

APPROVED

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

September 2, 2015

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

Board Members Present

Bryan Gootee, Chair
Cary Guenther, Vice Chair
Brian Borofka
Lois Broadway
Bruce O'Neill
Tom Walker

Board Members Absent

Staff Present

Mike Clugston, Senior Planner
Jen Machuga, Associate Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER BOROFKA MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JULY 1, 2015 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved 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:

File Number PLN20150016: A request from Edmonds 2020 LLC for a district-based design review for a new mixed-use building (Phase 2) at 201 Main Street

Mr. Clugston presented the Staff Report, noting that the proposal is to replace the existing post office building at 2nd Avenue and Main Street with a new mixed-use building. The applicant is proposing three ground-floor commercial storefronts, with 22 residential units above. Below grade parking will be provided, and the access from 2nd Avenue North will be shared with the north building.

Mr. Clugston explained that the project requires a two-phased public hearing. He recalled that on May 20th, the Board reviewed conceptual project plans, took testimony, established the Design Guidelines Checklist and continued the hearing to July 1st. Because the plans were not updated in time for review on July 1st, the Board continued the hearing to August 5th. The August 5th meeting was cancelled due to lack of quorum, and the hearing was re-noticed for September 2nd. At tonight's Phase 2 hearing the Board will review the revised plans and take public testimony. After the public hearing has been closed, the Board will be asked to deliberate and make a decision.

Mr. Clugston reminded the Board of the criteria they must consider when reviewing applications, including the Downtown Objectives contained in the Comprehensive Plan, the Design Guidelines Checklist (prioritized by the Board on May 20th and responded to by the applicant in Exhibit 4, Sheets A9 through A11), and the standards contained in Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC) 22.43 (use and dimension, parking, landscaping, and design).

Mr. Clugston provided photo simulations to compare the designs presented during the Phase 1 hearing with the updated design that was recently submitted by the applicant for the Phase 2 hearing. He recalled that the project was fairly well formed at the Phase 1 hearing, but the applicant has proposed some changes in response to the Board's comments. He specifically noted the following changes:

- The entrance at the corner of the building (2nd Avenue and Main Street) was modified to make it heavier, and the roof form was also modified to add additional emphasis.
- The residential entry on 2nd Avenue is articulated with curved brick and a stepped up glass canopy. Ornamental aspects were also added to the building to provide additional modulation and create interest at the ground level, as well as the upper stories.
- On Main Street façade was modified to provide more detail on the roof lines, windows and doors. The pedestrian courtyard or plaza in front of the retail units was also modified to be more pedestrian friendly and provide more interest.

Mr. Clugston provided night renderings of the north building, as well as the proposed building. He explained that although the buildings are somewhat similar in shape and size and a similar design theme was used, the buildings also have unique features that make them different. He also provided elevation drawings. He specifically referred to the corner element, which is intended to make the corner more dominant, and reminded the Board that the code allows five feet of additional height for corner elements. The applicant has indicated that the proposed design is consistent with the height limitations for the zone. However, the proposal will be reviewed again during the Building Permit process to make sure it is consistent with all code requirements.

Mr. Clugston referred to Pages 3 through 22 of the July 29th Staff Report, which describes how the proposed development is consistent with the design objectives of the Comprehensive Plan, the specific design criteria identified by the ADB during Phase 1 of the public hearing, and the zoning ordinance. He recommended the Board approve the application with the conditions outlined on Page 23 of the Staff Report.

Board Member O'Neill asked if the proposed building materials would be the same as those used for the north building. Mr. Clugston answered that they would be similar, but the applicant is proposing to use brick on the south building to echo the current post office building. He noted that the applicant could provide more details about the proposed materials.

Doug Spee, 2020 LLC, indicated he is the property owner. He reported that the design team used the comments from the Phase 1 hearing to update the design to include features the Board was looking for. In addition to updating the exterior design, the floor plan was also modified to include 22 rather than 28 units. He explained that after further consideration, he decided that the very small units were not right for Edmonds. The new floor plan has a more traditional layout of one and two-bedroom units. Although reducing the number of units also reduced the parking requirement, no changes have been proposed to the underground parking area or retail spaces. He said he anticipates three retail spaces, including a restaurant space on Main Street with open seating.

Mr. Spee explained that a paneling product would be installed around the decks. He is also proposing an earth-toned stucco product on the bump outs that will work with and compliment the brick and stone that is being used on the north building. He is committed to a bright white soffit with trim pieces beneath. The Inca brick on the north facade will have more of a post office feel, and he hasn't yet decided on the mix of brick that will be used on the south facade. Many of the roofing components will be the same as the north building, but the look will be slightly different.

Mr. Spee recalled that the Board voiced concern about the lack of interest on the east facade, particularly the concrete along the base of the structure. He provided a photograph of a 3-D mural that he saw used on the side of a building in Ogden, Utah. He suggested this would be a more attractive option for creating interest on the east facade than simply using stamped concrete.

Mr. Spee summarized that he is very happy with how the plans have evolved since the last meeting, and he believes the new proposed unit count is right for Edmonds. The building will also look great at night.

Scott Boyer, Heller Architects, Seattle, recalled that, at the Phase 1 hearing, he pointed out that the two buildings (north and south) will be similar yet different. He considers the north building to have a more modern design and the proposed design for the south building bows to the history of downtown Edmonds by providing more decorative ornamentation. Although the two buildings appear to be separate, they will be connected below. They will also be tied together with a brick band at the base, as well as a concrete belly band at the floor line. In addition to incorporating materials used in the north building, the applicant is proposing to use a stucco product on the south building.

Board Member Borofka asked what materials would be used for the two large roll-up doors on Main Street that serve the commercial spaces. Mr. Boyer said the roll-up doors would be fully glazed so that, when closed, people inside the building will be able to see outside.

Chair Gootee requested more information about the railing that is proposed along the plaza on Main Street. Mr. Boyer said this separation could be a glass or metal guardrail. He explained that the steep slope along Main Street makes it impossible to connect the plaza area directly to the sidewalk. In addition, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires that there be a separation. However, he noted that the plaza area would be terraced to be as close as possible to the sidewalk.

Board Member Broadway asked for clarification about where the stone veneer would be used. Mr. Spee said the stone veneer was used around the residential portion of the north building, and he provided it to the Board to illustrate the color scheme he is proposing. Board Member Broadway also asked where the simulated wood material would be used, and Mr. Spee answered that it would be used on the upper residential units around the decks. The protrusions between the decks would be stucco. Board Member Broadway asked how durable the simulated wood product would be, and Mr. Spee responded that he has used it for other projects and he believes the product will last.

Chair Gootee asked what materials would be used for the awnings, and Mr. Spee answered that they would be glass, using the same basic concept as the north building.

Board Member Walker questioned what materials would be used for the courtyard, and Mr. Spee said he will likely propose a deck coating that looks like tile. Board Member Walker asked what plant species is proposed for the trellis

feature. Mr. Boyer said the species has not been identified yet. Board Member Walker asked if the applicant has discussed options for greening up the courtyard area with planters along the sidewalk and guardrail. Mr. Spee said the intent is to provide lush landscaping in the courtyard area, but he acknowledged it is not shown on the current plans. He noted that street trees will also be required as part of the project.

Chair Gootee inquired if the 3-D artwork proposed by the applicant for the east façade would be considered a mural. Mr. Spee said the 3-D artwork he saw in Ogden, Utah was applied to plywood backing that may have been used to fill in a storefront. The sculpture was only 3 to 4 inches in depth, but had a 3-D appearance. He said he believes this type of artwork would be a nice addition on the east façade of the proposed new building.

Chair Gootee said he likes the 3-D sculpture concept, and he questioned the best approach for making sure it is implemented into the design. Mr. Clugston noted that Condition 1 in the staff's recommendation addresses the east façade. If the Board feels it is appropriate, they could amend the condition to be more specific or they could leave it as is to allow the applicant more flexibility. While the stamped concrete would be a nice addition to the proposed design, he agreed that the 3-D sculpture would be a better solution.

Board Member Broadway asked if the applicant would have to go through the City's Mural Committee to have the sculpture approved. Mr. Clugston answered that if the Board approves the design, including the 3-D sculpture (mural), the applicant would not need additional approval from the Mural Committee.

Scott Blumenkamp, Edmonds, said he likes the overall project design, but he cautioned the Board to be specific in their approval action rather than leaving it up to the staff to determine whether or not the final design is consistent with the Board's intent. He referred to the Woodway High School Field Project, which was approved by staff even though the site is not zoned correctly. He recalled that on August 27th, he was informed at a hearing that is still going on that the code is discretionary in its interpretation. Again, he recommended the Board be very careful in their approval to provide clear conditions or request a project come back to them for review to make sure it fits their vision rather than relying on staff.

No one else in the audience indicated a desire to address the Board, and Chair Gootee closed the public hearing.

Chair Gootee expressed his belief that the applicant has presented a Phase 2 plan that addresses all of the issues raised by the Board at the Phase 1 hearing. The proposed design is complementary of the streetscape for that particular area of Edmonds. Board Member O'Neill complimented the applicant for following through with the character of the north building and being sensitive to both modulation and form. He felt the proposed materials would really enhance the corner. Board Member Borofka said he particularly likes that the buildings appear to be separate, but will actually be connected. The buildings are different enough that the development, as a whole, is not overwhelming. Chair Gootee concurred that the two buildings are complementary and the applicant was sensitive to the view from downtown to the waterfront at the important pedestrian corner.

The Board had a brief discussion about whether or not Condition 1 should be modified to specifically require the 3-D mural on the east façade or if it should remain as written to allow the applicant flexibility. They concurred that they preferred the 3-D mural over the stamped concrete. They discussed that the applicant has offered the 3-D mural concept, which is over and above what the Board had originally recommended, and they agreed it would not be necessary to make Condition 1 too specific.

BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY MOVED THAT THE BOARD ADOPT THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND ANALYSIS OF THE STAFF REPORT AND 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. **ADDITIONAL INTEREST SHALL BE ADDED TO THE BLANK GROUND FLOOR WALL ALONG THE ALLEY OFF OF MAIN STREET. STAMPED CONCRETE, A MURAL, OR SIMILAR 3-D RELIEF WOULD BE APPROPRIATE.**
2. **IDENTIFY THE SPECIES USED FOR THE LIVING WALLS AND ON THE TRELIS ABOVE THE MAIN STREET TERRACES.**
3. **A PUBLICLY-ACCESSIBLE SEATING ELEMENT (BENCH, SEAT WALL OR THE LIKE MUST BE INCLUDED IN THE LANDSCAPED AREA TO THE NORTHWEST OF THE BUILDING IF THAT AREA IS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE REQUIRED OPEN SPACE CALCULATION PER ECDC 16.43.030.E.1.**
4. **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 WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

File Number PLN20150036: A proposal from GBH Holdings LLC for Phase 1 of a two-phase design review process for a proposed 9-unit residential building at 303 Edmonds Street and the re-cladding of an existing mixed-use building at 311 Edmonds Street. The subject site is located within the Downtown Business (BD2) zone.

Board Member Broadway disclosed that the application is being submitted by her work colleagues. None of the Board Members voiced a concern about her participation in the hearing and no one in the audience indicated a concern, either.

Ms. Machuga presented the Staff Report, advising that Steve Butterfield of TGB Architects has submitted a land-use application on behalf of GBH Holdings LLC for design review of a new 9-unit residential building and the re-cladding of an existing mixed-use building located at 303 and 311 Edmonds Street. She explained that the site is located within the Downtown Business (BD2) zone and within the general vicinity of commercial, mixed-use, single-family residential and multi-family residential uses. The site is a corner lot at Edmonds Street and 3rd Avenue, and is approximately 7,000 square feet in size. The eastern portion of the site contains an existing two-story building (311 Edmonds Street) that is currently being used as an office on the ground floor and four residential units on the second floor. The western portion of the site is currently an undeveloped gravel area that is occasionally used for parking, but it is not an improved parking lot. The site is fairly level, with no critical areas on or adjacent to it. She provided photographs to illustrate the existing conditions on the subject property.

Ms. Machuga advised that the proposal includes re-cladding the existing mixed-use building on the eastern side of the site and constructing a new 9-unit residential building on the currently vacant western portion of the site. Pedestrian access to both buildings will be directly off of Edmonds Street, and no vehicular access or on-site parking is included in the proposal. She noted that the zoning code for the BD2 zone does not require parking for buildings that have a floor area of 4,800 square feet or less. She provided pictures to illustrate what the applicant is proposing for both buildings.

Ms. Machuga explained that, pursuant to ECDC 20.12.010, proposed developments in the Downtown Business (BD) zones that require State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) threshold determinations also require review by the Architectural Design Board (ADB) in a two-phased public hearing process. The intent of this process is to provide public and design professional input at an early stage. She further explained that Phase 1 of the review process requires the applicant to provide a preliminary conceptual design and a description of the property to be developed, noting all significant characteristics. The Board will use this information to make findings regarding the particular characteristics of the property and prioritize the Design Guidelines Checklist (Attachment 5) based on these facts in addition to the design objectives in the City's Comprehensive Plan (Attachment 8), the BD Design Standards in ECDC 16.43 and 22.43 (Attachments 6 and 7) and the Landscaping Standards in ECDC 20.13.

Ms. Machuga referred to the Design Guidelines Checklist (Attachment 5), which includes guidelines related to site planning, bulk and scale, architectural elements and materials, pedestrian environment, and landscaping. Following the applicant's presentation and public testimony, the Board should establish the project's priorities within the Design Guidelines Checklist and continue the hearing to a date certain for Phase 2 of the process. The purpose of continuing the hearing is to allow the applicant to refine and redesign the initial concept to address the input received from the public and Board by complying with the prioritized Design Guidelines Checklist criteria. She noted that the applicant submitted updated plans after the Staff Report was sent out to the Board Members, and copies of the new drawings were provided. The Staff Report would be identified as Exhibit 1 and the new drawings as Exhibit 2.

Ms. Machuga summarized that once the applicant has submitted an updated design, staff will review the proposal again, complete the SEPA determination and schedule the project for Phase 2 of the public hearing. At the Phase 2 hearing, the Board will solicit public testimony, review the design, and make a final decision on the project.

Steve Butterfield, TGB Architects, Edmonds, indicated he is the project manager for the proposed application. He noted that the property owner, project designer, landscape architect and civil engineer were also present to assist in the presentation. He advised that the proposal is to construct a new 9-unit, 3-story apartment building alongside the existing mixed-use building, which is a 2-story building with four residential units on the 2nd story and commercial space on the ground floor. The two structures will be connected with a breezeway and the exterior finishes on both buildings will be complementary.

Alex Bautz, TGB Architects, Edmonds, said the subject property is located on the northwest corner of Edmonds Street and 3rd Avenue, and there is an existing building on the 311 site. The property is zoned BD2, which does not require on-site parking. The applicant is not proposing any on-site vehicular parking, but some on-site bicycle parking will be available. The property is located within close proximity of several bus stops.

Mr. Bautz said the applicant is proposing a 3-story, 8,000 square foot building that will house six, 1-bedroom units and three, 2-bedroom units. The new building will have a fire sprinkler system. The first floor entry will be defined by above-ground planters that will also be used for signage to identify the site's address. The entrance will be set back from the street to provide a protected courtyard area and a small private area near the entrance. A protected common area for the residents will be located behind the gate. Each of the ground floor units will have patio space and the upper level units will have deck space. Exterior lighting will consist of wall sconces on the patios and decks, as well as pathway lighting. The 2nd and 3rd floors will be similar to the ground floor units, but there will be some modulation on the south façade of the building. Undulating the 2nd and 3rd floor façade creates more interesting facades on the south elevation along Edmonds Street and on the West elevation along 3rd Avenue.

Mr. Bautz advised that both buildings will utilize the same materials consisting of brick veneer cedar wood siding, and Hardie Reveal panels. The patio fences and privacy fences will be cedar to match the buildings. The roof on the new building will be sloped to create a change in the roofline. He provided color samples of the proposed materials. He also provided a vicinity map to illustrate the location of the subject property, as well as several photographs to illustrate the surrounding uses.

Jared Underbrink, CG Engineering, Edmonds, said the proposal is classified as a small site category, which allows them to use a detention pipe to drain stormwater between the existing and proposed buildings. The pipe will connect into a storm main on 3rd Avenue. The project will connect into the water and sewer lines on 3rd Avenue, as well. The street improvements shown on the plan are per discussion with the City's Engineering Department and include a 2.5-foot planting strip and a 5-foot wide sidewalk. Street trees will be planted on both 3rd Avenue and Edmonds Street.

Shawn Parsons, PacLand, Edmonds, said he is the landscape architect for the project. He pointed out that the space between the two buildings will be shaded most of the day, so shade loving plants have been proposed in this location. The proposed landscaping along 3rd Avenue and Edmonds Street is consistent with code requirements for streetscape improvements. There will also be landscaping in the entryway to create a more intimate space for tenants. The

landscaping on the north side is intended to create a barrier, as well as buffer the commercial use from the adjacent residential uses. He summarized that the intent is to create a country-style landscape versus commercial to match the residential character of the buildings.

Mr. Butterfield pointed out that only minor changes were made to the drawings that were submitted as part of the original application.

Board Member Borofka asked if it is the applicant's intent that the upper story on the south elevation of the existing building will only have awnings over the easternmost window. Mr. Butterfield said the current design only has an awning on the easternmost window, but he agreed that awnings could be added to the other windows, as well. Board Member Borofka expressed his belief that adding awnings over each of the windows on the southern façade of the existing building would provide additional modulation to break up the plainness of the façade.

Board Member Borofka inquired if the applicant is proposing to replace the existing stairs on the east elevation of the existing building. Mr. Butterfield answered that the applicant is planning to use the existing stairs. Board Member Borofka asked if there would be any treatment to make them more aesthetically pleasing, and Mr. Butterfield said the plan is for the stairs to remain in their current condition.

Board Member Borofka voiced concern that the entryway on the south side of the proposed new building seems to be set too far back, which raises concerns about safety. The same is true for the courtyard. The lack of side view into these spaces could create a safety hazard. Mr. Butterfield explained that the client liked the idea of having an exterior courtyard at the entrance of the new building, which will include benches to sit on. The courtyard will meander in and out and they have taken the landscaping back. The entryway will also house the built-in mailboxes that serve the tenants.

Board Member O'Neill said it appears the existing building is getting "short sheeted" on quality and materials. It has some massive monolithic forms on all four sides, and he would like to see more definition and character in the siding of the existing building, particularly the north and west elevations. He asked if the applicant has considered adding a canopy over the western entrance on the existing building. Mr. Butterfield pointed out that this entrance is the back entrance to the commercial space. While he likes the thought of providing a little more design effort on the other elevations, he does not know if it would be appropriate to emphasize this back entrance.

Board Member O'Neill asked if the canopy along Edmonds Street on the existing building would cover the office entrance, as well, and Mr. Butterfield answered affirmatively. He advised that the property owner recently completed extensive tenant improvements on the ground floor to create office space. The building had a lot of damage and a significant amount of structural work was required. The building was constructed in the 1940s, and it will not support any more load associated with changes to the roof structure or additional modulation.

Board Member Walker referred to the brown band that runs just under the roofline on the south façade of the proposed new building and suggested that adding a similar band to the south façade of the existing building would give some additional modulation and tie the two buildings together.

Vice Chair Guenther asked if the applicant is proposing to change any of the windows on the existing building. Mr. Bautz answered that the windows were replaced several years ago.

Chair Gootee voiced concern that the south elevation on the existing building, which is very visible from the street, is quite stark and does not flow at all with the proposed new building. Mr. Bautz said the intent when designing the changes to the existing building was to be cost efficient. The structural capacity of the existing building does not allow any new undulation, and the proposed materials are intended to carry over as much of the language as possible from the new building, but not compete with it.

Board Member Borofka noted that electrical service for the existing building comes from the west. He asked if this would be true for the new building, as well. Mr. Butterfield pointed out that the site is currently served from an existing power pole at the corner of 3rd Avenue and Edmonds Street. The project engineer has indicated that a transformer vault will be placed near the dumpster, and the electrical wiring will be placed underground from the power pole to the new transformer.

Board Member Borofka asked if the good-sized shrub located at the northwest corner of the proposed new building is on the subject property. **Glen Safadago, Property Owner**, advised that the shrub is actually a holly bush located about 16 inches inside his property line. Per the survey, the property line is actually on the north side of the fence.

Board Member Walker voiced concern that the applicant is proposing to plant *Viburnum Davidii* in the planters near the entrance to the new building. He noted that the width of the planters is identified to be 1.5 feet, and this plant species grows quite large. The same is true for the *Viburnum Davidii* that is proposed along the western façade, as well. Mr. Parsons explained that the goal was to get a blend of evergreen and grasses in each landscaped area. The actual dimensions for the planting areas have not been worked out yet, and they are hoping to get at least two feet. He agreed that it will be a little tight, but it has been his experience that this species tends to grow to the space that is available.

No one in the audience indicated a desire to comment regarding the application, and Chair Gootee closed the public hearing.

Board Member O'Neill expressed his belief that the existing building needs more enhancement, and the remainder of the Board concurred.

Ms. Machuga pointed out that the applicant actually submitted more design information than what is typically required for the Phase 1 hearing. The point of Phase 1 is to establish the priorities for the project. She encouraged the Board to go through the Design Guidelines Checklist, identify the priorities, and make comments and suggestions to provide more specific direction to the applicant. The Board reviewed the Design Guidelines Checklist (Attachment 5) as follows:

A. Site Planning

- 1. Reinforce existing site characteristics (N/A).** It was noted that there are no desirable characteristics on the site, and the applicant is proposing to make the existing building better. The proposed design would exceed the existing site characteristics.
- 2. Reinforce existing streetscape characteristics (N/A).** There are no existing streetscape characteristics to reinforce.
- 3. Entry clearly identifiable from the street (Higher Priority).** It was discussed that the entryway for the new building is tucked back in, but that is by intent. Concerns about safety were expressed, and the applicant was encouraged to use lighting and landscaping to ensure that the entryway and courtyard are safe and defensible. Mr. Butterfield pointed out that the planters proposed at the entry will be about 2 feet tall, with an element extending up an additional 4 to 4.5 feet with address numbers on it. The entryway will be green and include appropriate lighting, as well.
- 4. Encourage human activity on the street (Lower Priority).** It was pointed out that the subject property is not in close proximity to Main Street, and there is not a lot of pedestrian activity because it is far enough away from the retail businesses that it will be difficult to create more activity.
- 5. Minimize intrusion into privacy on adjacent sites (Lower Priority).** The applicant is providing a fence along the northern property line to separate the subject property to minimize the project's intrusion into the adjacent properties.
- 6. Use space between buildings and sidewalk to provide security, privacy and interaction (residential projects) (N/A).** It was discussed that this building is constructed right up to the sidewalk and only has a small landscaping strip for separation.

- 7. Minimize open space opportunity on site (residential properties) (Lower Priority).** It was discussed that the subject property is a smaller site, and there is not a lot of additional area for open space given the number of units proposed. The courtyard between the two buildings will maximize open space for the residents. The applicant is proposing patios and decks for each unit, as well.
- 8. Minimize parking and auto impacts on pedestrians and adjoining properties (N/A).** It was noted that on-site parking is not required for a development of this size in the BD2 zone.
- 9. Discourage parking in street front (N/A).** Again, it was noted that the applicant is not required to provide on-site parking so residents will have to park on the street.
- 10. Orient building to corner and parking away from corner on public street fronts (corner lots) (N/A).** The applicant is proposing to maintain the existing building and maximize the space with the proposed new building.

B. Bulk and Scale

- 1. Provide sensitive transitions to nearby, less-intensive zones (N/A).** It was discussed that the adjacent property is developed as residential, but it is zoned BD2.

C. Architectural Elements and Materials

- 1. Complement positive existing character and/or respond to nearby historic structures (Lower Priority).** The Board agreed that the existing character is not a positive one, and they do not want the new building to complement it in its existing design.
- 2. Unified architectural concept (Higher Priority).** The Board voiced concern that there is not enough unity between the proposed new building and the changes to the existing building. They encouraged the applicant to make this a priority when preparing the final designs.
- 3. Use human scale and human activity (Higher Priority).** The Board discussed that the applicant is proposing canopies over the entrances, which brings the scale of the two buildings down.
- 4. Use durable, attractive and well-detailed finish materials (Higher Priority).**
- 5. Minimize garage entrances (N/A).**

D. Pedestrian Environment

- 1. Provide convenient, attractive and protected pedestrian entry (Higher Priority).**
- 2. Avoid blank walls (Higher Priority).**
- 3. Minimize height of retaining walls (N/A).**
- 4. Minimize visual and physical intrusion of parking lots on pedestrian areas (N/A).** No parking lot is proposed for the project.
- 5. Minimize visual impact of parking structures (N/A).**
- 6. Screen dumpsters, utility and service areas (Higher Priority).**
- 7. Consider personal safety (Higher Priority).** The Board discussed concerns about the existing stairway. Ms. Machuga advised that the Building Division will review the existing stairway in preparation for the Phase 2 hearing. They will also review the stairway as part of the building permit submittal. If the Building Division finds it does not meet code requirements, they may require the applicant to replace it.

E. Landscaping

- 1. Reinforce existing landscape character of neighborhood (Lower Priority).**
- 2. Landscape to enhance the building or site (Higher Priority).**
- 3. Landscape to take advantage of special site conditions (N/A).**

Mr. Machuga suggested that the Board provide direction on the following:

- The west elevation of the proposed new building could use more modulation. The center column seems a bit blank.
- More detail could be added to the windows of the proposed new building.
- A transformer is proposed to be located on the eastern side of the proposed new building (adjacent to the alley). The Board could provide suggestions for how the applicant could screen the equipment or locate it elsewhere on the site so it is not visible from the street.

Board Member O'Neill requested more information regarding the proposed material for the lower part of the new building's western façade. Mr. Butterfield answered that the material would be a black toned brick veneer. He said the applicant has discussed ideas for a better design of the western façade of the new building, which can be presented at the Phase 2 hearing.

Board Member O'Neill pointed out that the common fence that is proposed along Edmonds Street would probably require that the holly tree be removed. Mr. Butterfield concurred. He explained that the fence on the adjoining northern property line would be six feet tall and constructed of cedar materials. The other fence will be more open and horizontal, using the same cedar materials.

Mr. Butterfield agreed to bring back revised designs for screening the proposed transformer, which will be located close to the dumpster. He recalled that the City has very specific requirements for dumpster screening, and they will use similar screening for the transformer.

Chair Gootee said he likes to be practical and avoid adding a lot of unnecessary cost to a project. However, he felt the existing building needs to be designed to better complement the proposed new building. Perhaps the applicant could add a band on the existing building that ties with the band along the parapets of the proposed new building. Instead of the "old school" stairs on the east side of the existing building, he suggested they could be boxed in. Board Member Borofka observed that adding the Hardie Reveal Panel product to the exterior of the existing building will make the stairs look even worse. He suggested the applicant consider opportunities for upgrading the stairs in such a way that would provide more modulation to the eastern elevation. He suggested the applicant also needs to work on the design of the existing building's southern façade.

Board Member Borofka asked if signs would be included as part of the overall design package. Mr. Butterfield answered that the sign permit application would be submitted separately. Ms. Machuga advised that sign applications are administrative decisions unless an applicant is requesting a modification to the sign code. Board Member Borofka suggested that perhaps the sign design could help complement and modulate the existing building. Chair Gootee suggested the applicant provide more information about signage at the Phase 2 hearing.

VICE CHAIR GUENTHER MOVED THAT THE BOARD CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING ON FILE NUMBER PLN20150036 TO NOVEMBER 4, 2015. BOARD MEMBER BROADWAY SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

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:

The Board inquired about the vacant Board position, and Ms. Machuga advised that it has been advertised, and staff is waiting for applications to be submitted.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 p.m.