

DRAFT

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

July 2, 2014

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
Brian Borofka
Lois Broadway
Bruce O'Neill

Board Members Absent

Rick Schaefer (excused)
Cary Guenther (excused)

Staff Present

Mike Clugston, Senior Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JUNE 4, 2014 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER BOROFKA SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY MOVED THAT THE AGENDA BE ACCEPTED AS PRESENTED. BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH 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.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING ON JENNA LANE TOWN HOMES (FILE NUMBER PLN20140009)

The applicant is seeking design approval for two duplexes and a single unit at 8506 and 8510 – 240th Street Southwest. Two existing single-family residences will be removed while new frontage, utility and landscaping improvements will be constructed in conjunction with the five new dwelling units. The site is zoned Residential Multifamily (RM-2.4). This is a Type III-B permit with a public hearing and a decision made by the Architectural Design Board (ADB).

Chair Gootee emphasized that this is a continuation of the June 4th public hearing. Mr. Clugston added that the Board reviewed the project in detail on June 4th and requested the applicant provide additional materials to clarify the proposal. Because they continued the hearing to a date certain (July 2nd), no additional public notice was required. After the staff and applicant have presented the additional materials and information requested by the Board, the Board will accept additional public testimony. After closing the public hearing, it is anticipated that the Board will deliberate and make a decision. He advised that, in addition to the exhibits presented on June 4th, the following exhibits were added to the record:

- Exhibit 0 – Staff Memorandum dated June 24, 2014
- Exhibit 5 – June 4, 2014 Meeting Minutes
- Exhibit 6 – Applicant’s Response Letter
- Exhibit 7 – Revised Elevation Drawing for Units A and B
- Exhibit 8 – Revised Elevation Drawing for Units C and D
- Exhibit 9 – Revised Elevation Drawing for Unit E
- Exhibit 10 – Unit B Cross Section
- Exhibit 11 – Unit C Cross Section
- Exhibit 12 – Unit D Cross Section
- Exhibit 13 -- Revised Landscape Plan

He noted that at the June 4th hearing, the Board requested the applicant:

- **Provide south elevation drawings and artist renderings depicting how the buildings will look from 240th Street Southwest, Edmonds Way and the eastern property line.** Mr. Clugston reviewed that no south elevation drawings were provided in the original submittal. At the request of the Board, the applicant provided revised elevation drawings for Unit E (Exhibit 9), Units A and B (Exhibit 7) and Units C and D (Exhibit 8). In response to the Board’s comments at the last meeting that the original design for the three buildings was fairly sparse, the applicant has added detail to each of the buildings through the use of additional materials, colors, roof lines, etc.
- **Provide a drawing illustrating what the retaining wall system will be.** Mr. Clugston recalled that the Board requested more information about the proposed retaining wall along Edmonds Way. The applicant has indicated that the retaining wall would be eliminated from the proposal by lowering the pad elevation of Unit E. This should make the building less prominent and easier to screen with landscaping.
- **Provide revised north, east and west elevations that break up the façade.** Mr. Clugston reviewed that the Board requested cross sections of the proposed buildings to get a feel for how they would look relative to the existing buildings to the east. Currently, there are two single-family homes on the site, and it is clear that the new set of buildings would be larger. He referred to Exhibits 10, 11 and 12, which provide cross sections for Units B, C and D. He noted that the proposed new buildings would be sunk down into the site a bit. The site elevation for the existing building to the east would be about 429 feet adjacent to Unit B (Exhibit 10), 427 adjacent to Unit C (Exhibit 11) and 426 adjacent to Unit D (Exhibit 12). He explained that the building to the east is three stories tall. Although it is also sunk into the site, it is a little taller than the proposed new buildings. He acknowledged that the first and second floors of the existing building would look directly at the new buildings, but the third story should have a view over the new buildings. He emphasized that the buildings would be constructed to code, which means the applicant would not be allowed a greater height than what is allowed for any other development in the RM-2.4 zone.
- **Provide a revised landscape plan.** Mr. Clugston explained that in response to the Board’s concern that the original landscape plan was insufficient in some locations, the applicant has presented a new landscape plan (Exhibit 13) showing Type I landscaping along Edmonds Way and Type III landscaping along 240th Street Southwest. In addition, the landscaping along the west and east property lines is more in line with Type II specifications.

In addition to these items, Mr. Clugston recalled that the Board also discussed requiring additional lighting in the landscaped areas west of the driveway (See Condition 3 in Exhibit 1). The majority of the Board agreed that lighting should not be required and Condition 3 should be eliminated. They also discussed the need to screen utility and other structures. It was agreed that rather than requiring the landscape plan to be updated to incorporate the required screening, the issue could be addressed by Condition 2 of Exhibit 1, which simply requires the equipment to be screened.

With the additional information provided by the applicant, Mr. Clugston recommended the Board approve the revised design of the Jenna Lane Townhouses, with the following conditions:

1. The applicant must apply for and obtain all necessary permits.
2. All above-ground utility equipment must be located interior to the site or camouflaged or screened.
3. All light fixtures shall be dark-sky compliant cut-off fixtures.
4. The deck off the back of the house to the west will have to be removed, modified or otherwise provided for during building permit review.
5. A pedestrian walkway must be created connecting each of the dwelling units with the 240th Street Southwest right-of-way.

Board Member Borofka noted that the original submittal included a site grading plan (Exhibit 1 Attachment 7e). He asked if the applicant submitted an updated grading plan with the new submittal to incorporate the changes in the elevation of Unit E and elimination of the retaining wall. Mr. Clugston answered that no new plan was submitted for site grading. There is a note in the record that the retaining wall is proposed to be removed, but the rest of the features on the site would still be constructed as originally proposed.

Board Member Borofka asked if the applicant has provided any additional information in response to concerns raised at the previous hearing regarding stormwater runoff. Mr. Clugston reminded the Board that stormwater issues would be addressed as part of the building permit phase.

Board Member Borofka noted that in the original Staff Report (Exhibit 1) Type I landscaping was recommended along Edmonds Way. He asked if the applicant's updated proposal addresses this request. Mr. Clugston explained that the landscaping proposed along Edmonds Way does not exactly meet the requirements for Type I landscaping. However, it does show screening very much in keeping with Type I requirements, including a 5-foot wood fence and a mixture of evergreen and deciduous trees, shrubs and ground cover. This is one situation where the Board has the ability to approve something that is different than a strict interpretation of the code given the narrowness of the area, as well as the stormwater dispersion trench.

Board Member Borofka pointed out that the proposed roofline for Units A and B (Exhibit 7) and Unit E (Exhibit 9) is much different than the proposed roofline for Units C and D (Exhibit 8). He asked if the alternative designs were presented as design options or if the applicant is proposing that all three buildings be different in design. Mr. Clugston said Exhibits 7, 8 and 9 indicate that the buildings would each have a different design.

The applicant, **Luay Joudeh, P.E., D.R. Strong**, expressed his belief that the additional information he provided adequately addresses all of the issues and concerns raised by the Board at the last hearing. He thanked Mr. Clugston for a thorough Staff Report describing the new information and proposed changes.

Although the final design plans have not been prepared, Mr. Joudeh said he anticipates that the utility boxes will be located in the 10-foot franchise easement along Edmonds Way. After consulting with the utility company, he learned they would prefer there be no screening in front of the utility boxes. Board Member Broadway asked Mr. Joudeh to point out on the landscape plan (Exhibit 13) where the utility boxes would be located. Again, Mr. Joudeh said that, from his experience, utility equipment is generally located within the 10-foot franchise easement. If a transformer is required for the five units, the utility company has indicated they would like it to be visible and accessible from the public right-of-way.

Board Member O'Neill requested more information about the proposed change that would eliminate the need for a retaining wall on the eastern side of the property. Mr. Joudeh explained that some grading along the east and west property lines will be required to create the building pads and access to the units. Only the retaining wall proposed along Edmonds Way was eliminated from the proposal. The retaining walls on the east and west property lines would be constructed as originally proposed at a height of about three feet.

Board Member O'Neill recalled that several neighbors raised concern at the last hearing about the relative height of the proposed buildings in relation to the existing multi-family residential building to the east. He noted that the cross sections provided by the applicant (Exhibits 10 through 12) do not reflect the new building designs proposed in Exhibit 7 through 9. In addition, the cross sections do not illustrate the relationship of the proposed new building to the existing building. Chair Gootee agreed that the Board specifically requested a profile drawing showing the neighboring condominium units relative to the adjacent sections of the proposed new buildings.

Mr. Joudeh explained that he did not go onto the adjacent private property to measure the finished height of the existing building, but each block in the elevation drawings (Exhibits 7 through 9) represents 10 feet. The existing buildings are three stories tall, but the height is only about 24.5 feet tall because they are sunken into the ground. A person standing on the third floor would be able to see above the roof elevation of the proposed new buildings. As per the proposal, some excavation will occur to establish new building pad elevations, and the buildings will be sunk into the ground in some places. For example, Unit D would be about eight feet below grade near the east property line.

Mr. Joudeh commented that the purpose of his project is to develop a place for his mother to live, with his sister living next door. They decided to construct five units on the two properties; two for the family, and three to rent out. Five units would be consistent with what the current zoning allows. The two existing homes are situated above the existing grade and are run down. Both are visible from the condominiums to the east and from Edmonds Way. He expressed his belief that the proposed development would not negatively impact the character of the site; it would actually improve it.

Chair Gootee commented that the Board had previously indicated a desire to see a profile drawing of the adjacent multi-family development relative to the proposed buildings. Mr. Joudeh pointed out that the proposed buildings would not block the view of a person standing on the third floor of the adjacent units. However, he acknowledged that people in the first and second floor units would look out at the new buildings, as they currently look out at the existing homes.

Board Member Broadway clarified that the Board is really interested in a territorial view of the heights of the proposed buildings relative to the adjacent building. They are not so concerned about the floor levels of each individual unit, but the relationship between the rooflines. Mr. Joudeh pointed out that the outcome would not likely change if he decided to build four rather than five units on the subject properties; and a four-unit development would not require ADB review and approval. Again, he questioned how he could prepare a territorial drawing without surveying the buildings. Board Member Borofka suggested there may be as-built drawings and other materials on file with the City and/or county that would show elevations or building heights for the adjacent buildings to help the applicant prepare the information.

Board Member Borofka summarized that the Board is wrestling with the fact that they requested something at the last meeting in response to relatively strong public, and the new information does not appear to be responsive. The Board is the only venue that provides the public an opportunity for formal input regarding the project, and the Board is duty bound to be responsive. The issue is not about whether four or five units are developed on the site, but responding to questions and comments brought forward by neighbors. Mr. Joudeh said he appreciates the Board's concerns related to the public comments. However, he observed that staff did not raise any concerns with the additional materials he submitted. He cautioned that there must be a benefit to providing the materials requested by the Board, and there must be an end to the process. He said he could understand the Board's request for more detailed elevation and cross section drawings if he were asking to exceed the height limit allowed for the zone, but he doesn't understand why he is being put through this process when his proposed project meets all of the zoning code requirements. Because the code allows a building height of 25 feet in the RM-2.4 zone, the outcome for the neighbors would not be different if he were to

construct fewer units on the site. He said he is not aware of any view corridors on the subject property, and he does not understand how the City can place conditions on his property to protect the neighbors' views.

Chair Gootee commented that the ADB is not required to approve a project just because it meets code. If they feel that design elements need to be addressed for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, they can request additional information or modifications. At the last hearing, several of the neighbors were having a hard time understanding the relationship of the proposed new buildings to what they currently see outside their windows. The Board requested the applicant provide a profile of the proposed new buildings and the existing buildings. He said he was expecting the applicant to provide more information than what is contained in Exhibits 10 through 12.

Board Member O'Neill agreed with the applicant that there are certain code and zoning requirements that must be met. While the Board was asking for clarification for the neighbor's understanding, the applicant has a right to build to the height allowed in that zone. If the proposal meets all of the zoning requirements, which will be determined during the building permit phase, the Board does not have the purview to restrict the building height allowed in the zone. The Board was simply asking for clarification of the proposed buildings in relationship to the neighboring development.

Mr. Joudeh said he does not object to the Board asking for more information. However, when he submitted the cross section drawings, he did not receive any feedback from staff to indicate they were inadequate to meet the Board's intent. His understanding was that staff felt the information he provided met all of the items discussed at the first hearing. If he had received different feedback a week ago, he could have provided additional information.

Board Member Borofka asked if the applicant provided samples of the colors and materials proposed for the new buildings. Mr. Joudeh answered no.

Board Member Broadway pointed out that the updated Landscape Plan (Exhibit 13) identifies evergreen trees planted 20 feet on center for 130 feet along Edmond Way. However, the planting legend indicates that only four of the evergreen trees would be planted 20 feet on center and three would be clustered in the southwest corner of the property. Mr. Joudeh said the landscaping identified in Exhibit 13 is correct. There is a gap between the trees to accommodate the dispersal drain.

Board Member O'Neill asked why the applicant is proposing a different design for each of the buildings. Mr. Joudeh explained that the architect may have gone overboard trying to address the Board's concern that there needed to be more variation in the building design, and he would prefer to use a single design for all three buildings. Board agreed that they did not intend for the applicant to have separate designs for each of the three buildings. Their goal was to create more variation, and the design shown in Exhibit 8 is a vast improvement over the other two (Exhibits 7 and 9).

Eric Hartsfield, Edmonds, said he is on the Board of Directors for the Edmonds Greenery Condominiums. He asked if the trees identified on the landscape plan as existing trees would be retained. Mr. Joudeh said the two trees on Edmonds Way, west of the property line would be retained, as would the trees on his property towards the southeast corner. Chair Gootee added that trees identified as "existing trees" on the landscape plan will be retained.

Mr. Hartsfield pointed out that the applicant's drawings are wrong. The existing building to the east is actually located further south, which means that Unit D is the only one that would have a building directly behind it. The existing unit is not sunken into the ground as suggested by the applicant. Instead, the first floor is about even with the existing grade. Units A, B and C would be adjacent to a parking lot.

Lily Bojic, Edmonds, said she owns property to the west of the proposed building site. She explained that she and her husband purchased the home several years ago and the fence and deck had already been constructed. In the proposed plan, the property line has been moved so their deck is located on the applicant's property. The proposal will require that the deck either be modified or removed. She questioned how the property lines were determined and requested to see an official report from the County Assessor. Mr. Clugston advised that the property line issue would be addressed as part of

the building permit process. In this case, it sounds like a survey would be necessary since it appears the deck encroaches over the property line.

Ms. Bojic said she is also concerned about noise during construction of the proposed project. She is planning to open a medical facility in her home, and development noise could have a negative impact on her clients. Mr. Clugston explained that noise is addressed in Edmonds City Code 5.30, which establishes the days and hours in which construction can occur. Typically, construction would be allowed Monday through Friday between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. Work outside of those hours would require a variance. He acknowledged that there will be noise associated with construction activity on the site. If she believes the noise is too loud, she could file a complaint with the City. The construction activity on the subject property is not likely to be different than any other development in Edmonds, but the code is intended to protect from noise impacts.

Deborah Givens, Edmonds, said she also lives in the Edmonds Greenery Condominiums. She said she recently spoke with Mr. Clugston to gain a better understanding about the elevations of the proposed new buildings. Based on the Board's request at the last meeting, she anticipated the applicant would provide a height comparison of the proposed and existing buildings.

Ms. Givens asked about the composition of the proposed retaining wall on the east side of the property. She also asked if it would be visible or located underground. Mr. Joudeh answered that the retaining wall would likely be constructed of keystone. It will be visible to the new units, but not from the existing units.

Ms. Givens pointed out that the existing fence is located 1.4 feet east of the property line in one location and .1 feet west of the property line in another location. She asked if the fence would be relocated to follow the property line. Mr. Joudeh explained that the existing fence meanders in and out and does not exactly follow the property line. It will be examined to determine its condition. If necessary, it will be replaced with a new solid cedar fence within the subject property boundaries.

Ms. Givens asked if the 10-foot setback requirement would be measured from the building wall or the roofline. Mr. Clugston advised that the building setback would be measured from the property line to the building wall. Projections such as roof eaves can protrude up to 30 inches into the setback area.

Ms. Givens agreed that she now looks down on the existing houses, but they do not obstruct anyone's view from the complex. She acknowledged that developing the subject property into a high-density living area will change the area. She asked that the applicant consider either raising the bedroom window on the east side of Unit D or making it shallower. The living spaces face each other, and changing the location or size of the window would improve privacy for both units. Mr. Joudeh said he would like the window to be as large as possible to allow more light into the unit. However, if the larger window would be detrimental to the project, he would consider a smaller one. The Board indicated their preference to retain the window size and location shown on the drawings.

Ms. Givens agreed with Mr. Hartsfield that the existing building is actually located further south, so that only about 10.5 feet of it would face directly towards Unit D. Mr. Clugston agreed that the existing building to the east of the subject property is shifted too far north in the illustrations. Mr. Joudeh clarified that the locations of the proposed buildings are accurate based on a field survey, but the adjacent buildings were placed on the map based on drawings from the public record.

Mr. Joudeh summarized that Ms. Given's property is located directly east of Unit D, with a little overlap. It is on the ground floor, and she looks out at trees from her patio. As currently proposed, the existing trees on the subject property would be removed and replaced with Type II Landscaping, which would not be high enough to mitigate for the existing view. It will take time for the trees to grow. If that is her concern, providing a cross section drawing of the two buildings will not help. Whatever he builds there will block her view. To be a good neighbor, he proposed that Type I Landscaping be planted along the eastern property line to provide better screening between the two buildings.

Chair Gootee asked Mr. Clugston if Type I Landscaping would be appropriate along the eastern property line. Mr. Clugston answered affirmatively. As with the Type I Landscaping proposed along Edmonds Way, it might not exactly meet the requirements given the location and size of the planting area. However, it would provide a buffer of evergreen trees to address the neighbors' concerns. Mr. Joudeh said he is willing to work with adjacent property owners to come up with an appropriate landscape plan for this area.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED AT 8:30 PM.

Board Member Borofka observed that the applicant has responded to a number of the concerns raised by the staff, the Board and citizens. However, he is concerned that the current grading plan is not consistent with the most recent changes associated with Unit E and the retaining wall along Edmonds Way. He suggested it might be appropriate to request the applicant update the plan accordingly.

Board Member Borofka also noted that an adjacent neighbor expressed concern that the proposed development would result in additional stormwater runoff that would impact his property. He referred to Exhibit 14, which is a memorandum from the City's Stormwater Engineer related to stormwater control. He recognized that stormwater will be addressed as part of the development permit but expressed concern that the Board may not have an opportunity to review the property again if significant changes are required to meet the stormwater requirements. Mr. Clugston clarified that issues related to stormwater and grading will be addressed as part of the development permit and are not within the Board's purview. The applicant has shown it is feasible to address stormwater on site; and how it is done will be decided at the building permit stage. An accurate grading plan will also be required as part of the building permit. He reminded the Board that Condition 1 would require the applicant to apply for and obtain all necessary permits. It also clarifies that the application is subject to applicable code requirements.

Board Member Borofka observed that the colored renderings of the proposed new buildings show a purple color, which is likely a result of the printer that was used to produce the copies. He suggested that perhaps an additional condition of approval could be added to ensure that the paint colors are appropriate. Mr. Clugston said the building colors shown in Exhibit 8 appear to be tans and similar earth tones.

Board Member Broadway voiced concern that Type I Landscaping might not be appropriate along the eastern boundary given that the space would only be 10 feet wide and include a retaining wall. Mr. Clugston explained that Type I Landscaping is "intended to provide a very dense sight barrier to significantly separate uses and land use districts." The goal is to use evergreen rather than deciduous trees. He agreed there would probably not be enough space along the eastern property line to exactly meet the Type I Landscaping requirements. Perhaps the condition could require Type I or similar landscaping. Board Member Broadway stressed the importance of planting evergreen species that can survive in a very narrow margin. It was pointed out that the landscaping would be located on the west side of the fence, and would not have a significant impact on the neighbor's view of the proposed development.

Board Member Borofka recalled the inconsistencies between the landscape plan and the drawings, and the applicant indicated that the landscape plan was correct. He questioned if staff has enough information to move forward with the building permit or if an updated landscape plan would be needed. Chair Gootee pointed out that the landscape plan is solid enough for the Board's review and approval, but an updated plan could be a condition of approval.

Board Member Borofka pointed out that the applicant has not provided drawings for the southern elevations in Exhibits 7, 8 and 9. Chair Gootee did not believe the additional drawings are necessary since the applicant's intent is to duplicate the northern elevations. He noted that the Board has done numerous approvals with elevations representing just two or three sides of a proposed building. However, the issue could be clarified via an additional condition of approval.

Board Member Broadway applauded the applicant for taking her written comments from June 4th to heart and generating three options for building design. She said her comments were meant to imply that she was looking for variety in design

and not necessarily different designs for each of the buildings. She said she prefers the design identified in Exhibit 8 (Units C and D). The addition of shingles and articulation of the pitched roof bring the design more to a residential and craftsman style that makes it feel homier. She suggested that the design identified in Exhibit 8 be applied to all three buildings. The remainder of the Board concurred.

Board Member Broadway said she would like to add an additional condition of approval that requires the applicant to use earth tones and neutral colors in nature. The colors on the renderings in Exhibits 7 through 9 appear to be a purple color.

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL MOVED THAT THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD ADOPT THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND ANALYSIS OF THE STAFF REPORT AND FIND THAT THE PROPOSAL IS CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, POLICIES OF ECDC 20.10.000, DESIGN CRITERIA OR ECDC 20.11.030, AND ZONING REGULATIONS AND APPROVE THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED JENNA LANE TOWNHOMES WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE APPLICANT MUST APPLY FOR AND OBTAIN ALL NECESSARY PERMITS. THIS APPLICATION IS SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS IN THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE AND IT IS UP TO THE APPLICANT TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH THE VARIOUS PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE CODES.**
- 2. ALL ABOVE-GROUND UTILITY EQUIPMENT (INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO TRANSFORMERS, HOT BOXES, MECHANICAL UNITS, ETC.) MUST BE LOCATED INTERIOR TO THE SITE OR CAMOUFLAGED OR SCREENED WITH ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES, FENCING AND/OR LANDSCAPING.**
- 3. ALL LIGHT FIXTURES SHALL BE DARK-SKY COMPLIANT CUT-OFF FIXTURES.**
- 4. THE DECK OFF THE BACK OF THE HOUSE TO THE WEST PROJECTS OVER THE PROJECT SITE'S WESTERN PROPERTY LINE. THIS DECK WILL HAVE TO BE REMOVED, MODIFIED OR OTHERWISE PROVIDED FOR DURING BUILDING PERMIT REVIEW.**
- 5. A PEDESTRIAN WALKWAY MUST BE CREATED CONNECTING EACH OF THE DWELLING UNITS WITH THE 240TH STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY. THE WALK MAY BE STRIPED ASPHALT, ALTERNATE MATERIALS, OR THE LIKE.**
- 6. ALL BUILDING DESIGN WILL BE CONSISTENT WITH EXHIBIT 8.**
- 7. COLORS WILL BE EARTH TONES AND NATURAL COLORS SUBJECT TO STAFF APPROVAL.**
- 8. PLANTINGS ON THE EASTERN PROPERTY LINE WILL BE TYPE-I LANDSCAPING OR SIMILAR, SUBJECT TO STAFF REVIEW.**

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CONSOLIDATED PERMIT APPLICATIONS (No Public Participation):

There were no consolidated permit applications.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

The Board reviewed draft language outlining policies and procedures for public meetings. They agreed it would be appropriate to print the information on the back of each of their agendas, subject to review by the City Attorney.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

None of the Board Members provided additional comments.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.