

APPROVED

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

August 7, 2013

Chair Gootee 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

Bryan Gootee, Chair
Bruce O'Neill, Vice Chair
Lois Broadway
Cary Guenther (recused from public hearing)
Rick Schaefer
Tom Walker

Staff Present

Kernen, Lien, Senior Planner
Jen Machuga, Associate Planner
Jeff Tarraday, City Attorney

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

VICE CHAIR O'NEILL MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JULY 17, 2013 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

BOARD MEMBER GUENTHER MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER 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.

REMAND

Deliberations on proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision in support of the Architectural Design Board's May 15, 2013 vote to approve revisions to Point Edwards Building 10 and associated landscaping. The site is located at 50 Pine Street (File Number PLN20130022)

Mr. Lien recalled that, following a public hearing on May 15, 2013, the Board voted to approve the design of the Point Edwards Building 10 (PLN20130022) as proposed by the applicant. Since that time, the City received three appeals of the ADB's decision, and a closed record review was held before the City Council on July 2, 2013. At the outset of the appeal hearing and before the parties made their argument, the City Council remanded the application back to the Board

for entry of Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law to support their decision. He noted that the Board did not formally issue Findings of Fact and Conclusions when they made their decision on May 15th.

Mr. Lien said that, also on July 2nd, the City Council directed that staff prepare a first draft of the findings (Attachment 2) for the ADB's consideration. These draft findings were posted on the website and made available for any party of record to provide revisions. He referred to Attachment 1, which consolidates all of the proposed revisions to staff's initial draft findings. The applicant's proposed revisions to the draft findings are included in Attachment 3, and Attachment 4 contains revisions proposed by Douglas Purcell. He emphasized that the Board would work from Attachment 1. He explained that tonight's discussion is not a public hearing, and no new testimony would be taken. Instead, the ADB would deliberate the findings and conclusions to support their May 15th decision.

Board Member Schaefer observed that the findings and conclusions explain how the application responds to various criteria when looking from the south where the building presents a two and three-story profile. However, the findings and conclusions do not discuss the presentation of the building from the north or east, which was a significant issue raised during the Board's previous deliberations. He expressed his belief that the presentation of the building from the north and east is inconsistent with the Design Guidelines. While this may not change the Board's decision, it should be clearly stated in the record. He particularly referred to the draft finding related to Comprehensive Plan Criteria C.6.a and observed that, although the building may be excavated into the site, it would not be stepped into the slope of the site. Instead, it would protrude from the profile of the site.

Board Member Schaefer also referenced the draft finding related to Comprehensive Plan Criteria C.8.c, which tries to draw a parallel between the bulk and scale of the five and six-story groupings of existing buildings and the vertical five-story design proposed for Building 10. The illustration of existing development provides a more distant perspective of one building in front of another building, etc. Stepping the building up the site is not the same as a five or six-story vertical face, and it does not even look the same from a distance. He expressed his belief that it is inaccurate for the finding to state that proposed Building 10 represents a consistent and coherent addition to the overall design and corresponds with surrounding buildings in Point Edwards. Again, he expressed concern that, absent of findings and conclusions related to the north and east face building presentations, a person could be led to believe there are no concerns.

Chair Gootee reminded the Board that the purpose of their discussion is to clarify and not change their decision via findings and conclusions. Board Member Schaefer referred to the minutes from the May 15th public hearing, in which his concern was specifically discussed by the Board. He said he would like the issue to be addressed as part of the findings and conclusions, as well.

Board Member Broadway suggested that the finding related to Comprehensive Plan Criteria C.8.c be amended to read, "*Design of Building 10 is slightly different than the other buildings at Point Edwards and has a distinctive design identity by expressing a four and five-story height from the north façade. Building 10 is generally consistent with the proportions, forms and masses of the other buildings associated with the Point Edwards development.*" Board Member Schaefer agreed that this additional language would call attention to the Board's public hearing discussion about the north and east building facades.

City Attorney Tarraday suggested that the Board should take formal action (by motion) on any substantive amendments to Attachment 1. No formal action is necessary to correct grammatical and typographical errors.

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY MOVED THAT THE FINDING RELATED TO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CRITERIA C.8.c BE AMENDED TO READ, "DESIGN OF BUILDING 10 IS SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT THAN THE OTHER BUILDINGS AT POINT EDWARDS AND HAS A DISTINCTIVE DESIGN IDENTIFY BY EXPRESSING A FOUR AND FIVE-STORY HEIGHT FROM THE NORTH FAÇADE. BUILDING 10 IS GENERALLY CONSISTENT WITH THE PROPORTIONS, FORMS AND MASSES OF THE OTHER

BUILDINGS ASSOCIATED WITH THE POITN EDWARDS DEVELOPMENT.” BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Gootee said he supports the draft findings and conclusions outlined in Attachment 1. The findings and conclusions are well stated and supports the Board’s May 15th decision.

Board Member Guenther suggested that the word “save” should be changed to “site” in the second sentence in the finding related to Comprehensive Plan Criteria C.4.a. He also questioned the intent of the phrase, “*without blocking the sidewalk distance from the garage door to the right-of-way.*” City Attorney Tarraday advised that this phrase was inserted at the request of the applicant. He cautioned against the Board allowing the applicant to clarify the intent of the phrase without offering all other parties of record an opportunity to address the Board, as well. He advised that the Board can either delete the language or amend it to provide clarity.

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY MOVED THAT THE PHRASE, “DISTANCE FROM GARAGE DOOR TO THE RIGHT-OF-WAY” BE DELETED FROM THE FINDING RELATED TO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CRITERIA C.4.a. BOARD MEMBER GUENTHER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Gootee asked for clarification of the process for reviewing Attachment 1. City Attorney Tarraday advised the Board to continue to make their substantive changes to Attachment 1 via formal motions. Once all of the changes have been made, the Board could take formal action (via a motion) to approve the entire document, as amended, as the Board’s findings, conclusions and decision. If the final motion is approved, Mr. Lien would prepare and print a clean copy of the document for Chair Gootee to sign at the end of the meeting.

Board Member Broadway asked if it would be feasible for the Board to amend language in the introduction of Attachment 1 to help define the findings and conclusions. For example, she would like to include clarifying language to make it clear that the terms “landscape” and “landscaping” mean both hardscape and softscape. She recommended that the third sentence in the third paragraph of the introduction be changed to read, “*Additionally, the proposed landscaping, which is defined by both hardscape and softscape, for the revised Building 10 includes a water feature and patio area in an area previously designated as a landscaped area.*”

BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER MOVED THAT THE THIRD SENTENCE IN THE THIRD PARAGRAPH OF THE INTRODUCTION BE CHANGED TO READ, “ADDITIONALLY, THE PROPOSED LANDSCAPING, WHICH IS DEFINED BY BOTH HARDCAPE AND SOFTSCAPE, FOR THE REVISED BUILDING 10 INCLUDES A WATER FEATURE AND PATIO AREA IN AN AREA PREVIOUSLY DESIGNATED AS A LANDSCAPED AREA.” BOARD MEMBER WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Board Member Guenther referred to the finding related to Comprehensive Plan Criteria E.1.a and suggested the Board come up with a more professional term than “cookie cutter.” Board Member Schaefer suggested that the words “and not cookie cutter” should be deleted.

BOARD MEMBER GUENTHER MOVED THAT THE FINDING RELATED TO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CRITERIA E.1.a BE CHANGED BY DELETING THE WORDS, “AND NOT COOKIE CUTTER.” BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Board Member Walker suggested that if the third sentence in the third paragraph of the introduction is changed to define landscaping as both hardscape and softscape, perhaps it would also be appropriate to add the word “softscape” before “landscaped area.”

BOARD MEMBER WALKER MOVED THAT THE THIRD SENTENCE IN THE THIRD PARAGRAPH OF THE INTRODUCTION BE FURTHER CHANGED BY ADDING “SOFTSCAPE” BEFORE “LANDSCAPED AREA.” BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

City Attorney Tarraday observed that the last sentence in the finding related to Comprehensive Plan Criteria D.2.b needs further clarification.

BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER MOVED THAT THE LAST SENTENCE OF THE FINDING RELATED TO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CRITERIA D.2.b BE AMENDED BY DELETING THE WORD “AND” THAT FOLLOWS THE WORD “SOUTH.” BOARD MEMBER WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Lien pointed out that, once the Board has completed their review of the findings and taken formal action, the “from” line on the memorandum would be changed to “Brian Gootee, Chair, City of Edmonds Architectural Design Board.” The word “proposed” would also be removed from the title of the memorandum. The Board agreed that would be appropriate.

BOARD MEMBER WALKER MOVED THAT THE BOARD ADOPT THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND DECISIONS OUTLINED IN ATTACHMENT 1 AS AMENDED BY THE BOARD VIA THE PREVIOUS MOTIONS. BOARD MEMBER GUENTHER SECONDED THE MOTION.

PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS:

Phase 2 of the two-phase public hearing process for district-based design review of a new veterinary clinic to be located at 310 – 5th Avenue South. The completed project will include an approximate 6,000 square foot, two-story building with approximately 4,800 square feet of underground parking garage below. The design review application was prepared by Architectural Werks on behalf of Christopher Garg, VMD. The site is located in the Downtown Business (Downtown Mixed Commercial), BD2, zone. (File Number PLN20130027)

Board Member Guenther recused himself from the public hearing.

Ms. Machuga presented the Staff Report and Jeff Clark and Bernand Hou were present to represent the applicant, Christopher Garg, who was also present.

Ms. Machuga advised that the application is for design review for a new two-story veterinary clinic at 310 – 5th Avenue South. She explained that projects within the BD zones require a two-phase public hearing. The purpose of the Phase 1 hearing is for the ADB to set priorities through the Design Guidelines Checklist. She advised that the ADB conducted a Phase 1 public hearing on June 5, 2013, and tonight is scheduled as Phase 2 of the public hearing process. She announced that the applicant has provided more detailed plans, which were analyzed in the Staff Report. A State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Determination of Non-significance (DNS) was issued on July 24th following the Phase 1 hearing. The appeal period for the SEPA determination ended on the afternoon of August 7th, and no comments or appeals were received.

Ms. Machuga said the Staff Report includes a detailed analysis of the proposal’s compliance with the applicable design objectives of the Comprehensive Plan, priorities established by the ADB in the Design Guidelines Checklist, applicable zoning requirements, and Design Standards for the Downtown Business (BD) zones. She observed that the applicable design objectives and guidelines are fairly repetitive and are specifically addressed in the Staff Report. She said staff feels the proposal is generally in compliance with all the applicable design standards, with just a few conditions as outlined in the Staff Report. One condition would require that the metal cornice proposed for the western facade be carried around to the upper floor on the eastern side of the building. This change would help to accentuate the top of the

building. Staff is also recommending a condition that would require additional trim detail to the tops and bottoms of the windows on the western side and to the tops of the windows on the second floor on the eastern side to help accentuate the windows. She noted that the applicant is proposing that the building be placed at the northern property line, so the ADB should also consider whether or not the northern building façade should be further broken up.

Ms. Machuga said staff is recommending that the ADB approve the proposal with the nine recommended conditions of approval as outlined in the Staff Report. She noted that the applicant is not prepared to make a formal presentation to the Board, but a materials board has been provided for the Board's information.

Jeff Clark, Architectural Werks, Bothell, Washington, passed around the color and materials board. He said the applicant does not have any major concerns with the findings contained in the Staff Report and is more than willing to comply with the recommended conditions. He summarized that the intent was to design a building with a more modern take on a classical theme. Given that two sides of the building are located at the property line, it was difficult to transition to the classical theme from the front to the back. However, he felt the proposed design accomplishes this goal and the recommendations in the Staff Report provide further support.

Board Member Broadway inquired about the concrete masonry units (CMU) that would be used for the proposed awnings. Mr. Clark answered that the awnings would be constructed of integral concrete. Everything they are proposing would be in the concrete rather than painted. There was some concern about painting on the far side given the building's close proximity to adjacent structures. The base of the building (parking level) would be constructed of concrete walls that would have to be painted.

Board Member Schaefer asked if the applicant has considered options for softening the north wall a bit. He acknowledged that the adjacent site might be redeveloped in the future and another structure could abut the proposed new building, but the adjacent property is currently developed as a residential use. He suggested the applicant consider using a type of green wall similar to the one proposed for the back side. Mr. Clark said the applicant proposed a green wall on that corner. However, in recent discussions, the neighbor to the north did not have significant concerns about the proposed design and was not interested in having an easement on her property to accommodate the green wall. Board Member Schaefer summarized that he supports the proposed design for the north wall, as long as the adjacent property owner is fine with it.

Chair Gootee said it appears that the applicant has addressed most of the concerns raised by the Board at the Phase 1 public hearing.

Vice Chair O'Neill said he supports the proposed design for the east façade, but he is concerned about the north façade. Mr. Clark explained that a rain screen polycarbonate panel has been proposed for the east façade. While the panel is fire resistant, it is not impervious to fire and cannot be used on the north and south facades. Both the north and south facades require concrete masonry units (CMU), and they are trying to get away from that material on the front side. He said he has heard reports that the property owners to the south and north have indicated an interest in selling and/or redeveloping their properties.

Board Member Schaefer asked if the green screen on the western side of the building would be Boston Ivy. Mr. Clark answered that Boston Ivy would be planted to cover the CMU enclosure, and honeysuckle would be planted to cover a stainless steel wire stand. Board Member Walker noted that Boston Ivy is frequently used to cover CMU materials.

Chair Gootee referred to Attachment A11 and questioned the abrupt change of materials when transitioning from the west façade to the north and south facades. Mr. Clark reminded the Board that a fire wall is required for both the north and south facades, and the applicant is proposing to use CMU materials. It is not possible to continue the materials used on the western façade to the north and south facades because they are not fire rated. He also reminded the Board that neither the north nor south facades would be visible when redevelopment occurs at some point in the future. They did

try to match the materials colorwise, the lines were extended further back, and a vertical construction joint was added to match the width across the front.

Vice Chair O'Neill asked for clarification of the proposed condition that would require the metal cornice to be carried around the eastern side of the second floor instead of metal coping. Mr. Clark explained staff is asking that the flat coping on the eastern side be changed to a step coping similar to that proposed for the front façade. Ms. Machuga explained that the cornice proposed for the front façade would be more decorative than the coping.

Board Member Broadway asked if the rain leader on the south side of the garage doors would be painted white. Mr. Clark said the rain leaders would be located internally. However, the concrete wall that is shown in white would be painted to match the rest of the building.

Board Member Schaefer asked if the metal mesh garage door would allow light to penetrate. Mr. Clark answered affirmatively. He said the applicant is concerned about security, but the mesh door should allow for adequate air turnover, as well.

There was no one in the audience so the public portion of the hearing was closed.

Board Member O'Neill asked if proposed Condition 2 is an attempt to require the applicant to provide more details around the windows on the west side. Mr. Clark said the applicant would prefer not to add this additional trim detail. He noted that the applicant is proposing a rain panel system on the western façade so the more difficult the window trim detail, the harder it will be to fit the rain screens onto the building. Board Member O'Neill suggested that additional window detail on the western façade would contradict the applicant's proposed design. The majority of the Board concurred.

Mr. Clark said the applicant would also prefer not to add the metal cornice on the second floor on the eastern façade, and they would prefer less detailed windows on the eastern façade, as well. While he supports eliminating the condition that would require more window detail, Board Member Schaefer said he supports staff's proposed condition that would require a metal cornice on the second floor on the eastern façade to tie the second floor to the ground level. Vice Chair O'Neill concurred.

BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER MOVED THAT THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD ADOPT THE FINDINGS CONCLUSIONS AND ANALYSIS OF THE STAFF REPORT AND FIND THAT THE PROPOSAL (FILE NUMBER PLN20130027) IS CONSISTENT WITH THE ZONING ORDINANCE, THE DESIGN OBJECTIVES OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, THE DESIGN CRITERIA IDENTIFIED DURING PHASE 1 OF THE PUBLIC HEARING, AND THE DESIGN STANDARDS OF ECDC 22.43, AND APPROVE THE PROPOSAL WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. 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.**
- 2. THE METAL CORNICE SHALL BE CARRIED AROUND THE EASTERN SIDE OF THE SECOND FLOOR INSTEAD OF METAL COPING.**
- 3. TRANSPARENCY AT STREET LEVEL SHALL BE PROVIDED CONSISTENT WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF ECDC 22.43.050.**
- 4. STREET TREE(S) WILL BE REQUIRED CONSISTENT WITH THE CITY STREET TREE PLAN. SPACING AND VARIETY WILL BE SPECIFIED DURING THE BUILDING PERMIT REVIEW PHASE.**

5. ALL IMPERVIOUS SURFACES SHALL BE DISCHARGED TO THE ONSITE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM. THE PLANS CURRENTLY SHOW THE TRENCH DRAIN BYPASSING THE ONSITE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM. VERIFICATION OF THE IMPERVIOUS SURFACE AREA AND SIZING OF THE STORM DETENTION SYSTEM WILL BE REVIEWED BY THE ENGINEERING DIVISION AT THE TIME OF BUILDING PERMIT SUBMITTAL.
6. THE ENGINEERING DIVISION HAS REVIEWED AND APPROVED THE TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS. THE TRAFFIC IMPACT FEES WILL BE ASSESSED DURING THE BUILDING PERMIT REVIEW PHASE.
7. COMPLIANCE WITH ENGINEERING CODES AND CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS WILL BE REVIEWED WITH THE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE. THE APPLICANT IS ENCOURAGED, WHEREVER FEASIBLE, TO INCORPORATE PERVIOUS PAVEMENTS, RAIN GARDENS AND/OR OTHER LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT TECHNIQUES INTO THE PROJECT DESIGN.
8. THE APPLICANT MUST APPLY FOR AND OBTAIN ALL NECESSARY PERMITS. THIS APPLICATION IS SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS IN THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE. IT IS UP TO THE APPLICANT TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH THE VARIOUS PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE ORDINANCES.

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION, AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CONSOLIDATED PERMIT APPLICATIONS (No Public Participation):

There were no consolidated permit applications scheduled on the agenda.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

Mr. Lien presented Chair Gootee with an updated draft of the Findings, Conclusions and Decision for File Number PLN20130022 (Point Edwards Building 10). Chair Gootee signed the document on behalf of the Board.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

Chair Gootee requested an update on filling the vacant Board position. Ms. Machuga said she does not know the status of the vacant position.

Board Member Walker announced that he will resign his position on the Board so he can attend graduate school in London for a year.

As discussed prior to the meeting with the City Attorney, Board Member Schaefer suggested that it would be helpful for the Board Members to receive some training on the Appearance of Fairness rules. Mr. Lien said staff would schedule an opportunity for the City Attorney to conduct a training session with the ADB, especially with the recent turnover on the Board and the fact that more projects are coming online.

Jen Machuga announced that a public hearing for Phase 1 of the proposed Post Office Redevelopment Project has been scheduled for September 4th.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:17 p.m.