

APPROVED

**CITY OF EDMONDS
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD
Minutes of Regular Meeting
July 6, 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
Tom Walker, Vice Chair
Brian Borofka
Lois Broadway
Joe Herr
Lauri Strauss

Board Members Absent

Athane Tarrant

Staff Present

Kernen Lien, Senior Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER BOROFKA MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF MAY 4, 2016 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. VICE CHAIR WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

BOARD MEMBER STRAUSS 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.

MINOR PROJECTS: Edmonds Waterfront Center

Mr. Lien advised that the Senior Center is leading an effort to replace the existing building with a new building on the same site that will accommodate the Senior Center, as well as provide space for a variety of other community events. The property is owned by the City, and the current lease requires that the Senior Center obtain City Council approval for the design prior to applying for land-use and building permits. Ultimately, the land-use application will require a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit, design review by the Architectural Design Board, a Conditional Use Permit, and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review. Since the City Council must approve the design prior to application, the Senior Center is seeking early input from the Board on the preliminary design for the project. The idea is for the Board to get an early look at the project and provide feedback before it is presented to the City Council next week. This meeting is not a public hearing and no public comment should be taken at this time. The project will ultimately come back to the Board in the future for a public hearing and design review.

Phil Lovell, Edmonds, said he is currently a member of the Planning Board and a retired civil engineer. He has done a lot of work with public and private entities throughout his career, and he has been working with the Senior Center as a volunteer consultant for nearly three years. The purpose of the presentation is to make sure the Board is aware of the

project and to solicit preliminary feedback. He introduced Chris Wolfe, Accounting Manager for the Edmonds Senior Center, as well as Roger Tucker and Sally Knodell from environmental WORKS, the leading design team for the project. He also noted that members of the Senior Center Board and Building Committee were also present in the audience.

Mr. Lovell reviewed that the Senior Center has been working on the project for close to three years, starting with a feasibility study that was largely deemed necessary to determine the feasibility of making very necessary repairs to the current building. The City owns both the land and the existing building and has contributed to the Senior Center's annual operating budget since the 1970s. The Senior Center is an institution in the area and in the County, and it is a valuable asset to the community.

Mr. Lovell reported that the Senior Center decided fairly early in the process that the necessary repairs would be overly expensive, but they also considered the potential of renovating and updating the entire complex. However, because Edmonds waterfront was historically the site of numerous shingle mills, the resulting soil conditions are less than desirable. In addition, the existing building was meant to be a display and storage facility, and was never designed to function as it is currently programmed. The foundation slabs are unsettling and the building has leaks, as well. As the cost of renovating the existing building would be significant, the Senior Center also considered the option of replacing the structure, which led to the arrangement that is now a public/private partnership between the City and the Senior Center (a non-profit organization). The project has evolved into the Edmonds Waterfront Center, which will be a combined Senior Center/Community Center. The intent is for the facility to serve the senior community during the weekday hours and the community at large during the evening and weekend hours. The Senior Center has been working closely with Carrie Hite, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Manager, to create the appropriate spaces within the building to accommodate a variety of programming needs. The proposed building will be between 26,000 and 27,000 square feet in size.

Mr. Lovell advised that the 40-year, long-term lease between the Senior Center and the City requires that the Senior Center design and finance construction of the new facility. Maintenance of the facility will be the Senior Center's responsibility, as well. The site is located within the Commercial Waterfront (CW) zone and is designated as a park. The City has decided to upgrade and restore the waterfront area in conjunction with the building project, and the intent is to remove the old bulkhead and create a more accessible and soft beach area for the community to enjoy.

Mr. Lovell emphasized that the Senior Center has made a significant effort to involve the public in the process. A visioning workshop was held last May that was well attended. The workshop was followed by an open house that was co-hosted by Sustainable Edmonds and the Senior Center. The purpose of the open house was to introduce the public to the schematic design. Before the preliminary designs are presented to the City Council next week, the Senior Center felt it was very appropriate to introduce the Board to the project, as well.

Mr. Lovell advised that the vision of the project is to create a facility with a holistic model program that maximizes the full potential of participants of every age. The goal is to offer a range of programs that serve citizens of all ages and to protect, preserve and enhance the rare waterfront property for community use.

Roger Tucker, Director, environmental WORKS, said the focus of his company's work is on community facilities and projects for underserved communities.

Sally Knodell, Lead Architect, environmental WORKS, provided an aerial photograph to show the relationship of the subject property to surrounding properties. She noted that the Ebb Tide Condominiums are located to the south, followed by the waterfront park and parking. An office building is located to the North, and Railroad Avenue is located to the east, with the railroad tracks located across the street. In the next illustration, the proposed site plan was superimposed onto the aerial photograph. A black line identified the location of the proposed beach habitat restoration project that will accompany the proposed Community Center Project. The intent of the restoration project is to soften

the beach edge and extend the walkway to be continuous along the waterfront. The creosote pilings would be removed to create new habitat.

Ms. Knodell reviewed that the project will include a more convenient and organized parking area that is easier to navigate. It is anticipated that the new configuration will provide the same number of stalls as the current facility. Also, the American's with Disabilities (ADA) access will be easier and more convenient, and there will be a pedestrian path along Railroad Avenue. In addition, most of the stormwater runoff from the parking lot will feed into a bioswale and then into a rain garden before it is discharged into Puget Sound. However, because of the higher floor that is required to address sea level rise, a portion of the parking lot is sloped and some water will drain into the existing City storm drain. Currently, all of the stormwater from the site drains directly into Puget Sound without any water-quality treatment.

Mr. Tucker explained that at the onset of the project, a few firms were asked to do early concept designs that were intended to solicit the Senior Center's reaction to the overall design and the building's relationship to the Ebb Tide Condominiums to the south and the office building to the north. Maintaining the view corridors was very important, as right now, the bulkhead provides a great place for people to view the waterfront. At the same time, it is important to recognize that the Ebb Tide Condominiums is a very tall building (5 stories), with a blank wall on the north side. Rather than look at this blank wall from the new center, the idea was to push the center closer to the condominiums and create a pedestrian walkway between the two buildings that connects Railroad Avenue to the waterfront. The public areas proposed on the north side of the building are intended to provide a stronger connection between the street, center and waterfront.

Ms. Knodell advised that, early in the process, a lot of sentiment was expressed about giving back to the community a highly flexible and usable facility and a more active waterfront that serves the general population. Additional pedestrian traffic is anticipated if the waterfront walkway is contiguous, and the proposed building design offers both inside and outside space for the general public to enjoy. The intent is to pull people into the site from the waterfront and Railroad Avenue. She described some of the features of the proposed building design as follows:

- Space is allocated on the 1st floor for the existing Thrift Store to remain on the site.
- The main entry on the north side aligns with the pedestrian walkway that connects to Railroad Avenue.
- A meeting/conference room is proposed in the northeast corner of the 1st floor
- An open stairway will surround a coffee kiosk on the ground floor.
- The curved portion of the building (northwest corner) will serve as a lounge area that will be accessible to everyone. It includes a vestibule that leads to the waterfront walkway. The lounge area will extend out onto the outdoor plaza area.
- The 1st floor plan includes a large banquet room, which can be divided in half to meet various community needs. Adjacent to the banquet room will be a storage room, commercial kitchen and bridal/green room. A stage would be located on the south end of the banquet room.
- A 14-foot wide landscape strip will run between the west side of the building and the waterfront walkway. The 9-foot walkway will further separate the building from the bulkhead.
- Four multi-purpose rooms, each about 700 square feet, will be located on the west side of the 2nd floor. The partitions can be moved to double the space of the rooms when needed. A teaching kitchen would be located between the multi-purpose rooms.
- The majority of the 2nd floor will be office and medical clinic space, with a waiting room on the north end of the building.
- There will be two additional conference rooms on the 2nd floor. The larger conference room will be easily accessible from the main entry on the 1st floor.
- On the eastern façade there are opportunities for art or community-focused panels in front of the thrift shop. The water collected in the proposed rainwater cisterns on the eastern façade could be used to operate the toilets.

- The northeast corner façade will be completely glass, as would the curved portion of the building façade in the northwest corner. The design team is working to fine tune the design to solve the dichotomy of the impacts associated with storm activity with the desire to take advantage of the incredible views.
- The majority of the western façade will also be glass to take advantage of the waterfront view.

Ms. Knodell reminded the Board that the zoning code limits building height to just 30 feet. Given the additional requirement that the 1st floor be raised an additional two feet to accommodate sea level rise, the project is vertically constrained. The goal of the design is to incorporate northwest materials into the project, but minimizing the use of metals. Current feedback from shoreline experts is that all metals must be stainless steel and synthetic materials provide a more durable finish. The goal is to at least meet the LEED Silver Standard, and endeavor to meet the LEED Gold Standard if the budget can accommodate it.

Board Member Strauss voiced concern about the amount of glass proposed for the new building. She pointed out that when walking in downtown Edmonds between the 4:00 and 5:00 p.m., many business owners have their western-facing window shades pulled down to block out the sun because it gets too hot. The overhang that is proposed on the western façade will probably not do much to block the afternoon sun, and she suggested that the design team model the daylight as the project moves forward.

Board Member Broadway asked if the waterfront boardwalk in front of the Ebb Tide Condominiums would be part of the project. Ms. Knodell advised that the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Manager is working on this project independent of the Community Center Project. Mr. Lovell added that a lot of work has been done with the Ebb Tide Condominium owners in an attempt to complete that length of the waterfront walkway. However, nothing has been confirmed to date. Mr. Lien explained that, although the walkway project is separate, the plan is to have the connection done at the same time as the Community Center. The walkway would be located in front of the Ebb Tide Condominiums where the City currently has an easement.

Board Member Broadway observed that the public access on the north side of the building from Railroad Avenue to the waterfront appears to be about 8 to 9 feet wide. She recommended that the design team consider a wider sidewalk in this location because it is the only public access to the beach in this location. She also suggested that monument signage on Railroad Avenue should be integrated into the design rather than an afterthought.

Board Member Broadway commented that there does not appear to be a loading area to serve the building. Given that the 1st floor will house a banquet room and the thrift store, a loading area will be needed. She also commented that the current parking configuration only appears to include one ADA stall, and compliance with the City's code will require more. Given the audience and patrons that the building will serve, she hopes the design team considers opportunities to provide more ADA stalls. Ms. Knodell advised that a loading area will be provided at the south end of the parking area that is located on the east side of the site. The intent is to also provide two ADA parking stalls by the main entry, one on either side of the access.

Board Member Broadway said it is difficult from the perspectives provided to understand the transition in height between the western landscaping and the boardwalk component and sand beyond. Her sense is that there is enough height change that a guard rail will be required. Ms. Knodell said the current position of the team is that all of the openings along the banquet room will be operational for ventilation, but not for people to pass through. There will be a 3-foot vertical separation between the marina walkway to the finished floor of the building, but the western façade will have a two-foot solid wall before the glass starts. Board Member Broadway said she is more concerned about the vertical separation between the plaza area and the beach below.

Board Member Herr suggested that the drawings should be updated to eliminate references to gender. For example, the "bridal room" could simply be called the "green room." Also, he questioned if the design should designate separate restroom facilities for men and women given the current political climate. Mr. Tucker pointed out that the two larger restrooms would be designated for men and women, but there would also be an additional unisex restroom on each floor.

Board Member Herr asked where the Senior Center's current programs would be located during construction of the new facility. Mr. Wolfe answered that the Senior Center has had conversations with Harbor Square and the North Sound Church about the possibility of relocating their programs on a temporary basis. It is likely that the programs will be scattered throughout the community, but there is every intent to continue all programs during the 12 to 15-month construction period.

Board Member Borofka asked how far along the project design is. Mr. Wolfe answered that the design is close to completion. The design team and Building Committee has spent more than a year going over the plans, and public meetings have been held to solicit feedback from the community. They feel the designs are close to what the final design will be.

Board Member Borofka asked who would be responsible for maintaining the exterior of the building, and Mr. Lovell answered that the Senior Center would be responsible for maintenance and operation of the new building for the next 40 years. Board Member Borofka asked if much thought had been given to the selection of materials in terms of minimizing maintenance costs. He also asked if the design team has considered using reflective glass on the western facade to reduce sun exposure and sound proof glass on the eastern facade to reduce the impact of noise associated with the railroad tracks. Mr. Wolfe said these issues will be considered as the design is finalized over the next few months. There are good materials available that will work for this particular environment, but they are costlier. He said he believes the design team can come up with a really good plan for maintaining the building. He explained that rental income will be critical, and this revenue will be set aside in a reserve account to take care of long-term maintenance. He concluded that it is better to spend more for appropriate materials up front to lower the long-term maintenance costs going forward.

Vice Chair Walker requested more information about the proposed drainage system. Mr. Tucker answered that they have not reached full design of the drainage system yet, but the concept is that the central landscaped island would be the primary treatment swale, and then the water would be piped into a rain garden and then to Puget Sound. Vice Chair Walker asked if the remaining landscaped areas would be normal garden space, and Mr. Tucker answered affirmatively.

Vice Chair Walker asked if the design team had any discussion about trying to maximize the public space around the exterior of the building. For example, have they considered creating a roof garden. Mr. Lovell said roof gardens have been brought up by a number of people. However, the 30-foot height limit and the requirement that the building be raised two feet to accommodate the flood plain will not allow roof occupancy. Mr. Lien clarified that the height limit in the CW zone is 30 feet. In addition, the updated Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Flood Plain Map has adjusted the average flood elevation to 12 feet, and the City's updated Critical Areas Ordinance requires that height in the coastal easement zone be measured from two feet above the base level elevation. Although there are exceptions to the height limit for elevators, stairs, etc. there are no exceptions for railings. Going above the 30-foot height limit would require a variance, and variances are very difficult to obtain in the City of Edmonds. Mr. Tucker said the design team considered the concept of having a deck off the curved area at the 2nd floor level. While this would be wonderful, it was not within budget.

Vice Chair Walker suggested that the panels that are proposed in front of the thrift store (eastern facade) could be replaced with a digital system that is easy to change out. He said he likes the stone element behind the cisterns on the eastern facade, but he suggested that more green could be incorporated into the design to help break up the building. Perhaps some grasses could be added at the base of the western facade, as well. Mr. Wolfe agreed that the softening the entire perimeter with more landscaping is something the design team should consider. He commented that shrinking the floor area on the north end of the building allows more opportunity to incorporate landscaping. He noted that the City requires a view corridor of 30%, and the current proposal would provide a 50% view corridor. Vice Chair Walker suggested that the landscape architect consider opportunities to add features in the open plaza area for children to play on. Central Saint Martins College in London is a good example of an open plaza with a water feature during the summer

season. He also suggested that public art displays and/or temporary art installations could be incorporated into the landscaped areas.

Board Member Borofka asked if the HVAC mechanical equipment would be located on the rooftop or in the mechanical rooms on the 1st floor. Mr. Tucker answered that there are currently no plans for rooftop equipment because of the restrictive height limit. However, the lower portion of the roof (south side) may be a good location for mechanical equipment, if needed. Mr. Wolfe said the Senior Center is seriously looking at using geothermal heat pumps that are internal and do not require exterior equipment. This type of equipment is more effective at warming and cooling buildings.

Board Member Borofka asked if the applicant anticipates there will be venting louvres on the southern mechanical room. If so, how will the noise emanating from the mechanical room impact the Ebb Tide Condominiums? Mr. Tucker acknowledged that the design team has not studied this part of the plan yet, but they have acquired the services of an acoustical engineer on the team to consider these types of issues.

Board Member Borofka commented that while the curved building design looks nice, it will require the elimination of some of the parking spaces. From a utilization standpoint, parking will be limited. Mr. Tucker explained that the bulkhead and beach restoration project do not impact parking one way or another since the parking is based on the setback requirement. Mr. Lien advised that the bulkhead was one of the restoration projects identified in the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) update, and doing the project in conjunction with the Community Center Project is a great opportunity. As per the current SMP, parking is not a preferred shoreline use and a 60-foot setback requirement from the ordinary high water mark would apply. The updated SMP would allow the setback to be reduced to 40 feet, as long as access to the shoreline is provided.

Chair Guenther asked if any remediation will be required for the site. Ms. Knodell answered that none is anticipated at this time. The structural engineer is recommending either concrete or pin pilings that will go through a layer of sawdust to get the foundations to firm soil.

Chair Guenther asked how the proposed plan fits into the City's goal of connecting the downtown to the waterfront. Mr. Lovell said the site design is intended to invite the public to come to the building to use the amenities that are provided both inside and out. He noted that a coffee shop is proposed under the stairway, which will be assessable from the walkway on the north side. He summarized that the building has been designed to be accessible to the public and to enhance access and use of the waterfront.

Chair Guenther asked how much higher the ground floor of the building would be from street level due to the requirement to raise it above the flood plain. Mr. Lovell said the current elevation of the floodplain is at 12 feet above the ordinary high water mark, and the current walkway is also at 12 feet. The new FEMA guideline is set at 12 feet, plus an additional two feet is required to accommodate sea level rise. In theory, they should build the 1st floor at least 14 feet above the ordinary high water mark, and oceanography consultants have recommended that the 1st floor be at least 15 feet above the ordinary high water mark. That equates to three feet above where it is now and two feet higher than the current walkway.

Chair Guenther agreed with Board Member Broadway that a loading zone needs to be incorporated into the site design. He suggested that space could be dedicated near the proposed dumpsters for this purpose. He also voiced concern that locating the mechanical room right next to the stage could be problematic. Board Member Strauss commented that perhaps the sidewalk to the back door could be wider to accommodate deliveries, as well. A wider hallway back towards the stage would also be appropriate, and there should be a door from the green room to the back walkway.

Board Member Broadway said she appreciates that the air handling unit will be tucked away in the corner. However, she voiced concern that it will make a pretty tight intake and exhaust. Also, she asked if the applicant is anticipating

hoods in the commercial kitchen, and if so, where will the hoods be exhausted? Mr. Tucker agreed that is a good question that the design team has not yet figured out.

Board Member Broadway asked if the proposed design can meet the energy code given all of the glazing that is proposed. Also, when looking at the window rhythm on the west elevation, there are a number of solid breaks between the windows in the elevation drawing, yet in another rendering is it solid glass with small mullions. Mr. Tucker explained that the plan for the 2nd floor has changed since the initial models were developed, and this disconnect will be corrected.

Board Member Broadway commented that if the 1st floor banquet room is divided into two smaller rooms, more exterior exit points will be needed. More exits directly to the exterior may also be needed on the south side of the building near the storage room. Mr. Tucker said the initial strategy was that there would be doors in the folding walls that divide the banquet room so people can go through rooms to get out.

Board Member Broadway referred to the proposed coffee kiosk that is proposed to be located under the stairway on the north end of the building. The design team should pay attention to the rating of the stairway if the space below is going to be occupied.

Chair Guenther voiced concern about the difficulty of cleaning the west façade windows. He said he spoke to someone who manufactures window cleaning supplies and equipment and learned that the solar grills and louvres that project horizontally make it difficult to clean the upper windows. Mr. Tucker said one option to address this issue is to install folding canopies that can fold down in the event of a storm to protect the glass on the 1st floor. This would also allow access to the 2nd story windows for cleaning purposes. Chair Guenther said another option would be to make the canopy a catwalk to provide accessibility to the upper windows.

Vice Chair Walker referred to the estuary reclamation area and asked where high tide would come to on the site. Mr. Lien said the mean high water mark (or high tide) is about 11 feet and is near where the existing sea wall is located. Vice Chair Walker asked if there are specific requirements in order to mitigate and soften the sea wall and restore the area. Mr. Lien answered that the SMP does not bit about the beach access. An earlier plan had stairs all along the area and more hardscape, and the plan has since been revised to include more natural beach area and native plantings.

Vice Chair Walker questioned if the same environmental goals could be accomplished while allowing the area to be accessible to the public. Mr. Wolfe commented that the plans before the Board are not the latest iteration. The more recent plans that were submitted to the State as part of a grant application in May incorporated opportunities for public access. For example, a ramp is provided at the far north to provide ADA access to the water. There will also be an opportunity to launch kayaks from this location. Vice Chair Walker commented that the area is a prime location, and it is important that the space can be used actively by all ages. He suggested that Don Morris Park in Chelan included a lot of shoreline work and provides a great example of how public space could be incorporated into the design.

Board Member Strauss voiced concern that placing the new building within close proximity of the Ebb Tide Condominiums could create a good hiding place for graffiti, etc. A sidewalk would go from Railroad Avenue to the mechanical room door on the south side of the building. Perhaps it could be blocked off with a gate in this location to prevent through access or additional lighting could be provided to make the area safer. Mr. Wolfe agreed that this concern should be considered as the plans move forward.

Board Member Strauss said she is glad that the design team is considering resiliency when identifying appropriate materials for the exterior of the building. She asked if any thought has been given to raising the floor of the mechanical room higher than 15 feet to keep it safe in the event of a flood. Mr. Tucker said they have not finalized plans for the mechanical system yet and this is an interesting idea to consider.

Board Member Strauss said she was pleased to hear that the design team is working towards a LEED Silver rating, and she encouraged them to stretch further and obtain a LEED Gold rating. This is a community space and can become a great learning opportunity. The cisterns out front will provide a great example to the public of sustainable design, and she encouraged them to push the envelope even further. Mr. Wolfe explained that the Senior Center is required by funding sources to obtain at least a LEED Silver rating, but they are definitely striving for LEED Gold. Using a geothermal heating and cooling system, sustainable materials on the interior and exterior, and the building's close proximity to train, bus and ferry all increase the project's score. They plan to look at every possibility when it comes to achieving a high LEED score, and any suggestions from the Board would be helpful.

Board Member Herr voiced concern that having 13-foot ceilings on the 2nd story may be out of scale with the smaller office spaces that are planned. Ms. Knodell explained that the ceiling height will not be equal on both floors. The ground floor will have a greater ceiling height than the 2nd floor. Board Member Herr asked if it would be possible to break up the roof height rather than having a consistent roof height throughout. Board Member Borofka suggested that perhaps the taller ceiling height could be maintained for the banquet room on the west side of the ground floor, but the east side could have a lower ceiling height and a lower roof line. Because the City allows for height to be averaged, perhaps the height could be greater on the west side and lower on the east side. Mr. Lien clarified that height is measured from the average grade, but that does not mean that a building can exceed the height limit in one area in exchange for being lower in another. Height is measured to the tallest point of a building. Board Member Herr asked if the City has any provisions for allowing taller buildings given that the adjacent building is significantly taller. For example, some jurisdictions allow a developer to average the height between the buildings on either side. Mr. Lien answered that the City does not have any provision of this type, and Mr. Lovell added that building height is a very politically charged issue in Edmonds.

Board Member Herr suggested that the applicant could use an open web truss design to keep the duct work enclosed with nothing exposed. The system could be run through the open webs and go up and down to serve both floors; ducts in the ceiling for the lower level and ducts in the floor for the upper level. This approach saves a considerable cost because the exposed ducts have to be pretty and interior ducts can use flexible materials rather than hard metal. It also will work towards gold status by keeping all of the duct work in a conditioned space.

Board Member Borofka inquired about the Senior Center's schedule for moving the project forward. Mr. Wolfe said they must obtain preliminary design approval from the City Council and the SMP must be approved by the State and City before they can apply for the setback reduction from 60 to 40 feet. They must also obtain a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit, which will take a lot of time. Land use and environmental issues will be paramount over the next six to eight months. They will provide an update to the Board as the plan becomes more firm.

Mr. Wolfe reported that they have raised \$3 million of the total \$11 million required for the project. The Senior Center recently submitted a grant application and another will be submitted by August 5th. Funding, as well as approval of the SMP, will determine how fast the project moves forward.

Mr. Lien advised that the Department of Ecology issued conditional approval of the SMP, and it will go back to the City Council next week. He hopes that the SMP can be finalized by the end of the summer. He emphasized that the Senior Center has not submitted an application yet. Because the City Council must approve the schematic design, he felt it would be appropriate for the Board to have early input, as well. No action is required other than the comments provided. Mr. Wolfe encouraged the Board Members to continue to review the design and submit their comments via email.

PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS:

There were no public hearings.

CONSOLIDATED PERMIT APPLICATIONS (No Public Participation):

There were no consolidated permit applications.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

Board Member Borofka recalled that a question was raised at the last meeting relative to a budget for the Architectural Design Board to fund educational and training opportunities. Mr. Lien agreed to check to see if money has been dedicated for this purpose. He announced that there will be opportunities for Board Members to participate in Short Courses on Public Planning in the near future, and the events are free of charge.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

None of the Board Members provided comments during this portion of the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.