

APPROVED APRIL 18, 2012

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

December 21, 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
Lois Broadway, Vice Chair
Michael Mestres
Bruce O'Neill
Rick Schaefer
Tom Walker

Board Members Absent

Staff Present

Gina Coccia, Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 2, 2011 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER MESTRES SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER MOVED THAT THE AGENDA BE ACCEPTED AS SUBMITTED. VICE CHAIR BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Eric Norenberg, Historic Preservation Commission, presented each of the Board Members with a copy of the Historic Edmonds Calendar that was created by the Commission. He explained that the calendar is being offered to citizens free of charge to raise public awareness about the importance of preserving history. He invited the Board Members to attend Historic Preservation Commission meetings on the second Thursday of each month in the Brackett Room at City Hall at 5:30 p.m. He also invited them to visit the Commission's website to learn more about their activities.

CONSENT AGENDA:

There were no items on the consent agenda.

MINOR PROJECTS:

File Number PLN20110061: Design review of a new Key Bank Building proposed at 9930 Edmonds Way in the Neighborhood Business (BN) zone. This is a consolidated review, so the ADB will forward a recommendation to the Hearing Examiner who will hold a public hearing on January 26, 2011.

Ms. Coccia emphasized that tonight's meeting is not a public hearing. She explained that because this is a consolidated application (design and conditional use), the ADB will review the proposed design and provide a recommendation to the Hearing Examiner. The Hearing Examiner will conduct a public hearing on January 26th at 3:00 p.m. and make a final decision regarding both applications. Notice of the hearing will be mailed to all property owners within 300 feet of the subject property, posted in *THE EVERETT HERALD* and on the subject property, and posted at the Public Safety Complex, Community Development Department, and the Library. The public is invited to submit written and oral testimony until the public hearing is closed. She also advised that the applicant participated in a pre-application meeting with staff.

Ms. Coccia provided a zoning map and pointed out that the subject property is located at the intersection of Edmonds Way and 100th Avenue West, the site of an existing Shell gas station. Currently, the site is mostly paved, with a small amount of landscaping. The adjacent properties are commercially zoned and developed, as well. Ms. Coccia also provided an aerial photograph of the neighborhood to identify where the proposed project would be located and to illustrate the small amount of tree canopy that exists in the area.

Ms. Coccia provided the most recent elevation drawings and explained that the applicant has worked with staff to present a project they believe the Board can recommend approval of. She reminded the Board that the City Council recently adopted reduced street setback standards for properties fronting on Edmonds Way (8 feet) and 100th Avenue West (5 feet) in the Neighborhood Business (BN) zone. That means the proposed structure can be situated on the site so it is closer to the street, with the main entrance facing diagonally towards the intersection.

Ms. Coccia reviewed that the applicant is proposing a brick façade, with a layer of stone at the base (see materials board). Awnings and windows are proposed on each elevation. While the design of the building is somewhat boxy, the treatments make this less noticeable. The applicant is proposing to construct rain gardens on the site, and they will work with the Engineering Department staff to make sure they meet current engineering standards.

Ms. Coccia referred to the landscape plan that was submitted by the applicant. Trees are proposed around the perimeter of the site, but the remainder of the landscaping will consist mostly of shrubs. The applicant is proposing to provide the exact number of parking spaces required. She summarized that given the size of the site, the applicant has done a good job of making use of the available landscape space. However, she encouraged the Board to discuss the amount of landscaping proposed and determine if the project necessitates an exception to the standards found in Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC) 20.13 or if additional plantings should be required.

Ms. Coccia advised that review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) is required and the City issued a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) on December 7th for the building and site improvements only. No appeals were received. She explained that a second phase of SEPA review will address the large underground storage tanks and site remediation.

Ms. Coccia advised that in order to recommend approval of the proposed project, the Board must find that it is consistent with the Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC). She specifically referred to ECDC 16.45 (Neighborhood Business), which emphasizes the need to reserve areas for offices and retail establishments that offer goods and services needed on an everyday basis by residents of a neighborhood area and to ensure compact, convenient development patterns by allowing uses that are operated chiefly within buildings. She explained that the bank (office) use is a permitted primary use in the BN zone, but the drive-through component requires a conditional use permit. Ms. Coccia advised that staff also reviewed the application for consistency with ECDC 17.50 (Parking), 20.11 (General Design Review) and 20.13 (Landscaping) (See Staff Report). She summarized that the project, with conditions, appears to comply with the zoning ordinance. However, she once again reminded the Board that site landscaping should be thoroughly discussed, and findings about landscaping should be made clear in their recommendation to the Hearing Examiner.

Ms. Coccia said the Board must also find that the project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and the Staff Report cites numerous Comprehensive Plan goals to satisfy this requirement. She provided an illustration that was prepared as part of the City's recent study of the Westgate Community Center to show that the existing zoning and Comprehensive Plan land use designations match up quite well. She specifically referred to the following Comprehensive Plan goals:

- C.2 – Provide for transit and pedestrian access in addition to the need to accommodate automobile traffic.
- C.4 – Provide pedestrian walkways and transit connections throughout the community commercial area, assuring connections to nearby residential neighborhoods.
- C.2.a – Create adequate parking for each development, but keep the cars from dominating the streetscape.
- C.2.b – Improve pedestrian access from the street by locating buildings closer to the street and defining the street edge.
- C.2.c – Improve the project's visibility from the street by placing parking to the side and rear.
- C.5.a – Create an active, safe and lively street edge.

Ms. Coccia explained that because the building would be set closer to the street, parking areas would be located behind the building. This creates a more pedestrian friendly environment, as people will not have to walk through a parking lot to access the building from the street. As proposed, the development would help create a lively street environment. It would be situated at an angle, with steps leading to the building entrance.

Ms. Coccia reviewed that during the Westgate Community Center Study conducted by students from the University of Washington, citizens were asked what type of interface they would like to have with the businesses when walking down the sidewalk approaching a building. Seventeen of the 19 respondents indicated they would prefer businesses fronting on the street with business activity on the street. This response provided support for the City Council's recent decision to reduce the street setbacks along Edmonds Way and 100th Avenue West.

Ms. Coccia advised that the application was reviewed and evaluated by the Fire District, Engineering Division, Parks and Recreation Department, Community Services and Economic Development Director, and the Public Works Department. The applicant appears to have addressed all the issues raised during these initial reviews and is aware that a thorough review of the entire scope of work will take place during the building permit process.

Ms. Coccia said that based on the findings, analysis, conclusions and attachments in the Staff Report, staff recommends that the Board recommend approval of the design of the Key Bank building to the Hearing Examiner, with the following conditions:

1. The street tree species shall be reviewed and approved by the Parks Department for compliance with the Street Tree Plan during the building permit review process.
2. Height calculations are required with the building permit application in order to show that the project meets the 25-foot height limit.
3. The building shall be clad with a stone band around the base of the building, with brick above in order to appear pedestrian friendly.

Ms. Coccia explained that it is important to require an applicant to check with the Parks Department to make sure the proposed street trees match what they have in mind for the area, so this is a standard condition. The current proposal appears to comply with the Street Tree Plan. She noted that height calculations were not included in the application. While the proposed building would be single story, staff wants to ensure that height limits are met, and this needs to be clearly shown in the design proposal. Lastly, she said the Economic Development Director indicated it is important that the building design include a variety of attractive materials. He particularly liked the stone band around the bottom of the building. Condition 3 ensures that this would not be eliminated from the design at some point in the future.

Vina Anderson, Callison Architects, said the design team worked closely with Planning Division staff and the Economic Development Director to come up with a design that can be approved by the Board and Hearing Examiner. The proposed one-story building will be 2,740 square feet in size, which is smaller than the original proposal. The size was reduced in order to accommodate the parking spaces required by code. The latest proposal has the building rotated to 45 degrees to encourage pedestrian activity. The height of the building will be 22'2", with articulated cornices at the top. Banding will be placed at 10 feet from the top, 8 feet from the bottom, and 2'4" off the ground. Consistent with staff's recommendation, the building would be clad with a stone band around the base of the building.

Ms. Anderson said the current design is similar to a Key Bank building that was recently constructed in Eagle, Idaho. She provided photographs to illustrate the design and type of materials that would be used for the proposed new building. She specifically pointed out that a metal canopy would be located over a paved pedestrian walkway leading to the main entrance of the building, and red fabric awnings would be located above all windows. She also provided a picture to illustrate the drive-through design, which would consist of one drive-through lane and one by-pass lane.

Vice Chair Broadway requested more information about the proposed screening for the mechanical rooftop equipment. Ms. Anderson answered that the rooftop equipment would be concealed from view by screens fabricated by CityScapes. The prefabricated, fiberglass units would be attached to the mechanical equipment and would not be supported by the roof. The color of the screening would match the color of the cornices. Vice Chair Broadway asked if the applicant has used the screening material elsewhere to have confidence that it will hold up. Ms. Anderson answered that the material has been used successfully on numerous Key Bank buildings. She noted that the rooftop equipment would not be highly visible from the street edge.

Board Member Schaefer asked if signage is part of the Board's review. Ms. Coccia answered that signage would be addressed as part of a separate permit.

Board Member Schaefer said he appreciates the applicant's water-sensitive design, which includes rain gardens. However, he noted that the geotechnical report does not talk about the contamination that exists on the site. He asked how the applicant would address potential mobilization of contamination. Ms. Anderson answered that the current property owner must complete a SEPA review and will be responsible for demolition and removal of the underground tanks. They will be required to meet all State requirements and provide a report to Key Bank that the site is clean and free of asbestos and contaminated materials. Board Member Schaefer questioned if the site would be sufficiently clean so that remaining contamination is not mobilized. Ms. Anderson answered that Key Bank will require that the site be cleaned adequately to prevent future contamination problems.

Board Member Schaefer asked if the applicant's proposed parking replaces the three parking spaces that are proposed to be removed. Ms. Anderson answered that there are currently 29 parking spaces, and only 15 are required for the existing restaurant use. The remaining 14 parking spaces are adequate to meet the applicant's parking requirement.

Board Member Schaefer expressed his hope that the number of curb cuts would be reduced in this location. He asked if the applicant is proposing a fence or landscaping to separate the bank site from adjacent properties. Ms. Anderson answered that the existing retaining wall separates the existing restaurant from the proposed new bank. Aside from the retaining wall, landscaping will provide further separation. No fence is proposed.

Board Member Mestres asked if there is a specific street tree designated for the intersection of Edmonds Way and 100th Avenue West. Ms. Coccia answered that the Street Tree Plan lists several species that are appropriate for this area. Board Member Mestres suggested it is important to make sure the new street trees match the variety of the existing street trees at the intersection. Ms. Coccia noted that, as currently proposed, the applicant would be required to work with the Parks Department to make sure the street trees are compatible. The applicant would also work with the Parks Department to complete their rain garden design.

Board Member O'Neill referred to the landscape plan which seems to identify rather large plantings for relatively small planting strips. Joel Howitt, Barghausen Consulting Engineers, Inc., emphasized that the scale of the plantings would be appropriate for the size of the landscaped areas. He said he does foresee any issues associated with allowing the Parks Department to identify the appropriate street tree species. He said that while the amount of landscaping proposed appears to be a concern of staff, it is important to keep in mind that the site is only 14,000 square feet in size and the applicant is proposing that more than 28% of the site would be landscaped.

Board Member Walker asked why the applicant is proposing so many different species of trees on the site. Mr. Howitt said the applicant's intent is to provide street tree varieties that are consistent with the existing street trees in the area. However, a variety of other species are proposed for the site to create visual interest. Board Member Walker stressed the importance of planting the same tree species along both streets. Mr. Howitt said that is the applicant's intent.

Vice Chair Broadway said she supports Board Member Mestres' earlier comment about creating landscape consistency throughout the entire intersection. Board Member Mestres reminded the Board that when reviewing the PCC application (located across the street from the subject property), they recommended that the existing street trees be retained. He suggested that the street trees provided as part of the new development should be of a consistent variety.

Board Member Schaefer asked if the applicant is proposing a monument sign on the site. Ms Coccia said she does not believe a monument sign would be possible on the site, as currently designed, and freestanding signs are discouraged in the BN zone. Board Member Schaefer recalled that the PCC site was allowed to have a monument sign. However, the current proposal represents a different design configuration. Because the bank would be highly visible from the street and sidewalk, he did not believe a monument sign would be necessary. Ms. Coccia clarified that the applicant is not currently proposing a monument sign.

Board Member Walker asked if seating would be provided in the area where the patio pavers would be located. Ms. Anderson answered that the pavers have been proposed to create a place for pedestrians to linger, but no seating is being proposed. The pavers will lead to the main entrance. Vice Chair Broadway noted that a bike rack has been proposed near the front entrance, as well.

Ms. Coccia recalled that the City's Economic Development Director suggested that the handrails provided at the stairs could be decorative to add to the pedestrian appeal. She asked Ms. Anderson to describe what the applicant is proposing for the handrails and the ramp that is required to meet the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Ms. Anderson provided schematic drawings of the proposed tubular handrail, which would have an anodized aluminum finish. She explained that the proposed handrail design is simple so as not to detract from the building design. The railings would go the entire length of the stairs. Ms. Coccia advised that the Board could recommend that the applicant be required to install a more decorative handrail. She reminded the Board that this project is very important since it is the first one since the City Council adopted the reduced street setback requirements. She said staff is excited about the new project, and it is important that it be pleasing to the public. Board Member Mestres said that while it might be desirable to have decorative handrails, the applicant will likely have to meet various requirements for functionality. Ms. Anderson said the proposed design meets not only the ADA requirements, but liability requirements, as well. She pointed out that the anodized finish on the handrails would match the storefront materials. Board Member Schaefer pointed out that the proposed handrail design would tie in with other elements on the building such as the lighting sconces and the anodized aluminum storefront.

Chair Gootee inquired about the location of ADA access. Mr. Howitt answered that the main entrance will be the ADA access, and an ADA parking space will be provided near the building entrance. No ADA access will be available from the street to the front entrance. The ramp will run parallel to Edmonds Way and slope towards the front door as per ADA standards.

Board Member O'Neill asked if the applicant would be required to obtain ADB approval for their sign permit. Ms. Coccia replied that the sign permit would be approved by staff unless the applicant requests a variance from the sign code requirements.

Board Member Walker pointed out that some of the planting materials proposed for the rain gardens can get out of hand if not properly and regularly maintained. Mr. Howitt agreed and said it is in Key Bank's best interest to properly maintain the rain gardens so they continue to function well.

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL MOVED THAT THE BOARD RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE DESIGN OF THE KEY BANK BUILDING AS SHOWN IN FILES PLN20110061 AND PLN20110062 WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE STREET TREE SPECIES SHALL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE PARKS DEPARTMENT FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE STREET TREE PLAN DURING THE BUILDING PERMIT REVIEW PROCESS AND BE CONSISTENT WITH THE VEGETATION AT THE INTERSECTION OF EDMONDS WAY AND 100TH AVENUE WEST.**
- 2. HEIGHT CALCULATIONS ARE REQUIRED WITH THE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION IN ORDER TO SHOW THAT THE PROJECT MEETS THE 25-FOOT HEIGHT LIMIT.**
- 3. THE BUILDING SHALL BE CLAD WITH A STONE BAND AROUND THE BASE OF THE BUILDING WITH BRICK ABOVE IN ORDER TO APPEAR PEDESTRIAN FRIENDLY.**

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS:

No public hearings for Major Projects 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 announced that Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager, was recently recognized as the City's "Employee of the Year."

Ms. Coccia also announced that up to three ADB Members have been invited to participate in a Strategic Planning Meeting on January 18th at 3:00 p.m. in Room 302 of the Frances Anderson Center. Board Members Gootee, Schaefer and Mestres agreed to attend on behalf of the Board. Ms. Coccia added that the remaining Board Members are invited to attend two Strategic Planning open houses on January 19th in Room 206 of the Frances Anderson Center on January 19th at 1:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

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

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.