

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

June 15, 2011

Chair Kendall called the meeting of the Architectural Design Board to order at 7:05 p.m., at the City Council Chambers, 250 - 5th Avenue North, Edmonds, Washington.

Board Members Present

Valerie Kendall, Chair
Lois Broadway
Bryan Gootee
Michael Mestres
Bruce O'Neill
Tom Walker

Board Members Absent

Rick Schaefer, Vice Chair (excused)

Staff Present

Gina Coccia, Planner
Mike Clugston, Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

BOARD MEMBER WALKER MOVED THAT THE AGENDA BE ACCEPTED AS PRESENTED. BOARD MEMBER GOOTEE 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 meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA:

There were no items on the consent agenda.

MINOR PROJECTS:

File Number PLN-2009-0047: An application by Richard Kirschner for an amendment to an existing landscaping plan for two duplexes located at 7616 – 7618 and 7620 – 7622 202nd Place Southwest

Mr. Clugston presented the Staff Report, and Richard Kirschner was present to represent the applicant.

Mr. Clugston reviewed that in late 2009 the applicant applied for a Type II permit (staff decision with notice) to update an existing landscaping plan in order to remove three mature Douglas fir trees on the northern portions of the subject site.

The permit was approved in early 2010 with several conditions as noted in Exhibit 1 of the Staff Report. It was noted during the staff review that a great deal of the landscaping had been changed and/or removed from the time when it was originally approved in 1977. Condition 1 required the applicant to either reinstall the landscaping as it had been approved in 1977 or submit an updated landscaping plan to the Architectural Design Board (ADB) for review and approval. The replacement proposal submitted as part of the updated landscaping plan that was submitted by the applicant in 2009 was not code compliant and could not be approved by staff.

Mr. Clugston referred to Exhibit 2 (existing landscaping on the site) and Exhibit 4 (proposed landscaping). He specifically noted the location of the three trees that are proposed for removal; two on the eastern site and one on the western site along the northern yards. He explained that staff has already approved the proposed tree removal, but they are seeking direction from the Board about what the appropriate replacement should be. He advised that as replacement for the removed trees, the applicant is proposing to plant two Thuja hedge rows along the southern and western property lines. Given the property's location relative to surrounding parcels, Type II landscaping would be appropriate, and staff does not believe an evergreen hedge would meet this criteria. Staff also questions whether the hedge would make up for the loss of three, mature fir trees.

Mr. Clugston referred to Attachment 2 of Exhibit 1, which illustrates the landscaping that existed prior to development in 1977. He noted that numerous trees were removed from the southern portion of the property when the site was developed. He acknowledged that the landscape code allows the ADB to interpret and modify the requirements. He observed that there is a good deal of existing landscaping on the site. The question is whether the ADB is satisfied with the proposed hedge as a replacement or if they would prefer to see something more akin to the Type II landscaping called out in the code. He noted that, commonly, trees that are removed from multi-family parcels are required to be replaced with a similar species at a ratio of 2:1 or 3:1. If the Board is not satisfied with the proposed replacement hedge, he invited them to provide further direction to staff.

Board Member O'Neill said he viewed the pictures provided by the applicant and visited the site and he does not have a concern about allowing the applicant to remove the three mature fir trees, but he is concerned that the site is not being well maintained.

Board Member Mestres expressed his belief that requiring two or three replacement trees for each of the removed trees would be an absurd requirement for the subject site, which is already heavily landscaped. Mr. Clugston agreed the site already has a substantial amount of landscaping, and the code does allow the ADB some flexibility when making landscaping decisions.

Chair Kendall inquired if the Board is being asked to ignore the fact that a number of trees were removed without a permit before the applicant submitted his application in 2009. Mr. Clugston said these facts are informative, but not relevant to the current application. Chair Kendall said she read in the report that the trees that are proposed for removal have been poorly trimmed, which has compromised their health. They have been identified as a hazard to the residential units. Mr. Clugston referred to the certified arborist report, which was included in Exhibit 1. It indicates the three mature trees were not maintained well and could pose a safety threat. Again, he reminded the Board that staff initially approved the applicant's request to remove the three trees, but they are seeking direction from the Board as to an adequate replacement requirement.

Richard Kirshner, Edmonds, explained that the site was developed 35 years ago when development code requirements were much different. The landscape plan (Attachment 3, Exhibit 1) submitted with the original building permit application was preliminary, and many changes were made during construction. He challenged Mr. Clugston's comment that two dozen trees were either trimmed or removed from the southern property line. He said he recently counted only 10 stumps in this location. He referred to an aerial photograph, which illustrates that the majority of mature trees are located to the south of the subject property. Because of the shadows created by the trees, there appear to be more trees than what actually exist.

Mr. Kirschner compared the proposed landscape plan with the original landscape plan that was submitted in 1977 and pointed out that the parking area was moved to be located between the two buildings, and there are walkways and patios in the rear. Many of the trees that previously existed were small and deciduous. They had to be removed to accommodate building construction equipment. In addition, the parking that was to be located on the right side of the building was moved to the left to be closer to the building and to allow the subject trees to be retained. He emphasized that he obtained the required building permits for the existing development, which was done according to code requirements at the time.

Mr. Kirschner pointed out that he is not proposing to remove the trees to provide a better view. He is requesting permission to remove the trees because an arborist report has indicated they are unhealthy and pose a danger. He noted that the arborist who prepared the report would not be responsible for the tree removal. Therefore, there is no economic value in declaring the trees unhealthy. Mr. Kirschner said he does not want to remove the existing landscaping and plant new landscaping consistent with the plan that was approved in 1977. Instead, he is proposing to remove the three trees with a crane so as not to disturb and/or damage the existing landscaping. He pointed out that the tenants are under contract to maintain their own yards. Chair Kendall clarified that the staff and Board is recommending that Mr. Kirschner convert his landscaping to be consistent with the 1977 plan. Neither are they arguing about whether or not he should be allowed to remove the three trees. Staff is seeking input about what appropriate replacement plantings should be required.

Once again, Mr. Kirschner stated that the trees are dangerous, and he referred to letters he received from his insurance carrier, State Farm, stating that they would no longer renew his policy after August because the trees, which have a significant overhang, pose too much of a threat. He noted that the roots of the trees are also destroying the walkways, parking areas, and utility system. They represent a liability and the branches fall down all the time onto people's cars and property. He summarized that there is much more landscaping now than what existed when the site was developed. He said he does not plan to remove any of the existing landscaping, with the exception of the three trees. He believes the best location for replacement landscaping is along the border of the subject property to screen the tenants from the new development that is taking place on an adjacent property.

Board Member Broadway asked if the applicant is proposing to remove the stump and roots when the trees are taken down. Mr. Kirschner answered that he is not planning to remove the stumps and roots because he does not want to damage the surrounding landscaping. However, he will remove roots that are interfering with the sidewalk and parking lot areas. He said he plans to leave the trunks, as well, and either plant landscaping to screen them or place large planters on top.

Board Member Mestres asked the applicant to submit a copy of the letter he received from his insurance carrier into the record. Mr. Clugston noted that the letter was included in the Staff Report as Attachment 6. Mr. Kirschner also submitted an additional copy of the letter. Chair Kendall suggested that rather than requiring tree removal, the insurance company appears to be asking the applicant to trim the trees and resolve the tripping hazards caused by the roots. However, she acknowledged that the actual tree removal is not the subject of the current hearing. The subject of the hearing is related to replacement.

Board Member O'Neill suggested the applicant should be more specific about what he plans to do with the stump and roots associated with each tree. Mr. Kirschner said that many arborists he has talked to have encouraged him to leave the roots and stump in place so that surrounding landscaping is not damaged. Wherever possible, he would install plant materials to screen the stumps, but it may be difficult to dig down in the area surrounding the stumps. Mr. Clugston suggested that staff could work with the applicant to address the issue of stumps and roots once they have guidance from the Board about the replacement requirement.

Chair Kendall said she is not opposed to the applicant providing a hedge on the south and west property lines, but the hedge should not be considered an appropriate replacement for the three mature trees that would be removed. She said she understands that a 3:1 replacement ratio may be too onerous, but she would like to discuss the option of requiring the

applicant to plant one fir tree somewhere on the site to replace each of the trees being removed. Mr. Kirschner referred the Board to the numerous pictures he provided to illustrate the existing landscaping in the area. Chair Kendall agreed there is significant landscaping, but there would be no fir trees.

Board Member Walker said he supports the proposal to remove the three trees. However, he suggested the existing landscaping should be trimmed and better maintained. The areas where the stumps would be located are open enough that they could be ground out so that new trees could be planted. He suggested smaller growing species such as Hinoki Cypress, Serbian Spruce, etc., which would provide additional variety in the landscaped areas. Board Member Gootee agreed with Board Member Walker that it would not be a tall order to ask the applicant to grind out the stumps and plant replacement trees that are smaller and easier to maintain. This approach would be consistent with the intent of the original landscape plan. Board Member Broadway expressed her opinion that leaving the stumps behind would be detrimental to the appearance along the front of the building. The tree removal should be dealt with in an aesthetically pleasing way. She would support a requirement that the stumps be ground out and that replacement trees be planted. Once again, Board Member Walker emphasized the need to prune back the existing shrubs before planting the new trees so there is more light. This is particularly important when planting small coniferous trees.

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL MOVED THAT THE BOARD ALLOW THE THREE LARGE DOUGLAS FIR TREES TO BE REMOVED AND REPLACED WITH THREE MINIMUM-SIZED, 8-FOOT EVERGREEN TREES. THE STUMPS SHOULD BE GROUND BELOW GRADE. HE FURTHER MOVED THAT THE BOARD ALLOW STAFF DISCRETION TO DETERMINE THE SPECIES AND LOCATION OF THE REPLACEMENT TREES. BOARD MEMBER WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Board Member Mestres questioned if the ADB's purview allows them the authority to require stump removal. Mr. Clugston answered that the Board can require that the stumps be ground out to accommodate the replacement trees. However, some leeway is necessary to determine whether it is actually possible without damaging existing landscaping. He summarized that the Board is not against the applicant's proposal to add hedge rows along the south and west property lines. However, the hedges would not constitute an appropriate replacement for the trees. Instead, the Board would require three replacement trees. Chair Kendall agreed that the Board is not opposed to the proposed hedge, but it is not a requirement of the proposal.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS:

File Number PLN-2011-0007: A Type III-B design review application for a new mixed-use commercial and multi-family development at 23014 and 23020 Edmonds Way in the RM-EW and BC-EW zones. The project proposes 89 dwelling units, 6009 square feet of commercial office space, parking for 144 cars, grading of 10,000 cubic yards, and 500 cubic yards of fill

Ms. Coccia presented the Staff Report and Chris Davidson, Architect, Studio Meng Strazzara, and Mark Brumbaugh, Landscape Architect, Brumbaugh Associates, were present to represent the property owner, GRE Edmonds Way, LLC.

Ms. Coccia advised that the proposal is for design review approval of the site, landscaping, and proposed building designs of the GRE Edmonds Way mixed-use project located at 23014 and 23020 Edmonds Way in the Community Business Edmonds Way (BC-EW) and Multiple-Residential Edmonds Way (RM-EW) zones.

Ms. Coccia explained that she would briefly describe the review process and then the applicant's representatives would be invited to present their proposal. The public comment period would follow the applicant's presentation, and then the ADB would conduct their deliberations. A synopsis of the ADB's final decision would be mailed out to parties of record on Friday. She advised that after the Staff Report was sent out, the City received an additional comment letter from Linda Nomellini on June 13th. The letter was identified as Exhibit 2. She noted that the applicant's representatives may

also submit revised pages, which would be entered sequentially into the record to replace any existing pages in Attachment 1.

Ms. Coccia announced that a pre-application meeting was conducted between the applicant and staff to review the initial proposal and identify potential concerns. Because issues were sorted out early in the process, staff's design review was able to move quickly. She also announced that because the project prompts review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), review by the Architectural Design Board (ADB) is required as a Type III-B development application. The ADB will review the proposed design and make the final decision on whether the proposal is consistent with the design review criteria found in ECDC 20.11 (general design review), ECDC 16.30 and ECDC 16.50 (zoning ordinance), ECDC 20.13 (landscaping), and the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Coccia reviewed that a SEPA review was required because the project would contain 89 dwelling units, as well as 6000 square feet of commercial office space, parking for 144 vehicles, and grading of 10,000 cubic yards. The proposal was reviewed by several City departments to identify probable significant adverse environmental impacts that are not already covered by the City's codes and ordinances. It was concluded that no extra mitigating measures would be required, and the City issued a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) on May 27, 2011 (Attachment 8). No comments or appeals were received. She concluded that both the City and the applicant have complied with the SEPA requirements. She referred to a project that was proposed for this same site a few years ago, for which the City issued a Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance (MDNS). She explained that because the access would be different, the mitigation proposed at that time would not be required of this project.

Ms. Coccia explained that in order to approve the project, the ADB must find that it is compliant with applicable Development Code requirements. She briefly reviewed the purpose of each code section as follows:

ECDC 16.30.030 – RM-EW

- To reserve and regulate areas for a variety of housing types and a range of greater densities than are available in the single-family residential zones, while still maintaining a residential environment.
- To provide for those additional uses which complement and are compatible with the multiple residential uses.

Ms. Coccia explained that only residential development is proposed for the northern site, which is zoned RM-EW. Therefore, it appears the proposal meets the zoning requirements of ECDC 16.30.

ECDC 16.50.005 – BC-EW

- To reserve areas for those retail stores, offices, service establishments and amusement establishments which offer goods and services to the entire community.
- To ensure compact, convenient development patterns by allowing uses that are operated chiefly within buildings.
- To allow for mixed-use development which includes multiple dwelling unit(s) that support business uses.
- To implement the policies of the Edmonds Comprehensive Plan for the Edmonds Way Corridor.
- To meet the goals of the Growth Management Act and the City of Edmonds' Comprehensive Plan for housing diversity and economic vitality.

Ms. Coccia reminded the Board that there is no density limit for the southern BC-EW zoned parcel. The number of units would be determined by height, setback, landscaping, and parking requirements. It appears the zoning requirements of ECDC 16.50 can be achieved by the proposal.

ECDC 17.50.000 (Parking)

- To reduce street congestion and avoid crowding of on-street parking space.
- To require adequate landscaping of off-street parking areas.
- To protect adjacent property from the impact of a use with inadequate off-street parking.

Ms. Coccia stressed the need to provide adequate on-site parking so that the surrounding neighborhoods are not negatively impacted. She explained that the plan shows 144 stalls provided across both parcels, leaving 13 for the commercial uses. If the commercial uses were solely retail, 20.03 spaces (1:600 square feet) would be required. Office space (1:800 square feet) would require 15.02 stalls, while a service use would require 10.02 stalls. The applicant has indicated that future tenants would be offices with no customer service, which would only require 8 stalls. However, because they are not sure who the tenant spaces will be leased to in the future, staff is concerned that problems will come up down the road. Staff would like to avoid the need to deny a business license to a company that would like customers to visit because the new building is under parked. She emphasized that the parking requirements will have to be worked out prior to the applicant submitting for a building permit application. This is usually accomplished through a mix of uses that require different ratios as outlined in proposed Condition 2.

ECDC 20.10.000 (Design Review)

- To encourage the realization and conservation of a desirable and aesthetic environment in the City of Edmonds.
- To encourage and promote development which features amenities and excellence in the form of variations of siting, types of structures, and adaption to and conservation of topography and other natural features.
- To encourage creative approaches to use of land and related physical developments.
- To encourage the enhancement and preservation of land or building of unique or outstanding scenic or historical significance.
- To minimize incompatible and unsightly surroundings and visual blight which prevent orderly community development and reduce community property values.

Ms. Coccia explained that the ADB has certain leeway to condition various aspects of the project to meet the intent of this section of the code. Staff believes the project, as conditioned, meets the general design review criteria.

ECDC 20.13.000 (Landscaping)

Ms. Coccia explained that the landscape requirements found in this chapter are intended for use by City staff, the ADB and the Hearing Examiner in reviewing projects as set forth in ECDC 20.11.010. The ADB and Hearing Examiner are allowed to interpret and modify the requirements, provided such modification is consistent with the purpose found in ECDC 20.10.000. She referred the Board to the thorough landscape plans submitted by the applicant to identify the type, size and location of proposed plantings, as well as existing vegetation that would remain intact. She said the landscape plan appears to fulfill the requirement that some mature trees be preserved.

Ms. Coccia advised that the application was reviewed by the Fire District, Engineering Division, Public Works Department, Parks and Recreation Department, Building Division and Planning Division. The Fire Marshal warned that the fire lane striping will need to be identified on the site plan. He also noted that guest parking is typically an issue for residents. The Engineering Department reviewed the low-impact development (LID) techniques proposed and found them to be satisfactory. They encouraged the applicant to provide pervious pavement and rain gardens where feasible. The downstream analysis and traffic impact analysis have been reviewed and found to be acceptable. The Parks Department has requested that the street tree species should be changed to "Acer Rubrum Bowhall Maple" for consistency with an adjacent project. She reminded the Board that a thorough review by all affected departments would be conducted with a complete building permit application.

Ms. Coccia referred to a public comment letter from Claudia Olney (Exhibit 1, Attachment 9), which voiced concerns about height and privacy. Ms. Coccia noted that projects can be built to the maximum height allowed in the zone, but the ADB could help mitigate the concerns by requiring a privacy hedge, etc. She also referred to the public comment letter submitted by Linda Nomellini. While none of her issues were related to design, Ms. Coccia felt it was important to briefly respond to the concerns she raised. She pointed out that some mature trees would be preserved as required by the code. Noise issue would be addressed by the noise ordinance found in ECC 5.30. Property values are handled by the

County Assessor and not the City. Apartment buildings are a permitted primary use. The proposal is a high-quality design with no indication of Section 8 housing. The units will consist mostly of studios and 1-bedroom units for urban professionals, and there will likely be few children. Traffic issues are reviewed by the Engineering Department. The owners did not apply for a rezone. They designed the project around the existing zoning designations and regulations.

Ms. Coccia recommended the Board approve the new GRE Edmonds Way mixed-use project as shown in File PLN-2001-0007, with the following conditions:

1. Update the street tree species to “Acer Rabrum Bowhall Maple.” The street tree species shall be re-reviewed by the City of Edmonds Parks and Recreation Department prior to building permit issuance.
2. The parking will need to be recalculated at the numbers provided in the code by:
 - Reducing the number of residential units, and/or
 - Reducing the amount of commercial space, and/or
 - Reassigning a portion of the commercial space to a lower parking ratio providing for a mix of commercial uses throughout the site.

Board Member O’Neill asked what would happen if the parking requirement is established based on a certain percentage of office and retail space and then the uses change over time. Ms. Coccia said that staff would review each tenant improvement application to ensure the parking requirement can be met. She referred to the building located at the corner of 220th Street and 76th Avenue, which has a parking ratio of 1 space for every 800 square feet of commercial space. However, the actual uses require a higher parking ratio, which cannot be met on site. She said the purpose of Condition 2 is to prevent a similar situation from occurring with the proposed new development.

Chair Kendall asked if the commercial and residential uses could share parking since their highest demands are at different times. Ms. Coccia answered that joint parking is addressed in the use chapter, but it does not offer a credit for joint-use situations. Chair Kendall stressed the importance of making sure the residential uses are not restricted from using the commercial parking spaces during non-business hours. Ms. Coccia pointed out that parking requirement issues are not within the Board’s purview.

Chris Davidson, Architect, Studio Meng Strazzara, Renton, said the subject property is located on Edmonds Way and 232nd Street. He provided photographs of the site, which is currently vacant. He said that, at one point, it was a series of residential lots, but the homes were demolished. There is a substantial amount of vegetation overgrowth, and the property is a “dead area” along the Edmonds Way Corridor. He referred to the site survey that illustrates the unique nature of the site, which had a significant impact on the way the site was designed. He explained that moving from north to south on Edmonds Way, there is approximately 15 to 20 feet of grade change across 670 linear feet of frontage. As you move east to west, the site is relative flat until you get close to the southern end where there is anywhere between 20 and 24 feet of vertical grade change over a 70-foot area. He noted that, with the grade change on the south side, the mixed-use building ends up with a good portion being screened from the single-family residential development to the west.

Mr. Davidson reviewed that 144 parking stalls are proposed for the site, 120 of which would be accessed from Edmonds Way. The remaining 24 spaces would be accessed from 232nd Street, which is where the primary entrance to the residential units would be located. Three access points are identified; two on Edmonds Way and one mid block of the site. He noted that as part of their initial review, the Fire District asked them to add an additional egress on the northern portion of the site.

As part of the additional height allowed for the project, Mr. Davidson said the applicant is required to incorporate LID techniques to mitigate storm water runoff. The proposed project would utilize an infiltration pipe in the northern parking aisle, which will mitigate up to 80% of the runoff from the site. The remaining 20% would be mitigated by the rain

garden that is proposed in the southern portion of the site. The rain garden would also help create a more park-like atmosphere and soften the edge of the parking area.

Mr. Davidson advised that the southern mixed-use building would be four stories, with three stories of residential units (20 units per floor) above the ground floor. The ground floor would be designed for office and retail uses and residential amenities. Some of the critical design elements of this building were influenced by the way the property line sawtooths in and out. The code also requires a step back on the upper floor in order to gain an extra five feet in height. The lower portion of the building would be setback five feet from the property line along Edmonds Way. Although the code only requires a four-foot setback, they are proposing five feet to provide an extra buffer between the building and the street. The building's façade along Edmonds Way would be modulated with 30-inch offsets. The original plan was for the entire lower level to be occupied by office uses. However, to address the parking concerns raised by staff, they are now proposing to dedicate 2,500 square feet of the lower level for residential amenities. The residential amenities would be centrally located so they are easily accessible to residents in both buildings.

Mr. Davidson said the northern building was designed to be a contemporary take on a traditional walk-up apartment design. This was partly driven by the height restrictions and step back requirement. The design is also intended to tie into the surrounding multi-family development, which provides open circulation. They are proposing a large fenestration package to make the façade more engaging. An additional street buffer with landscaping was added by setting the building back 15 feet. This allows space for individual patios for the lower units to make the development more street friendly and reduce the scale of the building. Twenty-five open parking spaces would be located behind the building. There would be five units on the ground floor, with 12 additional units on each of the upper floors, for a total of 29 residential units.

Mr. Davidson provided a materials board to illustrate the colors and types of materials proposed for the buildings. He explained that because the southern building is intended to have a contemporary, urban feel, they are proposing to start with a very strong base. They originally discussed using concrete masonry units (CMU), but in an effort to use more sustainable materials, they decided that architectural concrete with design fenestration would be more appropriate because it has a higher recycling material value. The exterior materials for the residential units on the south building would be smooth face cement fiber panel siding and stainless steel edging material. The bay wall would be charcoal gray, which is a fairly trendy and ties in well with the residential products. The accent color will be an orange "pop" color to add to the movement of the building. For the north building, they are proposing LP siding material on the push outs at each of the bases and smooth face cement fiber panel siding for the remainder of the building.

Mr. Davidson advised that the applicant has decided to pursue LEED certification for new construction (NC). He pointed out that the proposal already incorporates the following sustainable features:

- Energy efficient lighting, appliances and equipment.
- Over 60% of the parking would be located underground.
- Three electric car charging stations in the southern building.
- Large glass windows for solar access and increased ventilation.

Mark Brumbaugh, Landscape Architect, Brumbaugh Associates, Kenmore, responded to Board Member Broadway's request for a description of the "Acer Rubrum Bowhall Maple" tree. He explained that they had originally proposed a red maple species, but they understand the City's desire to have consistent street tree species in the area. He said he believes the Bowhall Maple is an excellent street tree choice for this area because it grows tall and narrow and provides great fall color.

Mr. Brumbaugh explained that because the north building is all residential, the team felt it important to set it back to provide more privacy and garden-like landscaping. The goal is that each ground unit would have a sense of having their own front yard. A wide variety of planting materials have been proposed as per the landscape plan. He pointed out that

with most development along Edmonds Way, the sidewalk abuts the street. However, the applicant is proposing a five-foot planting strip between the sidewalk and the street. He advised that the south building would be situated closer to the street. Because of its retail aspect, they do not want a lot of landscaping separating the use from the building. The proposed landscaping represents a three-tiered approach, using ornamental native plants. A rain garden would be located at the corner of Edmonds Way and 232nd Street, and it is intended to capture rainwater before it enters the storm water system. Placing the rain garden in this prominent corner would demonstrate the sustainable aspect of the project to the community. It is intended to be planted with native and adaptive plant materials with seasonal interest and water tolerant characteristics. A small grove of deciduous canopy trees would provide a garden scale for pedestrians. He said another primary element of the landscaping is behind the southern building where the property abuts single-family residential lots. The City requires Type II Landscaping in this location, which is a heavier screening to provide separation of use. For this area, the existing mature native conifers would be preserved. Additional native trees of a larger size would also be planted, as well as a variety of native ornamental species.

Mr. Brumbaugh referred to the photographs he provided to illustrate the proposed species of vegetation proposed. He also referred to the detailed planting plan that identifies exactly what species would be planted, as well as the size and location.

Board Member Broadway asked if the applicant considered the option of pervious pavement in the parking areas. Mr. Davidson said they investigated the option but found that maintenance was a significant deterrent. They are proposing an infiltration pipe because it has a greater ability to remain functional.

Board Member Broadway asked what type of landscaping is proposed on the slope behind the parking area. Mr. Brumbaugh said the landscaping would consist of a combination of large and small native vegetation. The existing conifers would be retained, as well. Because there is no existing understory in this location, ground cover and shrubs would be added.

Chair Kendall asked if any of the existing fir trees along Edmonds Way would be preserved. Mr. Brumbaugh answered that the trees in this area would be removed to accommodate the construction of the buildings and sidewalks.

Ms. Coccia invited Mr. Davidson to specifically identify the changes that have been made to the proposal since the Staff Report was published. Mr. Davidson pointed out that the four separate windows were changed to one large window, the accent color on the northern building was changed, and the ground floor material proposed for the southern building was changed from CMU to concrete.

Board Member Walker observed that the rain garden would be located at the lowest point on the property. He asked if it would collect storm water from other portions of the site, as well. Mr. Davidson answered that it would be designed to collect water from the south parking lot. Storm water from the remaining portion of the site would be directed towards the infiltration pipe.

Board Member Broadway asked the overall street façade length of the north and south buildings. Mr. Davidson answered that the north building façade is 300 feet and the south building façade is about 275 feet. Board Member Broadway said she appreciates the modulation provided on the south building, but the depth does not appear to be more than 18 inches. Mr. Davidson said the depth of the modulation is actually 30 inches. Board Member Broadway expressed concern that the proposed modulation on the south building façade is insufficient to break up the mass of the building. Mr. Davidson pointed out that the façade is broken up both horizontally and vertically. There is a protrusion between the ground floor and second floor, as well as modulation between each individual unit. Board Member Broadway said she is not as concerned about the vertical modulation. She suggested the applicant could provide more horizontal modulation for both the north and south buildings by shifting the units. There are also opportunities to use color to break up the facades.

Board Member Gootee asked if the applicant has done any preliminary design for site lighting. He noted that a significant parking lot has been proposed, and lighting should not be allowed to impact adjacent single-family properties. Mr. Davidson answered that no lighting plans have been done at this point. Board Member Gootee said he would like the lighting plan to include lighting on the building so it is visible at night from Edmonds Way.

Ann Brudvick, Edmonds, said she owns property across 232nd Street. She said she is pleased with the proposed landscaping plan, which is compatible with the landscaping that is proposed for her new development. She expressed concern that the plan does not propose any guest parking. She also asked exactly how much commercial space would be provided on the site. Mr. Davidson answered that the commercial space has been reduced from 6,000 square feet to 3,500 square feet. Ms. Brudvick said she understands it is not possible to know how the commercial space will be used at this time, but it is important that the property can accommodate a wide variety of commercial uses. She noted that she was required to provide one parking space for every 200 square feet of space at her veterinary clinic. She asked the City to keep parking in mind when they review the development permit application. There is no on-street parking in this location so it is important that all parking needs can be accommodated on site. She asked if the applicant has prepared a sign plan. Mr. Davidson answered that signage has not been addressed at this point. Ms. Brudvick questioned where the individual commercial tenants would provide signage on the façade of the building.

Karen Goldsmith, Edmonds, also expressed concern about parking. The applicant is proposing 89 residential units and only 144 parking stalls. She said she is concerned about spill over parking in front of her house if there is not adequate parking on site. She asked where the main access would be located. Mr. Davidson said the primary residential entry would be off 232nd Street. However, most of the tenants would park in the garage, which is accessed from Edmonds Way. Ms. Goldsmith expressed concern that 232nd already has too much traffic. She questioned what would be done for the current single-family property owners to help them gain access onto 232nd Street once the additional traffic associated with the proposed project is added. She said she does not believe the Department of Transportation would change the emergency light to a regular light, nor would they likely add a left hand turn lane. She summarized that the building looks great, but she is concerned about parking and traffic.

Tom Fagnan, Edmonds, said he lives next to the parking lot that is proposed on 232nd Street. He asked if decks and/or balconies would be added to the residential units so that his yard becomes a television screen for the tenants. He noted that the proposed parking area appears to be two levels from 232nd Street, and most parking lots have extra lighting. He questioned how this would impact his property. Mr. Davidson said there would be Juliet balconies at a depth of about 6 inches to allow the tenants to open the windows for ventilation. They would not be accessible. Again, he said they have not designed their lighting plan yet, but they would be very sensitive to keep lighting on site. Mr. Fagnan asked if the setback area on the west side of the building would be accessible to tenants of the new buildings. Mr. Brumbough replied that the setback area would be heavily vegetated with native plants. While they cannot preclude people from walking in the landscaped areas on the property, there would be no reason for people to be back in this setback area. It has a significant slope, and would not be easy to walk through. Mr. Davidson said there would also be a fence to keep people off the retaining wall. He summarized that the setback area would be very difficult to access.

Mr. Fagnan pointed out that the north side of the property is almost at the Edmonds Way grade level. Mr. Davidson said there is a significant amount of retaining wall on the southern portion, specifically at the corner of Edmonds Way and 232nd Street. Most of the parking surface parking is located at the same grade as Edmonds Way. The only location with double level parking is on 232nd Street. Mr. Fagnan noted that the roofs of the cars would be below the grade of the property.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Chair Kendall summarized that public concerns were related to traffic, which is not really the purview of the Board. A traffic study was completed. Citizens were also concerned about light spilling over onto single-family residential properties, and she assumes this issue would be thoughtfully pondered by the applicant. She would have liked to see at

least preliminary plans for lighting and signage as part of the proposal. She agreed with Board Member Broadway's concern about the horizontal line of the building and the potential to break it up using color, etc.

Board Member O'Neill said he is disappointed with the modulation, as well, but the project, as proposed, meets the design criteria outlined in the Code. Chair Kendall agreed the proposal meets the design criteria, but the purpose of the ADB is to offer their design opinions. She emphasized that the proposed buildings would be high profile. They are nicely designed and would be a significant improvement to the site and the neighborhood, but she questioned the visual impact the long buildings would have on Edmonds residents who drive by on a daily basis. Board Member Broadway added that the ADB exists to provide guidance to the applicant, not to change the zoning code requirements. Board Member Gootee agreed that it is within the Board's purview to require some modulation, but their direction should be clear and the solution should be cost effective for the developer. He cautioned against requiring significantly more modulation that places an undue burden on a building that already meets the code requirements.

Board Member Mestres expressed his belief that the oblique nature of the south building in conjunction with the green space at the corner, offsets the impact of the large building mass. From the street level, the buildings would not appear as harsh or drastic. He reminded the Board that the buildings would be located on Edmonds Way, which means most people would pass by quickly.

Board Member Walker observed that if the Board requires the façade to be undulated more to provide modulation, the buildings might have to be pushed closer to the single-family residential properties. Board Member Broadway clarified that she is not necessarily suggesting a different undulation, but the applicant could use color and materials to break up the façades without changing the footprint of the buildings.

Chair Kendall summarized that she has not heard any significant criticism of the proposed building design. The Board has discussed modulation, and generally agreed that perhaps the applicant should take a second look at potential opportunities to further modulate the façades using techniques such as color and materials. She said the building is well designed, and she is excited to see the project move forward.

Board Member O'Neill suggested the Board require the applicant to come back to them with a proposed plan for lighting, modulation and signage. Board Member Gootee agreed that would be appropriate given that the buildings would be high profile. However, he cautioned against slowing down the process for too long.

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY MOVED THAT THE BOARD ALLOW THE APPLICANT TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THE DESIGN DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROJECT, UNDERSTANDING THAT A SECOND PRESENTATION BEFORE THE ADB WOULD BE REQUIRED TO ADDRESS LIGHTING, MONUMENT SIGNAGE, AND THE FINAL RESOLUTION OF THE MODULATION OF THE BUILDING. BOARD MEMBER GOOTEE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 5-1, WITH BOARD MEMBER MESTRES VOTING IN OPPOSITION.

Board Member Mestres said he finds the proposed building modulation sufficient to meet the code requirements.

Board Member Broadway asked if the applicant's recent change to reduce the commercial space to 3,500 square feet would address the parking issue outlined in Condition 2. Ms. Coccia said she has not seen an updated floor plan that illustrates the proposed change. She said she would like to leave Condition 2 as a placeholder so staff can review the change and determine if parking would be adequate for the proposed uses. If the amount of commercial space has been reduced, then the parking problem may be resolved.

Ms. Coccia asked for clarification about whether or not the Board agrees with the findings and conclusions in the Staff Report. The Board agreed they needed to provide further direction to both the applicant and the staff.

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY MOVED TO RESCIND HER PREVIOUS MOTION. BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE PLN-2011-0007 WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. UPDATE THE STREET TREE SPECIES TO "ACER RUBRUM BOWHALL MAPLE." THE STREET TREE SPECIES SHALL BE RE-REVIEWED BY THE CITY OF EDMONDS PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT ISSUANCE.**
- 2. THE PARKING WILL NEED TO BE RECALCULATED AT THE NUMBERS PROVIDED IN THE CODE. THE APPLICANT COUD EITHER:**
 - REDUCE THE NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL UNITS; AND/OR**
 - REDUCE THE AMOUNT OF COMMERCIAL SPACE; AND/OR**
 - RE-ASSIGN A PORTION OF THE COMMERCIAL SPACE TO A LOWER PARKING RATIO PROVIDING FOR A MIX OF COMMERCIAL USES THROUGHOUT THE SITE.**
- 3. THE APPLICANT MUST RE-APPROACH THE BOARD WITH PLANS FOR MONUMENT SIGNAGE, LIGHTING AND A MODIFIED MODULATION DESIGN ON THE STREET FACADES.**

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 5-1, WITH BOARD MEMBER MESTRES VOTING IN OPPOSITION.

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 announced her plan to tender her resignation from the Board, effectively immediately. The Board agreed to wait until the next meeting when all Board Members were present to elect 2011 officers.

Board Member Gootee said he is disappointed to lose Chair Kendall as a member of the Board. It will be a tremendous loss. Board Member Mestres commended her for her dedication and enthusiasm.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.