

**APPROVED**

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

**November 4, 2015**

---

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  
Tom Walker

**Board Members Absent**

Bruce O'Neill

**Staff Present**

Jen Machuga, Associate Planner  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**BOARD MEMBER BOROFKA MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 7, 2015 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY MOVED THAT THE AGENDA BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER BOROFKA 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.

**PRESENTATION BY MAYOR EARLING**

Mayor Earling recognized and thanked Board Members O'Neill and Gootee for their years of service on the Board, and presented Board Member Gootee with a gift. (*Note: Board Member O'Neill was absent.*) He noted that both would be retiring from the Board at the end of 2015. He said he receives numerous comments about the high-level of volunteerism in the community. He shared some examples, and advised that he has been invited speak on the subject at a conference in April.

Chair Gootee thanked the Board members and said he enjoyed working with them very much.

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

There were no items on the consent agenda.

## **MINOR PROJECTS:**

No minor projects were scheduled on the agenda.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS:**

**File Number PLN20150036: Phase 2 of a public hearing for GBH Holdings LLC for a district-based design review of a new 9-unit residential building at 303 Edmonds Street and architectural improvements to an existing mixed-use building at 311 Edmonds Street.**

Chair Gootee explained that the purpose of this open record hearing is for the Architectural Design Board (ADB) to address GBH Holdings LLC's design review application for a new 9-unit residential building and minor architectural improvements to an existing mixed-use building located at 303 and 311 Edmonds Street. The project is subject to a two-phase public hearing before the ADB. Phase 1 of the hearing occurred on September 2<sup>nd</sup>, at which time the hearing was continued to November 4<sup>th</sup> for the Phase 2 portion.

Chair Gootee opened the public hearing and reviewed the rules and procedures for the hearing. He advised that during the open record hearing, the staff, applicant and any member of the public would have an opportunity to introduce evidence into the administrative record. The evidence could 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. Board Member Broadway disclosed that the application is being presented by members of her firm. None of the Board Members felt it necessary for her to recuse herself from the discussion and decision. Lastly, Chair Gootee 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.

Ms. Machuga presented the staff report, stating that the subject proposal is for design of a new 9-unit residential building at 303 Edmonds Street and minor architectural improvements to an existing building located at 311 Edmonds Street. The site is located on the corner of 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue North and Edmonds Street and is within the Downtown Business (BD2) zone. The eastern portion of the site (311 Edmonds Street) is developed with existing two-story mixed-use building that contains an office on the ground floor and four residential units on the upper floor. The proposal includes minor architectural improvements to this existing building. The western portion of the site (303 Edmonds Street) is currently an undeveloped gravel area that is occasionally used for parking, but is not an improved parking lot. The proposed 9-unit residential building would be located on that portion of the property.

Ms. Machuga pointed out that pedestrian access to both building would be directly off of Edmonds Street, and no vehicular access or on-site parking is proposed. She noted that, following the issuance of the Staff Report, two public

comment letters were received, both of which address concerns related to the lack of on-site parking. Both letters were emailed to Board Members prior to the meeting, and hard copies are available, as well. She entered the letter from Barbara and Patrick Marker into the record as Exhibit 11 and the letter from Jeff and Vicki Phillips into the record as Exhibit 12. Although both letters referred to the parking standard within ECDC 17.50, it should be noted that the BD zoning standards of ECDC 16.43.030.D specifically state that whenever there are conflicts between the requirements of ECDC 16.43 and 17.50, the provision in ECDC 16.43 shall apply. Thus, the site is subject to the off-street parking requirements in 16.43.030.D, which do not require parking for any commercial floor area of permitted uses within the BD2 zone and also do not require parking for any floor area in any building with a total building footprint of less than 4,800 square feet. Therefore, no on-site parking is required for the subject proposal.

Ms. Machuga reminded the Board that, pursuant to ECDC 20.12.010, proposed developments in the BD zones that require a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) threshold determination also require review by the ADB in a two-phased public hearing process that is intended to provide public and design professional input at an early stage. Phase 1 of the process was held before the ADB on September 2<sup>nd</sup>, at which time the Board reviewed the conceptual project plans, took testimony, established the Design Guidelines Checklist, and continued the hearing to November 4<sup>th</sup>. Following the Phase 1 hearing, the applicant submitted revised project plans, which were provided in Exhibit 5 of the Staff Report, as well as a letter stating how the Design Guidelines were addressed (Exhibit 6). During the Phase 2 hearing, the Board will review the revised plans and take public testimony. After the public hearing has been closed, the Board will deliberate and make a decision on the proposal.

Ms. Machuga recalled that several criteria must be considered when reviewing the subject application, including the general and downtown-specific design objectives of the Comprehensive Plan, the Design Guidelines Checklist as prioritized by the ADB on September 2<sup>nd</sup>, the zoning standards of ECDC 16.43, and the additional design standards specific to the BD zones in ECDC 22.43. She further reviewed that the project plans were fairly well formed at the Phase 1 hearing, so the applicant has not made many changes to what the Board reviewed on September 2<sup>nd</sup>. The applicant has, however, eliminated the proposal to re-clad the existing building. Instead, the applicant is proposing to paint the building and make other minor architectural improvements such as a canopy over the front entry, enclosing the stairwell on the eastern side of the building, and providing hanging flower baskets and steel planter boxes.

Ms. Machuga provided drawings to illustrate the changes proposed for the existing building, as well as the design of the new building. She advised that the Staff Report provides greater detail as to how the proposal is in compliance with applicable codes and design guidelines. For example, the main entrances to both buildings have been clearly identified by a recessed entry on the proposed new building, canopies over both building entrances, and flower boxes and planters. Pedestrian access to both buildings is provided from Edmonds Street. Although the applicant is not proposing to use the same materials on both buildings, he is proposing similar colors and design elements. The screening wall around the stairwell will be the same material as the lower fence that will go around the patios on the proposed new building.

Ms. Machuga summarized that with the conditions outlined on Pages 27 and 28 of the Staff Report, staff believes the proposal is consistent with applicable codes, as well as the design guidelines and criteria. She recommended the Board approve the proposal with the conditions as outlined in the Staff Report.

**Alex Bautz, TGB Architects, Edmonds**, advised that to address the Board's previously-stated concerns relative to modulation, the west elevation was revised to continue the bump out that was originally proposed for the upper two stories all the way to the ground level. He provided material boards to illustrate the types and colors of proposed materials. The applicant is proposing a brick material on the lower level of the new building, with Hardie Panel and beveled lap siding above. Paint colors include "Drifting Sand" (grey) for the body, "Ocean Storms" (blue) for the accent, and "Herare White" for the trim. The applicant is no longer proposing Hardie Panel siding for the existing building. Instead, the existing siding would be painted to match the grey color (Drifting Sand) used for the body of the proposed new building.

Mr. Bautz further reviewed that the applicant is now proposing a canopy over the entrance and lower windows on the front façade of the existing building, as well as planter boxes and hanging baskets to match those proposed for the new building. As per the Board's request, the applicant is proposing to enclose the stairwell with a wood cedar horizontal fence that matches the horizontal fencing that is proposed for the new building, the screening around the dumpster and transformer enclosures, and the common area courtyard fence and gate. All of these modifications will bring down the human scale and create interaction at the street level.

Board Member Borofka requested clarification on the materials and colors proposed for the main portion of the two buildings. Mr. Bautz referred to Attachment A.5 of Exhibit 5 of the Staff Report and answered that the existing building would be painted the grey color (Drifting Sand) to match the color that will be used for the Hardie Panel proposed for the new building. The protrusions on the north, south and west facades of the new building would be painted the blue color (Ocean Storms), and the trim around the windows would be painted white (Herare White). The band on the south façade of the existing building would also be painted white.

Board Member Gootee requested more information about the proposed fencing materials, noting that cedar fencing will become discolored due to weather. Mr. Bautz said the fencing material would likely be horizontal cedar, but it would be stained and sealed to preserve its color.

Board Member Walker recalled that the Board previously voiced concern about the blank walls on the existing building. He said the band on the southern elevation works well to break up the wall, and he questioned why the applicant is no longer proposing that the band continue around all sides of the building. **Steve Butterfield, TGB Architects**, explained that as structural improvements were made to the existing building, the structural engineer voiced concern about whether the exterior structure could support the weight of the additional materials. The existing building will be painted to match the new building. Whether it is clad in CMU or Hardie Panel siding, the appearance should be similar. The applicant is currently proposing a band on just the southern elevation.

Board Member Borofka asked if the applicant has a drawing to illustrate what the existing building would look like if the conditions outlined in the Staff Report relative to the stairwell screening and band around the building were incorporated into the design. Mr. Butterfield explained that since the September 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting, the band around the existing building was removed because it was determined to be structurally unsound as it was applied to the existing CMU material. Another option would be to simply paint a band around the building or use a different material.

Chair Gootee referred to the drawings that were submitted during the Phase 1 hearing and said it appears that an element was removed from the parapet of the existing building. Mr. Bautz explained that the previous proposal included a wood element that was intended to tie to the new building. When the Hardie Panel was removed from the design, this element was eliminated, as well.

Chair Gootee summarized that it appears the options are limited for the existing building due to the structural integrity of the exterior wall. Mr. Butterfield reminded the Board that the applicant has already done extensive structural improvements, and it was determined that the existing band around the building created a safety hazard.

**Pat Marker, Edmonds**, said he attended the Phase 1 hearing, but was unaware that no on-site parking would be required for the project. He assumed that a 9-unit residential building would require parking, as would the existing mixed-use building. The project description provided for the hearing does not mention parking at all, and until recently, he did not know about the code provision that says no on-site parking is required for buildings with a footprint of less than 4,800 square feet. He questioned where tenants of the development would park, given that most of the parking in the area is limited to three hours. Lastly, Mr. Marker asked if the applicant would be required to provide an elevator in the proposed new building.

Mr. Butterfield responded that he met with City staff early in the process. Upon learning that the parking standard for the BD2 zone does not require on-site parking, the applicant decided to develop apartments on the site, with street parking rather than on-site parking.

Chair Gootee acknowledged that Mr. Marker's concern about parking is valid, but it is not within the Board's purview to address. The Board is strictly charged with reviewing the design of proposals, and staff is responsible for insuring that projects are consistent with the code, including parking standards. Ms. Machuga suggested that Mr. Marker take his concern to the City Council with a request that the code be revised. However, the current project is code compliant with regard to parking.

**Vicki Phillips, Edmonds**, said she lives right behind the subject property. She voiced concern that, although she has a permit, she often cannot find parking space on the street during busy days. With all of the activities that take place in the downtown area, people have often parked in her backyard. She asked if the applicant is proposing to provide a load/unload zone for people to move their things in and out of the building. If so, this could further limit the amount of on-street parking that is available to serve the tenants. While she does not foresee problems with parking during the week, it will be a greater concern during the weekends. She noted that people currently park in the alley, which would no longer be possible once the stairway of the existing building is enclosed as proposed. She expressed her belief that the applicant should want to ensure that enough parking is available for the tenants of the new project. While she is grateful that the existing building is being upgraded and the vacant site is being developed, she is very concerned about parking.

Again, Mr. Butterfield pointed out that the application is consistent with the City's current requirements for height and parking. The applicant is proposing to enclose the stairway to address life safety issues raised by the Fire Marshall who is concerned that garbage is dropped under the stairs, creating a fire hazard. He agreed that cars would no longer be able to park under the stairs once they are screened. The screening around the transformer and trash enclosure will also eliminate parking spaces along the alleyway. However, it is important to note that these screening elements are required by code.

**Pat Marker, Edmonds**, once again asked if an elevator would be required for the new building. Mr. Butterfield answered that an elevator would not be required based on the size of the proposed new building.

**CHAIR GOOTEE CLOSED THE PUBLIC TESTIMONY PORTION OF THE HEARING AND THE BOARD BEGAN ITS DELIBERATIONS.**

Chair Gootee voiced concern that the changes proposed for the existing building have severely reduced its appearance, and it will be a stark contrast to the proposed new building. He asked the Board to share ideas for how the existing building could be dressed up in a cost-effective manner. Vice Chair Guenther recalled that the Board previously commented on how the proposed changes to the existing building did not have the same level of detail as the proposed design for the new building. Now, because of the condition of the exterior of the existing building, the applicant has determined that it cannot be clad with Hardie board as originally proposed. Other than providing a band around the building, it appears that little can be done to provide more detail to the building. Board Member Walker suggested that another option would be to paint the top portion of the building a different color than the bottom. Board Member Broadway agreed that paint variation is one way to break up the monolithic look of the building without challenging the structure's integrity or adding significant cost. However, they must be careful with paint so the structure does not end up looking like a caricature building.

Mr. Butterfield requested an opportunity to converse with his client regarding the matter. Following this brief conversation, Mr. Butterfield provided an illustration of the existing building that showed a white band around the entire building, with the upper portion painted blue and the lower portion grey. The illustration also showed screening that follows the contour of the stairs and windows with a little bit of white trim. He emphasized that the band would be a

board that provides some depth. Ms. Machuga entered the illustration titled, "Approach from East Edmonds Street" dated October 22, 2015 into the record as Exhibit 13.

Board Member Walker asked if the structural engineer would support the application of a band around the entire building. Mr. Butterfield answered that it would depend on the material and application used. They need to come up with a material that provides both depth and shadow and then figure out the best way to affix it to the building to ensure it does not fall off.

The Board concurred that the illustration in Exhibit 13 adequately addresses their concerns relative to the design of the existing building, as long as the band has some depth. They acknowledged that it is not as favorable as the previous design, but it is a reasonable and affordable solution. The Board further concurred that the applicant has addressed all of the concerns that were raised at the Phase 1 hearing.

**BOARD MEMBER BOROFKA 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 DESIGN OBJECTIVES OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, THE DESIGN CRITERIA IDENTIFIED DURING PHASE 1 OF THE PUBLIC HEARING, AND THE DESIGN STANDARDS OF ECDC 22.43. HE FURTHER MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE PROPOSAL WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- 1. ADDITIONAL INTEREST SHALL BE ADDED TO THE EXISTING BUILDING BY EXTENDING THE PAINTED BELTCOURSE FROM THE SOUTHERN FAÇADE AROUND ALL FOUR BUILDING FACADES, FOLLOWING A PAINT SCHEME AS PRESENTED IN THE TOP DRAWING OF EXHIBIT 13, WHICH WAS SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT ON NOVEMBER 4, 2015.**
- 2. THE SCREENING WALL AROUND THE EXTERIOR STAIRWELL SHALL BE ANGLED TO FOLLOW THE SLOPE OF THE STAIRS AS SHOWN IN THE TOP DRAWING OF EXHIBIT 13, WHICH WAS SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT ON NOVEMBER 4, 2015.**
- 3. THE SCREENING OF THE STAIRWAY ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE EXISTING BUILDING SHALL NOT EXTEND FURTHER SOUTH THAN THE FACE OF THE BUILDING TO PREVENT OBSCURING PEDESTRIANS FROM CARS EXITING THE ALLEY.**
- 4. THREE STREET TREES SHALL BE PROVIDED ALONG EDMONDS STREET AT 30' ON CENTER SPACING PER THE CITY OF EDMONDS STREET TREE PLAN. STREET TREE SIZING AND SPECIES IS TO BE DETERMINED AT THE TIME OF BUILDING PERMIT REVIEW.**
- 5. THE APPLICANT MUST APPLY FOR AND OBTAIN ALL NECESSARY PERMITS, AND THE APPLICATION WILL BE SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS IN THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE. IT IS UP TO THE APPLICANT TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH THE VARIOUS PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE ORDINANCES.**

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

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

There were no consolidated applications on the agenda.

**ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:**

Ms. Machuga announced that the Board's December 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting was cancelled, but it may be necessary to have a meeting on December 16<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Machuga encouraged Board Members to view the video of a presentation the City Attorney made to the Planning Board on October 28<sup>th</sup> regarding the Appearance of Fairness Doctrine. She advised that once the Board vacancies have been filled, it may be appropriate to invite the City Attorney to provide training specific to the Board.

**ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:**

Vice Chair Guenther inquired if the City has allocated a budget to the Board to fund training opportunities, and Ms. Machuga agreed to check and report back.

Chair Gootee thanked the Mayor for his gift and presentation on behalf of the City. He also thanked staff for their help in guiding the Board Members along and helping them run effective meetings.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:16 p.m.