

**APPROVED**

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

**February 5, 2014**

---

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  
Cary Guenther, Vice Chair  
Brian Borofka  
Lois Broadway  
Bruce O’Neill

**Board Members Absent**

Rick Schaefer (excused)

**Staff Present**

Mike Clugston, Senior Planner  
Gina Janicek, Associate Planner  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 15, 2014 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER GUENTHER SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda was approved as presented.

**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:**

**A proposal by the Edmonds Boys and Girls Club for two new wall signs for their location at 310 – 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, which is zoned Public (P) (File Number PLN20130078)**

Mr. Clugston reviewed that the Boys and Girls Club is proposing two new wall signs for their location. He provided an aerial photograph of the site, which is located at 310 – 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue North. He explained that the applicant is proposing two new, non-illuminated, aluminum panel signs. The sign proposed for the south façade would be a 2’ x 9’ panel (Attachment 1) and a 3’ x 13’ panel (Attachment 2) has been proposed for the east façade.

Mr. Clugston explained that, normally, signs are reviewed by staff for dimensional and placement standards at the building permit stage; and those that meet the standards contained in Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC)

20.60 are exempt from design review. However, because there are no specific dimensional and placement standards for signs in the “P” zone in ECDC 20.60, the general design guidance for signs in ECDC 20.11 and the Comprehensive Plan would apply. Therefore, it is up to the Board to determine whether the proposed signs satisfy the applicable zoning code (ECDC 16.80), sign code (ECDC 20.60), and design guidance in the ECDC and Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Clugston advised that the Comprehensive Plan includes the following general design objectives for signs, which are applicable to the project:

- *C.11.a – Protect the streetscape from becoming cluttered.*
- *C.11.b – Minimize distraction from the overuse of advertisement elements.*
- *C.11.c – Provide clear signage for each distinct property.*
- *C.11.d – Use graphics/symbols to reduce the need to have large letters.*
- *C.11.e – Minimize potential for view blockage.*
- *C.11.f – Signs should be related to the circulation element serving the establishment.*

Mr. Clugston expressed his belief the proposed wall signs would not clutter the streetscape nor block views and the lettering on the sign would be small relative to the size of the building and larger site. Quite a bit of traffic comes from the east and south, but there are no signs on these facades. He suggested that the proposed new sign locations would enhance the circulation element.

Next, Mr. Clugston advised that ECDC 20.11 (General Design Review) contains one design criterion for signs:

- *ECDC 20.11.030.a.5 – All signs should conform to the general design theme of the development.*

Mr. Clugston advised that the proposed signs would be aluminum panels with a blue background and white lettering (Attachments 1 and 2). The proposed signs would be different in color and material from the existing wood sign on the western façade (Attachment 5) that has a white background and green lettering. However, both sign types fit with the general design theme and appearance of the building. He suggested the Board may want to consider adding a condition that would allow the applicant to replace the existing sign with a sign that is consistent with the design and size of the proposed signs without requiring additional design review.

Mr. Clugston said that, although the sign code (ECDC 20.60) does not provide specific criteria for signs in the “P” zone, there are general regulations for permanent signs in ECDC 20.60.020.A – M (Attachment 6). He summarized that the proposed, non-illuminated wall signs satisfy this criteria, specifically noting that walls signs are a permitted sign type in the downtown district and the signs would be located below the top of the wall. He reminded the Board that each site or tenant space is allowed a total of three signs (ECDC 20.60.025.A.4). With the two new signs and the existing sign, the building would have a maximum of three signs.

Mr. Clugston referred to ECDC 16.80 (Public “P” Zone), which states:

- *ECDC 16.80.030.D – Signs shall be kept to a minimum size, which is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and uses, while providing adequate visibility.*

Mr. Clugston reviewed that the sign proposed for the south façade would be 18 square feet (2’ x 9’) and would cover less than 1% of the 2,000 square foot façade. The sign proposed for the east façade would be 39 square feet (3’ x 13’), and would cover about 1.5% of 1,200 square foot façade. He concluded that neither sign would overwhelm their respective facades, and both appear to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood while providing adequate visibility. He recommended the Board approve the proposal with the following conditions:

1. A separate sign permit for the two wall signs is required from the Building Division.

2. The yellow temporary signs on the south and west facades must be removed.

Board Member Broadway asked Mr. Clugston to clarify Condition 1. She specifically asked if a separate sign permit would be required for each of the signs, or if both signs would be approved under a single sign permit. Mr. Clugston answered that only one sign permit would be required for both signs.

Board Member Broadway asked if the applicant has any plans to replace the existing sign on the western façade. She noted that it is beginning to deteriorate.

Board Member O'Neill asked if the building is considered to be historic. Mr. Clugston answered that it is not included on the Edmonds Register of Historic Places.

Chair Gootee asked if the total sign area of the proposed new signs and the existing sign would fall below the sign area allowed for the site. Mr. Clugston answered that there is no size limit for signs in the "P" zone. It is up to the Board to determine how much signage would be allowed on the site. He recalled his earlier comments comparing the size of the proposed signs to the total size of the facades. Chair Gootee suggested that if the Board decides to allow the applicant to replace the existing sign without requiring additional design review, the condition should specify that the sign must be of a similar size, type and design as the proposed new signs.

**Mike Kranz, Edmonds Boys and Girls Club**, explained that the club has no immediate plans to replace the existing sign at the front of the building. However, he agreed it would be helpful for the Board to include this option as part of their final decision so that no additional design review would be required.

Board Member O'Neill asked why the club is proposing such small signs. Mr. Kranz answered that the size of the proposed signs was presented to the club by the designer. Board Member Broadway agreed that the proposed signs appear to be small given the size of the facades. She also suggested that a larger sign would be appropriate on the west façade. She said she would be comfortable allowing signs up to 3' x 13' or 3% of the total façade area. She pointed out the opportunities for branding and recognition if the signs on all three sides are consistent in size and design. The Board reached a general consensus that no design review should be required for replacement of the western sign as long as it is consistent in size and design to the two proposed signs.

Chair Gootee asked about the existing banner signs, and Mr. Kranz said they advertise the martial arts class and will be removed after the Taste of Edmonds.

Board Member Borofka asked if the club has any plans to illuminate the signs at some point in the future. Mr. Kranz said that is a possibility, but is not being proposed at this time. Chair Gootee asked if illuminating the signs would require additional design review. Mr. Clugston answered that the code does not allow internal illumination, and external illumination would require additional design review. If the Board wants to allow external illumination without additional design review, they could add that as a condition. Board Member Borofka questioned how illuminated signs would impact the residential properties to the north.

**BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY MOVED THAT THE BOARD ADOPT THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND ANALYSIS OF THE STAFF REPORT AND FIND THAT THE PROPOSAL IS CONSISTENT WITH THE ZONING ORDINANCE AND THE CRITERIA IN ECDC 20.11.030 AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TECHNIQUES AND OBJECTIVES CONTAINED IN THE URBAN DESIGN CHAPTER OF THE COMMUNITY CULTURE AND URBAN DESIGN ELEMENTS OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, AND THEREFORE APPROVE THE PROPOSAL WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. **A SEPARATE SIGN PERMIT FOR THE TWO WALL SIGNS IS REQUIRED FROM THE BUILDING DIVISION.**

2. **THE YELLOW TEMPORARY SIGNS ON THE SOUTH AND WEST FACADES MUST BE REMOVED.**
3. **THE APPLICANT IS GRANTED THE LATITUDE TO PLACE MAXIMUM 13' X 3' SIGNS ON THE SOUTH, EAST AND WEST ELEVATIONS OF THE BUILDING, AND SUCH SIGNS SHALL NOT BE INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED.**

**VICE CHAIR GUENTHER SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Board Member O'Neill suggested it would be appropriate to allow signs on all four sides of the building.

**BOARD MEMBER O'NEIL MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION BY ALTERING THE THIRD CONDITION TO READ:**

3. **THE APPLICANT IS GRANTED THE LATITUDE TO PLACE MAXIMUM 13' X 3' SIGNS ON ALL ELEVATIONS OF THE BUILDING, AND SUCH SIGNS SHALL NOT BE INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED.**

**BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION TO AMEND, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**THE MAIN MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED AS AMENDED.**

The Board took a break at 7:35 p.m. to resolve technical problems with the recording system. The meeting was reconvened at 7:45 p.m.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS:**

**An application by Kautz Route, LLC for Type III-B design review application for five, detached townhouse duplexes (10 units total) located at 23220 Edmonds Way in the Multiple Residential (RM-1.5) zone (File Number PLN20130066)**

Gina Janicek reviewed that the applicant is proposing to develop five, detached townhouse duplexes at 23220 Edmonds Way. The half-acre property is zoned RM-1.5, and the neighborhood surrounding the site consists of commercial and multi-family development along Edmonds Way. The Woodhaven Veterinary Clinic is located to the north, and a large apartment complex to the south. Mike's Deli is located across the street to the east, and there are existing single-family homes west of the site.

Ms. Janicek advised that review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) is required for the project, and the City issued a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) on January 21, 2014 (Attachment 10). The comment period ended February 4<sup>th</sup>, and no comments or appeals were received. She further advised that a "Notice of Application" and a "Notice of Public Hearing and SEPA Threshold Determination" were published in the newspaper and posted on the site and other key locations in the City. Notices were also mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the site. No comments have been received to date.

Ms. Janicek said the project was reviewed and evaluated by various City departments. The Fire District (Attachment 9) expressed concern that guests will try to park in the fire lane if there is inadequate on-site parking for guests. They will require that the fire lane be visibly striped in yellow and that "no parking" signs be installed. The Engineering Division also noted the following issues:

- The stormwater system does not quite meet the code. However, the necessary changes will occur underground and will not affect the site or building design.

- The bus stop pull out just north of the site was not shown in the civil drawings.
- The small utility pole that provides access to the vacant house on the property must be removed and replaced with underground wiring. The civil plans must be updated accordingly.
- The proposed plans have not been reviewed by the Olympic View Water and Sewer District, which serves the site.
- Any construction on Edmonds Way must be reviewed by the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT).

Ms. Janicek explained that the hearing was scheduled prior to the applicant addressing the Engineering Division's issues because it is not anticipated they will impact the site and/or building design. However, the ADB should consider these outstanding items and determine if the project can be clearly conditioned for approval or if the public hearing should be extended to a later date so the applicant can redesign the project to meet the requirements.

Ms. Janicek reminded the Board that to approve the project, they must find that it is consistent with the zoning ordinance, the criteria in ECDC 20.11.030, and the goals and objectives contained in the Comprehensive Plan. She referred the Board to the Staff Report, which outlines the zoning criteria and Comprehensive Plan goals and policies that are applicable to the project. She specifically noted the following:

- The developed portion of the site is mostly flat, but slopes up at the southern edge. There is an unusually large hole located just north of the existing home, which will need to be filled.
- The wildlife associated with the property is typical of an urban environment.
- Parking is proposed in the garages of the units, so cars will be hidden from the street view.
- The lighting plan (Sheet L5, Attachment 7) shows that ample lighting will be provided. However, as pointed out by Board Member Borofka, the proposal will have to be consistent with the 2012 Washington State Energy code, which replaced the 2009 version. Incandescent lighting will not be allowed, and at least 75% of the lighting fixtures must be high-efficiency (LED).
- No signage has been proposed by the applicant at this time. If signage is proposed at a later date, it will be reviewed as part of the building permit application.
- The general design of each of the buildings is illustrated in Attachment 5 and includes a mixture of materials and quite a bit of articulation to meet the design objectives called out in the Comprehensive Plan. Color schemes are illustrated in Attachment 6.
- The proposed building design appears to meet the height requirement, but a survey will be required to confirm.
- The applicant appears to meet all of the applicable code requirements and development standards, including parking (ECDC 17.50) and design review (ECDC 20.11).
- As per ECDC 20.13 (Landscaping Requirements), three types of landscaping will apply to the project, and the landscaping plan (Attachment 7) appears to meet all of the code requirements. However, she noted that there are a number of significant trees located on the site, and the applicant is proposing to remove all but one. Street trees will be provided consistent with the property to the north on Edmonds Way.

Ms. Janicek summarized that the project appears to meet all of the code requirements and the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan and design guidelines. She recommended the Board approve the project 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. Compliance with the Fire District's fire lane striping and signage conditions is required.
3. The Stormwater system shall be designed to meet the requirements of ECDC Chapter 18.30 and the Stormwater Supplement.

4. The bus stop pull out at the north end of the property will need to be addressed in the civil plans.
5. The telephone pole will need to be moved either into the landscape strip or behind the sidewalk. A 5 foot sidewalk adjacent to a 4 foot landscape strip is required.
6. All requirements for sewer and water utility services shall be reviewed and approved by the Olympic View Water and Sewer District.
7. Construction in Edmonds Way shall be reviewed and approved by the WSDOT.
8. Should staff feel that the landscaping near the street has significantly changed from the version reviewed by the ADB (Attachment 7), the project shall be brought back before the ADB for review and approval prior to building permit issuance.

**Steve Price, Owner, Kautz Route LLC**, said the focus of the proposed project has been to create affordable, attractive rental units. It is not their intent to sell the units as townhomes or condominiums. They want to do the project in an efficient manner to keep the rents at price points acceptable to the market.

Mr. Price explained that meeting the Fire Division's requirements for hammerhead turnarounds required a significant amount of land area, which resulted in less density than would normally be permitted under the zoning code. This turning radius requirement is greater than in most other jurisdictions. He added that the amount of parking required, as well as the inability to do tandem parking without providing a third parking stall on site, further limited the density.

Mr. Price said they considered the option of applying for a variance to exceed the 25-foot height limit by one foot to provide a ceiling height of nine feet so the units are more attractive and comfortable. The property is located in a bit of a bowl so no view blockage would occur. In addition, the apartment complex to the south is higher than the proposed buildings would be, and the veterinary clinic to the north has a dog run and kennel located close to the property line. After further discussion with staff, they decided not to pursue a variance.

**Sean Hegstad, Architect, Haven Design Group**, pointed out that, as proposed, each unit would have its own entrance from the exterior of the building to create a sense of belonging and provide better access for tenants. He explained that, although the zoning would allow a maximum of 13 units on the site, they were only able to get 10. By developing duplex units, they were able to avoid the Fire Division's requirement for sprinklers, but attempts to reduce the turning radius for the hammerhead driveway was unsuccessful. In addition, the site is sloped towards the sidewalk, and the current driveway is hidden and dangerous. Grading will be required on the site to address these two issues.

**Niel Latte, Civil Engineer, WEB Engineering**, pointed out that the civil plans submitted for design review are almost to the level required for building permit review. This was done to address height and grading issues, as well as stormwater requirements. He provided the following responses to the concerns raised by the Engineering Division:

- Stormwater. The applicant has worked with the City's Public Works Director to address the stormwater issues. They are proposing a sand filter system to meet the elements of the stormwater code and address the concern raised by the Engineering Division.
- Bus stop. While the civil plans submitted for design review did not label the bus stop location, this change will be made and will not alter the proposed design.
- Utility Pole. This is an existing service pole that has an existing supply. It will likely be removed once the new utility lines are in place. If the pole is needed, it will be relocated as per the Engineering Division's request.
- Review by the Olympic View Water and Sewer District. The proposed plans have been submitted to the district for review. The district has identified some minor modifications that the applicant is attempting to comply with.
- WSDOT Access Permit. The applicant is proposing to improve the connections with the driveway located to the north to address site distance issues. They do not anticipate any additional problems.

**Molly Maguire, Molly Maquire Landscape Architecture**, advised that the landscape plan was designed to address code requirements for buffers and screening along all four sides of the property. The goal was to allow for personal,

multi-use open space around the building by clustering screening requirements towards the edges of the property in an informal manner using a mixture of conifers and broad-leaf evergreens. Street frontage landscaping took cues from the project to the north. The street trees will be a mixture of broad-leaf evergreen and flowering deciduous trees, with a few conifers. The plan calls for shrubs and lawn area below the trees.

Mr. Hegstad referred the Board to the new Attachment 6 that was provided just prior to the meeting, which better illustrates the colors of the proposed buildings. He also provided color samples.

Ms. Maguire said that a solid fence has been proposed along the southern and western property boundaries, and there is an existing fence along the northern property boundary. There has been some discussion about adding a fence along the eastern boundary, as well, but no decisions have been made to date. There is some concern about security for the residents in the units adjacent to the eastern and western boundaries.

Board Member Broadway noted that, with the exception of Unit 110, all of the units back up against a retaining wall and have dividers between them. However, the backyard of Unit 110 actually fronts along Edmonds Way. She asked how the applicant would address the safety concern this represents. She also noted that Unit 109 is the only one that will have two doors; one accesses the sidewalk on Edmonds Way and the other the hammerhead driveway. Mr. Hegstad replied that all units will have two doors, a primary access, as well as a secondary back patio access. He said he understands Board Member Broadway's concerns about privacy and safety, particularly for Unit 109, which has a secondary access from the garage to Edmonds Way. Ms. Maguire noted that fencing could be provided for privacy and safety, specifically for Units 109 and 110. Landscaping on the Edmonds Way side of the fence could be solid trees to provide screening from Edmonds Way and create a physical and psychological barrier. Board Member Broadway suggested, and the Board concurred, that a condition should be added to allow the landscape architect to come up with something that meets the needs of privacy and security and looks good from the street side.

Board Member Broadway referred to the small vignette of all the existing trees on the site, which was included in Attachment 7. She asked if it would be possible to salvage the existing trees along Edmonds Way since the applicant is proposing to replace trees in almost the same locations. Ms. Maguire reminded the Board that grading would be required prior to construction. While she agreed it would be lovely, it would be difficult to retain the trees in a manner where they would not be a hazard in the future.

**Gordon Smith, Owner, Kautz Route LLC**, further explained that if the tree roots are disturbed, they can become rotted and eventually fall down. Protecting the root trees of existing trees is very difficult on small sites. He said this is an example of conflicting requirements and the Fire Marshall's requirement for the hammerhead turning radius won out.

Board Member Borofka said it appears that 12 of the existing 13 large trees will be removed. He asked if the sidewalk could be modified to protect at least some of the existing trees along Edmonds Way. Ms. Janicek reminded the Board that the Engineering Department did not allow the applicant to snake the sidewalk around for any other reason, so it would not likely be an option for saving existing trees, either.

Board Member Borofka asked if it would be possible to relocate the trash enclosure to the north side of the property. He expressed concern about potential impacts on the residential properties to the south. Mr. Latte pointed out that the applicant is proposing a sand filter treatment system on the north side of the property. It may be possible to put the trash enclosure on top, but this could make it difficult to maintain the system. He noted that, because of the topography of the site, the trash enclosure will be nearly at grade, which will make it less intrusive. Board Member Borofka asked how the applicant would mitigate the noise impacts associated with the trash enclosure. Chair Gootee noted that the fence located above the retaining wall would provide some sound attenuation.

Board Member Borofka noted that Attachment 4 indicates that Units 102 and 103 will have three bedrooms, but the table on Attachment 1 indicates that all the units will have just two bedrooms. Mr. Hegstad confirmed that all of the units would have two bedrooms, not three.

Board Member Borofka asked if the gas fireplaces provided for each unit would have vertical or horizontal venting. Mr. Hegstad answered that direct venting is planned. However, he acknowledged that vertical venting may be required for some units.

Board Member Borofka asked if the lighting plan is consistent with the 2012 Washington State Energy Code, as discussed earlier. Mr. Hegstad answered affirmatively, noting that no incandescent lighting would be used. Most of the lighting would be LED, with some fluorescent fixtures.

Chair Gootee referred to Attachment 6, which illustrates the proposed color schemes for the project. He said he prefers Scheme 2, which provides more contrast between the base and upper portions of the building. He noted that some of the units would be visible from Edmonds Way, and Scheme 2 would break up the appearance of the blank walls. Mr. Hegstad clarified that both color schemes would be alternated amongst the buildings. He suggested that the Board add a condition that would require a contrast of color between the base and top of the buildings facing the street. The condition could also stipulate that contrasting colors be used for the buildings that face the street on the south and north sides of the property.

Board Member Broadway noted that craftsman style doors are shown on some of the units. She suggested, and the Board agreed, that this door style would be preferable to the flush doors.

Board Member Broadway questioned why the garage doors on Units 105 and 106 are an ivory color when all the other garage doors are darker. She suggested, and the Board concurred, that the two doors should be painted to match the garage doors on the remaining units.

Board Member Borofka asked about the applicant's plans for signage. Mr. Price said they have not discussed signage yet, but it will be included in the building permit application. He said he anticipates having a low and modest sign with the projects name, "Brackett's Court," and perhaps some address signs, as well.

The Board discussed whether or not it would be possible to craft conditions to address all of the items of concern so the application could be approved. Another option would be for the applicant to come back before the Board with a revised proposal that responds to all the items discussed. They agreed to move forward with approval of the application, as long as all of the conditions can be clearly articulated. However, they voiced some concern about whether or not the conditions would be adequate to ensure the end product meets the Board's intent. Ms. Janicek reminded the Board that staff would carefully consider each of the conditions when reviewing the application for a building permit.

**VICE CHAIR GUENTHER MOVED THAT THE BOARD ADOPT THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND ANALYSIS OF THE STAFF REPORT AND FIND THAT THE PROPOSAL IS CONSISTENT WITH THE ZONING ORDINANCE, THE CRITERIA IN ECDC 20.11.030, AND THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES CONTAINED IN THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, AND THEREFORE 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. COMPLIANCE WITH THE FIRE DISTRICT'S FIRE LANE STRIPING AND SIGNAGE CONDITIONS IS REQUIRED.**
- 3. THE STORMWATER SYSTEM SHALL BE DESIGNED TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF ECDC CHAPTER 18.30 AND THE STORMWATER SUPPLEMENT.**
- 4. THE BUS STOP PULL OUT AT THE NORTH END OF THE PROPERTY WILL NEED TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE CIVIL PLANS.**

5. THE TELEPHONE POLE WILL NEED TO BE MOVED EITHER INTO THE LANDSCAPE STRIPE OR BEHIND THE SIDEWALK. A 5-FOOT SIDEWALK ADJACENT TO A 4-FOOT LANDSCAPE STRIP IS REQUIRED.
6. ALL REQUIREMENTS FOR SEWER AND WATER UTILITY SERVICES SHALL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE OLYMPIC VIEW WATER AND SEWER DISTRICT.
7. CONSTRUCTION IN EDMONDS WAY SHALL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (WSDOT).
8. SHOULD STAFF FEEL THAT THE LANDSCAPING NEAR THE STREET HAS SIGNIFICANTLY CHANGED FROM THE VERSION REVIEWED BY THE ADB (ATTACHMENT 7), THE PROJECT SHALL BE BROUGHT BACK BEFORE THE ADB FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT ISSUANCE.
9. BUILDINGS 101 AND 102 AND 109 AND 110 NEED TO HAVE A COLOR CONTRAST THAT SEPARATES THE BASE FROM THE BODY, SIMILAR TO SCHEME B IN ATTACHMENT 6.
10. THE ENTRY DOORS THROUGHOUT SHALL BE CRAFTSMAN STYLE RATHER THAN FLUSH.
11. A DECORATIVE FENCE AND PLANTINGS SHALL BE PLACED ALONG EDMONDS WAY TO PROVIDE A PROTECTIVE BARRIER AND VISUAL DETERRENT TO ADDRESS PRIVACY AND SECURITY ISSUES.
12. THE PLANS MUST COMPLY WITH THE CURRENT CONDITIONS AND REGULATIONS.
13. ALL GARAGE DOORS SHALL BE OF A DARKER TONE.

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

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

No consolidated permit applications were scheduled on the agenda.

**ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:**

Ms. Janicek announced that the Board's March 5<sup>th</sup> agenda would include a review of a proposed assisted living project and a presentation by the City Attorney regarding the Open Meetings Act. The March 19<sup>th</sup> agenda would include a presentation on Swedish Hospital's proposed addition.

**ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:**

The Board requested an update on the vacant landscape architect position.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.