

**APPROVED**

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

**May 2, 2012**

---

Chair Gootee called the meeting of the Architectural Design Board to order at 7:05 p.m., at the City Council Chambers, 250 - 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, Edmonds, Washington.

**Board Members Present**

Bryan Gootee, Chair  
Bruce O'Neill  
Rick Schaefer  
Tom Walker

**Board Members Absent**

Lois Broadway, Vice Chair (excused)  
Michael Mestres (excused)

**Staff Present**

Kernen Lien, Planner  
Jen Machuga, Planner  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF APRIL 18, 2012 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

No changes were made to the agenda.

**REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

**Roger Hertrich, Edmonds**, expressed his belief that the public should be invited to comment when changes are proposed to major buildings in Edmonds. He said that while he likes the proposed changes to the Old Mill Town buildings, he suggested the ADB require the applicant to comply with the design that was originally approved, which called for awnings above the main entryway.

**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 (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. He reminded the Board that 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. He recalled that the Board reviewed the proposal on April 18<sup>th</sup>, and requested the applicant submit new elevations and a material board for ADB review prior to staff approval.

Mr. Lien said that, as requested by the Board, the applicant has submitted new elevations and renderings of the proposed improvements (Attachment 2), reflecting the Board's April 18<sup>th</sup> recommendations. He explained that although the ADB recommended the recessed area on the second floor of the main Old Mill Town Building be painted with the burgundy accent color, the applicant and owners prefer not to add the accent color and have chosen to supply elevations and renderings that do not show this area colored in.

**Rick Grimes, Freiheit & Ho Architects, Inc., 5209 Lake Washington Blvd NE, Suite 200, Kirkland, Washington,** was present to represent the applicant. He explained that the proposal is essentially a re-submittal of what was previously presented on April 18<sup>th</sup>, but incorporating the Board's recommendations. He reviewed the modifications as follows:

- **Upper Dayton Building** – The Board did not recommend any changes for this building, so the design is essentially the same as proposed under the initial submittal. The color board shows the three colors proposed for the building, plus the black that would be used for the canvas canopies over the windows.
- **Boardwalk Building** – The design is essentially the same as proposed under the initial submittal. The Board did not recommend any changes, but they requested specific color samples and a colored rendering showing both the Old Mill Town Building and the Boardwalk Building. The Board also asked the applicant to provide information about how the south façade would be treated. The applicant is proposing to paint the entire south façade a neutral sage color. The parapet would continue around the corner, and the railings would be painted black. The existing light fixtures would be replaced, as well. Signage would be addressed in the future as part of a separate sign proposal as he anticipates that the Hotel Group, the new hardware store, and other businesses will request signage on the building.
- **Old Mill Town Building** – The design is very similar to that proposed under the initial submittal, but with some modifications. As requested by the Board, the stone wainscot has been extended along Dayton Street. However, to be consistent with the 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue South elevation, the applicant is proposing that the stone only be located under the windows that have metal canopies located above them (two on Dayton Street and five on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue South). No stone is proposed for the picture widow located on the Dayton Street façade. The building façade would be accentuated by using dark and light paint colors; and a large, flat portion of the façade would be accented with burgundy.

The Board suggested that the recessed area on the second floor along the west façade should be painted the burgundy accent color. He said he reviewed this idea and studied it with the owners, but none of the involved parties (particularly the owners) liked the idea. As such, the revised drawings do not show the requested color change in this recessed area. Because it is likely the Hotel Group will want to place signage in this area, the owner expressed concern that the lettering would not stand out against the burgundy color. He said Mr. Clifton, Economic Development/Community Services Director, suggested the applicant try the accent color. If they find it does not add to the building's appearance, they could paint over it. However, at this point, the applicant is not in favor of the idea.

The Board has indicated support for the proposed improvements to the corner columns and the lighting fixtures across the façade. The Board asked the applicant to provide a colored rendering of the combined façade along the Dayton Street side to illustrate how the buildings would be completely different in colors and heights. He noted that the trash enclosure would separate the two buildings.

Board Member Schaefer asked where Mr. Grimes where he anticipates the signage for the Hotel Group would be located. Mr. Grimes said he anticipates that signage would be placed on the recessed wall, in about the same location as the previous Ace Hardware signage.

Board Member O'Neill said he supports the colors, as proposed by the applicant. He also supports the applicant's request to not paint the recessed area on the upper floor of the west façade the burgundy accent color. He felt the applicant's concern about sign visibility is valid. Mr. Grimes explained that the intent of the original submittal was to make it look like a two-story building by using stone work and a darker color on the base and a lighter color on the upper portion of the building.

Board Member Walker said he also supports the applicant's proposal for façade color. Chair Gootee reminded the Board that the goal was to make the colors used for the Old Mill Town building blend with the colors used for the Boardwalk Building, which has a "Knott's Berry Farm" style. However, he said he does not feel strongly enough to force the applicant to paint the recessed area burgundy.

Board Member Schaefer expressed his belief that painting the recessed area burgundy would emphasize the vertical character of the building and make it building appear as a "lined up set of blocks." He observed that the Old Mill Town Building is different than the Boardwalk Building, and it should have its own look. He recalled that when the ADB reviewed the original design proposal for the Old Mill Town Project, a lot of concern was expressed about building mass and the need to break the building up. He expressed his belief that the current proposal accomplishes this goal by providing recessed areas on the ground level and a solid color on top. He said he does believe it is necessary to require the upper recessed area to be painted burgundy.

At the request of Chair Gootee, Mr. Grimes explained that the pole at the corner of the site (Dayton Street and 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue South) would be finished with stucco and painted to match the building. Chair Gootee pointed out that stucco material is difficult to maintain.

Board Member Schaefer said the proposal for the corner entryway is consistent with the Downtown Design Guidelines, which call for clearly defined entryways. Mr. Grimes pointed out that each of the vertical columns would extend all the way up the building, and none of the columns would have stone at the bottom.

Mr. Grimes reported that he spoke with the Engineering Division about whether or not the City would allow the stone wainscot to protrude into the public right-of-way by three inches, and they have offered their verbal agreement. Mr. Lien confirmed that the Engineering Division is okay with the stone protruding out onto the sidewalk as a surface treatment, and no additional permit would be required.

Board Member Walker expressed concern that the elevation drawings make it appear as though two different colors of burgundy would be used. Mr. Grimes confirmed that the same burgundy accent color would be used throughout the Old Milltown Building.

Board Member O'Neill requested additional information about potential signage on the ground floor of the 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue South façade. Mr. Grimes said he anticipates that both the doctor's office and the restaurant would want to have signage directly above the canopies over the main entryways. Mr. Lien noted that the applicant has submitted an application for the necessary permits to move forward with tenant improvements.

Mr. Grimes requested clarification from staff regarding Mr. Hertrich's earlier suggestion that the applicant should be required to provide a canopy over the main entryway at the corner as originally required by the ADB. Upon reviewing minutes from past ADB meetings, Mr. Clifton summarized that the ADB originally stipulated that the awnings along 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue South should be designed to provide sufficient protection and extend five to six feet over the sidewalk at the architect's discretion. They did not require the awnings to extend north and south at the entrance. The ADB's decision was later appealed to the City Council. The only qualifying condition from the City Council record of November 2006

was that the awnings must extend a minimum six feet from the face of the building. Mr. Lien noted that issues related to the awnings came before the Board on numerous occasions, and they approved the applicant's request to not include awnings at the corner entryway. Board Member Schaefer recalled that the Engineering Division raised concern about the corner awnings. Board Member O'Neill added that the ADB determined that the recessed doors at the corner were sufficient to define the entrance of the building and awnings were not necessary.

Chair Gootee summarized that with the exception of painting the recessed area on the upper level of the Old Mill Town Building burgundy, the applicant has done everything the Board requested. Board Member O'Neill noted that the applicant has not affirmed that a concrete ledge would be added on top of the stonework. Mr. Grimes advised that the applicant is proposing to use a stone ledge that matches the proposed stonework.

**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 COLUMNS ON THE DAYTON STREET SIDE OF THE OLD MILL TOWN BUILDING SHALL BE RETAINED ON THE SECOND FLOOR.**
- 2. 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**
- 3. THE AWNING ON THE UPPER DAYTON BUILDING MUST BE OPEN-SIDED AND MAY NOT BE MARQUEE, BOX OR CONVEX IN SHAPE.**
- 4. ALL WINDOWS SHALL BE TRANSPARENT. WINDOWS SHALL NOT BE MIRRORED OR DARKLY TINTED GLASS, OR PROHIBIT VISIBILITY BETWEEN THE STREET AND INTERIOR.**
- 5. SIGN PERMITS ARE REQUIRED FOR INDIVIDUAL SIGNS ASSOCIATED WITH THE BUILDING.**
- 6. 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.**
- 7. WORK ON THE BOARDWALK BUILDING OR THE OLD MILL TOWN BUILDING CANNOT BEGIN UNTIL WORK ON THE HAZEL MILLER PLAZA HAS BEEN COMPLETED.**
- 8. THE APPLICANT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR SEEKING AND OBTAINING ALL OTHER REQUIRED LOCAL, STATE AND FEDERAL PERMITS.**
- 9. LIGHTING SHALL BE CONSISTENT WITH THE LIGHTING REQUIREMENTS CONTAINED IN THE DESIGN GUIDELINES.**

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

**Holy Rosary Church: Sign package for Holy Rosary Church located at 760 Aloha Street (File Number PLN20120013)**

Ms. Machuga presented the Staff Report. She explained that the applicant, Holy Rosary Church, is requesting a modification to the Edmonds Community Development Code to allow more than one freestanding sign on the subject property, which is located at 760 Aloha Street and within a Single-Family Residential (RS-12) zone. She advised that the applicant has submitted a building permit application for three new monument signs to replace three previously existing monument signs on the Holy Rosary Church property located at 760 Aloha Street. She referred to Attachment 6, which outlines the proposed sign design, and Attachment 5, which identifies the proposed locations for the signs. She noted that all three signs would be the same size and design, and they would be placed in three separate locations: one on the street front on 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, one at the corner of 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue North and Aloha Street, and one at the entrance to the school on Aloha Street.

Ms. Machuga advised that only one monument sign can be administratively approved for the site, as Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC) 20.60.045.F limits the number of freestanding signs on the subject site to one. However, she reviewed that pursuant to ECDC 20.60.015.B.1, the Board may review sign proposals that request a modification to any of the standards prescribed within the sign code if the following criteria can be met:

1. *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.* In this case, the site has frontage on two streets. In addition, the site is very large (approximately 9 acres) in size.
2. *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.* This site is unique in that it contains not only the church and the new parish, but also a school. There are three separate, large buildings on the site.
3. *The design of the proposed signage must be compatible in its use of materials, colors, design and proportions with development throughout the site.* As shown in Attachment 6, the proposed sign design would be consistent with the existing buildings on the site.
4. *In no event shall the modification result in signage which exceeds the maximum normally allowed by more than 50%.* In this case, the proposed signs are approximately 11.5 square feet each, and the total of all three signs would be well below the maximum allowed for the site. The applicant is asking for additional signs, but not additional sign area.

Ms. Machuga concluded that based on the analysis and attachments in the Staff Report, staff recommends approval of the proposed sign package with the following conditions:

1. An exception to the number of freestanding signs has been granted allowing a total of three monument signs. The monument signs must comply with all other applicable standards of the sign code.
2. Landscaping meeting the requirements of ECDC 20.60.045.G is required at the base of each monument sign.
3. The applicant must apply for and obtain all necessary building permits. This application is subject to the applicable requirements in the Edmonds Community Development Code. It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure compliance with the various provisions contained in these ordinances.

Ms. Machuga said that although the applicant is not proposing any wall signage, the Board may wish to further increase the total number of signs allowed for the site in case the church wants to install an additional wall-mounted sign in the future.

Board Member Schaefer said he understands the applicant's desire for three monument signs given the large size of the subject property. The applicant has noted that the signs are necessary because access to the site comes from all directions. However, Aloha Street is a dead end so there is no need to address access from all directions. Ms. Machuga concurred. Board Member Schaefer asked if the main entrance to the school, which is located in the northeast corner of the site, comes from Aloha Street or 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue North. Ms. Machuga said the school can be accessed from Aloha Street and from a long drive off of 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue North. She said she does not know which is considered the main entrance to the school, but the large parking lot is accessed from 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue North. Board Member Schaefer asked if all the signs would be the same or if the school sign would be different. Ms. Machuga said that, as currently proposed, the signs would all be the same.

Board Member Schaefer recalled that when the Board approved two monument signs for the PCC Market, it was noted that access to the site came from two streets with traffic traveling in both directions. This would not be the case for the church. Ms. Machuga agreed but noted that trees are located between the proposed sign locations, which could obstruct visibility from the north and south, even if the signs are double faced. Board Member Schaefer said he understands the need for two signs on 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, but he questioned the need for an additional sign on Aloha Street.

**Norm Sandler, 1661 East Olive Way, Seattle, Washington**, was present to represent the applicant. He explained that the sign permit application came up quickly with the arch bishop coming into town this weekend. He emphasized that the three proposed new signs would replace three existing signs. The sign on Aloha Street and the sign at the corner of Aloha Street and 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue South were removed during construction of the new parish. The other sign on 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue South is still in place. He said the entrance on Aloha Street serves as the main entrance to the school, and during the morning and afternoons when parents are dropping off and picking up children, this is a most delicate entrance. He said the sign would be turned parallel with Aloha Way. Rather than including the schedule for mass, the sign at the main entrance to the school would say "Holy Rosary School."

Mr. Sandler said the graphics and architecture proposed for the signs are consistent with the new parish and the existing church and school. The concrete banding and the two support blocks pick up the coloring of the parish wall, which is Dakota Mahogany. He said he believes the proposed sign application meets the criteria for granting a modification to the sign code to allow more than one monument sign on the subject property. He said people approach the property from the north and the south, and the buildings are used by about 85 organizations each week. Their hope is that the new parish will become an integral part of the Edmonds community. People who are not familiar with the site will need signs to identify the entrances. He noted that there is also an internal directional sign on the property.

Board Member Schaefer pointed out that because the buildings are set so far back on the site, wall signage would have to be significant in size to be seen from the street.

Board Member Gootee asked if the signs would be lit at night. Mr. Sandler answered that no internal lighting has been proposed for the signs. There would be some landscape lighting that would provide illumination for the signs at night. He said the applicant recognizes that the church is located in a single-family residential area, and illuminated signs would not be desirable.

Board Member O'Neill said he believes that more than one sign is warranted to provide direction for people wishing to access the site. He said he does not object to allowing three freestanding signs, particularly since the total sign area of would be well below the total sign area allowed on the site. Chair Gootee asked how much total sign area the applicant would be allowed on the site. Ms. Machuga answered that the BN zone allows a maximum sign area of one square foot per linear foot of wall along the main entrance. The main parish wall is 90 feet long, so the code would allow a maximum sign area of 90 square feet. The applicant is proposing a sign area of just under 35 feet.

While Chair Gootee recognized that the applicant is proposing a total sign area that is well below what the code allows, he would like to include an additional condition that no more signage would be allowed on the site. He said he does not believe the applicant would be opposed to this condition, as they have indicated they have no plans at this time for

additional signage. Board Member O'Neill also suggested the Board add a condition that would limit the freestanding signs to the size identified in the proposal. This would eliminate the potential for the applicant to increase the size of the three signs at some point in the future.

Board Member Schaefer characterized the proposed signs as "oriented for viewing from the street." Ms. Machuga read the definition for "sign" as contained in the sign code as "any fixture that is visible from a public place . . ." She summarized that the City would not regulate internal signs that are not visible from off site.

**BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER MOVED THAT BASED ON THE ANALYSIS AND ATTACHMENTS IN THE STAFF REPORT, THE BOARD RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SIGN PACKAGE PROVIDED IN FILE NUMBER PLN20120013 (HOLY ROSARY CHURCH) WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- 1. AN EXCEPTION TO THE NUMBER OF FREESTANDING SIGNS IS GRANTED ALLOWING A TOTAL OF THREE MONUMENT SIGNS OF THE SURFACE DIMENSIONS SHOWN IN THE SIGN PACKAGE. THE MONUMENT SIGNS MUST COMPLY WITH ALL OTHER APPLICABLE STANDARDS OF THE SIGN CODE. NO ADDITIONAL SIGNS WOULD BE ALLOWED THAT ARE VISIBLE FROM A PUBLIC SPACE IN THE FUTURE.**
- 2. LANDSCAPING MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS OF ECDC 20.60.045.G IS REQUIRED AT THE BASE OF EACH MONUMENT SIGN.**
- 3. THE APPLICANT MUST APPLY FOR AND OBTAIN ALL NECESSARY BUILDING PERMITS. THIS APPLICATION IS SUBJECT TO THE APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS IN THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH THE VARIOUS PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE ORDINANCES.**

**BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL 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:**

There were no administrative reports.

**ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:**

Once again, Chair Gootee requested an update on the appointment of new Board Members. Ms. Machuga said this discussion has not been scheduled on the City Council's extended agenda.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:03 p.m.