

APPROVED

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

March 4, 2015

Chair Gootee called the regular 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
Cary Guenther, Vice Chair
Brian Borofka
Lois Broadway
Bruce O'Neill

Board Members Absent

Rick Schaefer

Staff Present

Mike Clugston, Senior Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JULY 2, 2014 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Gootee announced that File Number PLN20140065 was moved from Item 6 (Minor Projects) to Item 8 (Consolidated Permit Applications).

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY MOVED THAT THE AGENDA BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER GUENTHER 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.

PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS:

There were no public hearings scheduled on the agenda.

CONSOLIDATED PERMIT APPLICATIONS (No Public Participation):

File Number PLN 20140065: Former Woodway High School Field Improvements. Edmonds School District, in cooperation with Verdant Healthcare and the City of Edmonds, is proposing a phased-project to upgrade the existing sports fields at the former Woodway High School. This phase involves installing two new illuminated synthetic turf multi-use fields along with associated catch fencing, backstops and dugouts. The consolidated project requires a design review recommendation by the Architectural Design Board (ADB). The final decision on the project's design, as well as conditional use permits and variances for the height of the backstops, fencing and lights, will be made by the Hearing Examiner.

Mr. Clugston explained that the Edmonds School District, in cooperation with Verdant Healthcare and the City of Edmonds, is proposing to upgrade the existing athletic fields at the former Woodway High School (See Attachment 1) located at 23200 – 100th Avenue West. The first phase of this three-phased project involves installing two new synthetic turf fields together with catch fencing, backstops, bleachers, dugouts and lights (See Attachment 2). Two more fields, fencing and lights, and a concession/restroom building are envisioned for the future.

Mr. Clugston reviewed that the project was identified in the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan that was adopted by the City Council in February of 2014. As per the PROS Plan, the site would be redeveloped into a regional sports and recreation asset with adult soccer/multi-sports turf fields, providing for year-round recreation options and serving a growing community.

Mr. Clugston explained that the parcel is split zoned, with an Open Space (OS) zoning designation on the west side and Single Family (RS) on the east side. Because a portion of the subject property is zoned OS, the Architectural Design Board (ADB) must review the design of the proposed improvements as per ECDC 16.80.030, which reads, “*each public use will undergo extensive review by the ADB in light of its relationship to its surrounding neighbors.*” In this case, design review will be consolidated with four associated land-use permits (two variance permits and two conditional-use permits). The ADB will make a recommendation about the project's design to the Hearing Examiner, who will then hold a public hearing and issue the final decision on the design, as well as the four associated land-use permits.

Mr. Clugston advised that the proposed application is an update of the existing fields. The existing school buildings, parking areas and vehicular patterns would remain unchanged. There are no building elevations that need to be considered, but the Board should review the proposed landscaping, lighting and materials.

Mr. Clugston provided an aerial photograph of the entire former Woodway High School site, noting the location of the existing school building, track field, sports fields, and the buffer of trees that surrounds the site. Once again, he emphasized that the applicant is not proposing any changes to the existing buildings, and the landscape buffer would not be disturbed.

Next, Mr. Clugston provided two diagrams to illustrate the current design and proposed new design for the field located in the southwest corner. He also provided more detailed drawings of the upgraded field and its associated catch fence, backstop, and dug out. He explained that the proposed catch fence would be approximately 8 feet tall, and the backstop would be slightly taller. The proposed new turf field is intended to serve multiple uses, and the track around the field would be constructed of pervious pavement. Lights have been proposed as part of the project, and as per ECDC 17.60.030.B, “*any lighting on a sports field or court shall be turned off by an automatically timed mechanism no later than 10:15 p.m.*” The lighting structures will range between 60 and 90 feet in height, and will be typical of the light fixtures located at other athletic fields in the region. He noted that a variance is required for both the light fixtures and the backstop, since both will exceed the height limit identified in the code.

Mr. Clugston provided several photographs to illustrate similar facilities with multi-use fields. He also provided photographs to illustrate typical designs for non-elevated bleacher systems, backstops fencing and netting, catch fencing,

dugouts, light poles and fixtures, and pervious concrete pavement. He also provided several simulated photographs of the proposed improvements, taken from various locations on the school site.

As far as landscaping, Mr. Clugston reminded the Board that the buffer of trees and the steep slope that surrounds the school site would remain undisturbed, and the applicant is proposing some additional trees along the entrance drive. Although the plan does not identify what species the new trees will be, he anticipates they will be of a standard street tree type. He advised that staff is recommending approval of the application with two conditions. One condition, in particular, would require the applicant to work with staff to identify an appropriate species of tree for the entry drive adjacent to the fields, and the Board could provide further direction as appropriate.

Again, Mr. Clugston reviewed that the City's current performance standard that requires that lighting be turned off by 10:15 p.m. He explained that the proposed cut-off directional lights, in combination with the existing forested buffer at the site boundaries, will result in minimal light spill off the site. He further explained that placing the light fixtures higher will result in less light pollution to adjacent properties. He advised that the materials used for the backstop, turf field, fencing, etc. would be similar to those used for other field redevelopment projects in the region.

Mr. Clugston recommended the Board approve the proposed design with the two conditions outlined in the Staff Report.

Board Member Broadway asked Mr. Clugston to clarify the inconsistency between the diagram on the cover sheet of Attachment 3 versus the layout identified as Sheet F1.0. She noted there is a "dog leg" on the cover sheet of Attachment 3 that is not shown on the other plans. Mr. Clugston suggested she seek further clarification from the applicant regarding this inconsistency. However, he did advise that the project would involve stormwater improvements outside of the Phase 1 field area.

Board Member Borofka observed that the proposed project is just Phase 1 of a three-phased project. He asked if the applicant has identified a schedule or timeline for the remaining phases. Mr. Clugston suggested the Board seek clarification of future phases from the applicant.

Board Member Borofka referred to Item 3 on Page 3 of the Staff Report, which states that the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) was updated in 2005, and the site was reclassified to contain areas of possible erosion and landslide hazards. He also referred to the drainage plan (Sheet F1.3) and asked if the proposed design takes these erosion and landslide hazard areas into account. Mr. Clugston explained that there are steep slopes around the exterior of the property where the forested area is located, but neither the slope nor the trees will be disturbed by the proposed project. The topography where the field upgrades are proposed is flat. He emphasized that a building permit would be required for the project, and stormwater issues would be addressed at that stage.

Chair Gootee observed that some design information related to Phase 2 of the project was included in the Staff Report. He asked if the Board is being asked to review elements of Phase 2, as well. Mr. Clugston clarified that the Board is only being asked to review the proposed design for Phase 1 at this time. He included elements of Phase 2 to give the Board a better context of what will likely happen in the future.

Chair Gootee asked if the applicant is proposing any new signage as part of Phase 1. Mr. Clugston suggested the Board invite the applicant to address signage.

Board Member Borofka noted that many of the "convenience" amenities would not be added until Phase 3. Chair Gootee particularly observed that restrooms would not be added until Phase 3 as part of the concession building. He asked how the district and City plan to provide this amenity in the meantime. Again, Mr. Clugston suggested the question be directed towards the applicant.

Edward Peters, Capital Facilities Director, Edmonds School District, introduced Nate Finch, Design and Construction Manager, Edmonds School District, and Design Consultant Bob Harding, Principal, D.A. Hogan and

Associates. Mr. Peters explained that the Edmonds School District has been working on this project with the City of Edmonds since 2006, and they have now secured funding to proceed with Phase 1.

Bob Harding, Principal, D.A. Hogan and Associates, said he does not have a formal presentation for the Commission, as he felt the Staff report provided by Mr. Clugston provided sufficient detail about the project. However, he agreed to answer the Board's questions and attempt to address their concerns.

Board Member Broadway referred to the drainage within the "dog leg" area that is portrayed on the cover of Attachment 3 and asked how the applicant plans to restore the area after the new drainage pipe has been installed. Mr. Harding explained that all stormwater that falls on the field would be incorporated vertically into the matrix of the synthetic turf and collected into an aggregate base. This water will flow through a series of pipes that discharge into the existing drainage system on the site. The "dog leg" corridor is a grassy area that is about 10 feet wide and relatively flat. The grass will be removed to accommodate the new pipe. Once the pipes have been connected to the downstream system, the area will be backfilled and either reseeded or new sod will be installed. Board Member Broadway asked if there is currently irrigation in the "dog leg." Mr. Harding answered no. However, he pointed out that, typically, there is too much water on the site, making the sports fields less playable. That is why the district and the City are proposing to convert the fields to synthetic turf to accommodate year-round use.

Board Member Borofka asked if the hydrograph of the site would change from its current condition, resulting in a steeper loading of the stormwater system. Mr. Harding explained that the project would have to comply with the stormwater code adopted by both the State and the City of Edmonds, and he does not anticipate the conditions will change as a result of the project. The aggregate base below the field will act as a sponge, and the slope currently on the field will be graded flat so that water runoff can be collected below the field and let out through a constructed structure. He emphasized that the stormwater situation would not be made worse by the proposed project, and he anticipates that the conditions will actually improve.

Chair Gootee asked if the applicant is proposing any scoreboards in conjunction with the field upgrade. Mr. Harding answered that the upgraded fields are intended for recreational rather than competitive play. The existing score board is a remnant of the former high school field and will be removed. As a recreational field, no scoreboard is intended.

Board Member Borofka referred to his earlier comment related to the areas of the site that have been identified in the CAO as possible erosion or landslide hazards. He asked if these areas have been addressed by the proposed plan. Mr. Harding clarified that the area where the field would be located is relatively flat, and the surrounding hillside slopes away from the field. There is a chain link fence on top of the slope, and all of the proposed work would take place at least 20 feet inward from the fence and the slope would be maintained in its current condition. The drainage system for the slope would remain undisturbed. He summarized that by reducing the field's size and placing it closer to the school, the applicant was able to retain the transition area and not disturb the slope and existing tree vegetation.

Board Member Borofka inquired about the applicant's timeline for the three phases of the project. Mr. Peters that the school district, in conjunction with the City and other user groups, created a master plan that identifies all of the facilities they would eventually like to have on the site. The project was divided into phases for funding purposes. Phase 1 represents the smallest increment of the master plan that would provide a useable facility. The intent is to proceed with the phases as funding becomes available. He said the district has been encouraged by Verdant Health Care's offer to fund a significant portion of Phase 1. Assuming that Phase 1 is successful, the plan is to approach Verdant Health Care with a grant request for additional funding to move the remaining phases forward. He noted there are other funding opportunities available including the City, the district, and grant funding from the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO). Both Verdant and the RCO have indicated that it is the type of project they like to fund. He summarized that while he cannot give a precise timetable for when the other phases will move forward, he is encouraged that doing Phase 1 will result in additional funding opportunities from the above-mentioned sources.

Mr. Harding summarized that the district contributed the property for the project, and funding was provided by Verdant Health Care, the City of Edmonds and the Edmonds School District. The City's Parks Department will maintain and manage the facility in coordination with the school district. He noted that the design team has worked closely with Rich Lindsey, the City's Parks Maintenance Manager, to carry the project forward and to help him understand the maintenance regiment that will be required for the new fields.

Mr. Peters advised that until funding is available for the new concession/restroom building (Phase 3), the plan is to provide port-o-potties. He noted that this is standard for fields of this type, and that is what currently exists on the site.

Chair Gootee asked if the applicant is proposing to add wayfinding signs on 100th Avenue West. Mr. Peters answered that the site is already well identified with a monument sign. The applicant will work with the City to determine if additional signage is needed, but he anticipates the sign located at the traffic signal will be sufficient. Rich Lindsey, Parks Maintenance Manager, announced that the City is in the process of updating its wayfinding signs. Once the field improvements are completed, or even before, he anticipates that better signage will be provided to direct people to the site.

Board Member O'Neill commented that most of the questions raised by the Board Members thus far are unrelated to design and outside of the Board's purview. While he appreciates the applicant's willingness to answer the questions, he is not sure they pertain to the issues the Board is charged with addressing. Chair Gootee agreed that the Board's purview is design related, but they can also ask questions relative to safety concerns.

Board Member Broadway referred to the chain link fence identified in Sheet F1.5 and requested more details about the proposed double gate. Mr. Harding responded that, for the most part, the gates leading into the facility will be of a pedestrian scale. However, the double gate is intended for maintenance and emergency access and will be approximately 12 to 16 feet wide.

Vice Chair Guenther asked if the proposed field is intended to replace the fields that were lost when the former Lynnwood High School site was demolished. Mr. Peters pointed out that new sports fields were developed as part of the new high school, so there was no net field loss. The district has been working closely with the City of Edmonds since at least 2006 to address the need for all-weather sports fields in this area of the school district boundaries. There is a high demand for these facilities for a variety of uses. The district had land available and others were interested in working with them to develop the funding for a year round recreational facility.

Members of the audience indicated a desire to address the Board. Chair Gootee explained that the proposal is a consolidated permit application, and only one public hearing is allowed. The Board's role is to provide a recommendation to the Hearing Examiner. The Hearing Examiner will conduct a public hearing and take action on all five items that are part of the permit application. Board Member O'Neill asked if staff had received any written comments related to the proposal, and Mr. Clugston answered that one has been received to date and will be included in the Hearing Examiner's materials.

Board Member Broadway observed that the concession building that would be constructed as part of Phase 3 is not shown on Sheet F1.5. She expressed concern that the location of the double gate for emergency vehicle access would need to be relocated in the future to accommodate the concession/restroom building.

Board Member Broadway also pointed out that no irrigation is proposed for the "boot leg" area that will be replanted after the drainage pipes have been installed. She asked if the Board is concerned about the viability of the newly planted grass if no irrigation is provided. Chair Gootee noted that there is currently no irrigation in this location, and the ground is usually soggy. He said he does not see a need to require irrigation in this location. Board Member Broadway asked if the applicant plans to use seed or sod to restore the "boot leg" area. Mr. Clugston said this issue will be addressed as part of the building permit application. He explained that the stormwater code identifies erosion sediment control as an important factor, and staff will use best management practices to identify whether sod or seed should be used.

Board Member Borofka referenced staff's proposed Condition 2 and asked if it refers to a single tree or to a group of trees. Mr. Clugston said it is intended to apply to all of the trees along the driveway, but he assumes the applicant will use a single species type. Board Member Borofka suggested the intent could be made clearer by adding the words "species of" before "tree."

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY MOVED THAT ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD ADOPT THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND ANALYSIS OF THE STAFF REPORT AND FIND THE PROPOSAL IS CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, POLICIES OF ECDC 20.10.000, DESIGN CRITERIA OF ECDC 20.11.030 AND ZONING REGULATIONS. SHE FURTHER MOVED THAT THE BOARD RECOMMEND THE HEARING EXAMINER APPROVE THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED FORMER WOODWAY HIGH SCHOOL FIELD IMPROVEMENTS WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE APPLICANT MUST APPLY FOR AND OBTAIN ALL NECESSARY PERMITS. THE 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 ORDINANCES.**
- 2. THE APPLICANT SHALL WORK WITH STAFF TO IDENTIFY AN APPROPRIATE SPECIES OF TREE FOR THE ENTRY DRIVE ADJACENT TO THE FIELDS.**
- 3. THE APPLICANT SHALL GIVE SERIOUS CONSIDERATION TO THE LOCATION OF THE DOUBLE GATE SO AS TO NOT NEED TO RELOCATE IT ONCE SUBSEQUENT PHASES OF THE PROJECT ARE IMPLEMENTED.**

BOARD MEMBER BOROFKA SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

Chair Gootee requested that staff provide an update on the status of filling the vacant Board position. Mr. Clugston agreed to contact Ms. Cunningham about the status of the vacancy and notify the Board Members via email.

Mr. Clugston provided the most recent code updates to the Board Members.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

Election of Officers for 2015

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL MOVED THAT THE BOARD REAPPOINT BRIAN GOOTEE TO SERVE AS CHAIR OF THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD IN 2015. BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY MOVED THAT THE BOARD REAPPOINT CARY GUENTHER TO SERVE AS VICE CHAIR OF THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD IN 2015. BOARD MEMBER BOROFKA SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Board Member Borofka noted that the Board has not met since July of 2014. He asked if there are any projects on the horizon that will require ADB review. Mr. Clugston said Phase 2 of the mixed-use project on the post office site will likely move forward at some point in 2015, but it may be later in the year. He summarized that the Planning Division staff has been busy reviewing permits, but most have not required design review by the ADB.

Board Member Broadway inquired why the changes that occurred to the Denny's Restaurant on Highway 99 were not brought to the ADB for design review. Mr. Clugston said the changes related to color. As per direction from the City Attorney, color is not a design criterion the Board and/or staff can consider as part of design review. He noted that, at this time, the City does not have any specific standards in place relative to color or an acceptable color pallet. Chair Gootee recalled that, on previous occasions, the Board has discussed color, but they do not have the ability to deny an application based on color. Mr. Clugston commented that if color starts to be a problem in the City, the Board could ask the City Council to consider establishing an acceptable color pallet for the City. Chair Gootee commented that, in the past, the Board has made recommendations to applicants relative to color, and the applicants have usually accepted the Board's recommendations.

Board Member O'Neill asked if the sign package for the Denny's Restaurant was required to have design review approval. Chair Gootee explained that as long as proposed signage meets all of the code requirements, no design review by the ADB would be required. The ADB only reviews sign design if an applicant is proposing a variance to the sign code, particularly the dimensional standards.

The Board discussed their concern that sometimes the end product after development is inconsistent with the design approved by the ADB. Vice Chair Guenther said the onus is on the Board to make sure the language in its recommendations is straightforward and easy for staff to interpret and apply. He suggested that the problems come up when the Board's recommendations are left open to interpretation. Mr. Clugston said it would be useful to staff if the Board Members could compile a list of the projects they are concerned about and provide specific information about elements they find inconsistent with their recommendation. He suggested the Board and staff could visit the sites and note the differences. He said staff does everything possible, with the information they are given, to ensure that the projects are consistent with the Board's design direction.

Chair Gootee explained that the Board is the messenger and not the enforcer. If a Board Member discovers a project is inconsistent with what was approved, he/she should review the meeting minutes and prepare a list for staff of the elements that are inconsistent.

ADJOURNMENT:

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