

APPROVED

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

January 15, 2014

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
Bruce O'Neill, Vice Chair
Lois Broadway
Cary Guenther
Rick Schaefer

Board Members Absent

Brian Borofka (excused)

Staff Present

Jen Machuga, Associate Planner

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 6, 2013 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

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:

Application by Greg Jacobsen of Jacobsen's Marine for general design review of an approximately 10,000 square foot boat sales and repair shop at 345 Admiral Way in the Commercial Waterfront (CW) Zone (File Number PLN20130070)

Ms. Machuga presented the Staff Report, explaining that the application is for design review of an approximately 10,120 square foot boat sales and repair shop at 345 Admiral Way. The project site is located within the Commercial

Waterfront (CW) Zone. It is approximately 36,000 square feet, and is a portion of a larger parcel that is owned by the Port of Edmonds. The parcel fronts Admiral Way and backs to the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railroad. Currently, the site is developed as a parking lot with a combination of pavement and gravel. It is relatively level, and the proposal is for a new single-story building for boat sales and repair. Parking would be provided on both the east and west sides of the building, and space for boat storage and display would also be provided on the west side.

Ms. Machuga reviewed that the same project was proposed in 2008. At that time, the Port of Edmonds issued a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Determination of Non-Significance (DNS), and the applicant obtained a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit through the City. Since the scope of work remains unchanged from that time, both the SEPA Determination and the Shoreline Permit are still valid. She advised that the applicant also submitted a design review application in 2008, but the application was withdrawn due to the economic downturn. The applicant must now go through the design review process and obtain the necessary building permits.

Ms. Machuga referred to the Staff Report, which provides a thorough analysis of the proposal and its compliance with the zoning standards. The proposed building meets and exceeds the requirements for setbacks and parking, and meets the requirement for building height (30 feet). Compliance with the zoning standards will be verified as part of the building permit review.

Ms. Machuga said the Staff Report also reviews the proposal's compliance with the design standards contained in the Comprehensive Plan and the Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC). Although the Staff Report calls out a few concerns, staff believes the proposal would enhance the surrounding area. The proposed building would be approximately eight feet from the edge of the right-of-way, and there is currently a fence between the property and right-of-way. Although the applicant is proposing to fence off part of the parking area, there would be no fence between the building and street. Providing a direct connection between the building and the sidewalk would create a pedestrian-friendly feel. The front of the building (northern façade) would have several windows facing Admiral Way. The single-story building would be similar in scale and bulk to the surrounding buildings in the area, and the wide horizontal band (blue) that is proposed at the top of the building would add more human scale and create a small covered area at the main entrance. The applicant is proposing a variety of horizontal and vertical siding materials, as well.

Ms. Machuga pointed out that the applicant is proposing a single type of siding for the southern building façade, which faces the railroad. However, different colors would be used to break up the façade. The Board may want to talk about other options for the south elevation. In addition, the roof of the proposed building does not include a parapet to screen rooftop mechanical equipment. Although the applicant is not proposing any rooftop equipment at this time, staff is recommending a condition that would ensure that any future mechanical equipment is adequately screened.

Ms. Machuga said the zoning code requires Type V landscaping within the parking area, and the applicant's proposal does not meet the minimum area required for landscaping or the type of plants required. Staff is recommending an additional condition to help augment the landscaping in the parking area.

Ms. Machuga noted that no public comments regarding the proposal have been received, and staff recommends the Board approve the proposal with the five conditions outlined in the Staff Report.

Board Member Schaefer inquired about the width of the existing sidewalk and whether it is consistent with the sidewalk width called out in the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Machuga answered that the Engineering Department reviewed the proposal and did not comment on a need to widen the sidewalk further.

Chair Gootee asked how much additional landscaping would be required in the parking area to meet the current code requirement. Ms. Machuga said Type V landscaping is required at a ratio of 17.5 square feet per parking space, and the applicant is proposing 30 parking spaces. This equates to a total of 525 square feet of landscaping, and the current proposal only provides 234 square feet. As the applicant is proposing more parking than what's required and could potentially replace some of the parking spaces with landscaping, the required quantity of landscaping could decrease.

Board Member Guenther noted that one of staff's recommended conditions pertains to fence height. He asked if the applicant is proposing a fence height of greater than six feet. Ms. Machuga said the applicant stated in a letter to the City that they would like the fence to be eight feet in height, and staff wanted to make it clear that the maximum height limit for fences is six feet. A variance would be required to exceed that height.

Greg Percich, PKJB Architectural Group, Seattle, said his company is serving as architect for the proposed project. He said he is happy with the Staff Report and recommendation. The design works well for the City, and they are seeking approval as presented. The applicant is looking forward to moving his business to Edmonds.

Vice Chair O'Neill asked if the proposed siding would be corrugated metal. Mr. Percich provided a rendering of the siding to illustrate the actual colors proposed. The blue across the top of the front elevation would be metal siding. The horizontal siding would be 1-foot wide HardiPlank that is painted white. The reveal strips between the HardiPlank siding would be aluminum.

Board Member Schaeffer asked where the mechanical equipment would be located if not on the roof. Mr. Percich said the intent is to have a heat pump that provides air conditioning and heating for the office area. The shop and sales areas would be heated with Reznor or unit heaters. No mechanical equipment would be located on the roof, and any equipment on the ground would be screened per the condition recommended by staff.

Board Member Broadway asked if the services provided inside the building would require an emergency generator. Mr. Percich answered no.

Vice Chair O'Neill said there's a statement in the building site identity section of the Staff Report that the proposed building utilizes some design elements tied to historic forms and patterns from downtown and along the waterfront. He asked the applicant to identify the historic design elements. Ms. Machuga said this statement was in reference to the scale of the building being smaller and similar in scale and color to existing buildings around the waterfront.

To provide further clarification, Mr. Percich said the applicant is proposing an 8-foot fence around the boat storage area so that the site can be secured from potential vandalism.

Chair Gootee said the applicant is proposing to mix up the south elevation by using different colors of the same material. No modulation is proposed. Mr. Percich advised that the south façade would be adjacent to private property, and the applicant believes the proposed design is the best way to accommodate the two-hour wall that is required by the Building Code. Board Member Guenther pointed out that the southern façade would not be highly visible since it faces the railroad tracks and the marsh is located on the other side of the tracks.

Board Member Schaefer asked why the applicant is proposing boat storage on both the east and west sides of the building. Mr. Percich said that most of the boat storage would be located on the east side of the building, but the west side could also be used for boat storage if the additional space is needed. Board Member Schaefer expressed concern that the applicant is proposing three swing gates for the parking and boat storage areas.

Chair Gootee asked if the storefront windows would be tinted or clear. Mr. Percich answered that the windows would all be clear.

Board Member Schaefer asked if the applicant has considered the potential for spills and other contamination that might occur on the site and how they might impact the marsh that is located on the other side of the railroad tracks. Mr. Percich said the applicant is not proposing to have any large fuel tanks on site. Board Member Schaefer noted that the Port of Edmonds has agreed to provide water-quality treatment for the applicant's stormwater. Ms. Machuga advised that stormwater issues would be addressed by the Engineering Department as part of its building permit review.

Chair Gootee asked the applicant to describe the anticipated signage. He noted that many businesses of this type display logos from the various companies they work with. Mr. Percich said he anticipates that most of the dealer signs would be located inside the building behind the window. Chair Gootee encouraged the applicant to keep the City's sign code standards in mind.

Vice Chair O'Neill expressed concern that there is little variation on the southern façade, which is actually visible from the properties to the south. He suggested that perhaps panels could be mounted externally to the siding to create some relief. Chair Gootee said the painted panels on the southern elevation make the building appear incomplete. Mr. Percich said the intent was to provide some rhythm and break up the flat wall. He summarized that the southern façade would be 110 feet long and located just two feet from the property line where the railroad tracks are located. Chair Gootee suggested that perhaps a horizontal band along the bottom of the southern façade would be more pleasing.

Terry McCartney, Jacobsen's Marine, Seattle, said he was present to represent the applicant and answer any questions the Board might have regarding the proposed project. He said it would be likely that service boats would frequent the west parking area, with new inventory located in the east parking area. The two gates on the south side of the building would allow customers who are towing boats to pull in one gate, unhook the boat, and then exit through the other gate. This provides a better flow of traffic and eliminates the need for people to back out into the street.

Mr. McCartney suggested that perhaps some of the panels on the south wall could be skylights or window to add more dimension, light and thermal gain. He said signage is undecided, but they will want to display some brand logos in a tasteful way. Their current location does not have a lot of signage because they are a destination store. He said the Port has been wonderful to work with, and he and Mr. Jacobsen are anxious to be part of the community.

Chair Gootee opened the public hearing.

Bob McChesney, Executive Director, Port of Edmonds, urged the Board to support the proposal. The Port believes it will be a great addition to the Port of Edmonds, the waterfront and the entire community. He referred to earlier questions about water quality and stormwater and explained that, as per the Port's agreement with Jacobsen's Marine, any requirement the City may have for off-site detention or filtration would be the Port's obligation. The Port has been working with the City Engineer to complete a stormwater analysis, and it has been determined that no off-site detention would be required. Because there would be direct discharge to Puget Sound through the marina, filtration would be required and could be provided strictly on site. The Port also hired the services of a registered engineer to complete a downstream analysis, which confirmed that there is sufficient capacity in the existing outfall line. Board Member Broadway asked if an oil/water separator would be required for the surface parking lots. Mr. McChesney said there are a number of alternatives for filtration that are included in the City's existing stormwater manual, including oil/water separators, catch basin canisters, and rain gardens.

Board Member Broadway expressed concern that the proposed building is very large, broad and tall, but there is nothing textural or human scale about it. She suggested that some sort of textural element be introduced and grounded at the base of the building on the north, east and west facades to help bring some human scale to the building. However, she questioned if adding the textural element to the base would be sufficient enough to break up the scale of the south façade.

Board Member Gootee expressed his belief that the southern façade is visible from Harbor Square, and the proposed mixed panels do not seem sufficient. He likes Board Member Broadway's suggestion of adding a base that wraps around the building. This would be an economical solution to the problem. Board Member Broadway cautioned that window openings would not be allowed on the south façade given its proximity to the property line, and simply adding a base element would not be sufficient to address the Board's concerns. She suggested that perhaps a base element could be added at the bottom of the south façade and a false parapet at the top, with a solid color in between. This would create a vertical instead of horizontal rhythm and make the building appear more grounded. She summarized that changing the color of the continuous metal panel is not significant enough to make the façade interesting. She encouraged the applicant to think about breaking up the mass of the building as opposed to putting a rhythm on the building.

Board Member Broadway referred to staff's recommended condition that the project must comply with the Type V landscaping requirements, which means that applicant must provide an additional 300 square feet of landscaping. She said that rather than one large landscaped area, she would prefer that the landscaped areas be dispersed throughout the parking area to provide rhythm and shade. Board Member Guenther said the applicant would likely locate the landscaping along the west property line since adding islands in the middle of the parking areas would make circulation difficult. Mr. Percich agreed but said the applicant would give some consideration to how the landscaping is spread out.

Board Member Guenther agreed that adding a base to the east, west and north facades would result in a more human scale design, but the approach might not be as effective on the southern façade. Board Member Broadway agreed and noted that the base element could end where the HardiPlank siding ends on both the east and west facades. A different approach could be used to break up the south façade. Mr. Percich agreed to give consideration to design elements that give rhythm and a sense of modulation to the south façade without actually modifying the construction of the building.

Chair Gootee suggested that a glass roll up door on the west elevation would be more pleasing from a retail standpoint than a solid door that matches the shop doors. This would not result in a significant cost but would make the building more open. Mr. Percich reminded the Board that the business is a destination, and they are not worried about displaying products to passersby. He also expressed concern that a glass door could create other issues with the energy code.

Board Member Guenther observed that the applicant is proposing a standing seam metal roof, which provides a great opportunity to add photo voltaic arrays to capture sunlight. He asked if solar panels would require screening, as well. Ms. Machuga said the City does not have specific requirements for screening of solar panels.

No one else in the audience indicated a desire to participate and the public hearing was closed.

BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER MOVED THAT THE ADB APPROVE THE PROPOSAL UNDER FILE NUMBER PLN20130070 WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. All new fences shall comply with the maximum allowed height of ECDC Chapter 17.30, or as amended.**
- 2. 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.**
- 3. Street trees shall be a minimum of 3 inches in caliper. Species location and spacing of the street trees will be determined during civil plan review.**
- 4. The project shall comply with the Type V landscaping requirements of ECDC 20.13.030.E, including the need to expand and/or add additional landscape beds to meet the minimum required total area, ensure that all Type V landscape planters meet the minimum size required per planter, and all planters must be planted in accordance with the requirements of ECDC 20.13.030.E.2, including one tree per planter.**
- 5. The project will provide a base across the street side of the building and wrapped around each end to provide a human scale to the building and will provide a similar horizontal pattern to the rear of the building facing the railroad tracks.**
- 6. 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 GUENTHER SECONDED THE MOTION, AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Board Member Broadway recommended that Condition 5 be modified to clarify the Board's intent.

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY MOVED THAT CONDITION 5 BE MODIFIED TO READ:

5. The project design shall be revised on the street side (north elevation) and the west and east elevations to the extent of the proposed HardiPlank to incorporate a base of textural material. In addition, the south elevation shall be revised so that the scale of the elevation is reduced by the introduction of multiple textural materials.

BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BOARD MEMBER GUENTHER MOVED THAT THE ADB ADOPT THE STAFF REPORT FOR FILE NUMBER PLN20130070 AS PRESENTED. VICE CHAIR O'NEILL SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CONSOLIDATED PERMIT APPLICATIONS (No Public Participation):

No consolidated applications were scheduled on the agenda.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

Election of Officers

BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER NOMINATED BOARD MEMBER GOOTEE AS CHAIR OF THE ADB FOR 2014. BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL SECONDED THE NOMINATION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER NOMINATED BOARD MEMBER GUENTHER AS VICE CHAIR OF THE ADB FOR 2014. BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE NOMINATION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

Board Member Schaefer recalled that the design approved by the ADB for the new McDonald's restaurant on Edmonds Way included a more pronounced and defined entrance, but this element was not included as part of the final project. Because it was included in the plans, he assumed it would be part of the final design. The Board discussed the need to be more specific in their actions and recommendations in order to ensure that important design elements are carried forward to the final designs that are submitted for development permits.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.