

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

**October 2, 2013**

---

Chair Gootee called the meeting of the Architectural Design Board to order at 7:00 p.m., at the City Council Chambers, 250 - 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, Edmonds, Washington.

**Board Members Present**

Bryan Gootee, Chair  
Bruce O'Neill, Vice Chair  
Brian Borofka  
Lois Broadway

**Board Members Absent**

Cary Guenther (excused)  
Rick Schaefer (excused)

**Staff Present**

Kernen, Lien, Senior Planner  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 4, 2013 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. VICE CHAIR O'NEILL SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY MOVED TO AMEND THE AGENDA TO PLACE THE PUBLIC HEARING (ITEM 7A) BEFORE THE CANDIDATE INTERVIEW (ITEM 4.A). CHAIR GOOTEE 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:**

No minor projects were scheduled on the agenda.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS:**

**Public hearing on Swedish Edmond Medical Center's proposal to construct a 363-stall, 3-story parking structure. The site is located at 21601 – 76<sup>th</sup> Avenue West (File Number PLN20130052).**

Mr. Lien presented the Staff Report, advising that this is a public hearing on Swedish Edmonds Medical Center's proposal to construct a 363 stall, 3-story parking structure on the hospital campus located at 21601 – 76<sup>th</sup> Avenue West. The structure will be located in the middle of the existing south parking lot and will be surrounded by the hospital and other medical-use buildings on the north, west and east. He explained that the parking structure is the first phase of proposed development on the hospital campus. In a few months, the Board will review additions to the hospital, which will take up some of the existing parking space. The parking garage is intended to replace the lost space.

Mr. Lien advised that a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review was required because the proposed project would exceed 20 new parking spaces. He announced that a SEPA determination of Non-Significance was issued on September 16<sup>th</sup> (Attachment 9), and no comments or appeals were received. He explained that the parcel the parking garage will be located on is split zoned. The western portion of the site is zoned Medical Use (MU) as is the rest of the hospital campus. The eastern portion is zoned General Commercial (CG2). He reminded the Board that design review of projects within the MU zone that require SEPA review are processed as Type III-B decisions. The Board will review the proposed development, conduct a public hearing and render a decision. The Board's decision is appealable to the City Council via a closed record appeal.

Mr. Lien reminded the Board that, when reviewing development proposals, they are required to find that they are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, policies of Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC) 20.10.000, design criteria of ECDC 20.11.030 and zoning regulations. He referred to the Staff Report, which provides a detailed analysis of how staff finds the proposal to be consistent with the above mentioned documents. He also referred to the materials board that was provided by the applicant.

Mr. Lien advised that the proposed new structure would be located on a site that is identified in the Comprehensive Plan as Hospital/Medical and within the Highway 99 Medical Activity Center High Rise Node, which has an unlimited height. The site is also subject to and must be consistent with the Stevens Memorial Hospital Master Plan, which is an adopted element of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Lien referred to Attachment 6 (parking Analysis prepared by Transportation Solutions, Inc.) and Attachment 7 (Parking Excerpt from traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Transportation Solutions, Inc.). He explained that Attachment 7 provides an explanation of how the proposed parking structure would meet the City's current parking standards. He reviewed that the parking requirement for hospital uses is three parking spaces per bed, and the parking requirement for medical uses is one parking space per 200 square feet of medical-use space. The hospital has 217 beds, which would require 651 parking spaces. Three other buildings provide 94,173 square feet of medical-use space, which would require another 471 parking spaces. The total number of parking spaces required on the hospital campus is 1,122, and the total number of parking spaces that would be available on the campus after the parking structure is completed would be 1,234.

Mr. Lien explained that Type V Landscaping is required for surface parking lots, but applying these standards to parking structures requires flexibility. Staff suggests the applicant calculate the required amount of Type V Landscaping from the number of surface parking spaces that are being displaced as a result of the parking structure. The parking structure and reconfiguration of some surface parking would result in the displacement of 177 surface parking spaces. Pursuant to ECDC 20.13.030E.1.b, which requires 35 square feet of landscaping for each parking space, the applicant is proposing 6,212 square feet of Type V Landscaping around the parking structure and to the northwest of the structure to accommodate a new fire lane.

Mr. Lien pointed out that one condition of approval is that the applicant must provide height calculations with the building permit application to show that the project meets the height limit. He noted that the height of the proposed parking garage is 31 feet 8 inches, which is within the height limit allowed in the MU (35 feet) and CG2 (75 feet) zones, as well as the height limit of the intermediate height envelope (5 stories of 60 feet) of the Stevens Memorial Hospital Master Plan. He concluded that the height of the proposed structure is well within the allowed height limit.

Mr. Lien referred to an illustration of the proposed parking structure, which is proposed to be open, with no roof. He specifically recalled the design standards related to massing and roof modulation. He noted that the building would be open, and different colors and materials would be used to help break up the mass of the proposed structure. In addition, modulation at the top of the structure would be provided by the stair wells and elevator shaft, as well as the decorative canopies.

Mr. Lien recommended the Board approve the application with the following conditions:

1. Height calculations are required with the building permit application in order to show that the project meets the height limit.
2. The applicant must apply for and obtain all necessary permits. The 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 pointed out that, although the Staff Report mentions some aspects of the proposal that were addressed by the SEPA determination, it did not include any information regarding traffic impacts. Mr. Lien explained that it is not anticipated that the proposed parking structure would generate any new traffic. Traffic would be generated by the medical buildings, and a traffic impact analysis was done for the proposed addition to the hospital. This analysis would be presented to the Board as part of a separate application.

Board Member Borofka questioned why the Board is being asked to review the parking structure as a separate project instead of in conjunction with the hospital's proposal to construct a new emergency room and urgent care center. Mr. Lien said the applicant could have combined the two projects for SEPA review, but chose to submit the parking structure proposal as a separate application. The traffic impact analysis that was completed for the new medical facility addressed the number of parking spaces that would be required to accommodate the added space. Board Member Borofka said he would prefer to review the proposed changes at Swedish Edmonds Medical Center holistically, recognizing that there will be some change in traffic as more vehicles will likely be accessing the site. Mr. Lien suggested that the applicants address this issue further in their presentation.

**David Jaffe, Chief Executive Officer, Swedish Edmonds Medical Center**, provided a brief overview of the project in its entirety to serve as a backdrop for the remainder of the applicant's presentation. He said the hospital is thrilled that the facility will finally be upgraded after so many years. He noted that no upgrades have been done on the hospital since 1972, and the proposed project will include a new emergency facility, an urgent care facility, a new patient imaging center, a 10-bed observation unit, and a new face for the hospital.

Mr. Jaffe emphasized that the emergency facility is the core of the project. Currently, the hospital serves in excess of 42,000 patients, and it was designed to handle 25,000 patients. While they have been able to provide excellent care in the existing facility, overall patient care and efficiency is sorely lacking. The hospital's goal is to meet the growing needs of the community and to bring the highest level of care to the residents of the community.

Mr. Jaffe explained that it is important that patients are treated in the right setting and at the most appropriate cost. Right now, patients only have one alternative for an emergency need, and emergency room care is more costly than the care that can be provided in an urgent care facility. Providing an urgent care facility will allow the hospital to bring down the cost of medical care, which is important to the community. They want to make sure patients have the ultimate experience in a safe, comfortable, calm and welcoming environment that provides the highest care possible.

Mr. Jaffe advised that the parking structure is a very necessary component of the proposed upgrades. Constructing the new facility will require the elimination of a number of surface parking spaces, and these spaces must be added elsewhere on the campus in order to meet the City's parking requirement. The hospital believes that a multi-storied parking structure is the most appropriate manner to provide the needed parking spaces.

**Scott Harris, JRJ Architects, LLC**, explained that the hospital update is a two-part project. He said his firm was hired to design the proposed parking structure, but not the new hospital facility. He referred to the parking analysis that was prepared by Transportation Solutions, Inc. to identify the number of parking spaces needed for the entire update project. He reported that the proposed parking structure would allow the hospital to provide 110 to 115 more parking spaces than required by City code. He explained that the parking structure must be in place before the hospital breaks ground on the Acute Care Center (ACC) sometime next spring.

Mr. Harris provided a map to identify the proposed location for the new parking structure, specifically noting that the applicant is limited by fire lanes on the north and south sides. In order to get the number of parking spaces and ramps necessary, the parking structure will be within inches of the fire lanes. He advised that the proposed structure would provide 363 parking spaces, and the first level would be at grade, with a 5-foot drop from the northwest to the southeast corners. The entry points at the northwest and southeast corners would meet up with the existing grade.

Mr. Harris advised that the main material for the parking structure would be cast-in concrete. The structure would be open to provide visual access through all levels. The only enclosure would be the elevator hoistways that would serve all three floors. The exterior of the hoistways would be constructed of ground-face architectural blocks. Vehicle barriers, also constructed of ground-face architectural blocks, would be provided on all levels. Stair canopies, as well as two longer canopies on the east and north elevation would be constructed of steel and painted white to add vertical clarity and interest to the structure. In order to protect the stairs from the wind and rain, the applicant is proposing a perforated metal screen that would be somewhat transparent. He advised that the height of the building is 31 feet 8 inches in the northwest corner, with a 5-foot drop to the southwest corner. A small bit of sidewalk would be provided at the northwest entry to provided pedestrian safety. Access and circulation throughout the site would be reconfigured to make it easier for visitors and staff to find the entry and move through the area.

Mr. Harris advised that the applicant considered the incorporation of low-impact development options. While the soil on the site perks too slow to accommodate pervious pavement, bio-retention planters would be provided to pre-filter the stormwater before it gets to the stormwater system.

Board Member Borofka asked if there would be some designated parking spaces in the proposed parking structure. Mr. Harris answered that the structure is intended to primarily serve hospital staff, but visitor parking would be allowed, as well. The hospital's intent is to provide visitor parking closer to the actual medical facilities. All of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) parking would be located closer to the entryways for each of the medical facilities. He noted that five spaces in the new parking structure would be designated for low-emission vehicles, and the applicant will provide conduit for future electric car charging stations. Board Member Borofka asked if there would be designated spaces for compact cars within the new parking structure. Mr. Harris answered that because the City's standards require such a small dimension already (16 feet by 8.5 feet), the applicant did not feel making smaller spaces would be prudent.

Board Member Broadway referred to Sheet C3 in Attachment 3 and noted that the property has a natural slope from the west to the east. She asked if the proposed plan addresses the potential sheet flow from the west to the east, and how it could impact the structural concrete on the west face of the building. Mr. Harris answered that the applicant has proposed pitching the grade away from the building so the water flows into a drain that collects it and puts it into the stormwater system.

Vice Chair O'Neill asked if the proposed parking structure would result in an increase of impervious surface on the hospital campus site. Mr. Harris answered that there would be very little, if any, increase in impervious surface.

At the request of Chair Gootee, Mr. Harris pointed out where the bio-retention planters and stormwater vaults would be located on the site. He noted that stormwater overflow would be taken to a surface detention pipe.

Chair Gootee questioned what the aluminum screen proposed around the elevator shaft and stairs would look like in a few years. Mr. Harris said the applicant has considered a few options for the screening material, and they are

considering a similar material to that used on the Cancer Care Center. It is transparent, but minimizes the impact of rain and wind on people using the stairs. He agreed that maintenance of materials is always a concern in the northwest. The block material will have similar issues, and regular maintenance will be required.

Chair Gootee observed that different colors have been proposed for the concrete materials used on the façade of the building. Mr. Harris answered that the concrete materials would be lighter and darker shades of gray, and the canopies and vertical columns would be painted white to provide contrast.

Board Member Borofka questioned how well the painted steel canopies would hold up in the weather. Mr. Harris said the applicant is proposing to use a high-performance, marine-grade primer and paint for the steel canopies. This material is made to last for years.

Vice Chair O'Neill asked if the applicant is proposing any signage on the proposed parking structure. Mr. Harris said no signage is currently proposed, with the exception of internal directional signs and bang bars to make sure cars over seven feet tall do not enter the garage. He reminded the Board that the structure is intended primarily for staff parking.

Board Member Borofka noted that the applicant is proposing LID lighting. Mr. Harris explained that the light standards would be at a maximum height of 15 feet on the upper level. He referred to the photometric plan (Sheet E1.1 of Attachment 3), which shows the proposed pole locations. He said the proposed lights include reflectors to control the pattern of the lighting. Controls would be provided inside the structure so that lighting can be reduced during daylight hours and increased as it becomes darker.

Chair Gootee asked Mr. Harris to share his thoughts on how the proposed lighting would impact adjacent properties. Mr. Harris said the parking structure would be open 24 hours per day. He said security and safety are a high priority for the hospital, and lighting must be at a level that people will feel comfortable moving in the parking garage at night. He said the lights will be set at a half candle minimum and one candle average, and they will be distributed as evenly as possible. The lighting inside the structure will be a little brighter for security purposes. He pointed out that there is an established line of trees along one side, and the structure will be surrounded with campus parking and buildings.

Board Member Borofka said he believes the need for the parking structure is being driven by the anticipated increase in vehicles associated with the new medical facility. He questioned the location of the new facility and asked if a traffic study was done to identify the impacts associated with increased traffic. Mr. Harris used a map to identify the location of the new medical facility, as well as the location of the existing hospital. Chair Gootee asked if the proposed new structure would be connected to the hospital, and Mr. Harris answered affirmatively.

Mr. Lien advised that a traffic analysis has been completed for the proposed new facility, which will come before the Board as a separate application. The analysis was forwarded to the City's Traffic Engineer for review and comment. He emphasized that the analysis is related to the proposed new facility, as it is not anticipated that the parking structure would generate additional traffic, and the main access to the hospital from 216<sup>th</sup> Street would not change.

Mr. Jaffe reminded the Board that the existing emergency room was designed for 25,000 patients per year, and they are now seeing in excess of 42,000 patients. This has resulted in problems with patient flow. He said he anticipates the new facility will see roughly the same number of patients, but in a more well-designed and efficient facility. He said he anticipates nominal growth, but not a dramatic increase in the number of patients served. The urgent care facility will take some of the patients currently being seen at the emergency room, and the 10-bed observation facility will be designed to avoid admitting patients to the hospital if possible. This is a much more cost-effective and efficient way to take care of patients. He said there is already an imaging center on the hospital campus, but the new facility would provide a more appropriate setting for the patients. He concluded that while the hospital facilities would be upgraded, they do not anticipate a dramatic increase in the number of people served.

Mr. Jaffe also advised that the applicant would provide two catch basins to capture the sheet flow water that comes from the remaining surface lots. The catch basins would intercept the runoff before it reaches the foundation of the new parking structure.

No one in the audience indicated a desire to comment on the proposed project, and the public portion of the hearing was closed.

Chair Gootee said he finds the proposed parking structure to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and zoning standards. The elevation drawings are well done, and he can easily visualize what the applicant is proposing.

Board Member Broadway recommended that the Board considering adding the following conditions to their approval of the project:

- Surface parking stalls are located immediately to the west of the building. She recommended that wheel stops be added to prevent cars from encroaching too closely to the building and leaving marks on the concrete at the ground level.
- Because the parking structure would be primarily used for staff parking, and shift changes happen during the night, she recommended that emergency call buttons be installed on the light poles throughout the garage.
- She also recommended the applicant install security cameras on all levels of the garage.
- While not a lot of landscaping has been proposed for the project, she expressed concern that the landscaping in the northwest corner might grow too tall and end up creating a pedestrian safety issue. She recommended that the applicant reconsider the size of the proposed landscaping near cross walks.
- No crosswalk is currently proposed near the stairway in the southeast corner of the structure. She suggested that the applicant provide some type of crosswalk or other demarcation for pedestrians coming out of this exit location to provide safe travel to their hospital destinations.

Board Member Borofka observed that some of the ADA parking spaces proposed for the hospital campus appear to be too narrow. Mr. Lien advised that the size of the ADA parking spaces would be evaluated by the building official as part of the building permit review to ensure they are consistent with ADA requirements. He said the applicant has discussed the idea of including ADA parking spaces in the new parking structure, but the Building Official suggested it would make more sense to provide the ADA spaces closer to the hospital facilities.

Board Member Borofka asked if it is within the Board's purview to consider pedestrian safety issues beyond the structure. Mr. Lien answered that it is within the Board's purview to look at safe pedestrian routes, which is a specific design objective in the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that the pedestrian routes throughout the hospital campus are clearly defined and will be improved, particularly in the northwest corner.

Mr. Harris advised that the entrance at the southeast corner would be for emergency access only. The City requires that two access points be provided, but the applicant anticipates that the majority of people will use the northwest access, since it is significantly closer to the medical facilities that the parking structure is intended to serve. He explained that adding a crosswalk at the southeast corner would be difficult because of the limited access isles. The applicant cannot create more width in the building without eliminating parking to the east. Board Member Broadway said that, in light of the fact that the southeast entrance would be for emergency access, she supports the design as proposed.

Mr. Harris advised that the applicant is proposing to install four emergency telephones and six security cameras on each floor of the proposed structure. The plantings in the northwest corner are intended to be low-growing, and he hopes the hospital's landscaping staff will keep them trimmed. He agreed that wheel stops on the western side of the structure would be appropriate, as suggested by Board Member Broadway.

**BOARD MEMBER BOROFKA MOVED THAT THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD ADOPT THE FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS AND ANALYSIS IN THE STAFF REPORT, FIND THE PROPOSAL CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, POLICIES OF ECDC 20.10.000, DESIGN CRITERIA OF ECDC 20.11.030 AND ZONING REGULATIONS AND APPROVE THE PROPOSED SWEDISH EDMONDS MEDICAL CENTER PARKING STRUCTURE (FILE NUMBER PLN20130052) WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS.**

- 1. HEIGHT CALCULATIONS ARE REQUIRED WITH THE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION IN ORDER TO SHOW THAT THE PROJECT MEETS THE HEIGHT LIMIT.**
- 2. 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.**
- 3. WHEEL STOPS WILL BE ADDED ALONG THE EDGE OF THE SURFACE PARKING AREA LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE.**
- 4. CALL BUTTONS OR EMERGENCY TELEPHONES WILL BE PROVIDED ON EACH LEVEL**
- 5. SECURITY CAMERAS WILL BE PROVIDED ON EACH LEVEL.**
- 6. THE VEGETATION SELECTED FOR THE NORTHWEST CORNER WILL BE APPROPRIATELY MAINTAINED TO ENSURE SAFETY FOR PEDESTRIANS.**

**BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

#### **INTERVIEWS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD CANDIDATES**

The Board interviewed Tina Vincent for the vacant Architectural Design Board position.

#### **CONSOLIDATED PERMIT APPLICATIONS (No Public Participation):**

No consolidated permit applications were scheduled for review.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Lien announced that the Board's next meeting is October 16<sup>th</sup> to review a sign permit application.

The Board had a discussion about what is within their purview to review when considering project proposals. There was particular discussion about whether traffic, pedestrian safety and stormwater issues could be addressed by the Board. Mr. Lien reminded the Board that their responsibility is to review applications for consistency with not only the design criteria called out in the development code, but with the design objectives outlined in the Comprehensive Plan, as well. He noted that the Comprehensive Plan includes design objectives related to both traffic and pedestrian safety, so it is within the Board's purview to consider these two issues. He also said it is within the Board's purview to consider how stormwater could impact the architecture of the building.

Mr. Lien pointed out that the staff's recommendation for approval always includes a condition that the applicant must apply for and obtain all necessary permits and that the application is subject to the requirements in the Edmonds Community Development Code. He reminded the Board that applicants are not required to provide civil drawings for design review. The more detailed, civil drawings are required for the building permit application, and various City departments will review the plans for consistency with code requirements related to traffic, safety, stormwater, lighting, parking, etc. However, it would be appropriate for the Board to provide direction on how the applicant could address these issues on the subject property. For example, traffic will be addressed as part of the State Environmental Policy Act

(SEPA) review, and mitigation will be required to address additional impacts identified in the traffic impact analysis, but it would be appropriate for the Board to provide direction related to traffic circulation and safety on the subject property.

Board Member Borofka requested that staff schedule a training session for Board Members. Mr. Lien agreed to contact the City Attorney to set up a training session at an upcoming Board meeting.

**ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:**

The Board discussed the candidate for the vacant ADB position. While they felt that Ms. Vincent had the technical capability and professional training to make a knowledgeable contribution to the Board, they were concerned about her hesitancy to make the required commitment. Mr. Lien agreed to forward the Board's comments to the Mayor.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.