

APPROVED

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

January 20, 2016

Vice Chair Guenther 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

Cary Guenther, Vice Chair
Lois Broadway
Lauri Strauss
Tom Walker

Board Members Absent

Brian Borofka

Staff Present

Sean Conrad, Associate Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 4, 2015 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

BOARD MEMBER WALKER MOVED THAT THE AGENDA BE ACCEPTED AS PRESENTED. BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY 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.

ELECTION OF 2016 OFFICERS

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY MOVED THAT THE BOARD TABLE ELECTION OF 2016 OFFICERS TO THEIR NEXT MEETING. BOARD MEMBER STRAUSS SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MINOR PROJECTS:

No minor projects were scheduled on the agenda.

PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS:

Public Hearing for Pride Ventures, LLC to construct 14 detached condominium units on approximately one acre. The two commercial buildings and one single-family residence will be removed to accommodate the 14 dwellings, which will range in size from 2,100 square feet to 2,400 square feet. The one-acre property is currently comprised of three separate parcels, which will be combined into one lot. The site is located at the southwest

corner of the intersection of 80th Avenue West and 212th Street Southwest and zoned Multi-Family Residential (RM-2.4). (File Number PLN20150050)

Vice Chair Guenther explained that the purpose of the open record hearing is for the Architectural Design Board (ADB) to address Pride Ventures, LLC's design review application for Brackett's Corner, a proposed 14-unit project located at the southwest corner of the intersection of 80th Avenue West and 212th Street Southwest. 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.

Vice Chair Guenther 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, Vice Chair Guenther 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.

Vice Chair Guenther 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. Conrad presented the Staff Report, providing a brief summary of the 14-unit residential project. He provided a map to identify the subject property, which is located along 212th Street Southwest, about ¼ mile east of the Five Corners Roundabout. The property is situated between the roundabout and 76th Avenue West, right next to Edmonds Woodway High School. He presented a zoning map, noting that RM-2.4 zoning lines 212th Street Southwest in the immediate neighborhood, and the zoning beyond is Single-Family Residential (RS-8). The proposed project is consistent with existing zone in use, scale and density.

Mr. Conrad displayed the proposed site plan, which identifies 14 residential units: four on the north boundary (212th Street Southwest), four on the south boundary, and six on the interior of the site. Two access points are proposed along 80th Avenue West. Landscaping would primarily be located along the perimeter of the site, and the proposed landscape plan meets the intent of the landscape requirements for a project of this type. Type II landscaping would be required along the west and south project site boundaries, and Type IV landscaping would be required along the north and east project site boundaries.

Mr. Conrad displayed the volume model contained in the application packet, which gives perspective as to the scale of the new units in relation to existing development in the area. Along 212th Street Southwest, the proposed units coincide with the existing residential units located immediately to the west, and they are a little shorter than the apartments to the east. Zoning to the south of the subject property on 80th Avenue West is RS-8, with single-family rambler-style homes, and the proposed new homes are within the height limit of the RS-8 zoning district, resulting in a similar scale and height.

Mr. Conrad displayed schematic drawings to illustrate the exterior design of the proposed units. He also provided a potential color pallet consisting of variations of grey and charcoal with white trim. The color of the units would be mixed up throughout the site so the units do not all look the same. The Staff Report indicates that the homes would be

between 25 and 30 feet in height, and the zone allows a maximum height of 30 feet. New information recently received from the applicant identifies the height of the new homes to be about 27 feet, which is under the maximum height limit allowed in the zone.

Mr. Conrad summarized that the proposed plan is in compliance with the City's Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies regarding residential development and consistent with the RM-2.4 zoning regulations. The applicant is proposing adequate off-street parking for all units, and landscaping would comply with the requirements of the Type II and Type IV Landscape standards. Therefore, staff recommends the Board grant approval of the project, subject to the conditions outlined in the Staff Report.

Board Member Broadway asked if the applicant is proposing auxiliary parking space for guests as part of the project. Mr. Conrad answered that, in addition to the garage parking, there would be auxiliary parking at the ends of the access drive and between the units. Board Member Broadway asked the distance between the units, and Mr. Conrad answered that the distance would be about 10 feet.

Jake Lyon, Pride Ventures, LLC, indicated he is the applicant for the project. He said his company recently completed a three-unit project in Edmonds that sold out at full price in ten days. They do high-quality work, but at a more affordable price range than many other projects in Edmonds. He said they like the Five Corners area, especially with the improvements the City has recently made in conjunction with the new roundabout. Their goal is to construct a project that brings more life to the area.

Mr. Lyon explained that the original design had a higher density. However, the number of units was later reduced so that the middle six units could be larger and have a courtyard area to give a community feel. The homes they construct are traditional craftsman style, with touches of modern. They use a lot of millwork around the doors and fully wrap all the windows. He believes the quality is far superior to a lot of other development in the area. It is estimated the price of the homes will range between \$400,000 and \$500,000 each.

Board Member Strauss asked where fencing would be located on the site. Mr. Lyon answered that there are currently six-foot fences on the west and south sides of the property, and they are proposing to add fencing on the north side of the project, as well as intermittently on the east side of the property. As noted in the Staff Report, the City recommended that the fence height be lowered to four feet, which they are willing to do. There will also be fences between the units so that each owner will have a separate backyard.

Vice Chair Guenther asked Mr. Lyon to describe the proposed community space. Mr. Lyon said the original plan included 16 homes, but it was later decided to reduce the number of units on the interior of the site from eight to six. The middle and eastern units were clustered in such a way to provide a more desirable and open space between the units. The intent was to make the project feel less dense and to provide more of a backyard feel for the residents living in the four units. He emphasized that the courtyard space is intended for the residents living in the four units, and not for the residents living in the remaining units.

Board Member Broadway pointed out that most of the units would have backyard space that is fenced and separate from the other units. However, it appears that the four units around the courtyard would have a shared backyard space. She asked if there would be covenants limiting the ability to put fencing in after ownership. Mr. Lyon said he hasn't fully figured out how to handle the fencing in this area, but the intent is that the space would have limited access and only be accessible to the residents of the four houses. Perhaps fencing in a cross configuration could be used to separate the space.

Board Member Walker asked if vehicular traffic would be allowed on the north/south connector street, and Mr. Lyon answered yes. Board Member Walker asked if consideration was given to moving the buildings over and limiting the cross street to pedestrian access only. He acknowledged that a pedestrian connection would be necessary, but perhaps the vehicular access could be eliminated.

Board Member Walker suggested that the open space between the inner four units could be reconfigured to allow more room between the units. As currently proposed, the space will be occupied by landscaping and trees and will not really be a plaza or gathering place. He suggested the applicant could maximize the space better to obtain the community concept he desires. Mr. Lyon emphasized that the community space would be limited to the residents living in the four units. He pointed out that the living rooms of the four units will face towards the common space, and the residents will not likely want all of their neighbors hanging out in the area and looking directly into their homes.

Board Member Strauss asked if the applicant considered alternative layouts that would allow at least some of the existing trees to be saved. Mr. Lyon answered that as much as he would like to save the trees, they are not located in a manner that allows the roads to be constructed. He said he does not have a layout that would save the trees because it was not feasible to do so given the price of the land and the need to get enough density to justify the project.

Board Member Broadway asked if the internal streets would be private driveways that are maintained by the homeowner's association or if the city be responsible for maintaining the streets. Mr. Lyon answered that they would be private property maintained by the homeowner's association. Board Member Walker asked if the fire code dictated where the streets are to be located, and Mr. Lyon answered affirmatively.

Vice Chair Guenther asked if any signage is being proposed as part of the project, and Mr. Lyon answered that there are no plans for signage at this time. Mr. Conrad reminded the Board that the code allows signage associated with a development of this type, but it would be addressed via a separate permit. Given the residential zoning, the sign size will be limited.

Board Member Broadway asked if there would be parking space in front of the units, and Mr. Lyon answered no. Parking for the units will be located in the garages and between the units.

Board Member Strauss asked the applicant to describe the stormwater plans for the project. Mr. Lyon acknowledged that drainage has been a difficult issue, and the current plan is to install infiltration galleries on the north and east sides of the property to infiltrate all stormwater into the ground. The ditches will be roughly seven feet deep, five feet wide, and ten feet long and will be filled in with drain rock. All of the stormwater from the site will be piped into these locations for infiltration. Board Member Strauss asked if roof runoff would also go into the infiltration galleries, and Mr. Lyon answered affirmatively.

Board Member Walker asked if the applicant is proposing irrigation in the landscaped areas, and Mr. Lyon answered that irrigation is proposed for the common areas, but no decision has been made for the individual backyards. Board Member Walker suggested the applicant use drought resistant plant materials in these locations.

Vice Chair Guenther invited members of the public to address the Board, but none came forward.

Board Member Strauss referred to plans included in the application relative to lighting and noted that the applicant is proposing some up lights. Mr. Conrad explained that up lights are not allowed in the commercial zones, but the requirements are more ambiguous in the multi-family residential zones. Lights must be kept to the property and not be a nuisance to adjoining properties, and what the applicant is proposing will work fine even with some up lighting because they will be on the individual units and would simply wash the building and eaves of the homes.

There were no additional questions and/or testimony, and the public portion of the hearing was closed.

Board Member Broadway said she was pleased that the applicant reduced the density of the project, and she likes the gesture towards more opportunities for communal space. However, she is concerned that the home's backyards will face 212th Street Southwest. This is converse to what you would expect going along 212th Street Southwest, but she

acknowledged that the applicant has taken great strides to address the design of each facade. She said she likes the internal focus of the courtyard concept and she will be interested in hearing how the applicant plans to design this space.

Board Member Strauss said she was also concerned that the back side of the homes will face 212th Street Southwest. From the backside, you will see a six-foot fence, and people looking out of the units will look at the fence, as well. On the other hand, she likes the courtyard design. While eliminating the fencing would result in a more residential feel, it is probably necessary to provide privacy for the residents from the busy street.

Board Member Strauss complimented the applicant on the good design. All of the units are different, but still a lot the same. She said she would prefer a larger color range with more variation to break up the facades more.

Board Member Walker suggested the applicant consider options that would better fulfill the concept of community space. He recognized that this would be challenging given that the units would be private residences. However, he sees the space as somewhere the neighbors can get to know each other, and the design could help foster that. It could be something as simple as providing a picnic table.

Board Member Broadway suggested that perhaps there could be something special about the internal north/south connector strip that would make the space unique and special to the residents. Board Member Strauss asked if the north/south connector is required to provide vehicular circulation or if it could be limited to pedestrians. Vice Chair Guenther asked if it would be possible to design the connector to be a type of community space that everyone could share. Board Member Broadway suggested that perhaps the applicant could look at some ways to delineate the north/south connector using patterns or colors so that it could be used as a gathering place on weekends, etc. Vice Chair Guenther commented that although cars would be able to drive down the street, it seems to have the potential to be a pedestrian connection and gathering place for the neighborhood.

Board Member Walker suggested that perhaps the north/south connector street could be greened up with grass pavers, etc. He asked if there are any code requirements relative to pavement materials. Mr. Conrad pointed out that, given the project will only have 14 homes, he does not anticipate there will be a lot of traffic on the connector street. While there must be space on the street to allow ample turning radius for the parking spaces, as well as emergency access to the development, the applicant could use different colors and materials as long as there is a hard surface that can accommodate vehicular traffic and emergency vehicles.

Board Member Walker suggested that hammerheads could be used to provide the necessary turning radius. Mr. Conrad agreed but said the site plan would have to change to accommodate a hammerhead design.

BOARD MEMBER WALKER MOVED THAT THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD ADOPT THE FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF THE STAFF REPORT; 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; AND APPROVE THE DESIGN OF THE 14-UNIT RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT KNOWN AS BRACKETT'S CORNER (FILE NUMBER PLN20150050) WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS.

1. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT FOR THE FIRST HOME IN THE DEVELOPMENT, A REVISED LANDSCAPE PLAN SHALL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT STAFF. THE LANDSCAPE PLAN SHALL BE DESIGNED IN ACCORDANCE WITH ECDC 20.12.010 AND INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

- PROVIDE TYPE II LANDSCAPING ALONG THE WEST AND SOUTH PROJECT SITE BOUNDARIES.**

- **PROVIDE TYPE IV LANDSCAPING ALONG THE NORTH AND EAST PROJECT SITE BOUNDARIES WITH STREET TREES IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE CITY'S STREET TREE PLAN.**
2. **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.**
 3. **DEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLY WITH THE SITE PLAN AND ELEVATION DRAWINGS APPROVED BY THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD.**

Note: Approval of the design review phase of the project does not constitute approval of the improvements as shown on the submitted plans. Compliance with engineering codes and construction standards will be reviewed with the building permit application for development of the site. The owner/applicant has been informed that the proposed infiltration rate was not derived correctly and a more accurate stormwater design may result in larger infiltration systems and/or an alternate method of meeting stormwater requirements. A stormwater redesign that results in changes to the layout of the site and/or building may require additional review by the ADB.

4. **PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT, THE LOTS SHALL BE CONSOLIDATED INTO ONE LOT.**
5. **THE BOARD RECOMMENDS THE APPLICANT REVIEW THE COMMUNITY CONCEPT PLAN FURTHER, PARTICULARLY WITH THE NORTH/SOUTH STREET AND HOW A GESTURE MIGHT BE MADE TO INCORPORATE SOME TYPE OF COMMUNITY GATHERING SPACE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT.**

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CONSOLIDATED PERMIT APPLICATIONS (No Public Participation):

There were no consolidated permit applications.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

Vice Chair Guenther recalled that he previously requested feedback from staff as to whether there is funding available for Board education and training. Mr. Conrad agreed to pursue the question and get back to the Board with a response.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

There were no Board comments.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.