

APPROVED

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

October 7, 2015

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
Cary Guenther, Vice Chair
Brian Borofka
Bruce O'Neill

Board Members Absent

Lois Broadway
Tom Walker

Staff Present

Kernen Lien, Senior Planner
Jeffrey Taraday, City Attorney

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 2, 2015 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER BOROFKA SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

BOARD MEMBER BOROFKA MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED. VICE CHAIR 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:

Architectural Design Board Review for a revision of the last of ten multifamily residential buildings approved for the Point Edwards Development. The proposed Building 10 includes 68 residential units, 118 off-street parking stalls (50 surface, 68 structured), and associated landscaping. File Number PLN 20150032

Chair Gootee explained that the purpose of the open record hearing is for the Architectural Design Board (ADB) to address Edmonds Pine Street LLC's design review application for the Point Edwards Building 10, located at 50 Pine

Street in the Point Edwards Master Planned Development. He opened the public hearing and reviewed the rules and procedures for the hearing. He explained that during the open record hearing, the staff, applicant and any member of the public will have an opportunity to introduce evidence into the administrative record. The evidence can be in the form of public testimony and/or through submission of written comments or other documents. He cautioned that evidence should be germane to the design review criteria and asked that speakers identify the design review criteria that their comments are intended to address. He noted that citizens who want to speak at any future appeal on the application need to testify during the hearing to preserve their ability to participate in the future.

Chair Gootee reviewed that the Appearance of Fairness Doctrine requires that the hearing be fair in form, substance and appearance. Not only must it be fair, it also must appear fair. He asked whether any member of the Board had engaged in communication with opponents or proponents regarding the issues in the design review matter outside of the public hearing process. All Board Members answered no. Next, Chair Gootee asked if any member of the Board had a conflict of interest or believed that he/she could not hear and consider the application in a fair and objective manner. All Board Members answered no. Lastly, he asked if anyone in the audience objected to any Board Member's participation as a decision maker in the hearing. No one in the audience indicated a concern.

Chair Gootee explained that, because the Board is making an evidentiary record that may be relied upon in the future, it is important that the Board Members ask any and all questions of speakers during the hearing. One of the most important purposes of the hearing is to ensure that all relevant facts are brought to light through the process. He asked all those who planned to testify at the hearing to stand and raise their right hand. He invited them to affirm that the testimony they would be giving would be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

Mr. Lien presented the Staff Report. He explained that additional items were received after the Staff Report was sent to the Board Members via the internet. These items included a letter dated October 7, 2015 in support of the project, an ADB Staff Report from 2005 for File Number ADB-2005-49, the ADB's decision from that same meeting, and an ADB Staff Report and decision from 2006 for File Number ADB-2006-97. These items were provided for background information on previous decision related to Point Edwards.

Mr. Lien explained that development proposals that require State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review are a Type III-B process that requires a public hearing before the ADB. In order to recommend approval, the Board must find that the proposal is consistent with the Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC) 20.11.030 and with the Comprehensive Plan Urban Design Chapter. He referred to the Staff Report, which provides a detailed analysis about how the proposal is consistent with the Urban Design Guidelines in the Comprehensive Plan and zoning (bulk and use) requirements in the ECDC.

Mr. Lien reviewed that the Point Edwards Development was originally approved by the ADB under file number ADB-2002-226 (Attachment 4) for 295 units. In 2005, the ADB approved an increase in the number of units to 350 under file number ADB-05-49, which is still below the maximum 419 units allowed by the Point Edwards Master Plan (Attachment 5). To date, 261 residential units have been constructed at Point Edwards. Building 10 was also the subject of further design review in 2006 under file number ADB-2006-97 and again in 2013 under file number PLN20130022.

Mr. Lien advised that the proposal before the Architectural Design Board (ADB) is for a revision to Building 10 of the Point Edwards Development (Attachments 1 – 3), which is the last of the buildings to be constructed for the master plan development. The current proposal for Building 10 includes 68 residential units and a 50 stall surface parking lot, with an additional 68 parking spaces within the proposed building. While the proposed design of Building 10 is slightly different than the other residential buildings located at Point Edwards, the applicant's intent for the re-design is for Building 10 to blend effectively with the Point Edwards area as a whole, using building materials, colors, and landscape palettes which are analogous to the surrounding environment, while appearing unique enough that it has its own identity.

Mr. Lien advised that the Point Edwards Master Plan and adopted zoning says that height should be calculated separately for each portion of the building. Building 10 has two segments (eastern and western) and each portion has its own height calculation. He provided drawings of both the east and west elevations, noting the average grade calculation for each portion of the building. He explained that the City measures height from the average grade, and the allowed height in the MP1 zone is 35 feet, with an additional 5 feet for a modulated roof design. Based on the height calculations, the proposed building would fall below the 35-foot height limit, so the ADB does not need to make the finding that it meets the criteria for a modulated roof design for the additional 5 feet in height.

Mr. Lien advised that the building is articulated with elements of varying materials, colors, bays, and hipped roof forms. Topography also plays a significant role in adjusting the scale of the building as the building steps into the site both north and south showing 1 to 2 stories on the south side of the building and 4 stories on the north side. The eastern portion of the building also steps down from the western portion, also serving to reduce the bulk and mass of the building. The change in materials and colors, as well as the eastern portion step down, help to divide the mass of the building horizontally. In addition, strong articulation of the building façade and modulated roof design help break up the mass vertically. The Staff Report provides more detailed information about how the proposed building meets the design guidelines and the zoning standards.

Mr. Lien referred to the Landscape Plan (Exhibit 3 of the Staff Report), which specifically states that tree selection for trees in the surface parking lot and along the rockery will be approved by the City and the property owner (Inadomi) immediately to the south of the development. Generally, the ADB approves landscape plans, including species. Given this condition on the landscape plan, he is recommending two conditions of approval (Conditions 3 and 4) that set some broad parameters of what the trees should be. Condition 4 would specifically require that the trees along the southern property line adjacent to the rockery must be an evergreen species at least 10 feet in height. He said he reviewed the conditions with the property owner to the south of the subject property, who has worked with the developer to identify an appropriate species for the southern property line. The applicant is currently proposing a dwarf southern magnolia, an evergreen species that grows to about 20 or 30 feet in height, which would meet Condition 4.

Mr. Lien said that in addition to the off street parking that will be provided with the proposed Building 10, the proposal also includes reconfiguring the on-street parking along Pine Street, which will result in 10 new parking spaces. As proposed, some of the existing bump outs along Pine Street would be eliminated to accommodate the additional on-street parking spaces. Staff supports the proposal, but they were originally concerned that it may block some of the lookouts, which are an important part of the overall design of the Point Edwards Development. After further evaluation, staff has determined that the way the additional parking would be situated, none of the lookouts would be blocked.

Mr. Lien summarized that staff recommends approval of Building 10, with the conditions listed in the Staff Report.

Board Member Borofka asked if any of the new information the Board received just prior to the meeting would alter the proposal that is outlined in the Staff Report. Mr. Lien answered no and added that it was provided as supplemental background information that has nothing to do with design review of Building 10 that the ADB is considering at this time. The 2005 document outlines the ADB's decision to allow the number of units to increase to 350. The 2006 document is associated with a former amendment to Building 10, but it is not relevant to the Board's review of the current version for Building 10 design.

Board Member Borofka referred to Mr. Lien's earlier notation that the landscaping along the southern boundary of the surface parking area must be approved by the adjacent property owner. Mr. Lien said the proposed Conditions 3 is tied to the Type V Landscaping requirements, which allow both deciduous and evergreen trees. While Condition 4 specifically requires evergreen species along the southern property line of the surface parking area, consistent with the requirements of Type I Landscaping, Conditions 3 and 4 are intended to be broad to allow the City staff and the neighboring property owner to select the remaining species. The height limit of 35 feet that is identified is consistent with the requirement in ECDC 20.13 that trees that are planted with development shall not exceed the height limit. Although a maximum height of 40 feet is allowed in the MP1 zone with a modulated roof, he went with the lower height

(35 feet) limit for the trees because the applicant is not proposing a modulated roof alignment. One purpose of allowing the property owner directly to the south to select the tree species is to allow for some view preservation. With the exception of the trees along the southern boundary of the surface parking area, staff is supportive of the trees species shown on the landscape plan.

Board Member Borofka requested more information about the rockery along the southern property line. Mr. Lien explained that the rockery is currently located on the Building 10 site, and the applicant is proposing a slight extension.

Courtney Kaylor, Attorney, McCullough Hill, PS, introduced Aidan Bird, Project Architect, Studio Meng Strazzara; Forrest Jammer, Landscape Architect, Thomas Rengstorf & Associates; and Rick Tompkins, Civil Engineer, Triad Associates. She reviewed that the project has a long history and has been controversial in the past. Since the project was before the Board the last time, the applicant has spent extensive time talking with neighbors on all sides. In particular, she recognized the efforts of the Point Edwards Condominium owner group called, Team 50. She also recognized Mayor Nichols from the Town of Woodway, as well as the three property owners immediately to the south of the project (Inadomi, Widing and Fleming). She reported that these individuals spent countless hours negotiating with the applicant to work out issues and concerns, and they were able to reach an agreement relative to height, project design, and project features that are outside the scope of design review. For example, the intent of the trees on the southern property line is to screen the parking lot from the Inadomi residence, while not growing so tall that they will block the view over the project. Condition 4 places a height limit on the tree species and requires that they be evergreen. There was also a desire to provide sufficient parking, not only for residents but for guests, as well. There were numerous discussions about where the parking would be located (underground, in the rear parking lot, and on the street). The proposed plan represents a compromise that was reached between all parties.

Ms. Kaylor expressed her belief that the proposed project complies with all of the requirements of the City Code, as outlined in detail in the Staff Report. In addition, the project is consistent with the prior approvals for the Point Edwards Master Plan, and the height of the building has been reduced from prior applications as a result of discussions with the neighbors. For these reasons, the applicant requests that the ADB approve the project.

Aidan Bird, Project Architect, Studio Meng Strazzara, explained that the design team has been trying to finesse the designs to accommodate the agreement requirements. Although it is somewhat different, he felt the proposed design would result in a very successful project that would benefit everyone. Mr. Bird explained that the property where the Point Edwards Development is located slopes down from the south to the north, and the existing buildings were used as the departure point for the design of the new building. The intent was to accommodate some of the details of the existing buildings, such as open spaces, outdoor living spaces, etc. In his opinion, it is a beautiful site with wonderful views that all the residents can enjoy. However, it is also a rugged site that has quite a bit of exposure, and the applicant is proposing to use durable materials that will withstand the conditions.

Mr. Bird pointed out that the proposed building design incorporates a long, boomerang shape. He illustrated the location of the proposed surface parking and parking garage access, and explained that the building would be four stories tall along Pine Street (north elevation). Pedestrian access would be provided to the outdoor spaces, and the ground floor units would have walk-out patios. The design includes a lot of glass so that the interior spaces can take in the view, as well. He pointed out that the south elevation of the west wing would be just two stories, and the south elevation of the east wing would be just one story. He also noted the location of the entrance to the building from the parking garage where a reception office would be located. He described the location and design of the outdoor space, as well as the proposed exercise room that would have access to the sidewalk. He provided an illustration showing how the units and amenity spaces would be laid out on each of the levels. He also pointed out the location of stairways and elevators, parking areas, and access points. He noted the public areas within the building that would have access to a view.

Forrest Jammer, Landscape Architect, Thomas Rengstorf & Associates, said the proposed large landscaped strips are intended to be consistent with the character of the rest of the project. The main components include patio spaces at the ground level and level two, as well as outdoor living spaces. Being consistent with the rest of the project, the at-

grade patios are enclosed with landscaping, and there is surrounding plant material to maintain the character. He pointed out where a trellis with vines growing on it would be added in the surface parking area to provide a vertical screen from the southern property and to reduce the scale of the parking area. As agreed upon with Dr. Inadomi, evergreen trees would be planted along the southern property line. As required by the City's code, street trees would be planted consistent with the previous street tree applications throughout the development, and they do not anticipate any height or view intrusion as they mature. The same would be true for the balance of the trees on the site, as they are very respectful of views to the south with regards to plant material. The intent is to maintain the view corridors to the Sound. He pointed out the amenity space, which would be developed to provide a comfortable setting for residents to relax outdoors. It will likely include grilling stations, fire pits, furniture, and some covered space. There would be a transition from the sidewalk to the amenity space, as well.

Chair Gootee invited members of the public to address the Board.

Tom Waggener, Edmonds, said he lives in the Point Edwards Condominiums and was present to speak on behalf of the group called Team 50, which is a coalition of residents at Point Edwards who have been involved in tracking this particular development for nearly three years. He said Team 50 members were involved in the original ADB hearings for Building 10, as well as the City Council's review of the ADB's prior decision after an appeal was filed. Since the court case was filed, Team 50 has worked as an independent committee trying to field issues surrounding Building 10.

Mr. Waggener said Team 50 is very much in agreement with the revised proposal, which confirms the modifications that deal with the issues that Team 50 has consistently raised. He recalled that in 2012, the team members did not have a clear understanding of master plans, design standards, and how height is measured in the City. At that time, they came to the Board to voice concern about the bulk, mass and size of the building, as well as traffic congestion and other related problems. He referred to a letter that was submitted by Nancy Jacobs, a Team 50 member, that provides details about the modifications that Team 50 was able to work through with the developer over numerous discussions and meetings. Team 50 believes the current proposal represents a good compromise for both sides. It is supportive of the community and will blend in with the existing Point Edwards Master Plan. They hope to have good neighbors and they hope to be good neighbors.

Mr. Waggener said Team 50 was concerned about the mass of the building that was originally proposed. It was too tall, too massive, too flat surfaced, and it simply did not fit in the location. The current proposal has been reduced in height to a maximum of four stories, and the building has been stepped down one full level on the western elevation. The bend in the middle of the building was distinguishable in the first proposal, and the new design opens it up a bit to give a visual separation of the linear mass that was over 360 feet in the original plan. The number of units was reduced from 89 to 68. This is a substantial change in the number of people and vehicles that will be added to the area, as well as the actual scope and size of the building. It was determined that the master plan's procedure for determining height had not been followed in the original design, but it has now been incorporated into the final plan.

Mr. Waggener pointed out that the corner where the driveway will enter Building 10 is also the entrance to the road that turns to the left and right going downhill to access other buildings in the development. Therefore, a great deal of traffic from Pine Street will utilize this corner, and traffic passing through the Town of Woodway will also pass through that corner. One of Team 50's legitimate concerns throughout the process has been the number of vehicles, where the vehicles will be parked on site, and how they will travel to get there. The reduction in the number of units will reduce the number of vehicles, and Team 50 has supported and worked with the developer to identify on-street parking additions. The on-site parking, both above and below ground, will be complimented by an additional 10 spaces, as well. All of these steps will help reduce congestion throughout the community, both north and south. As per the civil plans, a drainage pond will serve the entire condominium development, and the agreement is that the developer would work closely with the existing homeowners association board to handle the shared infrastructure resources, as well as the public trails, sidewalks and other access points throughout the site. He said the modifications proposed for Pine Street, particularly the additional parking, would help to preserve the scenic quality. He noted that Pine Street is their front yard, and it will be the front yard for the residents of the new building, as well.

Mr. Waggener thanked the members of Team 50 and the developer's representatives who worked with the team for over seven months to reach an agreement on many of the features. He particularly noted their cooperation and attitude of listening, as well as their willingness to consider design modifications to address their concerns. Again, he said the proposed plan represents a compromise for both parties. He said Team 50 would continue to work with the developer to clarify additional points, and they will work with their homeowners association to make sure that the common elements are satisfied.

Carla Nichols, Mayor of the Town of Woodway, Woodway, said she, as well as her staff and legal counsel, have reviewed the design elements contained in the proposed plan and concluded that they are consistent with the agreements they have entered into, along with other parties, with the developer. Although the following outstanding issues are not appropriate for the Board to consider, she asked that City staff address them consistent with the agreement:

- Changing the lights on Pine Street to low, architecturally appropriate lights, similar to what is already used at the Point Edwards Development.
- Providing lighting for the surface parking lot and making sure that construction traffic and marketing traffic once the building is developed, is controlled and parking does not spill out onto residential streets in Woodway. This has been a problem in the past with the Point Edwards Development during open houses, etc. The developer's representatives have been supportive of this concern.

Mayor Nichols asked that the Town of Woodway be notified when these issues are reviewed so its representatives can have an opportunity to weigh in on the discussion.

Ms. Kaylor asked the landscape architect to identify the species of trees that are proposed for the easterly end of the parking lot. Mr. Jammer answered that the trees would be a combination of the dwarf southern magnolias, Japanese maples and sumac shrubs. Board Member O'Neill referred to Sheet A7 of the architectural perspectives, which depicts very large evergreen trees for the easterly end of the parking lot. Mr. Jammer said the depiction is not consistent with what is actually proposed. He noted that there is an existing large tree to the east that would be maintained.

Vice Chair Guenther requested more information about the proposed materials. Mr. Bird said a variety of cement panel siding would be utilized, using varying exposures and colors to provide a different rhythm and density. The brown color would be a durable shingle product that is painted. All of the windows would be well-insulated vinyl in a light grey color. The guardrails around the balconies would probably be made as aluminum units that are powder coated with a dark bronze color. They will have panels of glass to hold people in. A running trim motif will break up the building as it changes colors, and the ventilated soffits would be a similar product. The exposed concrete walls where the building is stepped up would be paneled form, using cornices to maintain a horizontal line. The decks would have pedestal pavers, with waterproofing underneath, and the balconies would have aluminum planks that allow water to flow through. The eave projection at the top of the building would be approximately three feet, so most of the windows would receive quite a bit of protection.

Vice Chair Guenther said he was intrigued by the variety of roof elements that have been proposed. Mr. Bird said when he took over the design from a previous firm, he wanted to create something that had a rhythm to it. The intent was for the building to feel similar to the rest of the neighborhood, and he liked the more contemporary, restrained feel of the ribbed forms. They are clean and easy to maintain, and they do not pick up too much wind. He felt they would achieve the goal of having prominent overhangs to protect the project from the weather and to create some nice rhythms along the building. Chair Gootee asked what the roofing material would be, and Mr. Bird answered that it will be a TPO material with a welded ridge, so it looks like a standing seam roof. The entire project would have a similar roofing material so that it could be easily maintained.

Board Member O'Neill recalled that, in the past, concern has been raised that the material selections for the exterior of the building should be consistent with the existing buildings in the development. He asked if the applicant believes the proposed materials address this concern. Mr. Bird said this is a subjective issue. He drove around the neighborhood and tried to create a pallet of colors, textures and modulation that would give the building some life. He expressed his belief that the proposed building achieves a feeling of what the other buildings are doing, but it is not exactly the same. Board Member O'Neill asked Mr. Waggener if Team 50 is comfortable with the proposed materials and colors. Mr. Waggener answered that the proposed materials and color pallet satisfy the team's concerns about both color and natural design variations on the face of the building.

Board Member Borofka asked if the pallet and materials on the storyboard provided by the applicant match the description provided by Mr. Bird. Mr. Bird answered yes, but noted that the siding was painted a color that is close to the color chip that has been chosen. Board Member Borofka asked if the materials on the storyboard are part of the supporting material for the application, and Mr. Lien answered affirmatively.

Vice Chair Guenther asked if there are any sustainable building goals for the project. Mr. Bird answered that multifamily development is more sustainable than single-family development. In addition, the building is relatively tight so it will not consume a lot of energy relative to a single-family home. It's probably within walking distance of shopping, which is also a sustainable element. The materials are durable so they will not have to be replaced in the near future. They are not generating any of their own electricity, so it would not be considered a LEED certified project. However, the much of the landscaping would be draught tolerant.

Claire Widing, Edmonds, indicated that she was not present when those who spoke previously took their oath. Therefore, Chair Gootee asked her to raise her right hand and affirm that the testimony she would give would be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Ms. Widing explained that when the three parties from the Town of Woodway contested the project, one of the concerns had to do with the parking lot. She referred to the proposed parking lot plan and noted that in the agreement she signed, the five stalls on the east end of the parking lot were supposed to be located (see attached image). This issue is of particular importance to her because of her previously-stated concern about lighting and noise.

Ralph Swenson, Edmonds, said he lives in the Point Edwards Development. He voiced concern that the patios are too close to the street. One of the nice things about the Point Edwards Development is that all of the concrete patios along the street are hidden and the landscaping is excellent. The developer has placed Building 10 as close to the property line as possible, which means that the sidewalk would only be 10 feet from the patios. He doesn't believe people will want to look at all the stuff that is stored on these patios. The plan proposes a variety of treatments for the patios. Some have L-shaped structures, and others have vertical planters perpendicular to the building. He felt the proposal should clearly establish what is going to prevent the view to the patios from the street and sidewalk. He also voiced concern about the privacy for homeowners living in the units. He recommended that the ADB require knee-high or hip-high walls to protect the views of people walking on the sidewalk or driving their cars.

Board Member O'Neill said it appears that all of the patios along the north side of the building are elevated from the street, in some places as much as 12 to 14 feet. Mr. Swenson still felt the patios should be screened if they are only 10 feet from the sidewalk, particularly those on the east end, which are not significantly higher than the sidewalk. Mr. Lien referred to Sheet A35, which identifies the contour lines between the sidewalk and the street. He explained that the setbacks requirement along Pine Street is 15 feet, and each of the proposed patios is a minimum of 15 feet from the property line. With just a few exceptions, the sidewalks are at least 15 feet away from the patios. Mr. Bird said they have incorporated seat walls (about 18 inches tall) around the patios along Pine Street in an effort to define the spaces, as well as provide some screening as the grading slopes up the hill.

City Attorney Taraday asked Mr. Lien to solicit more information about the lighting concern raised by Ms. Widing in hopes that the Board could better understand how it relates to the design criteria. Specifically, he asked her to clarify

whether her lighting concern was related to artificial lighting or the blockage of natural light. He also asked the applicant to address the lighting issue.

Ms. Widing voiced concern about the headlights that would shine onto her property when people park in the six spaces on the east side of the parking area. During her discussions with the applicant, the parking was going to all be located elsewhere on site, and the vehicle lights would be directed away from her property. City Attorney Taraday clarified that Ms. Widing is concerned about vehicle headlights.

Mr. Jammer said the purpose of the trees and other landscape elements along the head-in parking spaces is to minimize impacts. The parking would also be located several feet below the finished grade on the side where Ms. Widing's home is located. Typical headlights are about 30 to 33 inches high so most of the glare would be taken care of by the difference in grade. The headlights would be further filtered by the trees, shrubs and other plant materials. Mr. Lien referred to Sheet A39, which provides a cross section of the site and clearly illustrates the elevation difference.

Board Member Borofka referred to the parking diagram (Sheet A25) and noted that several trellises have been incorporated. He asked if the applicant would consider installing and maintaining a vegetative trellis structure over the front of the parking stalls that have been called into question.

Chair Gootee called a short recess at 8:26 p.m. to allow the applicant to prepare a response to Ms. Widing's concern. The meeting reconvened at 8:30 p.m.

Ms. Kaylor pointed out that the Board does not have jurisdiction over private agreements between parties. She advised that the agreement does not include a parking lot map, but it does include some narrative requirements, and it was the applicant's belief that the plan complies. Nevertheless, she expressed assurance that the cooperation that built over the past many months will not end with the hearing, and the applicant intends to continue to work with all of the neighbors as the project moves forward. She referred to Sheet A39 and explained that the parking lot is across from elevation 65 and the ground level of the Inadomi house is at elevation 88, for a height difference of about 20 feet. The Widing property is further up the hill. With the additional trees, light spillage from headlights is very unlikely. Nevertheless, the applicant is offering a condition that the applicant work with the property owners to the south to identify methodologies to limit light spillage from headlights onto properties to the south. This could include a trellis, as has been suggested, other landscape modifications, or minor modifications to the parking lot configuration generally consistent with what has been presented. However, the applicant would request that the Board allow staff the ability to approve these minor modifications without coming back for a public hearing.

Chair Gootee called a short recess at 8:37 p.m. to allow a few Board Members to draft appropriate language for the condition, and to allow the City Attorney to confer with staff on the legal mechanism of the condition to make sure it is consistent with the City code. The meeting was reconvened at 8:44 p.m.

Mr. Lien suggested that the new condition could be similar to Conditions 3 and 4 related to trees, which set broad parameters. As long as the proposal falls within the parameters of the condition, the applicant's permit could be approved by staff. He referred to the design criterion C.10.B that requires applicants to minimize the potential for light to reflect or spill off site. He suggested that the condition could require the applicant to propose modifications to the landscaping and/or parking lot layout to minimize off-site spillage of light. However, he emphasized that the modifications should not change the number of parking stalls provided on the site. The Board and staff spent some time discussing the appropriate wording for the proposed new condition.

Reid Schoenfeld, Edmonds, said his understanding is that the existing Point Edwards Homeowners Association and the new homeowners association would share certain aspects of the master plan, such as the retention pond, public overlooks, public walkways, etc. He specifically asked if the retention pond would be adequate to handle the stormwater

runoff from Building 10. Chair Gootee noted that the stormwater requirements are outside of the Board's purview and would be addressed by the staff as part of the development permit review.

Rick Tompkins, civil engineer, Triad Associates, explained that the infrastructure to serve the proposed project is already in place as part of the previous phases. As a civil engineer, his job is to analyze what is there and ensure that the project can meet the current standards that apply to the master plan and make recommendations as to what further improvements might be needed. While the applicant is allowed to use the existing infrastructure, which includes treating water in an existing detention pond located downstream, he must validate that the capacity is still adequate based on the proposed design. It is likely that some corrections will be required, and the design drawings that were provided with the earlier application may need to be restored.

Louise Dickens, Customer Service and Warranty Manager for Point Edwards 1 and 2 LLC, reported that the LLC has drafted and presented a settlement agreement to the Point Edwards Homeowners Association, which addresses the detention pond, the second lift on the driveway, etc. A survey may be needed to determine if the detention pond is at its maximum capacity or not. If it needs to be dredged, the survey could identify what the process would be.

No one else in the audience indicated a desire to provide testimony and Chair Gootee closed the public testimony portion of the hearing.

Vice Chair Guenther expressed his belief that the proposal is well-conceived and put together well. The applicant considered all of the concerns and an agreement between all parties was reached prior to the hearing.

VICE CHAIR GUENTHER MOVED THAT THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD ADOPT THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND ANALYSIS OF THE STAFF REPORT; FIND THAT THE PROPOSAL IS 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 POINT EDWARDS BUILDING 10 UNDER FILE NUMBER PLN20150032 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. APPROVAL AT THE DESIGN REVIEW PHASE SHALL NOT BE INTERPRETED TO MEAN APPROVAL OF THE IMPROVEMENTS AS SHOWN ON THE PRELIMINARY PLAN.**
- 3. THE TREES WITHIN THE SURFACE PARKING AREA MAY BE EVERGREEN OR DECIDUOUS SPECIES. AT THE TIME OF PLANTING, THE TREES MUST BE A MINIMUM OF SIX FEET IN HEIGHT FOR EVERGREEN SPECIES OR ONE AND ONE-HALF INCHES IN CALIPER FOR DECIDUOUS. A TREE THAT REACHES LESS THAN 35 FEET IN HEIGHT AT MATURITY MAY BE APPROVED TO PROTECT THE VIEWS OF THE PROPERTY TO THE IMMEDIATE SOUTH OF THE DEVELOPMENT.**
- 4. THE TREES ALONG THE SOUTHERN PROPERTY LINE ADJACENT TO THE ROCKERY MUST BE AN EVERGREEN SPECIES AT LEAST 10 FEET IN HEIGHT AT THE TIME OF PLANTING, WHICH GROWS TO NO MORE THAN 35 FEET AT MATURITY. A TREE THAT REACHES LESS THAN 35 FEET IN HEIGHT AT MATURITY MAY BE APPROVED TO PROTECT THE VIEWS OF THE PROPERTY TO THE IMMEDIATE SOUTH OF THE DEVELOPMENT.**
- 5. 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.

- 6. THE APPLICANT SHALL ENSURE THAT LIGHT SPILLAGE TOWARD THE SOUTHERN NEIGHBORS FROM CAR HEADLIGHTS IN THE PARKING LOT IS MINIMIZED BY ADDING ADDITIONAL VEGETATION, SCREENING, TRELLISES AND/OR OTHER LANDSCAPING, AND/OR BY RECONFIGURING THE PARKING STALLS TO FACE A DIFFERENT DIRECTION, WITHOUT CHANGING THE NUMBER OF PARKING STALLS IN THE SURFACE PARKING LOT AND WITHOUT ADDING TREES THAT WOULD BE HIGHER THAN THOSE ALREADY CONTEMPLATED ALONG THE SOUTHERN PORTION OF THE SITE.**

BOARD MEMBER BOROFKA SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CONSOLIDATED PERMIT APPLICATIONS (No Public Participation):

There were no consolidated permit applications.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

There were no administrative reports or items for discussion.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

Chair Gootee announced he would resign his position on the Board at the end of 2015. Mr. Lien indicated that staff would review the requirements of the Board positions and advertise the vacant positions as needed.

Mr. Lien announced that the City has been moving away from providing paper packets to Board Members, and the information is now sent to Board Members via the internet. He reminded the Board of the Public Records Act and said the City generally tries to keep City business on the City's server.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:04 p.m.