A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO ADD THE FOLLOWING CONDITION:

- 7. THAT SCHEME C.1 IN EXHIBIT 2 BE BINDING AND THAT A RENDERING BE SUBMITTED TO STAFF AS PART OF THE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION.**

BOARD MEMBER MESTRES SECONDED THE FRIENDLY AMENDMENT, WHICH WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

THE MAIN MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED AS AMENDED.

PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS:

No public hearings for Major Projects were scheduled on the agenda.

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.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

Election of 2011 Officers

Chair Kendall noted that she has been chair for a number of years, and believes it is time for a change in leadership. Board Member Gootee indicated he would be willing to serve as chair. The Board agreed to postpone election of officers until more Board Members were present to participate.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.