

APPROVED

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

November 2, 2011

Chair Gootee called the meeting of the Architectural Design Board to order at 7:00 p.m., at the City Council Chambers, 250 - 5th Avenue North, Edmonds, Washington.

Board Members Present

Bryan Gootee, Chair
Michael Mestres
Bruce O'Neill
Tom Walker

Board Members Absent

Lois Broadway, Vice Chair
Rick Schaefer

Staff Present

Mike Clugston, Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER MESTRES MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 17, 2011 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL MOVED THAT THE AGENDA BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER MESTRES SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

No one in the audience expressed a desire to address the Board during this portion of the meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA:

There were no items on the consent agenda.

MINOR PROJECTS:

There were no Minor Projects scheduled on the agenda.

PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS:

Review of the Updated Stonebridge Court Planned Residential Development (PRD) (File Number PLN20070020. No public comment will be accepted at the ADB meeting. A future public hearing by the Hearing Examiner on the ADB's PRD recommendation and minor changes to the associated plat (PLN20070021) will be the opportunity for public comment.

Mr. Clugston referred the Commission to the Staff Report and attachments. He reviewed that the project initially came to the City in 2007 as a 10-lot Planned Residential Development (PRD) and plat proposal. The formal plat was granted conditional approval on September 11, 2007, but the Hearing Examiner remanded the PRD application back to the ADB to resolve several site design issues, including lot coverage and perimeter design. The Hearing Examiner did not feel the proposal met the perimeter buffer requirements in the code. Mr. Clugston advised that the project set idle for several years until a new applicant came to the City in early 2011 with a proposal to restart the project and address the Hearing Examiner's concerns.

Mr. Clugston explained that preliminary review of PRDs and formal plats are Type III-B permits, which require a public hearing and final decision by the Hearing Examiner. PRD's also require review and recommendation by the ADB. Because of the changes arising from the updated proposal, the ADB is being asked to review the revised plan in its entirety and make a recommendation to the Hearing Examiner on whether the proposal is consistent with all the single-family design criteria in ECDC 20.35.060. He referred to the Staff Report, which provides an analysis of each of the criteria. He summarized that staff believes the applicant has met the code requirements and adequately addressed the concerns raised by the Hearing Examiner in 2007.

Mr. Clugston described the subject property as being located at 7723 and 7807 220th Street Southwest, near the intersection of 76th Avenue West and 220th Street Southwest. The properties are currently developed with two dilapidated, single-family residences and associated outbuildings. The structures would be removed to accommodate the new development. He provided an oblique aerial photograph of the subject property to illustrate that the site is fairly well treed with a lot of undergrowth.

Mr. Clugston explained that when the original Stonebridge Court Project was submitted in 2007, the applicant requested a reduction in the setback requirements in exchange for providing a buffer around the perimeter of the property. The Hearing Examiner found that the proposal did not meet the buffer criteria and remanded it back to the ADB for further review.

Mr. Clugston compared the 2007 plan to the proposed 2011 plan and made the following observations:

- The two plans have the same basic features, with an interior cul-de-sac surrounded by 10 single-family residential lots.
- The 2007 proposal called for reducing the setbacks in exchange for a perimeter buffer around the entire property. The current proposal would comply with the setback requirements of the underlying zone, eliminating the need for a perimeter buffer.
- Under the current proposal, no lot will have more than 35% coverage. The lots will be regular single-family residential lots that are slightly smaller, which meets the intent of the PRD code to allow subdivisions to achieve the maximum density of the zone.
- The 2007 landscape plan included several areas of open space, one on the southwest side of the property and another on the southeast side, with landscaping around the internal lots, along the access tract, and at the end of the cul-de-sac. The 2007 plan also identified some exterior landscaping in an attempt to comply with the PRD buffer requirements.
- The 2011 landscape plan provides similar open space features adjacent to 220th Street Southwest and 78th Place West. The cul-de-sac road will have a parking strip, with street trees and additional landscaping.
- In 2007, the ADB requested the applicant retain additional trees in the northwest and northeast corners of the site, and the current applicant is proposing to retain four additional trees in the northwest corner, as well as some existing trees on the interior of the site if conditions warrant.

Board Member O'Neill clarified that if the applicant's proposal meets the setback requirements of the underlying zone, no perimeter buffer is required. Mr. Clugston explained that the code allows PRD applicants to do one of two things:

1. Meet the underlying zoning requirements for lot size and lot coverage, or
2. Reduce setbacks but provide an exterior buffer around the entire development in addition to the rear setbacks. This would result in a 30-foot space around the perimeter of the site (15 feet for a landscape buffer and 15 feet for a rear setback).

Mr. Clugston said that, in the current proposal, the applicant has chosen to comply with the underlying zoning requirements for lot size and lot coverage, so no perimeter buffer will be required.

Board Member O'Neill asked if the code places any constraints on interior fences with PRD's. Mr. Clugston answered that there are no restrictions on fences between lots.

James Egge, Planning Consultant, James Egge & Associates, was present to represent the applicant. He introduced the following people as additional representatives of the applicant:

- Bob Bick, Phoenix Development, LLC
- William Corky Brown, Landscape Architect, WBLA Architects
- Loree Quave, Project Manager, Phoenix Development, LLC

Mr. Egge explained that the prime condition in the 2007 proposal that the Hearing Examiner found fault with was the applicant's request to reduce building setbacks, which kicked in the site perimeter buffer requirement that limited the building envelop substantially. This was coupled with the fact that the applicant was asking for a substantial increase in lot coverage of up to 55%. The Hearing Examiner did not feel that adequate evidence was presented to allow the significant increase in lot coverage, so the proposal was remanded back to the ADB for further analysis.

Mr. Egge advised that upon further review of the subject property, the current applicant believes the perimeter buffer requirement could be overcome by meeting the side, front and rear setback requirements of the underlying zone. By reducing the size of the homes, the applicant found that the current 35% lot coverage requirement could be met. Therefore, no perimeter buffer would be required. He reviewed that the current proposal appears to be the same design, with ten lots and a cul-de-sac in the middle. However, at a closer glance, it is quite a bit different. While they are requesting alternative design standards associated with the PRD, none of the alterations would trigger the perimeter buffer requirement. The smallest lot would be slightly larger, but the others would be similar in size to the original proposal.

Mr. Egge said the applicant is requesting a modification to the street utility standards that would allow them to incorporate a five-foot landscape planter between the edge of the curb and the sidewalk to give additional landscaping and green to the development and provide a separation between the roadway and pedestrians. The Public Works Department has indicated this change would be acceptable.

Mr. Egge said the applicant is proposing to save more vegetation than what was proposed in the 2007 plan. The 2007 plan called for saving nine significant trees. By reducing the building envelope size, the new site plan conditionally proposes to retain 16 evergreen trees and two apple trees within the interior of the site. The two existing apple trees are subject to structure and aesthetic modification to make them viable. As for the evergreen trees, the certified arborist reserves the right to reevaluate the retained trees after excavation and construction to ensure their integrity is not impacted. If any of the retained trees are damaged during construction, the applicant would be required to replace the trees with coniferous trees of a minimum 10 to 12 feet in height at a ratio of 2:1.

Mr. Egge said the original proposal identified a maximum lot coverage of 55%, which would have accommodated a footprint of up to 3,500 square feet. The underlying zone limits the lot coverage to 35%, which is enough to accommodate a footprint of up to 2,100 square feet. The average lot coverage in the current proposal would be 1,884 square feet, which represents a 43% reduction in lot coverage compared to the original proposal. This equates to a

reduction in impervious surface and allows for additional tree retention. About 11.4% of the site would be reserved for active-recreation open space, which is similar to the original proposal and more than the 10% required by code.

Mr. Egge advised that the proposed project would incorporate four basic floor plans that provide modulation through recessed garages, rooflines, different window treatments, façade treatments and a mixture of horizontal and vertical siding. He referred the Board to the pictures provided in the Staff Report to illustrate the large amount of variety provided through the designs.

Board Member Mestres asked where the Douglas Fir trees that are proposed for retention are located. Mr. Brown answered that most of the evergreen trees are located along the perimeter of the subject property. There is a cluster of trees along the northern property boundary behind proposed Lots 6 and 7, another group in the southwest corner of the subject property, and some between Lots 3 and 4. There are two apple trees on the site, one in front of Lots 9 and 10 and another to the rear of Lots 1 and 2. Board Member Mestres asked how many of the evergreen trees are considered “orphan.” Mr. Brown answered that most of them are located in groups of three or more. Board Member Mestres inquired about the variety of the apple trees. Mr. Brown answered that they are fruiting apple trees, and the arborist has indicated that with pruning they could be viable to retain. However, they have been neglected for quite some time.

Mr. Brown summarized that while the goal is to retain the trees identified by the certified arborist. If this is not possible, the trees would each be replaced with two evergreen trees. A variety of narrowing-growing Western Red Cedar would be the preferred replacement species.

Board Member O’Neill said he has reviewed the Staff Report and finds the applicant has responded to every issue that was brought forward. The applicant has done a great job of responding and fulfilling all of the requirements of the PRD and the Hearing Examiner. He said he has no concerns with the project, as proposed. He particularly mentioned that the proposed home designs provide good modulation and appear to meet the City’s design criteria.

Board Member Mestres announced that, last night, the City Council discussed existing single-family residential development within the Medical Activity Center. There is a push to retain the single-family development rather than replacing it with multi-family. While the proposed development would be different than most of the smaller ramblers that exist in the activity center, it would provide desirable single-family residential homes for the City’s residents.

Board Member Mestres recalled that when the ADB reviewed the application in 2007, the proposal called for developing large homes on very small lots, and there was very little discussion about the design of the homes. This led to the perception that density was being exceeded. Mr. Egge summarized that while the code allows lot coverage of up to 35%, the actual lot coverage for the proposed development would be 31.4%.

Mr. Clugston clarified that this is not a public hearing. The public would be given an opportunity to comment on the proposal at a future public hearing before the Hearing Examiner.

BOARD MEMBER O’NEILL MOVED THAT THE BOARD RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE REVISED STONEBRIDGE COURT PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (FILE NUMBER PLN20070020) WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE APPLICANT SHALL WORK WITH THE PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT TO DETERMINE APPROPRIATE STREET TREE SPECIES FOR BOTH 220TH STREET SOUTHWEST AND THE PROPOED 78TH PLACE WEST. THE SELECTED SPECIES SHALL BE SHOWN ON THE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF REQUIRED CIVIL SUBDIVISION IMPROVEMENTS THAT ARE PART OF THE ASSOCIATED PLAT (PLN20070021).**
- 2. EMERGENCY ACCESS SHALL BE MAINTAINED ON PROPOSED 78TH PLACE SOUTHWEST. IF ON-STREET PARKING IS ANTICIPATED, THE STALLS MUST BE SHOWN DURING THE**

REVIEW OF THE CIVIL CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS THAT GO ALONG WITH THE ASSOCIATED PLAT. OTHERWISE, SIGNAGE MUST BE PROVIDED INDICATING THAT NO ON-STREET PARKING IS PERMITTED ON 78TH PLACE SOUTHWEST.

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

CONSOLIDATED PERMIT APPLICATIONS (No Public Participation):

No consolidated permit applications were scheduled on the agenda.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

Mr. Clugston advised that he provided code updates to the Board Members prior to the meeting.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

In response to Board Member Mestres' inquiry, Mr. Clugston reported that the vacant ADB position has been advertised in the local newspaper, on the City's website, and on myedmondsnews.com.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.