

APPROVED

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

September 15, 2010

Chair Kendall called the September 15, 2010 meeting of the Architectural Design Board to order at 7:10 p.m., at the City Council Chambers, 250 - 5th Avenue North, Edmonds, Washington.

ROLL CALL

Board Members Present

Valerie Kendall, Chair
Lois Broadway
Steve Bullock
Bryan Gootee
Michael Mestres
Bruce O'Neill

Board Members Absent

Rick Schaefer, Vice Chair (excused)

Staff Present

Gina Coccia, Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The September 1, 2010 minutes were modified to indicate that Board Member Broadway was excused.

BOARD MEMBER MESTRES MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 1, 2010 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER GOOTEE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

BOARD MEMBER BULLOCK MOVED THAT THE AGENDA BE ACCEPTED AS PRESENTED. BOARD MEMBER MESTRES SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

No one in the audience indicated a desire to provide comments during this portion of the meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA:

There were no items on the consent agenda.

MINOR PROJECTS:

File Number PLN20100053/PLN20100054: Columbia Bank. Concurrent design review and conditional use permit review of a new 4,000 square foot bank building with a drive-through window (Columbia Bank) at 96xx Edmonds Way in the Community Business Edmonds Way (BC-EW) zone.

Gina Coccia presented the Staff Report. She advised that the application is before the Board for a consolidated design review and conditional use permit review of a proposed new single-story drive-through building for a Columbia Bank Branch. She explained that a drive-through use requires a conditional use permit (PLN20100053) and because the scope of work triggers review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), design review by the Architectural Design Board is also required (PLN20100054). She noted that a Determination of Non-Significance was issued by the City on August 27, 2010 and no appeals were received.

Ms. Coccia advised that the Engineering Division noted that the driveway access on the west side of the development is located partially on the property to the west, which would require an easement. No easement has been obtained to date and additional information is requested on this item. If easements have not or will not be obtained for access, the plans will need to be significantly revised and this could affect the overall design of the project.

Ms. Coccia noted that a large amount of grading has been proposed, and it is not clear how this will affect the natural topography of the site. She noted that Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies are clear that property owners should maintain the natural topography as much as feasible. She suggested the applicant address this issue as part of the presentation

Ms. Coccia pointed out that no details were provided related to site utilities, storage, trash and mechanical other than the footprint of a trash enclosure on the landscape plan. She said the applicant should provide additional information about how the refuse area would be screened.

Ms. Coccia reviewed that the subject property is located at the bottom of a slope, and the residential neighborhood to the north of the subject property is on top of the slope. It is her impression that the new development would be screened from view from the residential neighborhood because of the slope height. She noted that the landscape code requires landscaping for screening purposes, and the Board should discuss if additional landscaping is needed near the parking area in order to meet this objective. The current plan indicates that some existing trees would remain, and this is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, which encourages the retention of healthy trees and landscaping.

Ms. Coccia advised that the proposed exterior lighting consists of several 25-foot tall arm-mounted light poles, similar to what can be observed at grocery store parking lots. The need for these tall light poles is not expressed in the application. Staff recommends that the lighting be changed from unnecessarily massive 25-foot poles down to low-rise lighting compliant with ECDC 20.11.030.B.8, which states that exterior lighting shall be the minimum necessary for safety and security. It further states that excessive brightness should be avoided and the lighting should be compatible with the overall theme. Since this is the only building on the site, the overall design theme is whatever is proposed by the applicant.

Ms. Coccia referred the Board to the applicant's signage site plan (Exhibit 2), and said she briefly discussed with the applicant how the City calculates sign area. In this instance, the applicant is proposing applied lettering on the east elevation over the entry and on the entry elevation, as well. It appears there will only be two wall signs proposed, but the applicant should clarify their sign plans. She advised that sign area is calculated based on the linear length of the building façade that contains the primary entrance. If the linear length is 50 feet, then 50 square feet of signage would be allowed on site. The sign design would be reviewed as part of the building permit, but the applicant would like the Board's acceptance of the overall look of the wall signs proposed. She noted that no monument sign is being proposed.

Based on the findings, analysis, conclusions and attachments to the Staff Report, Ms. Coccia recommended the Board recommend approval of the design of the Columbia Bank Building to the Hearing Examiner with the following conditions:

1. *Either an easement shall be obtained to allow access over the adjacent property to the west or the project will need to be revised to meet code. If the revision is substantial, the project may need to go before the ADB once more for review.* The Board can talk about this condition more after the applicant's presentation. The purpose

of the condition is to prevent a situation where the applicant finds that an easement cannot be granted after the design has been approved since this would require the applicant to redesign the project.

2. *The street tree species shall be reviewed and approved by the Parks Department for compliance with the Street Tree Plan.* This condition is based on the fact that the trees shown on the landscape plan do not match with the City's Street Tree Plan. The applicant will need to work with the Parks Department to identify an appropriate street tree.
3. *Additional "Type II" landscaping shall be provided near the east property line in accordance with ECDC 20.13.030.*
4. *Additional landscaping in and around the parking lot shall be provided in accordance with ECDC 20.13.030.*
5. *Grading shall be minimized in north portion of the site to maximum extent feasible and verified through a geotechnical report that is compliant with the Critical Areas Ordinance (ECDC 23) as well as ECDC 20.11.030.B.1 and the Comprehensive Plan.*

Ms. Coccia explained that a public hearing before the Hearing Examiner on the Conditional Use Permit is tentatively scheduled for October 7th, and notice will be sent out next week. At this time, the Board should ask questions of the staff and then allow the applicant to make a presentation. At the end of the meeting, the Board will make a recommendation to the Hearing Examiner and staff will send a report to all parties of record before the Hearing Examiner hearing.

Board Member Bullock explained that the point of the Board's review is to send a recommendation to the Hearing Examiner related to the design of the proposal. He reminded the Board that the Comprehensive Plan and zoning code for the BC-EW zone encourages joint access points. What the applicant is showing on the site plan is consistent with both the intent of the Comprehensive Plan and what the code calls for as far as joint shared driveways. Therefore, Condition 1 relates to an issue that would best be addressed by the Hearing Examiner. He did not feel it appropriate for the Board to address the easement issue as part of their design review. Ms. Coccia said she would like the applicant to explain how the overall design of the site would change if the easement is not obtained.

Dale Pinney, First Western Development Services, Inc., indicated he was present to represent the applicant. He concurred with the Staff Report. He explained that he would provide a brief overview of the project and then address each of the issues raised by staff. He advised that the site is located along the Edmonds Way Corridor next to the Quick Clean Car Wash. It is a gravel site at this time, and their plan is to primarily operate on the lower level gravel area. They will use the existing curb cuts for access, but the access would need to be improved. They are planning a full in/out access on the east for the main parking area. They are also proposing an access on the north side of the site and that is where the easement issue comes into play. He said it is important to note that the easement is not a requirement of the project, but something they are doing as a future benefit of the site. The building would be constructed slightly above the existing grade, and some minor grading would have to occur. They would take material from the east and move it to the west. Some type of retaining structure would be constructed at the back of the property. It would be about 8 feet tall at its highest point and would taper off on each end. He summarized that the retaining wall would be considered relatively minor for commercial development. He noted that a car wash is located on one side of the subject property, and residential uses are located to the north. There is also an older residential neighborhood located adjacent to the site, and a power substation is located across the street.

Boleslaw Zenczak, Zenczak and Partners Architects, AIA, said his firm has had the privilege of working with Columbia Bank since they first opened in 1993, so they have learned what they are looking for in their bank structures. He said he, personally, has been working on Columbia Bank projects since 1993. He explained that, from the start, Columbia Bank has been looking for a nice comfortable relationship with their customers and buildings. With that in mind, the buildings are designed with more of a human scale with a timeless nature. The interiors are designed to be very warm and comfortable, as well. In the 17 years they have designed for Columbia Bank, they have never used a cookie cutter design. The buildings are designed to fit in with the character of the surrounding area. However, they do use similar materials, such as the blue metal roof. He provided a colored drawing of the proposed design and briefly described the various features. The roof is a hip-roof structure, with some cap ends incorporated to enhance the entrance and specific features such as the drive-through. Brick wainscoting is used as an accent in conjunction with stucco siding

and exterior glass. The building is designed as a one-story structure of approximately 4,000 square feet. The proposed height is approximately 25 feet. Because of the natural counter clockwise flow of the bank and the elevation change from east to west, the entrance was created on the east side of the building, with associated parking. The drive-through was placed in the back in an attempt to control the noise that is typically associated with drive-through service.

Jerry Isaksen, Zenczak & Partners Architects, AIA, said he has also been working with Columbia Bank since 1993, and he agreed that the bank does try to create a more comfortable feeling within the neighborhoods they are located. As part of that, they like to incorporate a lot of the neighborhood feel into the landscaping that surrounds their buildings. He referred to the Landscape Plan and noted there are a number of existing mature trees on the site that would be retained, and they are proposing to add new plantings around the perimeter of the building to enhance its overall look. He referred to the colored rendering, which also identifies a rock garden immediately in front of the entry to the building that allows for visual access to the front doors for security. A large number of three-man rocks would be located in this area, as well as a number of street trees as required by City code. He indicated the applicant would work with the Parks Department to identify a tree species that is consistent with the City's Street Tree Plan.

Mr. Isaksen said that, as the code requires, a number of buffer areas would be provided around the perimeter of the property, specifically between the subject property and the adjacent residential neighborhood to the north where a 15-foot setback is required. The City requires a fairly substantial landscape buffer along the hillside, and the applicant is proposing to maintain the existing condition around the perimeters of the site. There are a number of very mature trees on the north side, and the applicant would like to maintain the hillside as it currently exists because of the maturity of the existing vegetation. There is a 50-foot utility easement that runs the entire length of the east side of the property. There are a number of mature trees along the eastern property line that create a wall, and they would like to maintain this vegetation. However, the utility providers may require them to trim it at some point.

Mr. Isaksen pointed out that a trash enclosure is identified on the site plan, and he has an exhibit that describes its design. It would be located to the far left of the building and would be difficult to see because it would be behind a brick wall and a number of shrubs would be planted in front of it.

Mr. Isaksen submitted Alternative Site Plan—Alternate A (Exhibit 3) and explained that the applicant originally contemplated a one-way access on the west side off the site for the bank. However, they understand the City's desire to have joint access. The applicant decided to pursue the easement so that a road could be installed at the time of bank construction so it is not an inconvenience for the bank customers in the future. Constructing the road would be a relatively minor aspect of the project. They have presented the easement request to the owner of Lot 9, which is between the car wash and the subject property and have received their initial support. However, they would like to see the corners of the easement located so they can visualize where it will be. Based on their initial contact with the adjacent property owner, they have a high level of confidence that the site plan that was originally submitted will be the one that is built. However, because there is some chance that the easement will not be granted, they would like the Board to recommend approval of the alternative site plan so the process can move forward either way. He emphasized that the easement is not a necessary element of the proposed project. It is an additional benefit and meets the City's intent, but they do not want the project to be held up if the easement is not obtained. He noted that the issue would likely be resolved before the application is presented to the Hearing Examiner for review.

Mr. Pinney addressed each of the issues raised in the Staff Report as follows:

- **Development on steep slopes and how the proposed development fits the natural topography.** Mr. Pinney explained that the topography has been changed in the recent history of the site. The applicant has gone to great lengths to keep the project on the flat portion of the site. The east side of the site is three to five feet higher than the west side so some cut and fill will be required to make the site truly flat. They went through a number of configurations for the parking lot, but they found that most required them to cut too far into the slope. This would have required a significant retaining wall on the hillside. They determined they could achieve the parking requirements with the current proposed parking configuration. He noted that a designated steep slope was

established on the site during the platting process, and this requires a steep slope buffer and steep slope setback from the buffer. None of the project would be located within the steep slope or steep slope buffer area. However, as allowed by code, a small portion of the project (back corner where the retaining wall is located) would intrude into the setback area. The applicant believes they are meeting the intent of the code by leaving the hillside intact and staying away from the steep slope. Most people who drive by the site after construction will not recognize that the topography of the site has changed, and the applicant has taken action to minimize the impact on the hillside. The raised portion of the parking lot on the north side goes up to 5% grade in order to minimize the cut required in the back of the property. They made a concerted effort to keep the development on the flatter portions of the property.

Mr. Pinney explained that as part of SEPA, the applicant solicited input from a geotechnical engineer related to the retaining wall design, but the retaining wall has not been fully designed. This would occur during the permitting process. However, the geotechnical engineer indicated the wall they are proposing would be appropriate for the subject site. Board Member O'Neill asked what type of retaining wall the applicant is proposing. Mr. Pinney answered that they would likely propose a gravity or modular block wall rather than a cast-in-place wall. Their engineer has indicated that a rockery may be possible, depending on the support that is required behind. This option would be evaluated during the permit process. If possible, a rockery would be their desired option.

- **Refuse area design and screening.** Mr. Pinney noted that this issue was addressed earlier by Mr. Isaksen. The trash enclosure has been screened so well, it is difficult to see on the proposed plan.
- **Landscaping and buffers.** Mr. Pinney provided photographs to illustrate the existing vegetation that is located within the required buffer areas. The photographs were identified as Exhibit 4. He explained that the northeast corner of the parking lot is completely outside the steep slope buffer area and its required setback. The only portion of the development that would be within the setback area is directly behind the proposed drive lanes. He said the applicant understands that a landscape buffer is required between the proposed commercial development and the residential development to the east. The code requires Type II landscaping, which typically consists of Douglas fir or deciduous trees and lower shrubbery beneath. He noted there are significant mature trees and landscaping on the west side of the northern buffer that far exceed what the applicant could plant in the next several years, and there are large deciduous trees, as well as large blackberry and scotch pine shrubbery near the center. There are fewer trees along the eastern side of the north buffer, but the sheer size of the native shrubbery is significant. The applicant believes the existing native vegetation would meet the Type II landscaping requirements for buffer areas.

Mr. Pinney provided pictures to illustrate the existing landscaping on the eastern boundary of the property. He noted that most of the vegetation behind the existing telephone pole would stay intact, which would meet the intent of the Type II landscape requirements. He noted that while some people do not like scotch broom, in this case, it provides an absolute buffer. The applicant is requesting that the Board find that the existing vegetation would replace any required Type II landscaping within the buffer area on the eastern property line.

Mr. Pinney observed that no issues were raised in the Staff Report regarding the internal landscaping. They are proposing typical Type II landscaping that is high quality as required by the Code. He noted that, with the existing landscaping, there would be far more than required by the code.

- **Height of light poles.** Mr. Pinney said he surveyed nearby properties and found the height of the light poles on the Key Bank property is 23 feet. The light poles at the PCC are 26-foot tall, but he acknowledged the PCC to be a much larger project. He said the applicant understands there is a general desire to reduce lighting and agrees that the light poles could be reduced to a height of 20 feet to address the staff's concerns. Based on the type of lighting proposed and the existing topography of the site, the applicant does not anticipate the adjacent residential neighborhood would be impacted by lighting from the site. He requested the ADB approve light poles at 20-foot in height.

- **Selection of street trees.** Mr. Pinney advised that the original landscape plan identifies the Bradford Flowering Cherry as the street tree, and they thought it was a species included in the City's Street Tree Plan. However, they agree to work with the Parks Department to identify an appropriate street tree species.
- **Signage.** Mr. Pinney referred to Exhibit 2, which is the applicant's signage plan. He advised that the applicant is proposing two signs on the building, one at the main entrance and one on the western wall that faces towards the Ferry on Edmonds Way. The western wall sign would be fairly prominent so they do not believe there is a need to add an additional monument sign. Because the main entrance wall would be 50 feet in length, the applicant would be allowed a total of 50 square feet for signage. The proposed signs should be consistent with the sign code requirements, and they would like the Board to recommend approval of the sign plan as presented.
- **Conditional Use Permit for the drive through.** Mr. Pinney noted that information regarding the drive through design was presented as part the application. He observed that drive throughs are utilized extensively by businesses located along the corridor. The street is auto oriented and the main corridor to the ferry terminal. Drive throughs are very common functions for banks, and they do not believe the proposed drive through would be a detriment to the surrounding neighborhood. He said the applicant is requesting a positive recommendation from the Board regarding the proposed Conditional Use Permit.

Board Member Broadway referred to the proposed sign plan (Exhibit 2) and asked if the existing grass bioswale would remain across the front of the site. The drawing suggests that new grass would be planted. She asked if stormwater from the site would utilize this bioswale. Mr. Pinney answered that the bioswale was constructed to serve the residential development on top of the hill. It is of low quality at this time, but the applicant proposes to improve its quality and function by planting the proper grass and cleaning and maintaining it.

Board Member Broadway asked if wheelchair ramps would be provided where the sidewalk connects with each of the proposed driveways. Mr. Pinney answered that the proposed project would meet all of the ADA requirements. Board Member Broadway observed that, as proposed, the only ADA access to the bank would be across the driveway. Mr. Isaksen agreed and added that they chose the path of travel that would best meet the ADA requirements.

Board Member Broadway suggested that the proposed location for the ATM appears to be in a less defensible location for evening hours. She asked if the applicant would consider placing the ATM on the east side of the building near parking stalls 1, 2 and 3. Mr. Isaksen answered that the soffit lighting would illuminate the ATM area for security purposes. The applicant has also discussed the option of adding a walk up ATM near the main entrance. Mr. Zenczak added that people who use the ATM at night feel more secure if they can access the machine without getting out of their vehicles.

Board Member Broadway referred to Illustration A.2 of Attachment 4, which indicates that the highest point of the roof ridge would be at approximately 25-feet. While the illustration includes light fixtures at a height of 25 feet, the applicant is now proposing a height of 20 feet. She asked if the light fixtures would be powder-coated, shielded boxes with only the lights exposed. Mr. Zenczak answered affirmatively.

Board Member Broadway referred to Illustration L.1 of Attachment 4 and noted that a concrete pad is shown just outside of what appears to be an exit door. Mr. Isaksen said this is an access door for the mechanical room and not an exit door for the building, itself.

Board Member Broadway referred to the utility easement and noted that the applicant is proposing to plan new grass within the bioswale area. However, it appears they are proposing to leave the existing brush in place. Mr. Isaksen explained that many of the utility providers do not want them to disturb the easement area. Mr. Zenczak added that the utility easement is relatively shallow. In addition, overhead power lines make it difficult to plant trees in this location. At this time, they are not proposing to change the ground cover in this location.

Board Member Gootee expressed his belief that merely extending the grass in this area makes the project appear somewhat incomplete. Mr. Isaksen explained that the applicant would need to have more discussions with the utility providers regarding this easement. There are very strict requirements about the type of landscaping that is allowed within easement areas. Based on these restrictions and because the utility lines are very shallow, the applicant cannot do a lot of grading or planting. He summarized that additional negotiations would have to take place with the utility providers before more landscaping could be added to this area. Board Member Gootee suggested that grass would be an acceptable alternative. Mr. Zenczak agreed, as long as the utility providers allow them to install an irrigation system.

Board Member Mestres recalled that the east side of the northern buffer (hillside) was cleaned out several years ago. Prior to that time, the area had numerous Douglas fir trees. The blackberry and scotch broom are manifestation of the trees being removed, and he considers them to be weeds. While he understands they can provide a natural buffer, they do not look good. He said he is having a hard time reconciling the applicant's proposal that the landscaping above the retaining wall would be scotch broom and blackberries. Mr. Pinney said the applicant is aware that the trees were removed from the hillside, but they are not excited about disturbing the hillside by planting new vegetation. The existing vegetation works well for erosion control and as a buffer. He suggested that given the retaining wall and the landscaping proposed around the parking lot, it is not likely that the landscaping above the retaining wall would be prominently seen. The green on the hillside would be a backdrop for the cosmetic landscaping around the parking lot. The existing landscaping effectively addresses the City's buffer requirements given the slope of the hillside and the intensity of the existing landscaping. He referred the Board to the pictures he provided to illustrate the view from the residential areas above the subject property.

Board Member Mestres inquired if the applicant considered the option of terracing the hillside. Mr. Pinney answered that disturbing this stable, steep slope would require a whole new level of environmental review. The applicant purposely avoided this additional work by keeping development away from the slope.

Board Member Mestres pointed out that because cars approach the site quickly, the proposed wall signage may not be adequate. He suggested it may be necessary for the applicant to provide a small monument sign near the drive through entrance. Mr. Pinney explained that there is a 15-foot easement off the back of the curb, with some landscaping. With the exception of one shrub that blocks the view from the road, the applicant believes the wall signs would be visible and no monument sign would be necessary. The applicant would likely propose to replace this one shrub with a low-growing species to open the view corridor to the main bank entrance. Mr. Zenczak added that the entrance to the bank was purposefully placed at an angle to capture people's attention as they come around the corner. They believe the proposed wall signs would be adequate to meet their needs in this regard.

Board Member Mestres agreed that the 20-foot light poles would be consistent with security requirements for the bank. The significant slope would likely do a lot to reduce light pollution from the site. He said he believes the easement is a good idea, but three points of access would be challenging.

Board Member Bullock said he is excited to see the site cleaned up and developed. He said he likes the proposed building architecture, although he is not so fond of the blue roof. He especially likes the wainscoting. He said he supports the proposed landscaping plan for the portions of the site that will be developed, but he would like more information about what materials would be used for the retaining wall. He emphasized that the applicant must work with Parks Department staff to determine the appropriate species of street trees, and he reminded the applicant that the Street Tree Plan calls for three-inch caliper trees. While he recognized this is a significant requirement, the larger trees would add a lot more visibility for the building.

Mr. Bullock noted that scotch broom and blackberries are natural growing, but they are not native to the area. He said he has a problem with the applicant's proposal to leave some of the blank areas as they currently exist. At the same time, he agreed that the existing vegetation provides a big separation with a lot of green. With that in mind, he said he would like the applicant to plant some low-growing ground cover around the perimeter of the drive isles and parking areas, on top of the retaining wall, and around the perimeter of the site. There are some natural evergreen trees in the northwest

corner of the site, and he would like these to be supplemented with shrubbery between the parking area and the slope. Above the ground cover, he would like the applicant to plant trees that will screen some of the other green stuff that looks like weeds. In the far southeast corner, he would like the applicant to plant lawn further back, or perhaps some type of wildflower mix. He said he would really like to see a lot of the blackberry and scotch broom vegetation pulled back as far north as the edge of the parking lot and replaced with something different. He suggested they pull back the retaining wall at the north corner from the parking lot so they can plant trees in front of it. He said that, in his opinion, this would reduce the appearance of the overall size of the wall. He provided a redlined copy of the applicant's landscaping plan to illustrate his proposed changes. The redlined plan was identified as Exhibit 5. He recommended the applicant update their landscape plan prior to forwarding their application to the Hearing Examiner.

Mr. Pinney referred to the large site plan provided by the applicant and explained that they would like to retain the existing dense vegetation as the functional buffer within ten feet of the property line. However, he agreed that the changes suggested by Board Member Bullock could be implemented, as well.

Chair Kendall agreed that the building design is very attractive. She also agreed that the blue roof is bright. However, compared to the red roof they recently were asked to consider, it is acceptable to her. She said she is very interested in saving the significant native trees on the site, and she appreciates the applicant's efforts in that regard. The subject property is located at the "gateway" to Edmonds. She pointed out that blackberries and scotch broom are considered invasive species, and she would love for them to be replaced with native trees. However, she understands the applicant's concern about disturbing the slope. It would be wonderful to see some trees planted in this area over time, but this should be considered more of a request than a requirement.

Board Member Mestres recalled that the landscape plan for the Point Edwards Project included certain species of vegetation that would maintain and stabilize the hillside. He concluded that it is not necessary to plant Douglas fir trees on the hill side, but another type of vegetation could be used to stabilize the hill side yet be more attractive than blackberries and scotch pine. He said he understands that these species provide an excellent barrier but other species can serve the same purpose.

Board Member Gootee said he supports the changes Board Member Bullock proposed for the landscape plan. He felt they represent a good compromise to encourage the project to move forward without adding a lot of cost. He reminded the Board that development of the site will benefit the City, so it is important not to place impractical requirements on the applicant. He said he supports the applicant's desire to avoid disturbing the steep slope. He expressed his belief that the parking lot and the structure will become the focus on the site, and not the steep slope.

Board Member Bullock said he finds the applicant's proposed sign plan acceptable and to scale, as long as they can confirm that it is code compliant at the time of building permit. Board Member Broadway added that she supports the two proposed wall signs, but she would discourage the use of a monument sign. She observed that because of the speed of passing traffic, introducing a monument sign along the roadway may make it more challenging for drivers to see the entrance to the site. Chair Kendall agreed. Board Member Gootee expressed his belief that the two proposed signs are subtle and very suitable for the site.

For clarity, Ms. Coccia reviewed the exhibits as follows:

- Exhibit 1 – Staff Report
- Exhibit 2 – Applicant's proposed sign plan.
- Exhibit 3 – Applicants proposed site plan, Alternative A.
- Exhibit 4 – Photographs submitted by the applicant.
- Exhibit 5 – Board's redlined landscape plan.

Ms. Coccia emphasized that the Engineering Department has not reviewed Exhibit 3, but it appears that no significant changes would be required. She said she supports the applicant's alternative site plan (Exhibit 3) if the easement is not obtained. She also agreed with the applicant's proposal to reduce the height of the light poles to 20 feet. She reminded the applicant that exposed neon lighting is not permitted, and Mr. Isakson indicated that the signs would be internally illuminated and not neon.

Ms. Coccia reviewed that height is measured from the average original grade. However, height calculations are not part of the Board's review. Height would be addressed as part of the building permit, and the building official would require the applicant to submit surveys for this purpose. She encouraged the applicant to contact the City Engineer for additional information about the City's requirements for rockeries. She thanked the Board for creating Exhibit 5 to illustrate their proposed changes to the applicant's landscape plan. Mr. Penney said it is the applicant's intent to submit an updated landscape plan to staff prior to the hearing before the Hearing Examiner.

BOARD MEMBER BULLOCK MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD FILE NUMBERS PLN20100053 AND PLN20100054 TO THE HEARING EXAMINER WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL. HE FURTHER MOVED THAT THE BOARD AGREES WITH THE FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF REPORT (EXHIBIT 1) WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. EITHER AN EASEMENT SHALL BE OBTAINED TO ALLOW ACCESS OVER THE ADJACENT PROPERTY TO THE WEST OR THE PROJECT WILL NEED TO BE REVISED TO MEET CODE. IF THE REVISION IS SUBSTANTIAL, THEN THE PROJECT MAY NEED TO GO BEFORE THE ADB ONCE MORE FOR REVIEW.**
- 2. THE STREET TREE SPECIES SHALL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE PARKS DEPARTMENT FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE STREET TREE PLAN.**
- 3. THE APPLICANT WILL SUBMIT AN UPDATED LANDSCAPING PLAN TO STAFF PRIOR TO GOING TO THE HEARING EXAMINER THAT REFLECTS THE BOARD'S DISCUSSION AND SOME OF THE DIRECTION SHOWN ON EXHIBIT 5 (THE ADB'S REDLINE LANDSCAPING PLAN).**
- 4. GRADING SHALL BE MINIMIZED IN NORTH PORTION OF THE SITE TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT FEASIBLE AND VERIFIED THROUGH A GEOTECHNICAL REPORT THAT IS COMPLIANT WITH THE CRITICAL AREAS ORDINANCE (ECDC 23) AS WELL AS ECDC 20.11.030.B.1 AND THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.**
- 5. THE 25-FOOT TALL LIGHT POLES SHALL BE REPLACED WITH 20-FOOT LIGHT POLES AS PROPOSED BY THE APPLICANT.**

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Penney expressed concern that the Board's motion did not address the applicant's alternative site plan (Exhibit 3). Board Member Bullock pointed out that the easement issue must be addressed by the Hearing Examiner. The Board's charge it to review the proposed design, and the easement is not really an issue they are required to address.

PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS:

No public hearings were scheduled on the agenda.

CONSOLIDATED PERMIT APPLICATIONS (No Public Participation):

No consolidated permit applications were scheduled on the agenda.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

Ms. Coccia read a letter from Mayor Cooper into the record, recognizing Board Member Bullock for his outstanding service as a City employee and as a volunteer. On behalf of the Architectural Design Board and Planning Division staff she presented him with a plaque and thanked him for his service.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

Board Members thanked Board Member Bullock for his service on the Board and wished him well. They agreed that his depth of knowledge would be difficult to replace.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.