

APPROVED

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

August 17, 2011

Vice Chair Schaefer 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

Rick Schaefer, Vice Chair
Lois Broadway
Bryan Gootee
Bruce O’Neill

Board Members Absent

Michael Mestres
Tom Walker

Staff Present

Gina Coccia, Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER GOOTEE MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JUNE 15, 2011 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA 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 ADB20110007: “GRE Edmonds Way” – Approval by the ADB on June 15, 2011 with the condition that the applicant re-approach the Board with plans for monument signage, lighting, and a modified modulation design on the street facades.

Ms. Coccia referred the Board to the memorandum she prepared regarding the applicant’s revised plans. She noted that the applicant would also provide an updated draft of the proposal, which incorporates additional changes to the revised plan. She reminded the Board that they have been charged with reviewing the information before them and providing the applicant with feedback. She cautioned that the Board should review the overall design of the monument sign, and not necessarily the placement. Placement will be addressed as part of staff’s review of the sign permit application.

Chris Davidson, Architect, Studio Meng Strazzara, Renton, provided a PowerPoint presentation of the most current proposal, which specifically addresses modulation, signage and lighting. He advised that the applicant is proposing the following three alternatives to address the Board's previously stated concerns about modulation:

- **Alternative 1:** When the proposal was originally presented to the Board on June 15th, he failed to point out that the design modulation was developed around the idea of being efficient with material, as well as sticking with a modular panelized system. Alternative 1 represents the initial proposal to use sizing of material to achieve modulation. In this alternative, mineral fiber cement panels would be used. The width and depth of the building modulation would be increments of the 4' x 8' panel dimensions. By utilizing this strategy of building cladding, the most efficient use of materials can be achieved while minimizing building waste.
- **Alternative 2:** This alternative would create a rhythm along the façade by shifting the panels up and down one foot. The same color pallet would be used.
- **Alternative 3:** This alternative also uses the panelized system, but adds LP siding material and an additional darker color. This option appeals more to the residential siding that will be used on the northern building and ties the two buildings together.

Mr. Davidson advised that a monument sign is proposed to be located off the main entrance between the north and south buildings. The idea is that the sign should be centrally located on Edmonds Way to tie the two buildings together. The intent is for the design to be simple, sleek and modern. The sign would be constructed of a weathered steel panel that would patina over time. They are considering two options for individual signage on the commercial spaces: the standard sandwich board sign or 3-dimensional letters applied directly to the site of the building. The applicant believes both are attractive options.

Mr. Davidson recalled that at the June 15th meeting, the Board expressed concern about light trespassing onto the adjacent properties, particularly the residential neighborhood to the south. The current lighting proposal utilizes bollards that cast out a lower lighting level and allow the parking lot to be lit, but not trespass onto single-family properties. The buildings, themselves, will provide ample light, as well. Pole lights would be used to light the main entrances. The south parking lot will be lit entirely with bollard lighting, and pole lighting will be used throughout the north parking lot area. Because there is substantially more surface parking in the north parking area and it will not receive as much lighting from the building, the taller light pole fixtures are needed to cast additional light. Bollard lighting will be installed at the main entrances to further illuminate the area. He provided illustrations of what the light fixture would look like. He explained that bollard light fixtures reduce the amount of glare and cast light down onto the ground rather than onto adjacent properties. Pole mounted lighting can be anywhere from 15 to 30 feet in height, and they are proposing 18 feet in height to provide ample lighting but not illuminate the adjacent hillside.

Ms. Coccia pointed out that pole signs are not permitted in the Multi-Residential Edmonds Way (RM-EW) zone. The monument sign proposed in the applicant's revised plan would be supported by steel posts, which would be considered a pole sign. Pole signs are only permitted in the General Commercial zones. Vice Chair Schaefer asked if a sign with a continuous panel to the same width and elevation would be allowed. Ms. Coccia answered that a continuous panel sign would be allowed as long as it meets the setback and size requirements. She reminded the Board that they have the ability to modify the sign code requirements to allow for additional sign area.

Board Member Broadway pointed out that the poles are exposed in the actual dimension rendering of the sign, but in the site rendering. Mr. Davidson clarified that the sign design was changed in response to concerns raised by staff that the sign would not meet the size requirement for the zone. Board Member O'Neill asked if the applicant would be able to meet the size requirement if the sign were pulled down to the ground. Mr. Davidson pointed out that if the sign were pulled down to the ground it may not be visible enough from the street. He noted there is quite a bit of grade change in that location. In response to Board Member O'Neill's question about the dimensions of the proposed sign, Mr. Davidson answered that, as currently proposed, the sign would be 2' x 5' or a total of 10 square feet.

Vice Chair Schaefer asked if the sign could be located on the other side of the driveway in the Commercial Business – Edmonds Way (BC-EW) zone, which allows for larger monument signs. Mr. Davidson pointed out that there are electric sprinklers and water vaults in the area on the other side of the driveway.

Board Member Gootee asked Ms. Coccia to provide more information about the Board's ability to grant a variance to the sign code size requirement. Ms. Coccia explained that if the applicant were to submit an application that included a request for a variance to the sign code, the Board could consider a request to increase the size of the monument sign as per ECDC 20.60. However, they must identify reasons to justify the variance.

Board Member O'Neill expressed his belief that all of the three alternatives would be acceptable to address the concerns raised by the Board. Board Member Broadway said she prefers Alternative 3, which blends textures and offers a distinct color change. On the other hand, Board Member O'Neill said he prefers Option 1, which uses one color. He expressed his belief that mixing the panels up seems to confuse the design. Also, while LP siding is appropriate for residential development, he does not believe it is as appropriate for large commercial buildings. Vice Chair Schaeffer said he prefers having the variable colors on the two-story building as opposed to being uniform as shown in Option 1. He said he would prefer Alternatives 2 or 3.

Board Member Gootee said he would support any of the three alternatives. Board Member O'Neill agreed that all three alternatives would create modulation, which is what the Board asked the applicant to do. He suggested that the surface color and materials should be left to the applicant's discretion. Board Member Broadway agreed that any of the three alternatives would be acceptable, but she personally prefers the LP siding because it introduces some residential character to the commercial building. For the shorter residential building, she said she likes the introduction of the strong orange and that they have kept the protruding bay a darker color. Mr. Davidson explained that part of the original design concept was to have distinct differences between the two parcels since one would be developed as a mixed-use building and the other as multi-family residential. The LP siding was introduced to strengthen the residential identity, but it could also be used to connect the two buildings together.

THE BOARD AGREED THAT ALL THREE ALTERNATIVES WOULD ADDRESS THEIR PREVIOUSLY STATED CONCERNS ABOUT MODULATION ON THE STREET FACADE. THEY FURTHER AGREED TO ALLOW THE APPLICANT THE DISCRETION TO SELECT A PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE.

Vice Chair Schaefer said the code allows the Board the latitude to increase the signage size by up to 50%. He said he believes a solid panel sign to the ground would be much more aesthetically pleasing than a pole sign. He said he would also support a variance to allow the sign area to increase. He said he believes there are sufficient site limitations to provide a basis for the Board to grant a variance. Board Member Broadway added that she prefers surface mounted signs because they are easier for passing cars and pedestrians to read. Vice Chair Schaefer summarized that while the City's goal is to promote pedestrian activity, most of the people will access the site by vehicle from Edmonds Way. Therefore, it is important that signage is visible to passing cars.

THE BOARD INDICATED THEIR SUPPORT FOR A VARIANCE TO THE SIGN CODE TO ALLOW THE APPLICANT TO INCREASE THE SIZE OF THE MONUMENT SIGN TO 3' X 5'.

Board Member Gootee said he supports the lighting proposed by the applicant because it address the Board's earlier request that the lighting be more subdued. Mr. Davidson pointed out where the eight bollard and six pole lighting fixtures would be located. Board Member Broadway referred to the night-shot of the main entrance lighting, which has a pole light placed at 18 feet in height. She asked the height of the windows on the adjacent residential building. Mr. Davidson answered that the first window is about 15 feet in height. Board Member O'Neill asked if there are street lights on Edmonds Way now, and Mr. Davidson said he does not recall any.

THE BOARD INDICATED THEIR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LIGHTING PLAN. IT WAS NOTED THAT NO MOTION WAS NECESSARY BECAUSE THE APPLICATION WAS PREVIOUSLY APPROVED BY THE

BOARD ON JUNE 15, 2011. THE BOARD CONCLUDED THAT THE APPLICANT ADEQUATELY RESPONDED TO EACH OF THEIR CONCERNS.

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:

Ms. Coccia announced that a Strategic Plan and Visioning meeting has been scheduled for September 14th and members of the Planning Board, Economic Development Commission and City Council have been invited to participate. The will be open to the public, and staff encourages interested ADB Members to attend, as well. The Board asked Ms. Coccia to send out additional information regarding the meeting via email.

Ms. Coccia reported that staff is requesting an ADB representative to work with the Mayor's Climate Protection Committee, the Historic Preservation Commission, and the Planning Board to identify ways to encourage people to incorporate green techniques into development proposals. The Board asked Ms. Coccia to email each of them to invite interested Board Members to respond.

Ms. Coccia announced that an ADB meeting has been scheduled for September 7th, at which time the Board would review an application by Swedish Hospital for a new Cancer Infusion Center in the middle of their campus. She agreed to email the Board Members to make sure a quorum is available for that meeting.

Ms. Coccia reported that the ADB agendas are now being published on Agenda Quick, which means that staff uses a program to upload the staff reports onto the internet. As a result, the public has access to not only the ADB agendas, but the supporting documentation that is included as part of each staff report. She noted that some members of the Planning Board have requested that the City no longer send them paper packets. Instead, they bring their laptops and access the information via the internet. She asked the Board Members to notify staff if they want to discontinue their paper packets, as well.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

Election of 2011 Officers

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY NOMINATED BOARD MEMBER GOOTEE AS CHAIR OF THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD. BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL SECONDED THE NOMINATION. THE NOMINATION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER NOMINATED BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY AS VICE CHAIR OF THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD. BOARD MEMBER GOOTEE SECONDED THE NOMINATION. THE NOMINATION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.