

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

September 7, 2016

Vice Chair Guenther 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

Cary Guenther, Chair
Brian Borofka
Joe Herr
Lauri Strauss
Athene Tarrant

Board Members Absent

Lois Broadway
Tom Walker, Vice Chair

Staff Present

Michael Clugston, Senior Planner

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER BOROFKA MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JULY 6, 2016 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER STRAUSS 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.

MINOR PROJECTS:

No minor projects were scheduled on the agenda.

PUBLIC MEETING: MADRONA SCHOOL REPLACEMENT

Mr. Clugston explained that due to the location and scope of the project, general design review is required by the Architectural Design Board (ADB) using the requirements in Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC) 20.11. The Board's findings must be made relative to the design criteria in ECDC 20.11.030, the Urban Design Chapter of the Community Culture and Urban Design Element of the Comprehensive Plan and the zoning ordinance. Pursuant to ECDC 20.01, the design review is being consolidated with two Conditional Use Permits (CUP), which are required because the proposed replacement facility has a design capacity in excess of 60,000 square feet and several features of the site are proposed to be between 25 and 35 feet in height. Because only one public hearing is allowed per project, the ADB will review the project at a public meeting and then make a recommendation about the project's design to the Hearing Examiner. The Hearing Examiner will then hold the public hearing and issue a final decision on the project's design, as well as the CUPs. The Hearing Examiner's decision will be appealable to the City Council.

Stewart Mhyre, Executive Director for Business and Operations, Edmonds School District (ESD), thanked the voters in the City of Edmonds for overwhelmingly approving the February 2014 bond issue that not only funded the Madrona School Project, but other projects throughout the District, as well.

Taine Wilton, Project Manager, ESD, also introduced Ed Peters, Director of Capital Projects, ESD and Corrie Rosen and Joanne Wilcox, consultants from Mahlum Architects. She briefly reviewed where the project is in the process, noting that the intent is to obtain approval of the CUPs in October of 2016, site permits in November of 2016, and a building permit in January of 2017. Construction will start in the spring of 2017, with an 18-month construction window. Construction will happen while the students are occupying the site, and site work will extend past the start of school in September of 2018 to accommodate earth work, plantings, etc. that cannot be done until the new school has been constructed and the old school has been demolished.

Ms. Wilton provided a site map, noting that 236th Street SW to the north will serve as the main access road to the site, with additional pedestrian access from both the south and east side of the site. The intent is to retain as many trees as possible, and the proposed site plan is just about as green as the existing site. Ball fields will be installed where the existing buildings are located. To be sensitive to the existing neighborhood, the building will be located towards the south end of the site to mitigate noise and glare. The proposed one-story height will maintain the low residential feel of the original school. She provided a map and described how the project will move forward in phases.

Corrie Rosen, Mahlum Architects, walked the Board through a series of site-analysis slides that were used as a tool to figure out the most valuable place to build on the site. Although the site is 40 acres, developable land is limited. She specifically noted the property line, the 25-foot setback line, and the series of trails on the existing site. She pointed out the significant grade difference between the existing Madrona School and Woodway Elementary at the bottom of the slope.

Ms. Rosen advised that site access is very limited. The two existing points of access will be maintained, and no additional vehicular access will be provided. There are also three wetlands on the site. Wetlands A and C are located on the steep slope between the two schools, and Wetland B is on the east side of the school. As a Category 3 Wetland, Wetland B has a 60-foot buffer and a 15-foot building setback requirement. They have worked with staff to reduce the buffer to 45 feet through buffer averaging, but the 15-foot building setback will be maintained. She provided photos to illustrate existing development on the site, particularly noting the “island” on 236th Street SW that the community is very interested in maintaining.

Ms. Rosen described the problems with the current circulation and site flow, which is a significant community and school concern, and presented the proposed plan for vehicular and bus traffic, as well as bicycle and pedestrian traffic. She emphasized that the drop off and traffic flow will be separated from a large portion of the parking to minimize problems with stacking. As currently proposed, it will no longer be necessary to stagger start times for the various school programs, as the new bus loop will be able to accommodate buses more efficiently. A sidewalk will take pedestrians and bicyclists from 236th Street SW through the entry area and to the entry plaza and a clear front door.

Ms. Rosen advised that there are currently 117 striped parking spaces on the site, and it is incredibly challenging to move through the lots during pick up and drop off. The proposed plan will provide 119 parking spaces, with an additional 80 spaces in the bus and parent loops that could be used for event parking.

Joanne Wilcox, Mahlum Architects, explained that, as proposed, the pedestrian, bus and vehicular circulation will come to an entry plaza at the center point of the site. From there, there will be easy access to and an overview of the playground, as well as access to the fields. For after hour events, people who park can have easy access to the fields and playgrounds without having to go through or around to the back of the site, which is what

happens now. As proposed, the school will be located such that the large community gathering points will be oriented towards 236th, and then it moves into a series of quieter exterior and interior learning centers. The site is organized so that the school, itself, will have easy access to the playground, and the track is intended to stay in its current location. However, instead of housing a large athletic field, it will house a playground that allows for easy supervision. Moving the soccer field component to the front of the site will allow easier access for community members and draw families in after hours, as well.

Ms. Wilcox said it was important to the community that the school building is nestled against the wooded edge. The intent is to protect the wooded area, but also allow children to experience nature on a daily basis from both inside and outside of the building. The building's current location makes it hard for children to experience the wooded edge and engage the trail system that is there.

Ms. Wilcox commented that the program needs for Madrona School are different than many other schools, and four goals rose to the top:

- Addressing the whole child. They are very focused, not only on academics, but the social and emotional needs of kids as they grow up. The intent is to consider how the building can engage students in not only academics, but their surrounding environment. The goal is to give them independence and allow them to model or exhibit behaviors that foster both social and emotional growth.
- A beautiful natural school. It is very important that there are connections not only visually to the exterior environment, but a material pallet that fits well with the environment. The goal is that it be as warm and welcoming and connected to the exterior as possible. She shared drawings done by the students to illustrate their ideal learning environment, noting that most were exterior learning spaces. Almost 100% of the community embraced outdoor circulation.
- Appropriate acoustics. Because of the unusual teaching methodology, different acoustics are needed to support those types of learning. They would like appropriate acoustics to help the students understand whether it is palace to be loud or a place to be quiet. The acoustics should provide special division rather than dividing walls. This high priority on acoustics played a significant role when developing the entire site plan.
- 21st Century learning. This group has embraced the idea that education can look different, and they asked them to think about space in that same way. They conducted an extensive workshop format to really understand what that means within the building and site. Part of the idea of 21st Century learning is not just about technology, but the ability for students to engage in a variety of different learning environments, one being the exterior.

Ms. Wilcox reviewed the floor plan for the proposed school, noting that the front entry continues to the primary exterior learning environment within the school, itself. It was important for the community that there be a place both inside and outside to gather all 650 students for concerts and/or school events. These two spaces (gym and common areas) are connected. The gym, library and cafeteria will all have a direct connection to the common area, and covered walkways will provide access to all of the learning environments. The district's intent is to close off access to the more intimate learning spaces, but leave the remainder of the site open for the public to enjoy.

Ms. Wilcox advised that the design incorporates the idea of a sheltering canopy or treating the roof scape as it is a canopy over the entire environment of learning. The roof is articulated as a heavy plain under which the land (interior and exterior learning environments) can slip through a series of transparent spaces. Currently, the learning centers are isolated, and the learning community believes that students learn as much from the watching students in other centers as they can from the students in their own centers. The idea of transparency under the

roof canopy is important to the learning community, so the proposed design includes a high amount of glazing, which allows them to see from center to center, integrates each center to the outdoor learning spaces, and provides the most controlled daylight into the learning spaces. The public spaces will be highly transparent, as well, to provide connectivity between the interior and exterior spaces.

Ms. Wilcox explained that the roof canopy reaches around and becomes the overall massing of the building. The roof is articulated to slope, and because of the grade change, there will be a purposeful path leading to the front door and entry plaza. The low point of the roof will relate more to the student's scale. Gently sculpting the roof up as it moves to the back and then folding it back down to the edge will provide better water drainage both interior and exterior. A rain garden will be located under the center spine of the roof, which will provide a great opportunity to bring in sustainability and a direct connection to the environment. The roof is also sloped to provide access for solar to the west. The roof sloping allows them to mitigate the height of the gym by bringing a lower roof form in front of it and then folding the gym up out of the plain so it is less noticeable as a separate bulk on the site.

To emphasize the sheltering nature of the roof plane, Ms. Wilcox said they are proposing a color pallet that is on the darker side. The extent between the ground plain and roof plain will be lighter. The upper portion of the building will be a mid-tone, warm grey, and the lower portion will be a white colored brick. The fiberglass windows and cement panels will be in a similar color pallet. She provided an image showing the color pallet of the upper roof scape. Part of the gym as it looks out to the west will be a translucent panel, and the brick will be a creamy, light, natural tone, with a natural grout. The reflectivity of the glass will allow the green spaces to be part of the activity of the façade, as well as bring in a natural element. They are having discussions with the district about the idea of using weathering steel around some of the perimeters and integrating it into some of the elements of the building. For security purposes, there will be some fencing that separates the interior courtyard from the exterior, but it will be of a decorative nature (perforated or patterned material out of weathered steal) yet to be determined. The intent is for the fence to become part of the exterior façade. She summarized that the proposed five materials will be highly variegated as they move across the glass and glazing. In conclusion, she provided colored renderings of the front of the proposed new building, as well as the proposed view from the street.

Mr. Clugston reviewed that the site, itself is zoned Residential Single-Family (RS-8), and the proposal is to replace the existing school with a new facility. He referred to the zoning requirements for community facilities (ECDC 17.100), and advised that two CUP's will be required for the project. First, a CUP will be required for both the flag pole and gymnasium, which will both exceed the 25-foot height limit (ECDC 17.100.050.I.1). Second, a CUP will be required because the proposed floor area of 80,000 square feet is greater than the 60,000 square foot limit (ECDC 17.100.050.G.2). The district has already applied for these two CUPs.

Mr. Clugston advised that sidewalks are required for projects of this type, and the district will dedicate a 30-foot strip of land on the south side of 236th Street SW and sidewalks will be constructed to connect to the east down to Edmonds Way to connect with a City project that is currently under construction. Right now, there are no frontage improvements on 236th Street SW. Approximately 72 parking space are required for the project, and the applicant is proposing to retain the existing 119 spaces, as well as provide special event parking spaces as required by code.

Mr. Clugston referred to the general design review criteria (ECDC 20.11) and advised that the proposal meets all of the design standards relative to building design, color, massing, etc. The one thing that is not adequately addressed is the requirement that the loading and/or service area be screened. Staff has proposed a condition that the site on the northeast corner of the building needs to be screened.

As was pointed out by the applicant, Mr. Clugston said the site is already heavily treed, and the existing buffer around the exterior is impressive. A survey of the site identified 554 existing trees and recommended that just 32

of them be removed because of ill health. The district is proposing that all other existing trees be retained to maintain the buffer, which can be used to take the place of some of the otherwise required landscaping on the site. For example, ECDC 13 requires landscaping within the parking areas. However, in this case, the site is already so well treed that the Board could determine that the existing vegetation can make up for the other types of required landscaping. He said the Board is allowed to make this interpretation as appropriate.

Mr. Clugston said the code also requires automatic irrigation for newly landscaped areas that are approved by the ADB. He referred to staff's recommended condition that this requirement could be waived if the Board chose to do so. He explained that with the use of bioswales and other types of native plant species, automatic irrigation may not be necessary. He recommended that the Board leave this decision up to the applicant.

Board Member Borofka asked if there will be a walkway between the three buildings in the southwest corner and the other buildings on the site. Ms. Wilcox answered that no covered connection has been proposed along this gap, but there will be covered connections between the three buildings.

Board Member Borofka asked if construction and demolition hours will be limited. Mr. Clugston answered that the code places limits on the hours of construction and the noise level allowed. There are also performance standards related to noise, dust, glare, etc. These will be reviewed through the building permit.

Board Member Borofka asked if the vertical metal grading will have structural integrity from a security standpoint or if it is intended to be decorative. Ms. Wilcox answered that it was included in the plans as a placeholder, and they are working with the district to determine what the pattern can be from a security standpoint. It will be located within the security envelope to keep people both in and out of the facility, so the fence will be structurally sound.

Board Member Borofka asked the applicant to address the plans for lighting. Ms. Rosen responded that light poles will be located around the bus loop and parking areas, as well as the front entry and plaza, and there will be a slight variation in terms of the brightness of the fixtures. Board Member Borofka voiced concern that lights around the perimeter of the site, particularly on the south and east sides, could have a negative impact on adjacent residential properties. Ms. Rosen noted that the lights will be located quite far from the residential neighbors. While they will need to provide lighting at the egress locations, they do not anticipate that poles will be used. Ms. Wilton added that at other schools, the exterior lighting is on a program that is controlled. The lighting after hours will be put on a motion sensor. If there is motion the lights will turn on, but dim to 10% of the total light capacity when there is no motion. At 10 p.m. they will be turned off. That is likely how this site will be handled, as well.

Board Member Borofka asked if any materials from the existing school will be repurposed. Ms. Wilton answered that the plan is to salvage materials from the existing school to use on the Spruce Elementary School Project that will begin the following year. The glulam beams that are throughout the school are beautiful.

Board Member Tarrant commented that, without reading the floorplan, it appears that the natural entrance to the village of buildings is actually through the courtyard. While there is a plaza entrance, the traffic flow of people becomes restricted as they approach the actual front door of the building. He noted that the applicant is proposing to use decorative screening for security across the front of the courtyard, which means all of the people will come in and out of the front door. Ms. Wilcox explained that the intent is to open the gate in the morning when students are arriving so they can bypass the front door and proceed to their academic spaces. After school has started, the gate will be closed and visitors will be asked to enter through the front door. The gate will be opened again when the students are leaving for the day.

Board Member Tarrant voiced concern that the proposed layout of the counseling pods and restrooms could restrict the district's ability for flexibility. Mr. Mhyre explained that the design was very purposeful. Once all of

the students have arrived and class is in session, it is important to be very specific on where visitors must go to check in and identify their purpose for being at the school. This is the way schools are now being designed across the nation with specific entrance points for security purposes. Board Member Tarrant felt it would improve flexibility of the space if the gymnasium could be opened up to the courtyard during large functions. Ms. Rosen pointed out that there will be broad entrances directly out to the courtyard on each side. She noted that the strip of space along the gym is called the wellness center where occupation and physical therapy takes place. If the space is not being utilized for this purpose, the physical education classes can use it, as well. The space is also called the den and is intended to function as a student lounge for students who have a hard time with the cafeteria and recess experiences. The intent is that these students can slip into the den and still be part of the recess experience.

Board Member Strauss voiced concern that the trash will be located at the end of a long driveway. Ms. Rosen said the driveway is also intended as the fire lane access, and that is why the gate is not pushed further up. Board Member Strauss asked if there is adequate space for fire access to all sides of the school, and Ms. Rosen answered that they have been working with the Fire District to ensure there is adequate fire access.

Board Member Strauss questioned how the students will get to recess if the gates to the courtyard are closed during school hours. Ms. Wilcox said they have been working closely with the district to address this issue. The entry gates for student flow will face the parking lot so students can move directly in. There will be another series of access points out to the playground that come directly down from the courtyard and those doors will be open and accessible during recess. They are working with the district to understand whether the doors will be on car readers so that staff can open and close them during recess. They want to make sure the students can not only get to recess, but can get back out through the gates. She noted the location of the points of access for recess.

Board Member Strauss asked if the pods for the lower grades will be separated from the pods for the higher grades. Ms. Wilcox said it will vary depending on the administrators and the academic programs they want to bring in. There are several different center designs they are working with, and the intent is that the first four will be kindergarten and preschool. They will be supported by a natural learning area outside of that. There will be four primary and four intermediate centers, and the goal is to scatter them. Middle school will also be equally distributed. There will be separate DHH centers for preschool, primary and middle school students. Students from all age groups will mix in the courtyards. Ms. Rosen added that most of the rooms are designed to be flexible in their uses.

Board Member Strauss referred to the rendering provided by the applicant and commented that the front entrance is not well distinguished. She asked if this was done on purpose. Ms. Wilcox commented that the landscaping and sidewalk will lead people to the entrance, and they are working with the district to understand what their signing desires will be. There will be a continuous canopy along this edge to provide a place for people to gather. Their intent with bringing in the secondary material was to draw the eye back into the area, but she agreed to think about it a little more.

Board Member Herr questioned why the building occupies so much ground area. Most districts are building two and three-story buildings because of the cost factor. He thought the problem was related to the height limit, but the attic space, in cubic feet, will just about equal the cubic feet of the learning space. The skylight wells will be 10 feet deep. He questioned why they are spreading the design out so far rather than making it more compact in terms of cost savings, etc. Ms. Wilton agreed that is a fair question that the district considered, as well. However, based on the schools programming needs, they were desirous of having the ground floor of a one-story building. They also considered a two-story structure, but the idea of moving 50 students from a second story to a ground floor or outdoor study space will be difficult to do safely and expeditiously. The one-story design was needed for students to flow indoors and outdoors and use the space year round.

Edward Peters, Capital Projects Director, ESD, the project is being done under the general contractor/construction manager delivery method, and a cost analysis was done before the schematic design was started. Forma Construction, the contractor for the project, costed out both one and two-story designs and found that the current proposal came in at the same cost as a two-story building. While the proposed design has a larger roof area, it has less costly foundations

and there are fewer vertical circulation needs. He agreed to share the cost estimates upon request. He summarized that there is no cost premium for the building being single-story, and it will suit the program well.

Board Member Strauss asked if the applicant is going for LEED Certification. Ms. Wilton answered that they are actually doing Washington Sustainable Schools Protocol, which is similar to the intent of LEED and also required for State funding. Chair Guenther asked the applicant to go into more detail about the aspects of sustainability. The design team pointed out the following:

- The classrooms in the existing school are oriented east and west, which makes it difficult to control the lighting. The new classrooms will have a north and south orientation with an overhang to control the lighting.
- The skylights will help get daylight into the large spaces, which will reduce lighting costs.
- They will be using LED fixtures and heat recovery.
- They will use a displacement ventilation system to deliver the air slowly and down low, and they are planning on radiant floors in the learning center areas because so much of the work that is done with student is on the floor.
- Underground injection control wells will be used throughout the project. Because of the topography of the site, they are able to drill down and allow the stormwater to be filtered and cleaned and dropped right into the aquifers. There will be no runoff from the site.
- They are doing a high-performance envelope, which is meeting or exceeding the current code for 2030 guidelines. That means continuous exterior insulation, and they are currently looking at fiberglass windows, as well as some other aspects.
- They are using linoleum and interior rugs rather than carpet in many of the spaces for a cleaner interior surface.
- The cross ventilation in many of the centers will allow for cross cooling during the shoulder seasons.

Board Member Tarrant asked if the applicant anticipates any problems with glare given the proposed light colored panels adjacent to the large windows. Ms. Wilcox said this is something they will continue to work on. The elevation that faces south has an overhang that provides a good cover of shade in the hot, sunny areas. They are also looking at lower trees species and other opportunities for shading in those areas, as well. Ms. Rosen added that the landscape architect is looking at screening via landscaping.

Board Member Strauss asked if there will be a central mechanical room. Ms. Wilcox answered that there will be mechanical rooms distributed in each of the pavilions. There will also be mechanical space in a mezzanine above. All mechanical equipment will be contained within the building envelope, as per the district's standard.

Board Member Strauss asked if the school will be considered an emergency shelter, and Ms. Wilcox answered that while it will still need to meet the building code, it is not being designed as a shelter in place.

BOARD MEMBER STRAUSS MOVED THAT THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD ADOPT THE FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF THE STAFF REPORT; FIND THE PROPOSAL IS CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, POLICIES OF ECDC 20.10.000, DESIGN CRITERIA OF ECDC 20.11.030, AND ZONING REGULATIONS; AND RECOMMEND THAT THE HEARING EXAMINER APPROVE THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED MADRONA SCHOOL REPLACEMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. TREES MUST BE PROTECTED AND REMOVED IN ACCORDANCE WITH ECDC 18.45.050.H AND THE TREE PROTECTION AND MITIGATION GUIDELINES FOUND IN ATTACHMENT 12, AS AMENDED.**
- 2. DEVELOPMENT MUST OCCUR IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE WETLAND CODE IN ECDC 23.50. THE WETLAND REPORT (ATTACHMENT 9) MUST BE UPDATED TO ADDRESS HOW THE**

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT MEETS THE BUFFER AVERAGING/REDUCTION AND ENHANCEMENT REQUIREMENTS OF ECDC 23.50.040.

- 3. DEVELOPMENT MUST OCCUR IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GEOLOGICALLY HAZARDOUS AREAS CODE IN ECDC 23.80. THE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT (ATTACHMENT 10) MUST BE UPDATED TO ADDRESS SPECIFIC ELEMENTS OF THE PROPOED DEVELOPMENT RELATIVE TO THE STANDARDS IN SECTIONS 23.80.060 AND 23.80.070.**
- 4. SERVICE YARDS AND OTHER AREAS WHERE TRASH OR LITTER MAY ACCUMULATE MUST BE SCREENED WITH PLANTINGS OR FENCES OR WALLS, WHICH ARE COMPATIBLE WITH NATURAL MATERIAL.**
- 5. THE PROPOSED LANDSCAPING SHOWN ON SHEETS L-100 AND L-101 OF ATTACHMENT 5 MEETS THE INTENT OF CHAPTER 20.13 OF THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE. AUTOMATIC IRRIGATION SHOULD NOT BE REQUIRED.**
- 6. A 30-FOOT RIGHT-OF-WAY DEDICATION ALONG THE SOUTH SIDE OF 236TH STREET SW IS REQUIRED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY'S OFFICIAL STREET MAP.**
- 7. STAFF WILL VERIFY COMPLIANCE OF THE PROPOSAL WITH ALL RELEVANT CODES AND LAND USE PERMIT CONDITIONS THROUGH REVIEW OF BUILDING AND ENGINEERING PERMITS. MINOR CHANGES TO THE APPROVED DESIGN MAY BE APPROVED BY STAFF AT THE TIME OF BUILDING PERMIT WITHOUT FURTHER DESIGN REVIEW BY THE BOARD AS LONG AS THE DESIGN IS SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR TO THAT ORIGINALLY APPROVED.**

BOARD MEMBER BOROFKA SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CONSOLIDATED PERMIT APPLICATIONS (No Public Participation):

There were no consolidated permit applications.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

Mr. Clugston agreed to provide a schedule for upcoming short courses in public planning. In addition, staff will invite the City Attorney to attend a Board meeting and further explain the Board's role in the public planning process.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

Chair Guenther welcomed Board Member Tarrant to the Board.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.