

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

April 3, 2013

Vice Chair O'Neill 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

Bruce O'Neill, Vice Chair
Cary Guenther
Rick Schaefer
Tom Walker

Board Members Absent

Bryan Gootee, Chair (excused)
Lois Broadway (excused)
Michael Mestres (excused)

Staff Present

Stephen Clifton, Community
Services/Economic Dev. Director.
Mike Clugston, Senior Planner
Jen Machuga, Associate Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 19, 2012 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER GUENTHER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

No one in the audience indicated a desire to address the Board during this portion of the meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA:

There were no items on the consent agenda.

MINOR PROJECTS:

Edmonds Village, LLC: Sign modification at 22001 Highway 99 (PLN20130019)

Mr. Clugston presented the Staff Report. There was no present to represent the applicant.

Mr. Clugston explained that sign permits are usually reviewed by staff for code compliance according to ECDC 20.60. However, in instances where applicants desire modifications to the sign code, the ADB must review and approve the permits. In this case, the applicant is requesting relief from strict application of ECDC 20.60.0256.A.2 to allow the use of wall sign area derived from a qualifying frontage on a non-qualifying frontage. He advised that the property is located at the southeast corner of Highway 99 and 220th Street Southwest (See Attachment C). The applicant has renovated the

building, which was formerly an auto parts store. He provided pictures of the building before and after the renovation (See Attachment F). He noted that the rectangular building directly abuts 220th Street Southwest on the north and Highway 99 on the west, and the entrances are located on the south side. The space has been adapted to serve up to four tenants.

Mr. Clugston explained that the sign code for the Highway 99 area only allows signage on qualifying building frontages. Because of the way the building is situated, signage would only be allowed on the north, west and south sides of the building, and the applicant desires to have some signage on the east side, as well. He noted that the east side faces the heavily travelled arterial of westbound 220th Street Southwest. This modification requires approval by the ADB.

Mr. Clugston advised that a sign was located on the east side of the building prior to renovation, and there is also a pole sign on the site to identify the Family Fun Center, which is located to the east of the subject property. Staff discussed with the applicant the possibility of expanding the pole sign to provide extra signage for the tenants of the building. However, staff does not support this option as it would be out of character with the recent site improvements. He referred to Attachment I, which provides a general idea of the type of sign the applicant is proposing for the eastern side of the building. The design is attractive and uses simple channel letters with perhaps small logos. Attachment H outlines the sign criteria that each tenant would be required to follow so that all signs on the building are consistent.

Mr. Clugston reminded the Board that in order to approve the permit, they must find that the modification request meets all of the following criteria:

1. The request is for signage on a site that has a unique configuration, such as frontage on more than two streets, or has an unusual geometric shape;
2. The subject property, building or business has site conditions that do not afford it the opportunity to provide signage consistent with or similar to other properties in the vicinity;
3. The design of the proposed signage must be compatible in its use of materials, colors, design and proportions with development throughout the site;
4. In no event shall the modification result in signage which exceeds the maximum normally allowed by more than 50 percent.

Mr. Clugston pointed out that the site is unique given its location and the way the building is laid out on the site. The building is constructed at the property line on the north and west sides, and the primary entrance is located on the south side of the building. The building is also unique because it is on one of the busiest intersections in Edmonds. Staff believes it would be reasonable to allow signage on each of the four facades so they are visible coming from all four directions approaching the building. In addition, the design and materials of the proposed signs would be compatible and consistent throughout the site. Attachment I outlines a package of signs with very simple, understated detail. The signs would be internally illuminated white channel letters on a raceway painted to match the building. Color accents and logos would be allowed but would have to be compatible with the building, as well. The applicant's intent is to use the same sign design on all four facades of the building.

Mr. Clugston emphasized that the applicant is not proposing to increase the amount of sign area allowed on the building. The request is to use a portion of the total allowed sign area to provide signage on the east side of the building. He recommended the Board approve the applicant's request with the following conditions:

- A. Separate permits from the Building and Engineering Divisions may be required and it is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure compliance with all applicable codes.
- B. No commercial sign shall be illuminated after 11:00 p.m. unless the commercial enterprise is open for business and then may remain on only as long as the enterprise is open (ECDC 20.60.020.H).

Vice Chair O'Neill asked if the applicant desires to have signage on the north façade, as well. Mr. Clugston said the applicant's intent is to apply signage on each of the four facades. However, the total sign area would not exceed the

amount allowed based on calculating the length of the north, west and south facades. The applicant has indicated, in fact, that the actual signage would be less than the total sign area allowed based on this calculation.

Board Member Schaefer asked why the eastern façade would not be considered a qualifying surface when calculating total sign area. Mr. Clugston answered the total sign area is based on the length of the facades that front on the street and the facades that have entrances. The east side of the building does not front on a street or have an entrance.

Vice Chair O'Neill suggested that the Board could approve the applicant's request to place signage on the east side of the building in exchange for eliminating signage on the north façade. Mr. Clugston agreed that is one option the Board could consider. However, he reminded the Board that the way the building is situated on the site is unique. People will approach the building from all directions, including from the north. He also reminded the Board that prior to renovation, there was signage on all four sides of the building. Vice Chair O'Neill agreed that it is important to allow a single sign on both the east and west sides of the building, and up to four signs on the south side of the building, but he did not feel it would be necessary to also allow four signs on the north side of the building, as well. Mr. Clugston pointed out that the code already allows signage on the north, south and west sides of the building. The applicant's desire is to also place signage on the east façade.

Board Member Walker asked if each tenant would be allowed to have one sign on each of the building facades. Mr. Clugston answered that tenants would be allowed a maximum of three signs. As currently proposed, each tenant would have signage on both the north and south facades, and the tenants on the ends would have additional signage on the east and west facades. The current code limits tenants to three signs each. The proposal would result in four signs on the north and south façades, and one sign on the east and west facades. Board Member Guenther summarized that the tenants on the end would have three signs, and the two tenants in the middle would have just two signs. The total number of signs proposed is ten. Mr. Clugston pointed out that, as per the current code, staff could approve a total of nine signs on the west, north and south sides of the building. The proposed modification would allow one additional sign on the east side of the building.

Board Member Schaefer asked if the City has attached the time limit for illuminated signs as a condition of approval on other applications. Mr. Clugston answered that the condition has been added to several staff approvals in recent months.

Once again, Vice Chair O'Neill recommended that the additional signage on the east side of the building should be allowed in exchange for eliminating the signage on the north side. Board Member Guenther reminded the Board that the total sign area is based on just the north, south and west facades. The east façade would not be included in the calculation. The proposal would not increase the sign area, but it would allow for one additional sign on the east façade. Mr. Clugston added that signage proposed by the applicant is less than the total sign area allowed on the building.

Board Member Walker summarized that the applicant is not proposing any additional sign area. He said that if he had a business in this location, he would want signage on the north façade, too. He expressed his belief that one more sign on the east façade would not make the site aesthetically unpleasing.

BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER MOVED THAT, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT, ANALYSIS AND ATTACHMENTS IN THE STAFF REPORT, THE ADB RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF FILE NUMBER PLN20130019, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS, BECAUSE IT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA FOUND IN THE ZONING ORDINANCE AND THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

A. SEPARATE PERMITS FROM THE BUILDING AND ENGINEERING DIVISIONS MAY BE REQUIRED AND IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE CODES.

B. NO COMMERCIAL SIGN SHALL BE ILLUMINATED AFTER 11:00 PM UNLESS THE COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISE IS OPEN FOR BUSINESS AND THEN MAY REMAIN ON ONLY AS LONG AS THE ENTERPRISE IS OPEN (ECDC 20.60.020.H).

VICE CHAIR O'NEILL SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTIO CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS:

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

CONSOLIDATED PERMIT APPLICATIONS (No Public Participation):

McDonald's: The applicants are proposing to construct a new 4,270 square foot McDonald's restaurant building, dual lane drive-thru facility, and associated parking lot on a 1.91-acre site. An existing McDonald's restaurant will be demolished as part of the redevelopment. The proposal requires design review (PLN20130002), a conditional-use permit for the drive-thru (PLN20120003), and a conditional use permit for 24-hour operation of the restaurant (PLN20120006). The ADB will review the design elements of the proposed new McDonald's in a public meeting and make a recommendation to the Hearing Examiner for a final decision combined with the two conditional-use permit requests. The site is located at 10124 Edmonds Way and is zoned Neighborhood Business (BN)

Jen Machuga presented the Staff Report. Jenelle Taflin, PacLand, and Brian Mattson, McDonald's USA, LLC, were present to represent the applicant.

Ms. Machuga advised that the proposal is for a consolidated review of two conditional-use permit applications and design review of a new McDonald's building to be constructed at 10124 Edmonds Way. The site is located within the Neighborhood Business (BN) zone, which is subject to the general design review requirements of ECDC 20.11. The requested conditional-use permits are for the drive-thru and extended operating hours. She explained that because the design review application was consolidated with the conditional-use permit applications, the ADB will make a recommendation to the Hearing Examiner, who will make the decision on the applications following a public hearing. The Hearing Examiner's decision will be a Type III-B decision.

Ms. Machuga said the site currently contains a McDonald's restaurant and associated parking. The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing building and construct a new 4,270 square foot building with a dual-lane drive-thru and associated parking. She explained that the ADB must review the proposal for compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and zoning ordinance. The subject property is within the "Community Commercial" designation of the Comprehensive Plan, which establishes numerous goals and policies applicable to the proposal that are discussed at length in the Staff Report. The Staff Report also gives a detailed analysis of the proposal's compliance with the zoning ordinance, including the design review criteria (ECDC 20.11) and landscaping requirements (ECDC 20.13).

Ms. Machuga summarized that staff feels the proposal, as conditioned, would comply with the Comprehensive Plan and zoning ordinance in that it will:

- Eliminate one of the three existing curb cuts on Edmonds Way.
- Improve the streetscape with new street trees and a landscape strip between the sidewalk and street.
- Provide pedestrian connections from the sidewalk and throughout the site.
- Include an outdoor plaza with outdoor seating near the building entry.
- Include a variety of design elements and materials in the building design to break up all four facades.
- Include human-scale elements in the building design.

Ms. Machuga advised that the applicant has discussed the possibility of establishing a shared driveway with the adjacent property to the south. Although the proposal would eliminate the landscape strip, staff supports the concept because it would result in one less curb cut along Edmonds Way. She also pointed out that the proposed landscaping varies slightly from the landscaping requirements of ECDC 20.13, but staff feels that the landscaping meets the intent of the requirements. However, the ADB may want to look closer at the landscape strip between the sidewalk and the drive aisle in front of the building where the Northern Lights Tufted Hair Grass is proposed. She suggested that an evergreen shrub, such as Dwarf Otto Luyken Laurel, may provide better year-round screening of the drive aisle and parking area. Based on staff's review, she recommended that the ADB recommend approval of the proposed project with the five conditions outlined in the Staff Report.

Vice Chair O'Neill verified that the proposal to create a shared driveway would result in one less curb cut on Edmonds Way. Ms. Machuga concurred. She pointed out the location of the existing landscape strip that would be eliminated to accommodate the shared driveway.

Brian Mattson, McDonald's USA, LLC, Kirkland, WA, said he did not prepare a formal presentation, but wanted to comment on some of the items in the Staff Report. He explained that the property owner to the south recently approached him with the concept of establishing a shared driveway. He said the applicant is open to the idea and understands that it would not only provide better access for the property to the south, it would also be viewed as favorable by the City because it would eliminate a curb cut. However, they do not want the change to slow down the permitting process.

Mr. Mattson referred to Page 9 of the Staff Report, which states that no pole sign would be associated with the project. Instead, the applicant proposes a 14-foot tall monument sign. He clarified that, rather than a monument sign, the applicant is actually proposing to somewhat replicate the existing pole sign. However, the sign would stay within the 14-foot height limit.

Vice Chair O'Neill cautioned that it is not within the Board's purview to make a recommendation regarding the proposed shared driveway. Staff will need to make a determination as to whether it is appropriate or not. Ms. Machuga agreed that the shared driveway would be reviewed by staff. She said she raised the issue to make the Board aware that if the shared driveway is approved, the landscape strip between the two properties would be eliminated. Board Member Guenther observed that while the amount of landscaping would be reduced, the tradeoff would be fewer curb cuts on Edmonds Way.

Vice Chair O'Neill asked if the proposed signage, including the pole sign, would meet the code requirements. He also asked if the additional signs shown in the drawings would be counted as part of the overall sign area allowed. Ms. Machuga said the drive-thru and directional signs would be considered incidental signs and would not count as part of the total sign area allowed. She said a full review of the proposed signage and total sign area would be done as part of staff's review of the sign application. At this time, the applicant is not asking for an exception to the sign code. The sign plan was included in the Staff Report for the Board's information. She has not reviewed the applicant's request to replicate the existing pole sign, but the current sign code does not allow pole signs. The sign would have to have a monument base with perhaps a top similar to what exists. An exception to use a pole sign would require ADB approval. Again, she emphasized that staff has not reviewed the sign proposal.

Board Member Schaefer expressed concern that because the Staff Report includes information about proposed signage, a recommendation from the ADB to approve the application could be misinterpreted as approval of the sign proposal, as well. Ms. Machuga suggested that this concern could be addressed by attaching an additional condition to the Board's recommendation.

Board Member Schaefer asked for more information about what would be planted in the landscape strip between the subject property and the property to the south if the shared driveway is not created. Mr. Mattson answered that the applicant is proposing to maintain the existing landscaping. Board Member Schaefer pointed out that the current access

allows for right turns only when exiting the subject property. Mr. Mattson said the applicant is proposing to maintain the right-turn-only exit in this location. Ms. Machuga pointed out that a shared access may allow sufficient space for cars to exit in both directions.

While staff has indicated they approve of the proposed landscaping along the street, Board Member Schaefer said it would be helpful to have an illustration of what the landscape strip would look like. Mr. Mattson said the only illustration they have of the landscape strip is Exhibit PL-1.0. Board Member Walker said he does not believe it would be appropriate to plant shrubs that would eventually overgrow into the sidewalk in this location. The proposed ground cover and street trees would be suitable. Board Member Schaefer said he likes the separation that would be provided between the sidewalk and Edmonds Way.

Board Member Schaefer questioned if it would be possible to use landscape techniques such as rain gardens on the back side of the property where there is a slope. He noted that there have been issues with drainage in the past in this location. It appears the proposed plan would simply take runoff to the slope and into the City's stormwater system.

Janelle Taflin, Packland, explained that the applicant is proposing to handle 100% of the stormwater on site via an underground infiltration system. However, a connection would be provided to the off-site municipal conveyance on Edmonds Way for emergency conditions only. Vice Chair O'Neill pointed out that, at this time, stormwater on the subject property is not handled on site, and the catch basins flood frequently. He asked how the applicant's proposal would improve the situation. Ms. Taflin answered that the existing system would be removed and replaced with an entirely new on-site infiltration and conveyance system that would collect stormwater from the parking lot and building roof. She noted that a geotechnical engineer has reviewed their proposal for stormwater improvements and found them to be consistent with the Department of Ecology's 2005 Stormwater Manual, which the City requires. The system has been designed to handle the stormwater on site, and the municipal system would only be used during emergency situations.

Board Member Walker pointed out that a variety of ornamental grasses have been proposed for the front landscape area, some of which are dormant and brown during the winter months. He recommended that the Board's recommendation include a condition that would require more variety along this strip other than just ornamental grasses. Mr. Mattson asked if Board Member Walker could provide some suggestions for appropriate species to use in this location. Mr. Walker said he would leave this to the applicant's landscape architect. Ms. Machuga said staff could work with the applicant to incorporate some evergreen shrubs in this planting strip.

BASED ON THE FINDINGS, ANALYSIS, CONCLUSIONS AND ATTACHMENTS IN THE STAFF REPORT, BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER MOVED THAT THE BOARD FIND THAT THE APPLICATION IS CONSISTENT WITH THE DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA FOUND IN THE ZONING ORDINANCE AND THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF FILE NUMBERS PLN20130002, PLN20130003, AND PLN20130006 WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. HEIGHT CALCULATIONS ARE REQUIRED WITH THE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION IN ORDER TO SHOW THAT THE PROJECT MEETS THE 25-FOOT HEIGHT LIMIT.**
- 2. THE LIGHT STANDARDS INSTALLED IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE PROJECT CANNOT EXCEED 25 FEET IN HEIGHT.**
- 3. ALL MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT AND OTHER UTILITY HARDWARE ON THE ROOF, GROUNDS, OR BUILDINGS SHALL BE SCREENED TO MITIGATE VIEW IMPACTS FROM STREET LEVEL. SCREENING COULD INCLUDE THE USE OF ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS, LANDSCAPING AND/OR FENCING.**

4. **STREET TREE SPECIES, LOCATION AND SPACING SHALL BE DETERMINED DURING CIVIL DESIGN REVIEW.**
5. **THE APPLICANT MUST APPLY FOR AND OBTAIN ALL NECESSARY PERMITS. THE APPLICATION IS SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS IN THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE (ECDC). IT IS UP TO THE APPLICANT TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH THE VARIOUS PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE ORDINANCES.**
6. **SIGNAGE IS SUBJECT TO ECDC 20.60 AND THE PROPOSED SIGNAGE HAS NOT BEEN REVIEWED FOR COMPLIANCE BY THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD.**
7. **THE APPLICANT SHOULD INCREASE THE VARIETY OF SHRUBS AND GRASSES IN THE AREA BETWEEN THE PARKING LOT AND THE SIDEWALK.**

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

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

There were no administrative reports.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

Board Member Guenther advised that Planning Board Member Valerie Stewart approached him with a request that she and Planning Board Member Ian Duncan be allowed to make a presentation to the Architectural Design Board regarding sustainable development. The Board agreed that the presentation should be scheduled for May 1st.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.