

**APPROVED**

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

**April 18, 2012**

---

Chair Gootee called the meeting of the Architectural Design Board to order at 7:08 p.m., at the City Council Chambers, 250 - 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, Edmonds, Washington.

**Board Members Present**

Bryan Gootee, Chair  
Lois Broadway, Vice Chair  
Michael Mestres  
Bruce O’Neill  
Tom Walker (arrived at 7:17 p.m.)

**Board Members Absent**

Rick Schaefer (excused)

**Staff Present**

Kernen Lien, Planner  
Stephen Clifton, Community Services  
Economic Development Director  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**BOARD MEMBER MESTRES MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 21, 2011 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. VICE CHAIR BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**BOARD MEMBER MESTRES MOVED THAT ITEM 6b (SEVEN HILLS PROPERTY—FILE NUMBERS PLN20110076, PLN20110077 AND PLN20110078) BE MOVED TO ITEM 8a ON THE AGENDA. CHAIR GOOTEE SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Mr. Lien explained that the Seven Hills Project requires three separate permits (design review, conditional use and short plat) and should have been identified on the agenda as a “Consolidated Permit Application.” He reminded the Board that State Law prohibits more than one public hearing, so no public comment should be accepted by the Board regarding this item. Public comments can be provided at the hearing before the Hearing Examiner.

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

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

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

There were no items on the consent agenda.

**MINOR PROJECTS:**

**RH Old Milltown Association, LLP: The proposed improvements include minor modifications to the façade and update the exterior paint colors to the main two-story building on the corner of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue South and Dayton Street (PLN20120005), minor modifications and paint the Boardwalk Building adjacent to the new Hazel Miller Plaza (PLN20120006), and construct a new façade on the Upper Dayton Building (PLN20120007)**

Mr. Lien presented the Staff Report and explained that three separate design review actions have been grouped under the same Staff Report. Because the proposed updates do not require State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) review, the design review decision will be a Type I Staff Decision. However, given the prominence of the buildings in downtown Edmonds and the history of the recent remodel, staff is seeking a recommendation from the ADB prior to issuing a decision.

Mr. Lien reviewed that the applicant is proposing to make modifications to the facades of the Old Mill Town Building Complex. The proposal includes the following:

- **Old Mill Town Building at the corner of 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue South and Dayton Street (PLN20120005)** – The applicant is proposing minor modifications and new exterior paint on the façade of this building. New light fixtures would be added along the roadway, and the open pole at the corner would be squared off. The proposal calls for maintaining the existing materials, but adding ledge stone material as a wainscoting at the window base along 5th Avenue South. Staff has suggested adding the ledge stone under the windows on the Dayton Street side of the building, as well. Staff has also suggested that the recessed area on the second floor be painted the same color as the recessed panels above the windows to help accent the corners of the building and give a more urban feel. In addition, staff would like to see the columns on the Dayton Street side of the building continued up to the second floor, similar to what is proposed for the 5th Avenue South side. Staff believes that the proposed changes are consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and objectives contained in the design standards for the BD1 zone.
- **Boardwalk Building adjacent to the new Hazel Miller Plaza (PLN20120006)** – The applicant is proposing minor modifications and new exterior paint on the façade of this building. No changes to the ground floor windows have been proposed, but the two artificial windows on the upper façade would be removed. One of the upper parapets would also be removed. Staff is recommending that at least one of the paint colors be similar to the Old Mill Town Building to tie the project together. Staff believes that the proposed changes are consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and objectives contained in the design standards for the BD1 zone. However, the Board should inquire of the applicant regarding the proposed treatment for the façade facing the parking area.
- **Upper Dayton Building (PLN20120007)** – The applicant is proposing to construct a new façade on this building. The existing wood façade would be demolished and a new metal frame exterior wall with metal siding would be constructed. A new aluminum storefront system would be installed and the existing exterior concrete walls would be repainted. The proposal also includes the installation of two new metal/glass canopies, one new canvas awning, several decorative wall sconces, built-in concrete planters, “knife plate” tenant signage, and new concrete retaining walls as required to accommodate the grade change. Staff believes that the proposed changes are consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and objectives contained in the design standards for the BD1 zone.

**Rich Grimes, Freiheit & Ho Architects, Inc.**, 5209 Lake Washington Blvd NE, Suite 200, Kirkland, Washington, was present to represent the applicant. He advised that the three buildings have a new owner, and they have tenants and prospective tenants for nearly all the space in all three buildings. He summarized their proposal as follows:

- **Boardwalk Building adjacent to the new Hazel Miller Plaza (PLN20120006)** – The proposal calls for the removal of two artificial windows and an upper parapet. The goal is to bring the façade back and add some color to it. The back side of the building would be painted a uniform neutral color. The lighting on the building would be reworked, and the lighting under the actual boardwalk portion of the canopy has already been redone. While the façade is in very poor condition, the owners are not proposing that it be replaced at this time.

- **Old Mill Town Building at the corner of 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue South and Dayton Street (PLN20120005)** – As per the proposal, the building would be repainted. Rather than the existing uniform façade, the goal is to divide the building horizontally to emphasize the different types of uses between the upper and lower floors. The applicant is proposing to add a black, horizontal EIFS band between the two floors and repaint the lower floor a darker charcoal and the upper floor a lighter cool grey. The uppermost cornice would be painted black. The recessed panels above the horizontal canopies over the sidewalks would be painted cranberry red to match the existing canopies. He agreed with the Staff Report that the canopies should be a darker color. He noted that the proposal also calls for sconces and the existing pole at the corner would be reworked. He said the applicant has expressed a desire to extend the ledge stone along the entire Dayton Street facade, consistent with staff's recommendation. However, because the façade of the building already abuts the sidewalk, installing ledge stone would require a right-of-way permit. He said that while he supports staff's recommendation to extend the columns, he does not want to paint them a darker color since it would break the building into too many small pieces. They are looking for more of a horizontal separation to reflect the two-story nature of the building.
- **Upper Dayton Building (PLN20120007)** – The façade of this building is in very poor condition. The building has a concrete frame, and the wood on the exterior façade would be stripped off and replaced with wood or metal siding. The existing concrete would be painted a dark chocolate brown. A new aluminum storefront system would be installed, and a canopy would be added over the main entry. New canopies would be installed, as well. Both free-standing and built-in planters would be provided. A retaining wall would be constructed, with planters across the top and sconces below.

Board Member Mestres pointed out that the front façade of the Boardwalk Building has a “Knott’s Berry Farm” feel. The building was constructed in the early 1970s and should not be considered a heritage installation. He said he would be receptive to a more innovative design if and when the façade is replaced in the future. He said the only historic feature of the building is the post that is located at the corner. He expressed his belief that updating the building is a good thing. Mr. Grimes advised that the post is in poor condition. It would be upgraded and protected from the weather.

Board Member Mestres agreed that the proposed horizontal band would help break up the monotony of the building façade along 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. However, he questioned staff's recommendation to extend the ledge stone materials around the entire expanse of the building. Mr. Grimes noted that the vertical columns protrude out from the building edge and would break up the ledge stone so that it is not a continuous response. Board Member Mestres said he concurs with the staff's recommendation related to the columns and the recessed areas. However, he suggested that painting the columns on the upper floor may be overdone. Mr. Lien clarified that staff is suggesting that the existing stucco column be retained, but they are not recommending that they be painted.

Board Member Mestres said he does not have an elevation drawing for the Upper Dayton Building. He asked if the individual elements on the storefront would be stair stepped up Dayton Street. Mr. Grimes answered affirmatively and explained that the existing slab inside the building actually stair steps, with a different level at each base.

Board Member O’Neill observed that the existing façade on the Boardwalk Building has a rustic look. He asked what materials would be used for the new façade. Mr. Grimes answered that the goal is to maintain as much of the existing wood as possible. However, they know that the entire façade will eventually have to be replaced. He noted that the building is small and does not go deep into the hillside. Given that the applicant has already invested a lot of money into the building, they plan to postpone the façade replacement.

Board Member O’Neill recalled that when the Board previously reviewed a design proposal for the Old Mill Town Building, they liked the spindly columns because they emphasized the entrance of the building at the corner. He said he supports the proposed changes to the façade of the building, as long as the columns are maintained. Board Member Mestres added that the post was never a beloved element, but it was accepted as part of the overall building design. Mr.

Grimes said the pole would likely be wrapped in stucco so it matches the existing column bump outs. While they may have to rework the doors, the goal is to maintain the main corner entryway.

Board Member O'Neill asked if the columns would be changed in either direction. Mr. Grimes said he anticipates that the same line would be used to extend the columns. Board Member O'Neill said it appears that the awnings would be removed on the Dayton Street side of the Old Mill Town Building. Mr. Grimes answered that the awnings are in great condition and will be retained. Board Member O'Neill asked if the applicant is proposing to change the cornice detail, and Mr. Grimes answered no.

Vice Chair Broadway observed that an earlier rendering of the Old Mill Town Building showed articulation in the cornice, but the articulation appears lost in the latest rendering. Mr. Grimes said the articulation would be retained, but the cornice would be banded.

Chair Gootee asked how the applicant proposes to add ledge stone on a "sinking ship" (Dayton Street façade). Mr. Grimes said the ledge stone would be stepped up from the sidewalk level to the bottom of each window. Chair Gootee expressed his belief that ledge stone material would be better than the existing stucco. Board Member O'Neill expressed concern that the ledge stone may appear too residential. Mr. Grimes suggested that larger stone could be used to make it look less residential. He suggested that cap stone should also be placed on top of the ledge stone and underneath each of the windows. Board Member O'Neill agreed that a concrete cap stone should be required.

Board Member Mestres suggested, and the Board agreed, that if the ledge stone is extended along the entire façade of the Old Mill Town Building, it would be appropriate for the applicant to provide a colored rendering, as well as material samples prior to final approval. He noted that the building is an important element of the downtown. Mr. Grimes agreed that the building is located in an important corner of the downtown. Their goal is to design a building that, accompanied by the new park, will draw people from the main circular intersection up 5th Avenue South.

Board Member Mestres commented that, with the proposed revisions, the Upper Dayton Building can become as significant as the 1970s design. Mr. Grimes agreed that the design of the new façade is important because the building is a major part of the downtown Edmonds streetscape. The idea is to draw people up the street so the building needs to be highly visible. The proposed new canopies and planters will protrude from the building to provide horizontal interest. There is also six feet of space between the building and the sidewalk, which can be used for tables and chairs, planters, etc. These are critical elements for drawing people up the street.

Board Member O'Neill asked if the applicant is proposing changes to the landscaping. Mr. Grimes answered that all of the existing landscaping is located within the public right-of-way and is maintained by the City. Mr. Lien said the existing landscaping was done as part of the street improvements that were required as part of the original remodel. No changes have been proposed.

Chair Gootee asked the applicant to elaborate on the proposed lighting. Mr. Grimes responded that there is currently no lighting on the Old Mill Town Building. The only lighting comes from the street lights and through the windows. They are proposing wall sconce lighting to further emphasize the building and columns. The lighting will be redone on the Boardwalk Building, but the individual flood lights and the canopy lighting would be retained. It is important that the Upper Dayton Building be lit properly to draw people up the street. The applicant is proposing to use wall sconce lighting, and light fixtures would also be placed on the top side above the canopies to further emphasize and bring light to the building. Mr. Lien asked if the applicant is proposing to use LED lighting. Mr. Grimes said they have not selected the type of lighting that would be used, and they are willing to listen to the Board's concerns regarding the issue. Mr. Lien pointed out that LED lighting may be a little too dim. Mr. Grimes agreed that they want the lighting to glow, and the color of the lighting is important to the applicant, as well.

Board Member Mestres recalled that a previous proposal for the Old Mill Town Building included skylights, and concern was raised about potential light pollution. While he recognized it is not part of the Board's purview, directional

lighting should be carefully considered. Mr. Grimes agreed that light pollution is a valid concern. It is important that lights have an appropriate cut off and that they do not shine directly towards buildings or glare into the street.

Board Member Walker asked for more information about the windows that would be removed from the Boardwalk Building. Mr. Grimes clarified that two artificial windows would be removed and the siding would be extended. Board Member Walker asked about proposed signage for the buildings. Mr. Grimes said no signage has been proposed at this time. The issue would be addressed at a later date. Mr. Lien clarified that a sign permit would be required for each unit, but signage would be allowed along the façade of each building. Board Member Walker said it would be nice if the signs blended with the character of the buildings. Mr. Grimes said the applicant is well aware that box and cabinet signs would not be allowed. They own numerous buildings throughout the Puget Sound area and they clearly understand the sign requirements. They also recognize that quality signs are necessary for quality buildings.

Chair Gootee recalled that the Board previously reviewed a sign permit application by ACE Hardware, a previous tenant in the Old Mill Town Building, which called for a mural being painted on the retaining wall. Mr. Lien clarified that while this permit was approved, the applicant did not proceed with the project. Mr. Grimes said he assumes the applicant would paint the retaining wall to match the color of the building. Chair Gootee agreed this should be part of the overall project.

Mr. Grimes advised that the back side of the building facing the parking area would be painted a neutral color. He said the wall is in poor condition and needs to be repaired.

Vice Chair Broadway said she has serious concerns about extending the ledge stone along the Dayton Street façade of the Old Mill Town Building. She observed that 5th Avenue South is a primary arterial and is different than Dayton Street, which is a secondary arterial. She said she likes the idea of stone being placed on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue South where they are trying to get pedestrian movement from the fountain to the new park. However, requiring the ledge stone along Dayton Street would not serve a real purpose. She pointed out that the façade on Dayton Street is very contemporary in design, and adding the ledge stone would be out of character. She said she would like the ledge stone to stop at the corner of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue South and not continue up Dayton Street. Mr. Grimes said that, although it is not visible in the drawings provided in the Staff Report, there is an approximate 20-foot gap on the Dayton Street side to accommodate the trash enclosure. This would create a break in the ledge stone.

Board Member Mestres agreed that extending the ledge stone could become monotonous, but he felt the Dayton Street façade is a little underdone at this time. He said he does not object to extending the ledge stone, and he would defer to the architect's best judgment. Mr. Grimes noted that the original renderings did not include an extension of the ledge stone. However, the property owners have subsequently indicated their desire to extend the ledge stone along the Dayton Street façade, as well. He said he supports the notion of extending the ledge stone, as long as they can obtain the required permits.

Chair Gootee said he supports the notion of extending the ledge stone to add depth and richness to the Dayton Street façade. He said he also understands the owner's desire to maintain the original façade on the Boardwalk Building, but its rustic appearance does not blend in with the contemporary facades on the other two buildings.

Vice Chair Broadway cautioned against making mistakes similar to what occurred in Wallingford, where they arbitrarily pushed buildings in and out and changed colors to create what now appears to be a "three-ring circus" with a lot going on. The buildings already have a lot going on with heights, columns, windows, balconies, etc. Painting the Boardwalk Building different colors to look like separate units may be too much. Again, she said she would prefer not to extend the ledge stone on the Old Mill Town Building, either.

Board Member Walker said he supports extending the ledge stone to the Dayton Street façade so the building appears balanced from the corner of Dayton Street and 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. If the ledge stone is not extended, the building would

appear unfinished. Chair Gootee agreed that the building would appear unbalanced if the ledge stone is not continued on the Dayton Street façade.

Mr. Lien referred the Board to the conditions for approval outlined in the Staff Report. The Board agreed that because so many changes have been proposed, they would like the applicant to submit new elevation drawings, colored renderings and sample materials before forwarding a recommendation to staff. Board Member O'Neill questioned if the Board's request for updated information would prevent the project from moving forward in a timely manner. Mr. Lien explained that the Board could approve the proposal contingent upon final review of new renderings, elevations and material samples, which could be provided at the next Board meeting. Mr. Grimes said he does not anticipate the applicant would take issue with the Board's request for updated information before issuing a final recommendation.

**BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL MOVED THAT, BASED ON THE ANALYSIS AND ATTACHMENTS IN THE STAFF REPORT, THE BOARD RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE FAÇADE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE OLD MILL TOWN BUILDING AT THE CORNER OF 5<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE SOUTH AND DAYTON STREET (PLN20120005), THE BOARDWALK BUILDING (PLN20120006), AND THE UPPER DAYTON BUILDING (PLN20120007) WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- 1. THE RECESSED AREA ON THE SECOND FLOOR OF THE OLD MILL TOWN BUILDING SHALL BE PAINTED THE SAME COLOR AS THE RECESSED PANELS ABOVE THE HORIZONTAL CANOPIES OVER THE PUBLIC SIDEWALKS.**
- 2. THE COLUMNS ON THE DAYTON STREET SIDE OF THE OLD MILL TOWN BUILDING SHALL BE RETAINED ON THE SECOND FLOOR.**
- 3. LEDGE STONE SHALL BE INSTALLED UNDER THE WINDOWS ON THE DAYTON STREET SIDE OF THE OLD MILL TOWN BUILDING CONSISTENT WITH THE INSTALLATION OF THE LEDGE STONE ON THE 5<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE SOUTH SIDE OF THE BUILDING, AS ALLOWABLE BY THE CITY ENGINEERING DIVISION. A CONCRETE RIDGE STONE CAP MUST BE ADDED TO THE TOP OF THE LEDGE**
- 4. THE AWNING ON THE UPPER DAYTON BUILDING MUST BE OPEN-SIDED AND MAY NOT BE MARQUEE, BOX OR CONVEX IN SHAPE.**
- 5. ALL WINDOWS SHALL BE TRANSPARENT. WINDOWS SHALL NOT BE MIRRORED OR DARKLY TINTED GLASS, OR PROHIBIT VISIBILITY BETWEEN THE STREET AND INTERIOR.**
- 6. SIGN PERMITS ARE REQUIRED FOR INDIVIDUAL SIGNS ASSOCIATED WITH THE BUILDING.**
- 7. A RIGHT-OF-WAY CONSTRUCTION PERMIT SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO THE CITY ENGINEERING DIVISION FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL PRIOR TO WORK START. THE RIGHT-OF-WAY PERMIT SHALL ADDRESS SIDEWALK AND/OR PARKING CLOSURES REQUIRED TO PERFORM THE PROPOSED WORK AS WELL AS POTENTIAL STAGING WITHIN THE COURTYARD ADJACENT TO THE BOARDWALK BUILDING. A TRAFFIC CONTROL PLAN SHALL BE SUBMITTED WITH THE PERMIT APPLICATION.**
- 8. ENCROACHMENT PERMITS WILL BE REQUIRED FOR ANY PROJECTIONS PROPOSED BEYOND THE PROPERTY LINE AND INTO THE CITY RIGHT-OF-WAY, AND THIS PERMIT WOULD PERTAIN TO THE LEDGE STONE.**
- 9. WORK ON THE BOARDWALK BUILDING OR THE OLD MILL TOWN BUILDING CANNOT BEGIN UNTIL WORK ON THE HAZEL MILLER PLAZA HAS BEEN COMPLETED.**

10. **THE APPLICANT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR SEEKING AND OBTAINING ALL OTHER REQUIRED LOCAL, STATE AND FEDERAL PERMITS.**
11. **PRIOR TO STAFF APPROVAL, THE APPLICANT MUST SUBMIT UPDATED ELEVATIONS OF EACH BUILDING, UPDATED COLORED RENDERINGS OF EACH BUILDING, AND MATERIAL SAMPLES TO THE BOARD FOR FINAL REVIEW.**
12. **LIGHTING SHALL BE CONSISTENT WITH THE LIGHTING REQUIREMENTS CONTAINED IN THE DESIGN GUIDELINES.**

**BOARD MEMBER WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chair Gootee summarized that the only items the Board would review at their next meeting would be the updated colored renderings, elevation drawings and material samples. Mr. Lien said that once the Board has issued their final recommendation, staff would take action on the permit applications.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS:**

No public hearings for Major Projects were scheduled on the agenda.

**CONSOLIDATED PERMIT APPLICATIONS (No Public Participation):**

**Seven Hills Properties: Public meeting before the Architectural Design Board (ADB) to review the design of proposed Walgreens and bank in order to make a recommendation to the Hearing Examiner for final decision. The site is located at 9801 Edmonds Way (PLN201100076, PLN20110077 AND PLN 20110078)**

Mr. Lien presented the Staff Report. He advised that the subject property is located at 9801 Edmonds Way and is zoned Neighborhood Business (BN). The applicant is proposing to subdivide the property into two lots and construct a Walgreens and a bank. The proposed drive-through use for both the bank and Walgreens requires a conditional use permit, and because the scope of work triggers review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), design review by the ADB is required. The design review and conditional use permit review are considered Type III-B Decisions, and the short plat permit is considered a Type II Decision. All three permits have been consolidated for review pursuant to ECDC 20.01.002.B. When projects are consolidated, the ADB reviews the proposal without a public hearing and makes an overall design recommendation to the Hearing Examiner on whether the proposal is consistent with the zoning ordinance and the City's Comprehensive Plan. The Hearing Examiner holds a public hearing and makes the final decision on the proposal.

Mr. Lien advised that the subject property is located east of the PCC Natural Market and is currently occupied by Robinhood Lanes. A parcel between the two developments contains a shared parking lot. There are two access driveways onto Edmonds Way and a third driveway on the PCC site that accesses 100<sup>th</sup> Avenue West. All three access points would remain. As recommended by the Westgate Plan, which is currently in progress, pedestrian connections would be provided off of Edmonds Way to the entrances to the two buildings and between the proposed development and the PCC Natural Market. Required frontage improvements would widen the sidewalks to seven feet and a planter strip would be provided between the sidewalk and Edmonds Way to further enhance the streetscape and pedestrian activity. The existing retaining wall would be extended the length of the development to provide access along the back side of the property.

Mr. Lien reviewed the Staff Report, particularly highlighting the following:

- **Building Elevations.** Staff believes the applicant has done a good job of breaking up the mass and bulk of the Walgreens building by incorporating two colors of brick. In addition, columns extend above the roofline to further

break up the building. A large parapet is proposed over the main entrance of the building. Trellises with vines would be added along the side of the building, and there would be windows all the way to the walkway on two sides of the building. The north side is the only blank wall and would be located on the back of the development. The garbage and delivery areas would be enclosed with cyclone fences. The proposed bank building would be similar in design, using two different colors of brick and a taller parapet over the entrance. A drive-through would be located on the side of the building. To address the City's concern about future use of the building if it converts to something other than a bank, the applicant is proposing transparent windows on the south side of the building. Staff believes that both building designs comply with the City's design standards and Comprehensive Plan.

- **Landscape Plan.** Type I Landscaping is required along the northern property boundary where the subject property abuts residentially-zoned properties. The area is currently vegetated. With the exception of the retaining wall extension, the applicant intends to leave this area in its existing state. Any vegetation above the retaining wall that is damaged from the installation will be replaced. A maple and arborvitae will be planted along the base of the retaining wall. Staff believes the landscaping proposed for the northern boundary of the project is consistent with the requirements of Type I Landscaping.

Type II Landscaping is required along the project's eastern boundary to provide separation between similar uses. The proposal is not entirely consistent with the requirements for Type II Landscaping in that all of the proposed trees are deciduous and would be planted 30 feet on center. The code requires that no more than 30% of the trees be deciduous and that they be planted at intervals no greater than 20 feet on center. The applicant argues that existing site restrictions prevent them from meeting the code requirement in this location. The code allows the ADB and the Hearing Examiner to interpret and modify the requirements of the landscaping chapter. Staff feels the proposed landscaping meets the intent of Type II Landscaping to create a visual separation between similar uses and would be complementary to the other proposed landscaping associated with the proposal.

Type III Landscaping is required to separate the development from the street. The applicant is proposing frontage improvements along Edmonds Way that includes a planter strip separating the sidewalk from Edmonds Way. The applicant is proposing to plant Bowhall red maples at 40 feet on center. While the planting is not consistent with Type III Landscaping requirements, the proposed planter strip is consistent with the City's Street Tree Plan and will provide a visual separation and soften the appearance of the street and parking area consistent with the intent of the Type III Landscaping requirements. Additional landscaping associated with the proposal include plantings along the edge of the parking areas and adjacent to the buildings consistent with the code requirements. Staff feels the proposed landscaping is consistent with the intent and requirements of Type III Landscaping.

Type V Landscaping is required in the parking lot area. The code requires 35 square feet of landscaping for each of the 164 proposed parking spaces for a total of 5,100 square feet. The applicant is proposing 6,400 square feet of Type 5 Landscaping. The proposal also includes three new rain gardens in the parking lot area. Staff believes the proposal meets and exceeds the intent and requirements of Type V Landscaping.

- **Parking.** Three parcels make up the development on the northwest corner of Edmonds Way and 100<sup>th</sup> Avenue North. PCC Natural Market is on the western most parcel, and there is a shared parcel that is developed with a parking lot. The subject property is the eastern most of the three lots. There is currently a parking agreement between Newkirk Washtex (PCC), the Wuscher Family Limited Partnership (owners of the subject property), and Robinhood Lanes (represented by Guenther Entities). As per the agreement, Newkirk has sole use of the 76 parking spaces on one parcel and access to parking in the shared parking lot to satisfy their additional parking requirement. Guenther Entities and their successors have access to 66 parking spaces on the shared parcel, but only until April 30, 2015. The Wuscher Family Limited Partnership and their successors have access to at least 66 parking spaces with no expiration date.

Based on the current parking requirements, 119 parking spaces are required for the PCC. The proposed Walgreens would require 48 parking spaces, of which 8 would be provided on site and 40 would be accommodated in the

shared lot. The new bank would require 17 parking spaces, of which 11 would be provided on site and 6 would be accommodated in the shared lot. For all three developments, a total of 184 parking spaces would be required, and 240 would be available after the proposed development. However, staff recommends that, as a condition of approval, the parking agreement should be updated to make it clear that the Walgreens and bank have enough parking spaces to meet code requirements for the life of the development.

- **Signs.** Signs associated with the proposal will require separate building permits and are regulated by ECDC 20.60. The sign code limits the maximum total permanent sign area in the BN zone to one square foot of sign area for each lineal foot of wall containing the main public entrance. As per the code, the Walgreens building would be allowed approximately 138 square feet of sign area, and the bank would be allowed approximately 32 square feet of sign area. The applicant is requesting 143 square feet of sign area for the Walgreens. The code allows the ADB to approve requests for modification of the sign standards proscribed by ECDC 20.60 if the following four criteria can be met:
  - *The request is for signage on a site that has a unique configuration, such as frontage on more than two streets or has an unusual geometric shape.* Given that the Walgreens would be located back in the corner of the property and the applicant is not proposing a freestanding sign at the street front, staff recommends approval of the additional 5 square feet of sign area to allow the sign to be more visible from the street.
  - *The subject property, building, or business has site conditions that do not afford it the opportunity to provide signage consistent with or similar to other properties in the vicinity.* Staff recommends approval of the additional sign area for the same reasons mentioned above.
  - *The design of the proposed signage must be compatible in its use of materials, colors, design and proportions with development throughout the site.* Staff feels the proposed signs meet this criteria.
  - *In no event shall the modifications result in signage which exceeds the maximum normally allowed by more than 50%.* The applicant is only requesting an additional 4% of sign area over what the code allows. Staff believes their request is consistent with the criteria.
- **Lighting.** The applicant has proposed light posts that are 30 feet in height, but the maximum height allowed in the BN zone is 25 feet. The light posts must meet the requirement unless the applicant obtains a variance.
- **Garbage Enclosure and Delivery Area.** These areas must be screened so the cyclone fence should have slats to provide additional screening.

Board Member Mestres asked if the PCC Natural Market was required to provide Type III Landscaping along their street front. If so, he said he does not recall any street trees. Mr. Lien used an aerial photograph to point out that street trees are located along PCC's street front. The applicant is proposing to widen the sidewalk to seven feet and install a planting street between the sidewalk and the street. The PCC frontage improvements do not include a planting strip.

Board Member Mestres asked for further clarification about how the applicant proposes to meet the parking requirement. Mr. Lien said there are more than enough parking spaces available on the three corner parcels to meet the parking requirements of existing and proposed development. However, it is not clear whether the parking agreement would allow Walgreens and the bank to use the shared parking spaces for the life of the development. Staff is recommending that a parking agreement update be required as a condition of approval.

Board Member Mestres recalled that the PCC Natural Market proposal included a request for a variance to the sign code. However, the Board held hard and fast to the City's sign code requirement and did not approve additional sign area. He commented that the Board has a responsibility to remain consistent from decision to decision. Mr. Lien noted that the two sites are different. The PCC Natural Market has a freestanding sign located at their entrance near the street. The Walgreens would be located back from the street, and all their signage would be located on the building, itself. Board Member Mestres summarized that in past design reviews, the Board has tended to be the least flexible when it comes to signage.

Chair Gootee asked staff to clarify the City's current method for calculating sign area. Mr. Lien said the sign area is measured based on the area of each individual letter. The applicant is requesting 143 square feet of signage, and the BN zone limits the signage to 138 square feet.

Vice Chair Broadway observed that renewing the shared parking agreement into perpetuity would preclude or significantly limit future development of the center lot. Mr. Lien agreed that 184 of the available 240 parking spaces would be required to meet the parking requirements of the two adjacent properties. Vice Chair Broadway noted that the 56 unrestricted parking spaces would equate to about 10,000 square feet of property that is eligible for development. However, anything developed on the site would likely have associated parking requirements, as well. Mr. Lien said noted that future development of the site could include a parking garage. He also reminded the Board that the City would review and likely amend their parking standards in the future, and this could change the amount of parking that is required for each of the uses.

**William Ruecker, Baysinger Partners Architecture PC**, 1006 SE Grand Avenue, Suite 300, Portland, Oregon, was present to represent the applicant. He thanked Mr. Lien and Mr. Clifton for helping the design team work through the City's codes and standards. He said their goal is to design a project that meets or exceeds all the City's standards. Regarding the Type III Landscape requirement, he said their goal is to exceed not modify the requirement.

Mr. Ruecker provided a colored rendering of the proposed project, which consists of fairly modern buildings with numerous sustainable features. He noted that Walgreens has abandoned their prototype to reflect daylight and wellness initiatives. The proposed new buildings include natural light and shading features to allow the maximum amount of light to enter the buildings, but prevent the buildings from becoming overheated as a result of increased solar gain. The goal of the building design is to create well-crafted simplicity that will withstand the test of time. They believe they have done a good job creating a sustainable Walgreens design and a campus atmosphere that will support both the bank and Walgreen uses.

Mr. Ruecker advised that Tom Rocco, Seven Hills Property, is in the process of extending the parking agreement. He noted that a 5,000 square foot building could be constructed on the middle lot, with adequate space to meet the additional parking requirement, as well. He acknowledged that while future development on the middle property would not be precluded, it would be limited.

Chair Gootee asked if the applicant is seeking to obtain LEEDS Certification. Mr. Ruecker replied that they are not planning to go for LEED Certification. Their focus will be on active performance of the building. They will do what is necessary to provide an energy efficient building and proper lighting for the occupants.

Chair Gootee asked the applicant to provide more information to support the argument for a variance to the sign code standards. Mr. Ruecker said the proposed signs represent the size Walgreens believes is necessary to provide adequate visibility from the street. They are only asking for five additional square feet of sign area. He said the applicant would likely be willing to waive the additional sign area provided there is an opportunity for pylon signs. If not, they would like the signs on the building to be as large as possible. Chair Gootee said he is not finding a strong argument to support the applicant's request for additional signage. For the sake of fairness and consistency, he would like to hear strong arguments to support a sign code variance. Mr. Ruecker stated that signs are the life blood of many businesses. A 4% increase in the total sign area is a rather minor adjustment. Because the City measures sign area based on a rectangle around all the sign letters, Walgreens is penalized by using both lower and uppercase letters. Chair Gootee noted that the City calculates sign area by measuring the area around each individual letter, so Walgreens would not be penalized.

Board Member O'Neill asked if staff has compared the applicants proposed sign area with what was approved for the PCC Natural Market. Mr. Lien said he has not made this comparison.

Mr. Ruecker pointed out that the proposal is consistent with the Westgate study because the buildings would be located closer to the street and connections from each building to Edmonds Way would be provided. He asked that the Board recommend approval of the proposed design. Mr. Lien elaborated that the City Council passed an ordinance last year that reduced the setback requirement along Edmonds Way to eight feet. The setback requirement on 100<sup>th</sup> Avenue West was reduced to five feet. These reduced setbacks are consistent with the Westgate Plan that is currently in progress. While it was not an interim ordinance, it included a sunset date of one year. In order to vest to the current setback requirement, the applicant must submit a complete building application by July 14, 2012. He said staff would much rather see the building closer to the street as opposed to 20 feet back, which is what would be required once the ordinance sunsets.

Once again, Chair Gootee said he does not see a strong argument to support a variance for five additional square feet of signage. Although it may cost more, signs can be adjusted for the square footage allowed without compromising the logo and brand. He does not believe Walgreens' business would be hampered if the variance is denied. He reminded the Board that they have consistently enforced the sign code requirements and they should continue to do so.

Vice Chair Broadway said the proposed location of the Walgreens on the corner lot actually allows for a great deal of visibility in a very strong development core. The Walgreens sign is well recognized. Because the subject property is neither a flag lot nor a recessed lot, visibility of the building would not be precluded. She said she would not support a variance to allow more sign area.

**BOARD MEMBER MESTRES MOVED THAT, BASED ON THE FINDINGS, ANALYSIS, CONCLUSIONS AND ATTACHMENTS IN THE STAFF REPORT, THE BOARD RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE DESIGN FOR THE PROPOSED WALGREENS AND BANK BUILDINGS TO THE HEARING EXAMINER (FILE NUMBERS PLN20110076, PLN20110077 AND PLN20110078) WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- 1. WHERE WALKWAYS CROSS VEHICULAR AREAS, THEY WILL BE CLEARLY DELINEATED THROUGH THE USE OF STRIPING.**
- 2. THE CHAIN LINK FENCE SHOULD INCLUDE SLATS THAT SCREEN THE COMPACTORS AND TOTE STORAGE AREAS FROM VIEW.**
- 3. HEIGHT CALCULATIONS ARE REQUIRED WITH THE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION IN ORDER TO SHOW THAT THE PROJECT MEETS THE 25-FOOT HEIGHT LIMIT.**
- 4. THE LIGHT STANDARDS INSTALLED IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE PROJECT CANNOT EXCEED 25 FEET IN HEIGHT.**
- 5. IN ORDER TO VEST TO THE 8-FOOT STREET SETBACK FROM EDMONDS WAY, THE APPLICANT MUST SUBMIT A COMPLETE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION BY CLOSE OF BUSINESS ON JULY 14, 2012.**
- 6. ALL MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT AND OTHER UTILITY HARDWARE ON THE ROOF, GROUNDS OR BUILDINGS SHALL BE SCREENED TO MITIGATE VIEW IMPACTS FROM STREET LEVEL. SCREENING COULD INCLUDE THE USE OF ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS, LANDSCAPING AND/OR FENCING.**
- 7. AN UPDATED PARKING AGREEMENT SHALL BE SUBMITTED PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT.**

**8. THE APPLICANT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR SEEKING AND OBTAINING ALL OTHER REQUIRED LOCAL, STATE AND FEDERAL PERMITS.**

**BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:**

There were no administrative reports.

**ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:**

The Board discussed the current status of the vacant ADB position.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.