

**APPROVED**

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

**June 4, 2014**

---

Chair Gootee called the meeting of the Architectural Design Board to order at 7:00 p.m., at the City Council Chambers, 250 - 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, Edmonds, Washington.

**Board Members Present**

Bryan Gootee, Chair  
Cary Guenther, Vice Chair  
Brian Borofka  
Bruce O'Neill (arrived at 7:03)  
Rick Schaefer

**Board Members Absent**

Lois Broadway (excused)

**Staff Present**

Mike Clugston, Senior Planner  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**BOARD MEMBER BOROFKA MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF APRIL 2, 2014 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER MOVED THAT THE AGENDA BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED. BOARD MEMBER BOROFKA SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

**Natalie Shippen, Edmonds,** asked if the Architectural Design Board has an opportunity to provide input on the placement and quality of signs in Edmonds. Mr. Clugston explained that, generally, sign applications require an administrative review by staff, and no design review is required as long as the proposal meets the requirements of the sign code (ECDC 20.60). If the applicant wants to vary from the sign code requirements, the proposal would come before the ADB for review and approval.

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

There were no items on the consent agenda.

**MINOR PROJECTS:**

No minor projects were scheduled on the agenda.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON JENNA LANE TOWN HOMES (FILE NUMBER PLN20140009)**

**The applicant is seeking design approval for two duplexes and a single unit at 8506 and 8510 – 240<sup>th</sup> Street Southwest. Two existing single-family residences will be removed while new frontage, utility and landscaping**

**improvements will be constructed in conjunction with the five new dwelling units. The site is zoned Residential Multifamily (RM-2.4). This is a Type III-B permit with a public hearing and a decision made by the Architectural Design Board (ADB).**

Mr. Clugston explained that the subject properties are located on 240<sup>th</sup> Street Southwest, near the intersection of Edmonds Way and Highway 99. Currently, the site is developed with two single-family residential homes and is zoned RM-2.4. The applicant is proposing to remove the two existing homes and develop five new units on the site. The project will include the buildings, frontage improvements on 240<sup>th</sup> Street Southwest, site improvements and landscaping. Because this is a Type III-B Permit, the Architectural Design Board is required to conduct a public hearing and issue a decision, which is appealable to the City Council. He entered the following items into the record for the hearing:

- **Exhibit 1** is the Staff Report that was published and mailed out on May 28, 2014, along with 12 attachments.
- **Exhibit 2** is a marked-up, colored rendering of the proposal prepared by Board Member Broadway, with some suggestions for possible improvements to the building design.
- **Exhibit 3** is a colored elevation drawing for the single-family unit, which was submitted by the applicant just prior to the start of the meeting.
- **Exhibit 4** is a colored elevation drawing of the duplex units, which was submitted by the applicant just prior to the start of the meeting.

Mr. Clugston displayed a map of the subject properties, pointing out that that the properties to the east are zoned RM-2.4. The properties to the west across Edmonds Way are zoned RM-1.5, and the properties to the north across 240<sup>th</sup> Street Southwest are zoned Single-Family (RS-8). He also provided aerial and oblique photographs of the site, noting that the southern portion is heavily treed and the two properties have been developed as single-family residences for at least 50 years. Mr. Clugston provided street views of the site looking south from 240<sup>th</sup> Street Southwest and northeast from Edmonds Way. He noted that the existing homes are tucked into the landscaping. He also provided an existing site plan showing the location of the two houses.

Mr. Clugston referred to Attachment 7d of the Staff Report (Exhibit 1), which shows that the bulk of the trees would be removed from the site. However, the applicant is proposing to retain three trees on the southern end of the site as part of the required landscaping. He also referred to Attachment 7e of the Staff Report, which illustrates the proposed location of the single-family unit, as well as the two duplexes. It also illustrates the location of the proposed retaining wall on the perimeter of the site. He noted that access would be from 240<sup>th</sup> Street Southwest via a driveway along the western portion of the site.

Mr. Clugston explained that staff reviewed the elevation drawings that were initially submitted by the applicant to determine if the proposal meets the guidance in the Comprehensive Plan and the requirements of the Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC). He advised that, generally speaking, the project is consistent with the requirements of the ECDC and the guidance in the Comprehensive Plan, but staff felt the design was a little plain. The duplex structures have some differentiation on the top and bottom, as well as some vertical separation; but the units appear to be a mirror image of one another. The use of varied colors or materials would help provide more of an individual identity to each unit. He said he invited Board Member Broadway, who was unable to attend the hearing, to provide some ideas (Exhibit 2) for improving the building design. She recommended that the applicant use different materials, colors and window shapes. She particularly suggested accent colors for the garage doors and eaves to provide more façade interest.

Mr. Clugston referred to Attachment 7c of the Staff Report (Exhibit 1), which represents the applicant's current proposal for landscaping. He said the proposal meets the general requirements of the Landscape Code (ECDC 20.13); but given the site's location near Edmonds Way, staff is recommending that additional landscaping be required. He referred to Attachment 12 of the Staff Report (Exhibit 1), which is a marked-up version of the landscape plan to illustrate some of staff's ideas. He explained that the applicant had proposed Type III Landscaping along Edmonds Way, and staff is

recommending Type I Landscaping, which is thicker and denser and includes a fence. This will provide additional screening for the structure from Edmonds Way. Staff is also recommending the applicant use Type III Landscaping on the northern property line to buffer the site from 240<sup>th</sup> Street Southwest and the existing church. Type II Landscaping is proposed along the east property line, including Douglas Fir trees in the narrow landscape areas. The homeowner's association for the adjacent properties (Edmonds Greenery) has raised concern about using this species in such a small space. Staff is recommending that the Douglas Fir trees be replaced with a more appropriate species. Type II landscaping is proposed on the western property line. However, given the narrow planting area, staff suggests that some type of hedge material would be appropriate in this location.

Mr. Clugston concluded his presentation by stating that staff recommends approval of the proposed development, with eight conditions (Page 20 of the Staff Report). He specifically reviewed the following proposed conditions:

- **Condition 2** would require that all above-ground utility equipment be located interior to the site or camouflaged or screened with architectural features, fencing and/or landscaping. This is a common condition for all multi-family development.
- **Condition 4** would require the applicant to add interest to the windows and garage doors.
- **Condition 5** would require the applicant to add interest to the facades and eaves in the form of other colors.
- **Condition 7** would require the applicant to work with staff to update the landscape plan using the guidance provided in the Staff Report regarding landscape types and materials that are appropriate for the site.
- **Condition 3** would require the applicant to install illuminated bollards in the landscaping area west of the driveway across from each of the residential garages. The only lighting proposed by the applicant is on the buildings, themselves, and lighting the entrance will provide additional safety.

Mr. Clugston pointed out that the applicant has not made provisions for pedestrian access in the roadway area. While the site is fairly narrow and there is not enough room for a sidewalk, staff is proposing that the applicant use striping or some other feature on the pavement along the eastern side of the driveway to connect the pedestrian area up to 240<sup>th</sup> Street Southwest.

Mr. Clugston suggested the Board utilize the Staff Report (Exhibit 1), as well as information provided by Board Member Broadway (Exhibit 2) and the applicant (Exhibits 3 and 4) to come up with conditions and/or recommendations to address concerns related to building design, landscaping, etc.

Board Member Borofka pointed out that the applicant has provided elevation drawings titled "A1 of 3 (Attachment 7b). He asked if the applicant also submitted sheets A2 and A3. He also pointed out that the applicant did not provide drawings for the south elevation of Building E (single-family house), which will face Edmonds Way. Mr. Clugston clarified that Sheet A1 (Attachment 7b) was submitted as part of the application, but sheets A2 and A3 were not included. Just prior to the meeting, the applicant submitted new elevation drawings, but not for the south elevation of Building E. Chair Gootee agreed with Board Member Borofka's concern that there is no drawing to illustrate the southern elevation of Building E. This elevation will front on Edmonds Way and will be seen by people coming down the road.

**Luay Joudeh, P.E., D. R. Strong**, said he is a member of the LYDD Properties Group and the project engineer for the Jenna Lane proposal. He said he worked very closely with Mr. Clugston to address the concerns raised in the Staff Report, as illustrated in Exhibits 3 and 4. Regarding the south elevation drawing for Building E, he pointed out that the dense landscaping buffer proposed along Edmonds Way would screen Building E from the roadway. To provide additional clarity, he advised that the southwest elevation would likely mirror the northeast elevation.

Mr. Joudeh said he finds the conditions outlined on Page 20 of the Staff Report (Exhibit 1) to be reasonable, and he also tried to incorporate the comments provided by Board Member Broadway (Exhibit 2) into the new elevation drawings (Exhibits 3 and 4) that were submitted just prior to the meeting. The new drawings also incorporate the comments

provided by Mr. Clugston in the Staff Report. He summarized that the new drawings (Exhibits 3 and 4) provide a variety of paint colors to create depth and separation between the two units that will be side-by-side.

Mr. Joudeh referenced comments provided by the City Engineer regarding the proposed project (Attachment 5) and explained that the recommended drainage condition actually applies to a different project. Mr. Clugston agreed that the City Engineer's comments in Attachment 5 are related to another project on Edmonds Way, and reference to the comments should be removed from Condition 1. The City Engineer has indicated that the basic facility proposed by the applicant is acceptable, and that stormwater requirements will be addressed as part of the building permit.

Board Member O'Neill asked Mr. Joudeh to describe the modulation shown in the elevation drawings. Mr. Joudeh that they are working with 21 x 45-foot buildings and the goal is to maximize their size. That means that opportunities for modulation are limited. He pointed out that the garage doors will be painted a different color, and there will be some lattice work over the garage and patio doors. He summarized that they have provided as much modulation as possible without compromising the size of the units.

Board Member O'Neill asked if the driveway width is the minimum width required. Mr. Joudeh answered affirmatively. Board Member O'Neill asked if the applicant is proposing to incorporate both of the scenarios shown in Exhibits 3 and 4, or if he would choose one of the scenarios to apply to all three buildings. Mr. Joudeh clarified that, as currently proposed, the duplex units would have one design scheme, and the single-family unit another. However, he said he is open to additional suggestions from the Board, and would not be opposed to a different scheme for each of the three buildings.

Board Member O'Neill expressed his belief that the Board should require the applicant to submit elevation drawings for the south side of Building E prior to Board approval. Board Member Schaefer agreed and commented that although the façade would eventually be screened as the landscaping matures, the building would be constructed on fill and would be prominent to those coming down Edmonds Way.

Chair Gootee asked what the applicant has in mind for the vegetative screen along Edmonds Way. Mr. Joudeh answered that three existing Douglas Fir trees near the southern corner of the property would be retained, and would provide some screening from Edmonds Way. At the City's request, the applicant would provide Type I Landscaping to provide a dense site barrier and separate the development from Edmonds Way. While he recognizes the need to provide a buffer, it is also important to allow some sunlight into the new building. He said he is not against providing south elevation drawings for Building E. It was not provided previously because it would simply be a mirror image of the northeast elevation.

Vice Chair Guenther said he would also like the applicant to provide a southern elevation drawing for Building E. He said he does not believe it would be possible to simply mirror the northeast elevation, given the location of windows, etc. It is critical for the Board to see what the southern façade will look like prior to approving the application.

Chair Gootee observed that there are so many ideas floating around that it will be necessary for the applicant to provide new elevation drawings for all the buildings, with the appropriate adjustments, before the Board can approve the application. Board Member Schaefer concurred and stressed the importance of providing clear direction for the applicant to move forward with new drawings.

Board Member Borofka asked if the applicant has artist renderings to illustrate what the buildings will look like from 240<sup>th</sup> Street Southwest and Edmonds Way. Mr. Joudeh answered that no artist renderings have been prepared. Again, he pointed out that the elevation drawings in the initial Staff Report (Exhibit 1) have been updated (Exhibits 3 and 4) to incorporate comments from Board Member Broadway and staff.

Board Member Schaefer pointed out that the proposed Douglas Fir could encroach with the long-term function of the disbursement trench. He suggested that whatever is planted in this bed should have a root structure that is consistent with the presence of the disbursement trench.

Board Member O'Neill said it appears from the elevation drawing that the applicant is proposing to add fill behind the rockery. He pointed out that not only would the rockery require a surcharge, the City does not allow rockeries to be filled from behind. He requested more information about how the applicant would address this situation. Mr. Joudeh explained that as the foundation design is developed, the applicant will consult with a structural engineer. Options include a mechanically stabilized wall or a taller foundation to eliminate the need for a wall altogether. Board Member O'Neill said he would like to see more definite plans for the retaining wall and/or taller foundation before approving the project.

**Predreg Bojik, Edmonds**, said his property is located adjacent to the western boundary of the subject property, and he would like assurance from the City that stormwater issues will be properly addressed before a building permit is issued. He noted the slope that separates the two properties and commented that simply planting vegetation may not prevent the slope from sliding. Board Member O'Neill explained that, as part of the building permit review process, the applicant will have to demonstrate that the proposed project will not erode the bank.

Mr. Bojik asked if underground utilities would be required. If so, he asked if he would also be required to place his utilities underground. Board Member O'Neill answered that all new construction in Edmonds requires underground utilities, but Mr. Bojik would not be required to change his service.

Board Member O'Neill requested more information about Condition 8, which makes reference to a deck on an adjacent property. Mr. Clugston explained that the deck on the adjacent property protrudes into the western boundary of the subject property. The adjacent property owner will need to either remove the deck or obtain an easement from the applicant for its maintenance. This issue will need to be addressed before a building permit can be issued.

Mr. Bojik said his homes and the two homes on the subject property were built in the 1950's, and there is already a problem with stormwater runoff. When it rains heavily, water goes under his house, and he is afraid the new development will cause the problem to worsen. Board Member Schaefer pointed out that because the applicant would be required to meet strict stormwater standards, the situation could actually improve as a result of development.

Mr. Bojik asked where residents of the new homes would park. Mr. Clugston explained that the project will include frontage improvements (curbs and gutters) along 240<sup>th</sup> Street Southwest, but no sidewalk would be provided. Parking for one or two cars will be provided along the street front.

**Sally Vosk, Edmonds**, said she lives in the Edmonds Greenery Condominiums that are located directly to the east of the subject property. She asked where she could find information to illustrate how much of the proposed new buildings would be visible from the Edmonds Greenery Condominiums, particularly Building B that is located to the east of the subject property. Currently, there is a six-foot fence along the property line, but the subject property would still be visible from the second and third stories of the condominiums. Mr. Clugston responded that the entire Staff Report, and all the associated attachments, are available on the City's website.

Chair Gootee pointed out that, typically, the Board does not require applicants to provide perspective drawings from each angle of the project. Instead, the Board has to look at the elevation drawings and envision what the new buildings will look like from different elevations.

Ms. Vosk asked if it would be reasonable for the Board to require the applicant to provide an artist's rendition of what the proposed buildings will look like from Edmonds Way and 240<sup>th</sup> Street Southwest. Board Member Schaefer said that is not a common requirement because artist renderings are costly. Most of the time, the Board Members can visualize how things will look by reviewing the elevation drawings.

Ms. Vosk pointed out that the City typically requires sidewalks for all new multi-family development. Mr. Clugston said the Engineering Division has indicated that there needs to be a sidewalk on at least one side of the roadway, but they are not required on both sides. Because there is an existing sidewalk on the north side of 240<sup>th</sup> Street Southwest, the applicant would not be required to construct a sidewalk on the south side, as well. However, frontage improvements (curb and gutter) would still be required.

**Nola Topolinski, Edmonds**, said she also lives in the Edmonds Greenery Condominiums and came to the meeting hoping to get an artist rendition of what the new buildings would look like from the condominium complex. She asked if the buildings would be two or three stories. Board Member Schaefer answered that the proposed buildings would be two stories tall. Chair Gootee added that staff will review the height of the proposed buildings as part of the building permit to ensure they are code compliant. Mr. Clugston pointed out that building height in the RM-2.4 zone is 25 feet, and it appears from the elevation drawings that the tallest portions of the proposed buildings will be 24.5 feet. He reiterated that building height would be verified as part of the building permit.

Ms. Topolinski asked how much separation there would be between the proposed new buildings and the condominiums. Mr. Clugston answered that the new buildings would be set back 10 feet from the property line, and the existing condominium buildings are located between 12 and 15 feet from the property line. The separation would be between 22 and 27 feet.

Ms. Topolinski asked where the existing trees the applicant is proposing to retain are located. Board Member Schaefer said the trees are located at the southern tip of the subject property next to Edmonds Way. One is actually located on the Edmonds Greenery Condominium property, and two are on the subject property. There are three existing trees in the right-of-way in this location, as well. New landscaping would also be added along the property boundary. Ms. Topolinski said she lives on the third floor of her condominium building, and she currently looks out at greenery and blue sky. She is happy to hear that the trees will not be removed.

No other members of the public indicated a desire to participate in the hearing. Mr. Clugston suggested that if the Board would like the applicant to provide more information and updated drawing, the best approach would be to continue the public hearing to a date certain. This would allow the applicant time to update the drawings as per the Board's direction. For example, the Board could request the applicant provide artist renderings depicting how the building will look from 240<sup>th</sup> Street Southwest, Edmonds Way, and the eastern property line. He noted that the City typically requires artist renderings for development proposals in other areas of the City where development standards are applicable. While elevation drawings and landscape plans typically provide all the information the Board needs, they can request a higher level of detail.

Chair Gootee expressed support for continuing the hearing. He observed that a number of ideas have been proposed, and it is important for the Board to provide clear direction to the applicant. The Board discussed potential dates of June 18<sup>th</sup> or July 2<sup>nd</sup>. It was questionable whether or not a quorum would be available on June 18<sup>th</sup>, and there was some concern that the updated drawings would not be available to provide sufficient time for both the Board and the public to review prior to the hearing.

The Board agreed it would be appropriate to continue the public hearing to July 2<sup>nd</sup>. They discussed that the applicant could obtain guidance from the comments in the Staff Report (Exhibit 1) and the drawing submitted by Board Member Broadway (Exhibit 2). They recognized that timing is important, but it is essential the Board has enough information to feel comfortable with its decision. It is also important to provide additional information to address concerns raised by citizens. The Board asked that the new information from the applicant be posted on the City's website as soon as possible.

Board Member Borofka said he would like the applicant to provide more modulation, particularly on the east and west facades of the duplexes. He recognized the small lot size, setback requirements and the need to maximize footprint; but

he suggested that color or material changes could be used to provide some vertical breakup between the units. In addition, he noted that adjacent residents are concerned about what the new buildings will look like from the condominium complex, and Board Members would like a sense of what the buildings will look like from Edmonds Way. Artist renderings would help the Board and nearby residents visualize what the completed project will look like.

**BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER MOVED THAT THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR FILE NUMBER PLN20140009 (JENNA LANE TOWNHOUSES) BE CONTINUED TO JULY 2<sup>ND</sup>. VICE CHAIR GUENTHER SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

In preparation for the continued hearing on July 2<sup>nd</sup>, the Board discussed the following items and gave further direction to the applicant.

- 1. South elevation drawings and artist renderings depicting how the building will look from 240<sup>th</sup> Street Southwest, Edmonds Way, and the eastern property line.**

Mr. Joudeh requested more information about what the Board would like the new drawings to include. In addition to south elevation drawings, the Board agreed that the artist renderings could be simple drawings that show the cross sections through Buildings B, C and D to illustrate the relative height of the proposed buildings to each other and to the adjacent buildings to the east. Board Member Guenther pointed out that the second and third floor condominium units would be above the proposed buildings, and only the first floor would look directly at them.

- 2. A drawing illustrating what the retaining wall system will be.**

Mr. Joudeh asked if the Board's concerns are about structural issues or what the rockery will look like. Board Member O'Neill said he would prefer a rockery over a retaining wall, but the Engineering Division will likely impose surcharge limitations. A three-foot rockery would have to be located six feet from the edge of the pavement. While you can cut from the bank and construct a rockery in front, you cannot construct a rockery and then fill in behind. Mr. Joudeh said his understanding is that you can fill behind a rockery if it is not taller than three feet.

Mr. Joudeh said visibility of the rockery from Edmonds Way should not be a concern. While he does not mind providing the additional detail requested by the Board, he noted that the plantings provided in the landscape buffer would screen the rockery from Edmonds Way. The Board agreed they wanted additional information about the type of retaining wall system the applicant would use.

- 3. Revised north, east and west elevations that break up the façade as per the comments in the Staff Report (Exhibit 1) and Board Member Broadway's drawing (Exhibit 2).**

Vice Chair Guenther observed that Board Member Broadway's drawing was based on the elevation drawings that were submitted with the initial application. The applicant has updated the elevation drawings (Exhibits 3 and 4), to incorporate some of her suggestions. He pointed out that Board Member Broadway's recommendation for windows may not be possible to implement. The Board agreed that the applicant should prepare new elevation drawings that incorporate the recommendations from both staff and Board Member Broadway. While they asked the applicant to consider Board Member Broadway's suggestions for window placement and size, it was recognized that consideration must also be given to the inside functions.

The Board noted that the elevation drawings shown in Exhibit 3 pertain to the single-family unit and are different than the elevation drawings shown in Exhibit 4, which pertain to the duplex units. They agreed they would like the applicant to use both schemes, and perhaps incorporate a third scheme so that each building is

somewhat different. They further agreed that the buildings would be enhanced by providing a variety of materials and colors.

**4. Revised landscape plans that incorporate the comments provided by staff in the Staff Report (Exhibit 1).**

Mr. Clugston explained that if the Board agrees with staff's recommendations related to the landscape plan, they could ask the applicant to update the drawings accordingly. Another option would be to simply include Condition 8, which requires the applicant to work with staff to create a landscape plan using the guidance in the Staff Report. The Board agreed that the landscape plan should be updated according to staff's recommendations.

**5. Additional lighting in the landscaped area west of the driveway.**

The Board discussed whether additional lighting should be required or not. It was noted that the only lighting currently proposed is near the doorways to each of the units; and staff has recommended Condition 3, which would require the applicant to install illuminated bollards in the landscaping area west of the driveway across from each of the residential garages. Chair Gootee cautioned against requiring additional lighting, which could impact adjacent properties by shining onto nearby homes. On the other hand, Board Member Borofka pointed out that there is not enough space to provide a sidewalk along the driveway for pedestrian access to 240<sup>th</sup> Street Southwest. He expressed his belief that bollard lighting would address a safety issue rather than a design issue. The majority of the Board agreed that bollard lighting should not be required and Condition 3 should be eliminated.

**6. Additional information about utility boxes or other structures that would be need to be screened as per Condition 2.**

Board Member Borofka noted that the applicant has not provided any details about proposed above-ground utility equipment and how it would be screened. He suggested that the landscape plan be updated to incorporate this required screening. The remainder of the Board agreed that information would be useful, but noted that the issue could also be addressed by Condition 2, which requires that all utility equipment be screened. Mr. Joudeh pointed out that the only utility equipment would be a transformer and a phone post, which would be located within the right-of-way. Utility companies do not allow this equipment to be screened.

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

There were no consolidated permit applications.

**ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:**

There were no administrative reports.

**ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:**

Vice Chair Guenther commented that the minutes from the Board's April 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting were very thorough. He suggested that a copy of the minutes be provided to new Board Members to provide information about the Board's roles and responsibilities.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:54 p.m.