

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

November 6, 2013

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
Brian Borofka
Lois Broadway
Cary Guenther
Rick Schaefer

Board Members Absent

Bruce O'Neill

Staff Present

Mike Clugston, Senior Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Commission approved the minutes of October 2, 2013 as amended.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION. 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:

No minor projects were scheduled on the agenda.

PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS:

File Number PLN20130046 -- Phase 2 of a two-phase public hearing process for district-based design review of a proposed mixed-use building, including multi-family residential and commercial space for the new post office, to be located at 130 - 2nd Avenue North within the Downtown Business (BD2) Zone

Mr. Clugston presented the Staff Report for the proposed project (File Number PLN201300460). He explained that Phase 1 of the public hearing was held on September 4th, at which time the applicant presented conceptual design plans for the Board's review. Using the Design Guidelines Checklist, the Board prioritized specific items the applicant should

address as part of the 2nd phase. He reported that the applicant has responded to the Board's direction with new information. He specifically referred the Board to the Staff Report for Phase 2, which includes the following exhibits:

- Exhibit 1 – Staff Report and Attachments from Phase 1 Public Hearing (September 4, 2013)
- Exhibit 2 – Architectural Design Board Minutes of September 4, 2013
- Exhibit 3a – 3q – Applicant's Phase 2 Submittal based on the prioritized Design Guidelines Checklist
- Exhibit 4 – Public Notice Information
- Exhibit 5 – Email from Jolene Usitalo Smith dated September 4, 2013

Mr. Clugston advised that Ms. Smith submitted another email on November 6th (today), which was forwarded to each of the Commissioners. He added the email to the record as Exhibit 6.

Mr. Clugston explained that the Phase 2 hearing will be based on a more detailed design that was prepared by the applicant using feedback the Board provided at the previous hearing. He said the Board's review should focus on the proposal's compliance with the Design Guidelines contained in the Comprehensive Plan, the prioritized Design Guidelines Checklist, and the applicable design standards and zoning code. He reminded the Board that the project is still in the design review phase. If the design of the building is approved, the applicant's next step would be to apply for a building permit. Issues such as building height, setback, impact fees, etc. would be addressed as part of the building permit review process.

Mr. Clugston displayed Exhibit 3e (a colored view of the west and north elevations). He expressed his belief that the proposed design addresses all of the elements the Board typically considers when reviewing projects (i.e. bulk, massing, pedestrian scale, etc.). For example, there are different elements on the street front facades that provide pedestrian scale such as canopies on the 2nd Avenue façade and above the residential entrances. The recessed residential entrances and the mid-level cornices provide the building with good pedestrian scale and break up the building vertically. The building is also broken up horizontally through the use of materials and modulation. For example, there appears to be three distinct buildings on 2nd Avenue, and the townhouse entrances have a different feel than the commercial storefronts. The trellis on the second level further breaks up the façade. On the Bell Street side, the building would be pulled back from the property line to site the required open space and allow the existing view corridor to continue. The entire building would be capped by a fairly substantial roof form that would echo the building façade modulations along 2nd Avenue and Bell Street. He summarized that while the building would be fairly large, the applicant has done a nice job of reducing its scale and making it more pedestrian friendly by using a variety of materials, colors, shapes and modulation.

Mr. Clugston reminded the Board that the proposal must comply with the specific design standards in the Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC), and he expressed his belief that the proposal appears to meet the zoning requirements. He noted that there is no setback requirement for the BD2 zone, but there is a height limit of 30 feet above the average original grade. He advised that Exhibit 3c provides a general elevation view, and it appears that the proposed building would meet the height requirement of the BD2 zone. He emphasized that height compliance for all of the features of the project would be verified at the building permit stage.

Mr. Clugston explained that the way the site is configured, the commercial ground floor requirement would extend into the building along 2nd Avenue. Rather than a commercial use, the applicant is proposing to use this area for a garage entrance. The applicant is also proposing 75 feet of commercial space adjacent to the garage entrance. Although this commercial space is not located adjacent to a designated street front and would not be required to meet the depth and height requirements that would otherwise be applicable, the applicant has indicated that the ground floor level would have a 12-foot ceiling height and a depth of 45 feet.

Mr. Clugston reminded the Board that, based on the size of the site, at least 5% of it must be open space. He referred to Exhibit 3g, a colored rendering of the north façade, and noted that open space would be provided along the northern (Bell Street) and western (2nd Avenue) facades. He specifically noted that a concrete transformer pad is proposed next to

the residential entrance. He suggested the applicant could work with the utility company to eliminate this feature to provide additional open space.

Mr. Clugston explained that there is no parking requirement for the commercial component of the proposed project, but the residential component would be required to provide one parking space per unit. The applicant is proposing 43 units and 51 parking spaces in the basement parking garage, which meets the parking requirement.

Mr. Clugston reminded the Board that there are specific Design Standards for the BD zones, which track along with the Design Guidelines contained in the Comprehensive Plan and the Design Guidelines Checklist, which the Board completed at the Phase 1 hearing. The standards discuss massing, articulation, orientation to the street, ground level details, awnings/canopies, transparency, blank walls, etc. Again, he referred to Exhibit 3e, which shows a visually distinct building base through the use of a middle cornice. Using different colors and materials gives an articulated feel and depth. Along the 2nd Avenue façade, the building gives the appearance of three separate buildings, which echoes the historic character of the area (60-foot building façade widths). He noted that the building is clearly oriented towards the street; the townhouse units would exit to the street and the primary residential entrance would be from the street. The commercial portion of the building would also be located at the street front. There are five requirements related to ground level details, and the applicant's proposal shows lighting, medallions, plinths for columns, bulkheads for storefront windows, clerestory windows, etc. that are intended to create a good ground level entrance. Canopies would be provided on all the entrances, and the proposed design for the commercial element addresses the requirement for transparency at the street level. There are no blank walls on any of the facades, and the applicant has proposed a small green wall at the southwest corner to add diversity.

Mr. Clugston said the code also has requirements for landscaping and street trees. He referred to Exhibit 3m, which identifies the types of street trees and landscaping proposed by the applicant. He reminded the Board that street tree size and type, as well as the landscaping requirement, would be verified as part of the building permit phase. Mr. Clugston concluded his presentation by stating that staff is recommending the Board approve the proposed building design with certain conditions.

Board Member Borofka clarified that issues related to parking and traffic would be addressed as part a development permit. He asked if signage would also be addressed under a separate permit. Mr. Clugston answered that traffic, including impact fees) would be dealt with as part of a larger development permit application. While the applicant could have chosen to include signage as part of the current design review, he did not. Therefore, a separate sign permit would be required.

Chair Gootee asked if the building location was shifted since the Phase 1 hearing. Mr. Clugston replied that no change was made to the building's proposed location and there are no required setbacks for the BD2 zone. The applicant is proposing to pull the northern portion of the building back from Bell Street to provide open space area, but that was shown in the Phase 1 drawings, as well.

Board Member Borofka asked how the Board would address the specific questions that were raised in written comments from citizens, particularly those related to traffic. Mr. Clugston explained that, although traffic is an element the Board should generally consider, a specific traffic analysis would be completed and mitigation fees would be assessed as part of a building permit application.

Doug Spee, Applicant, Edmonds, emphasized that he has no intention of selling the subject property after it has been developed. He pointed out that the project is not as simple as just replacing the old post office with a new post office. It was very tricky to fit their needs into the building. For example, two large semi-trucks come to the current site each morning, blocking traffic. With the new site, the post office has agreed to downsize to two-ton trucks similar to moving trucks that can be rented. In addition, there will be 45 feet available between the back of the sidewalk and the face of the actual loading docks to accommodate the trucks. The traffic situation should improve as a result of the proposed project.

He noted that the Edmonds Post office has more outgoing mail than incoming mail, and the proposed design will adequately meet their needs.

Mr. Spee said the design team also worked hard to split the 2nd Avenue façade into three looks. The goal was to bring the classy, brick look of the post office into the ground floor commercial space. The brick theme would be taken right to the roof, all the way through the center body of the building on 2nd Avenue to create a distinctive look. The brick would be mixed up with some bands of charcoal. They are proposing a classier residential look at the north end, which would extend around to the Bell Street side. He provided a sample of the stone veneer that would be used along this façade, particularly noting that the great colors in the sample would allow for a variety of choices for accent coloring. The north end would have a more distinct feel by using a rust theme mixed with a marine (blue/gray) combination. He recalled that several citizens have expressed concern that the building would be too large. He pointed out that from the most prominent view point (Main Street), the building façade would be broken up. In addition, a courtyard would be located on the south side. At the request of the City to avoid beige colors, they have chosen to use dark brown and a natural finish. The cement board would have a light trim color to accent the brown and work with the charcoal and brick color. He summarized his belief that the proposed design does a great job of breaking the building into three, classy-looking thirds. He said the direction provided by the Board at the Phase 1 hearing was helpful. While the design is not perfect, it is much improved and he is proud of it. He said he wants to construct a building that is very close to the design shown in the renderings.

Scott Boyer, Haller Architects, LLC, Seattle, reviewed the applicant's response to each of the higher priority items on the Design Guidelines Checklist as identified by the Board during the Phase 1 hearing.

A. Site Planning

- 2. Reinforce existing streetscape characteristics.** Mr. Boyer pointed out that the building would front on both 2nd Avenue and Bell Street. He said Mr. Clugston did a great job of describing how the proposed design would address this standard.
- 3. Entry clearly identifiable from the street.** Mr. Boyer noted that the residential entry on Bell Street would be articulated with stone and a glass canopy. The post office entry would be inset with a wide concrete seat wall with signage and a glass canopy.
- 4. Encourage human activity on street.** Mr. Boyer advised that the applicant is proposing to use canopies, street trees and open space at the north end to bring building to a pedestrian-friendly scale and encourage sidewalk intimacy along 2nd Avenue and Bell Street.
- 6. Use space between building and sidewalk to provide security, privacy and interaction (residential projects).** Mr. Boyer pointed out that the townhomes on 2nd Avenue and the north entry to the apartment building would be set back from the street to provide open space but keep visual connection with the street.
- 7. Maximize open space opportunity on site (residential projects).** Mr. Boyer advised that Mr. Clugston's presentation noted how the applicant is proposing to address this standard.
- 8. Minimize parking and auto impacts on pedestrians and adjoining property.** Mr. Boyer noted that the parking would be located below grade, so there would be no parking impact associated with the project.
- 10. Orient building to corner and parking away from corner on public street fronts (corner lots).** Mr. Boyer advised that the residential portions of the building would be oriented towards both 2nd Avenue and Bell Street.

B. Bulk and Scale

1. **Provide sensitive transitions to nearby, less-intensive zones.** Mr. Boyer recalled that, at the Phase 1 hearing, a citizen raised concern about the scale of the building from the east side. He briefly explained how the building would tuck into the natural rising topography to minimize its height on the alley side in relation to the neighbors to the east. He also noted that the design would use bays and decks to articulate the building façade along the alleyway. Contrast in color would be used to further articulate the building and break up the mass.

C. Architectural Elements and Materials

2. **Unified architectural concept.** Mr. Boyer reviewed that both Mr. Clugston and Mr. Spee discussed how the proposed design would meet this standard.
3. **Use human scale and human activity.** Mr. Boyer said that the Staff Report provided by Mr. Clugston also explained how the proposal would meet this standard.
4. **Use durable, attractive and well-detailed finish materials.** Mr. Boyer recalled that Mr. Spee provided information previously regarding the high-quality materials that would be used.
5. **Minimize garage entrances.** Mr. Boyer noted that two garage entrances are proposed for the building. The residential entrance would be located at the south end, with the commercial entrance at mid building. Not only would the proposed design minimize the number of garage entrances, it would separate them, as well, to minimize impact on street activity.

D. Pedestrian Environment

1. **Provide convenient, attractive and protected pedestrian entry.** Mr. Boyer pointed out that canopies would be provided for protection from the elements.
2. **Avoid blank walls.** Mr. Boyer recalled that the Staff Report provided by Mr. Clugston demonstrated how the proposal meets this standard.
6. **Screen dumpsters, utility and service areas.** Mr. Boyer pointed out that the trash enclosure would be located on the alleyway, and the transformer and electrical room would be located in the basement of the new building.
7. **Consider personal safety.** Mr. Boyer explained how openings in the masonry wall and glazing would be utilized to provide “mini” view corridors so pedestrians could see cars that are exiting from the parking garages.

E. Landscaping

1. **Reinforce existing landscape character of neighborhood.** Mr. Boyer said the goal is for the landscaping to have a more urban feel along the post office façade. More vegetation would be used in the open space areas in front of the residential elements.
2. **Landscape to enhance the building or site.** Mr. Boyer advised that a variety of deciduous and evergreen trees would be planted to provide seasonal interest.

Board Member Broadway observed that the site plan submitted as part of the Phase 1 hearing showed a dimension of 31 feet from the face of the south wall to the face of the existing post office once the roof has been removed. However, in the updated site plan (Sheet A1, Exhibit 3b), that portion of the existing post office would remain and the dimension would be decreased to only 14 feet. She asked the applicant to clarify this change. Mr. Boyer explained that, under a separate future permit, the applicant would remove the roof of the existing post office and create a new loading dock for the new post office. The current loading dock would continue to function during the construction of the proposed

building. Chair Gootee noted that this concept is clarified in Exhibit 3f. Mr. Boyer clarified that the original site plan did not identify the existing boiler, which cannot be removed.

Board Member Broadway asked if Federal Law requires that all post offices have flag poles. Mr. Spee acknowledged that the existing post office has a flag pole, and a new flag pole could be added to the plan.

Board Member Broadway asked if the post office would provide individual boxes that are accessible during non-office hours. If so, will the parking garage be assessable as well. She noted that the current post office provides a few five-minute parking spaces for these customers. Mr. Spee answered that the post office would screen off their retail store portion at the end of office hours each night. The garage door would likely be closed at 9 p.m. or 10 p.m. each night, but the front door to the post office would remain open. People could park in the loading zone to access the building during the off hours.

Board Member Borofka said that the previous site plan showed a generator/transformer cover on the north end. He asked if the applicant is still considering a generator in this location or just a transformer. He also asked if the cover must be located next to the pad mount. Mr. Boyer answered that a generator would be located in the basement, which would exhaust through the garage exhaust shaft. The transformer would also be located in the basement, but the Snohomish County Public Utility District (PUD) is requiring a cover in this location in order for their equipment cranes to remove defunct transformers. He will contact Seattle City Light to find out what they use to remove defunct transformers from buildings and then work further with Snohomish County PUD.

Board Member Borofka noted that on the building the applicant constructed at 3rd Avenue and Bell Street, the transformer is offset to the side near the gas meter. He suggested that perhaps the transformer cover for the new building could be moved around the corner. Mr. Spee noted that there is already an electric switch box at the corner where the alley meets Bell Street. He said he would be happy to purchase a surface transformer, but they are unsightly. He believes the best option is to bury the equipment in a transformer room right off the parking level with a hatch door. He expressed his belief that the lid would not be highly visible once the project has been completed. Staff's question is whether this area to the left of the main entry to the building should be lawn or concrete. He suggested there are a number of options besides planting grass. He said the applicant met numerous times with the Snohomish County PUD to get approval to place the switch box inside the building in the basement, but their request was denied. The box will only be two feet tall and green, and it could be camouflaged with plantings.

Board Member Borofka thanked the applicant for addressing the issue regarding visibility in and out of the parking garages. He referred to Exhibit 3c and noted there is a sizeable opening on the south elevation. He asked if a similar opening would be provided on the north elevation. Mr. Boyer answered affirmatively. Board Member Borofka asked if the architect is satisfied that the proposal would provide the necessary vision for both drivers and pedestrians. Mr. Boyer answered affirmatively.

Board Member Borofka noted that in Exhibit 3c, the elevator overrun would be set back. He asked if there would also be HVAC overruns. Mr. Boyer said there would be a mechanical shaft for the garage exhaust, but it would be just high enough to provide a waterproof termination (about 8 to 10 inches). Elevator overruns have hoists that push them a little higher.

Board Member Borofka referred to Exhibit 3i, which is a drawing of the south elevation. He noted that individual HVAC units for each residential unit will be located under the short windows next to the doors. Mr. Boyer said that is correct for the south and west elevations only. There would also be whole-house ventilation throughout the building to meet the fresh air energy code.

Board Member Borofka once again referred to Exhibit 3e and asked if awnings would be provided over the lower windows in the northwest corner. Mr. Boyer answered that sunshades would be located over the windows to shade the windows from the summer sun. He advised that the sunshades would be located above the cornice and would be

constructed of either painted steel or aluminum. Broad overhangs would be provided on the top floor to shade the windows. He acknowledged that the sunshades are not yet identified in the cad drawings.

Board Member Schaefer asked what materials would be used for the canopies over the town house doors. Mr. Boyer answered that these canopies would be constructed of painted steel and glass to be translucent.

At the request of Chair Gootie, Mr. Spee reviewed the variety of proposed materials and where they would be located on the building as shown in Exhibit 3j (a colored night rendering of the proposed project). He noted that materials include stone veneer, brick, wood, metal, glass and fiber cement products. Colored samples were provided by the applicant, as well as pictures of other developments on which the proposed materials and colors were used.

Chair Gootie asked if cherry and maple street trees would be planted across the front of the west façade (2nd Avenue). Mr. Boyer answered affirmatively. Chair Gootie asked how tall these trees would be when mature. Mr. Spee said he requested trees that will minimize view blockage. He noted that cherry trees were planted in front of his other building on Bell Street, and they have been kept trimmed so they do not grow above the railing of the first level of residential. His goal would be the same for the proposed new building.

Chair Gootie asked if accent lighting would be provided as part of the proposed project. Mr. Boyer answered that each residential unit would have a porch light, and accent lights would be provided for each of the piers at the post office and at the main entrance to the residential units. The accent lighting would be subtle.

Board Member Schaefer said he was pleased to see the setback that is proposed for the Bell Street façade. He asked if the 5% required open space would include the space in the atrium. Mr. Boyer answered that the atrium would be for the private use of tenants and would not be counted as part of the required open space.

Board Member Schaefer noted that the Design Guidelines talk a lot about upper story setbacks. He asked the applicant to provide measurements to indicate what the second floor setback would be.

Board Member Schaefer noted that the green (living) wall on the south facade is not called out in the plan, but it has been included in the colored rendering. He suggested that this feature should be added to the landscape plan. Mr. Boyer said it was not included on the landscape plan because it will be part of a second permit for constructing the loading dock. Although the irrigation piping will be provided as part of the building project, construction will not occur until the loading dock project moves forward. Board Member Schaefer expressed his belief that the green wall is an important feature that should be formally documented as a requirement of the project. Mr. Clugston noted that staff's proposed Condition 3 would require the applicant to add the climbing vegetation at the southwest corner of the building to the landscape plan that is submitted with the building permit. Mr. Boyer agreed that would be possible, but it should be noted that the actual construction would occur as part of the loading dock project.

Bob Groeschell, Edmonds, said he lives in Edmonds and also owns commercial property at the corner of 3rd Avenue and Bell Street, located immediately east of the proposed project. He observed that, as per the recent election, Edmonds voters once again repudiated candidates that are supportive of increasing building heights and density in the downtown. He said he recently an opportunity to visit Port Townsend where he was reminded of the efforts they have gone through over many years to forge a sense of identity, sometimes at the cost of expediency of development in their downtown core. As he came back across on the ferry, he had a chance to view the Edmonds streetscape and found that the buildings constructed before the current requirements were in place continue to stand out as the "sore thumb." These buildings have been identified and recognized as examples of the type of development they don't want going forward. He said his Certified Public Account (CPA) has an office in downtown Kirkland, which had a similar downtown core years ago. There is now an 8-story building being constructed across the street from his CPA's office, and they are moving because customers find it impossible to access and do business. He said all these examples are portends of future decisions on scale of projects.

Mr. Groeschell noted that the proposed project would be the largest, continuous downtown building in the City of Edmonds. Given that, the City should have a very cautious understanding of what they are establishing as a precedent. He said he has done a fair number of government contracts during his years in human services, and he is not sure how certain the post office relocation is. He understands the procurement and bidding process, and he has not heard that there is a guarantee that the post office will, in fact, be located at this particular site and building. If that is not the case, the City should be cautious about how they describe the proposed project. There is certain cache of describing it as the new post office as opposed to the new west side Teriyaki/espresso stand. If accommodations are being made based on the post office being located in the building, that fact needs to be established before concessions are granted.

Mr. Groeschell expressed concern that the view corridor has not been accurately portrayed in the renderings he has received. Walking from 3rd Avenue to Sunset Avenue, looking left and right at the setbacks and existing buildings down the two-block corridor, you will find that the buildings are set back 20 to 30 feet to provide a broad view corridor. The proposed plan calls for a 10-foot setback on Bell Street, and some of the drawings show five street trees and some do not show any trees. Some drawings show the sidewalk relocated out to the street, with a small strip of grass in between. However, no matter how it is carved up, the building will be significantly closer to Bell Street than any of the existing buildings up and down the street. It will also be as tall, if not taller, than the existing buildings. The streetscape of the north end of the building will be significantly different than the existing view lines and intrusions of the street.

Mr. Groeschell also expressed concern about the mass of the proposed building. He questioned if it would be possible include a condition on Phase 1 of the project that would place restrictions on any future Phase 2. He said the worst case scenario in his mind is that Phase 2 is a continuation of Phase 1, which means they would end up with a 30-foot tall, block wall. Regardless of the number of materials and modulations that are provided as part of the plan, the building will be a large wall. Unless there is some interruption, the resulting building will be a very dominating piece of work that is far out of scale with existing structures in that area. He encouraged the Board to consider the long-term impact the project will have on the community. While the renderings are important considerations, the big picture is the impact. Will they look at this building in the future as the condominium building that is down on the water or will they look at it as an asset that blends appropriately with downtown Edmonds?

Roger Hertrich, Edmonds, said this is his first opportunity to review the proposed plan since the original drawings were provided months ago. He expressed concern that the building would be very large in relation to the surrounding buildings. He referred to Exhibit 3f, which shows the west elevation of the building. He noted that, on the west side of 2nd Avenue, there are four buildings from Main Street to Bell Street, and there are four residences on the east side of the building within the same general area that this one, long building would sit. The existing development provides breaks between the buildings, and the proposed building would result in a very large wall. He noted that, as per the Design Guidelines, the alley facing the four proposed residential units is supposed to be used for vehicular access. On the post office side, there would be two entrances to the building. He understands that one is needed for the post office, but he does not believe the residential entrance is necessary because the Design Guidelines call for the alley to be used for residential access.

Mr. Hertrich referred to Exhibit 3h, which portrays the roofline of the proposed building. Regardless of the modulation along the façade, the roof would be absolutely flat horizontally. This type of situation is encouraged by the City Council's recent decision to change the height requirement in the BD zones from 25 feet, plus an additional five feet for roof modulation, to a straight 30-foot height limit. This will be the first building in Edmonds that portrays a long, flat, unbroken surface for the entire roofline, making the building look square.

Mr. Hertrich expressed concern about the traffic that would enter the building from the post office side. A high number of people currently use the post office site each day, and the access has a circular pattern with wide driveways and plenty of room to maneuver. However, he noted that the proposed new post office does not include a drop off site, which he thought was part of any post office operation. Mr. Hertrich asked if there would be a continuous weather protection canopy where pedestrians will walk on 2nd Avenue. Given the climate, he suggested that weather protection is needed along all walking areas in Edmonds, if possible.

Mr. Hertrich voiced concern that the design of the east side (alley) of the building does not have much variety, yet it will be highly visible. He said he likes some of the features that have been proposed for the west side of the building, but the roof would be long, flat, monotonous and unbroken. He recalled that the Design Guidelines speak to long, unbroken, monotonous as something the City does not want. He summarized that there is no opportunity for vertical variety because of the 30-foot height limit that was recently adopted by the City Council.

Mr. Hertrich said he is particularly concerned about the traffic that would result from having two entrances on 2nd Avenue. The current post office has on-street parking, off-street parking, and drive-through. Providing parking and access for all of the post office patrons, in addition to the residential tenants, will result in just too much activity. He felt the proposed entrances have been poorly placed.

Mr. Boyer commented that his firm designs buildings throughout the region with similar height restrictions. Architects have used all kinds of shenanigans to make rooflines gyrate up and down. Rather than using these decorative elements to articulate the building, the modulation (decks and spaces that go in and out) on the proposed building would be more spacial and useful. While the proposed roofline may appear flat when viewed from out on Puget Sound, the building would be very articulated from a pedestrian scale. He summarized that the roofline could be flat, but still very interesting in a horizontal way. Mr. Spee said he modeled the proposed roof after an 18-story condominium that was developed on Old Main Street in Bellevue. This same roof looked fantastic from the ground. He commented that Mr. Hertrich loves to get historical about everything to his advantage. What he didn't share is that during the evolution of the "25 plus 5" height limit, a mansard roof became the standard, vanilla roof of Edmonds. There was no interesting architecture whatsoever. Because a pitched roof was required on the upper five feet, developers simply used a mansard roof, pulled the brim of the cap down to the window header of the top floor, and still got the floors they needed for the project to pencil out. However, the architecture was very disappointing. He said he is quite proud of the proposed design, and Mr. Hertrich's comments that the roof is dead and flat would apply if you were a hummingbird and could look at the building from a height of 30 feet. That is not the case. No one on the street will ever view the building from that perspective.

Mr. Spee clarified he signed a lease with the post office two years ago to be included in this specific project. They are interested in downsizing from their current 8,000 square foot space to a 4,000 square foot space. The lease is a legal document that is signed and official. He simply needs to get the building constructed so the new post office can move in. There is nothing tentative about how the space will be used. It will be leased by the United States Post Office for a retail store.

Contrary to citizen comments, Mr. Spee expressed his belief that the proposed building would compliment what is currently happening on Bell Street. He noted that he owns a building at the corner of Bell Street and 3rd Avenue that was developed with a zero setback. The code allows full build out in the BD2 zone, which is exactly what he is allowed to design to. He has voluntarily agreed to set back the building 10 to 12 feet from the sidewalk to be consistent with other development along the street. This was a design sacrifice. Rather than a full build out that would have provided more square footage, he felt it was more valuable to preserve the look that takes you down Bell Street.

Regarding citizen remarks about the proposed building being enormous and oversized, Mr. Spee pointed out that Mr. Groeschell works out of an old home that is now used as a commercial building, as are the other structures going down 3rd Avenue on the back side of the alley. These structures were never designed to be commercial buildings, and they are not in any way, shape or form representative of the Design Standards for renewing downtown Edmonds. These are old homes that are being operated as commercial uses.

Mr. Spee pointed out that the condominium located directly to the north of the subject property is definitely taller than the proposed building. He knows that for a fact because when he originally pitched a 35-foot high building, his structure would have been a foot lower than the condominium. His building will also be lower than the office building currently located across the street to the west of the subject property. As far as scale, if the Board looks at the condominiums that currently exist on 2nd Avenue, they will not find the building to be a "dinosaur in the middle of a bunch of giraffes." The

proposed building is very reflective of what is going on on 2nd Avenue, as well as some of the streets outside of Main Street. He agreed that the building is good sized, but it is not a monstrosity that grossly out sizes everything else. It may be larger than the buildings across the street, but it is not out of scale with other buildings in the vicinity. The building is well designed and articulated.

Chair Gootee referred to Exhibit 3h to address Mr. Hertrich's comment about the lack of variety in the proposed design for the alley side of the building. He suggested that the building would be modulated more than it appears. Mr. Boyer pointed out that the building would have recesses to accommodate the decks, which would extend beyond the edge of the building by about 1½ feet.

The Board agreed that a stand-alone flagpole would likely be required for the post office site, and they discussed whether the application could be conditioned to provide sufficient direction for staff to review the flagpole design or if the application should come back to the Board for additional review before final approval. Chair Gootee suggested that design approval should be contingent upon the applicant meeting the United States Post Office requirements for flagpoles. Because the post office portion of the building would be located directly adjacent to the sidewalk, Board Member Broadway questioned where a free-standing flagpole would be located. If the pole must be incorporated onto or within the building, additional Board review should be required. Mr. Boyer agreed to consult with the architect who will design the interior of the post office space to address the flagpole concern. Mr. Spee pointed out that there are hanging baskets, street trees, post indicator valves, and fire department connections located on the sidewalk, and the flagpole could be mounted within the public right-of-way, as well. The Board agreed their preference would be for a freestanding flagpole. Mr. Clugston summarized that the Board would like to review the application again if the flagpole is attached to the building. No additional Board review would be required if the flagpole is located within the landscape buffer or sidewalk area.

Board Member Schaefer asked if there would be a continuous canopy on the commercial frontage to provide weather protection for pedestrians. Mr. Boyer answered affirmatively. Board Member Schaefer pointed out that because of grade, access to the residential garages from the alley would be impossible. He recalled this was discussed at the previous hearing. Mr. Boyer agreed that it is not physically possible to provide access to the residential parking garage from the alleyway.

Board Member Schaefer recalled that the Board has received several comments about the mass and size of the proposed new building. He reminded the Board that the code calls for avoiding mass that is long and continuous, and the applicant has proposed a considerable amount of modulation around the perimeter of the building, including the alley side. While the roof would be flat, the applicant is proposing 11 distinct blocks of varying textures and colors, as well as modulation. From his viewpoint, the proposed design is consistent with the Design Guidelines for the BD zones.

Chair Gootee observed that the applicant has adequately and properly addressed all of the items raised by the Board during the Phase 1 hearing. The proposed project meets the code requirements and is consistent with the Design Guidelines. He expressed his belief that the design provides more than sufficient modulation along the street front. The modulation for the alley façade is minimal, but adequate. He said he would support approval of the proposed design. He emphasized that the Board can only review the application before them for consistency with the code and the Design Guidelines. They cannot speculate as to how the property to the south will be developed at some point in the future.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER MOVED THAT THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD ADOPT THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND ANALYSIS OF THE STAFF REPORT; FIND THAT THE PROPOSAL IS CONSISTENT WITH THE ZONING ORDINANCE, THE DESIGN OBJECTIVES OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, THE DESIGN CRITERIA IDENTIFIED DURING PHASE 1 OF THE PUBLIC HEARING, AND THE DESIGN STANDARDS OF ECDC 22.43; AND APPROVE THE PROPOSAL WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THE PAD MOUNTED SWITCH CONNECTION AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF THE SITE SHOWN ON EXHIBIT 3g SHALL BE SCREENED OR CAMOUFLAGED TO REDUCE ITS VISUAL IMPACT AT THE STREET LEVEL.
2. ADDITIONAL INTEREST SHALL BE ADDED TO THE RESIDENTIAL WINDOWS AND DOORS IN THE FORM OF VARIED SILL OR CASING WIDTHS OR ADDITIONAL COLOR.
3. THE CLIMBING VEGETATION AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE BUILDING BY THE POST OFFICE LOADING AREA AND ON THE SECOND FLOOR TRELIS ADJACENT TO 2ND AVENUE SHALL BE IDENTIFIED ON THE LANDSCAPING PLAN SUBMITTED WITH THE BUILDING PERMIT.
4. THE “CONCRETE LID OVER BASEMENT TRANSFORMER” SHOWN ON THE SITE PLAN (EXHIBIT 3b) SHALL BE ELIMINATED UNLESS IT IS SHOWN THAT IT IS INFEASIBLE TO INSTALL AND ACCESS THE TRANSFORMER IN ANY OTHER WAY. IF THE CONCRETE LID IS ELIMINATED FROM THE PROPOSAL, ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPED OPEN SPACE SHALL BE PROVIDED IN THAT LOCATION BY THE APPLICANT.
5. A SEATING AREA ACCESSIBLE TO THE PUBLIC SHALL BE PROVIDED WITHIN THE REQUIRED OPEN SPACE AREA ADJACENT TO BELL STREET OR 2ND AVENUE.
6. THE PARKING GARAGE DOORS SELECTED FOR THE BUILDING SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED USING MATERIALS AND COLORS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE USED THROUGHOUT THE PROJECT.
7. STREET TREES ARE REQUIRED CONSISTENT WITH THE CITY STREET TREE PLAN. SPACING AND VARIETY WILL BE SPECIFIED DURING THE BUILDING PERMIT REVIEW PHASE.
8. THE ENGINEERING DIVISION HAS REVIEWED AND APPROVED THE TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS. THE TRAFFIC IMPACT FEES WILL BE ASSESSED DURING THE BUILDING PERMIT REVIEW PHASE.
9. COMPLIANCE WITH ENGINEERING CODES AND CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS WILL BE REVIEWED WITH THE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE. THE APPLICANT IS ENCOURAGED, WHEREVER FEASIBLE, TO INCORPORATE LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT TECHNIQUES INTO THE PROJECT DESIGN.
10. IF IT IS FOUND THAT POST OFFICE REGULATIONS REQUIRE A FLAGPOLE BE ATTACHED TO THE BUILDING, THE DESIGN SHALL BE REVIEWED BY THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD.
11. THE APPLICANT MUST APPLY FOR AND OBTAIN ALL NECESSARY PERMITS. THIS APPLICATION IS SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS IN THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE. IT IS UP TO THE APPLICANT TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH THE VARIOUS PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN THESE ORDINANCES.

BOARD MEMBER BOROFKA 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 announced that Board Member Gootee’s term expires at the end of the year. He asked him to notify Ms. Cunningham if he plans to continue for an additional term. He reminded the Board that they need to elect 2014 officers at their next meeting, as well.

Mr. Clugston advised that there are a few projects coming down the road. One may be available for design review on December 18th or January 15th. Staff will notify the Board when the applications are ready for review.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

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

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.