



MEMORANDUM

Date: September 30, 2013
To: Edmonds City Council and Mayor Earling
From: Kernen Lien, Senior Planner
Subject: Point Edwards Building 10 Design Review
PLN20130022
Closed Record Appeal
APL20130005 – APL20130008

Introduction

One of the appeals submitted on the Architectural Design Board (ADB) approval and the written argument submitted by the Town of Woodway reference staff's proposed Condition No. 1¹ and the analysis in the staff report in support of the proposed condition². At the May 15, 2013 Architectural Design Board public hearing on the proposed Building 10, staff provided some clarification on the proposed Condition No. 1³. This memorandum reiterates staff clarification of the proposed Condition No. 1 provided at the May 15, 2013 Architectural Design Board public hearing.

Staff Proposed Condition No. 1

Section VI.3.L of the staff report notes that while, in staff's opinion, the proposed Building 10 complies with the zoning standards and a number of the design standards detailed in the Comprehensive Plan and Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC) 20.11, the

¹ Record at 0136

² Record at 0130 - 0132

³ May 15, 2013 Verbatim Transcript Page 4

proposed Building 10 is not consistent with the Point Edwards Master Plan or with a number of design standards and policies within the Comprehensive Plan⁴. In particular, staff did not feel the proposed building was adequately integrated into the hillside or in similar scale and character to the remainder of the Point Edwards Master Plan Development. Please refer to the record at pages 0130 – 0132 for a full analysis.

Staff concluded that if the eastern portion of the proposed Building 10 were stepped down to conform with site topography, as Building 10 was originally designed, the proposal would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Point Edwards Master Plan. Staff's simplistic way of achieving the step down was to propose the elimination one of the floors in the eastern portion of the building reducing the building to four stories while still maintaining the overall design (particularly the step back on the top floor and the modulated roof design). As staff noted at the May 15, 2013 Architectural Design Board public hearing⁵, if the same affect (appearance of a step down to conform with the site topography and reduction of mass and scale) could be achieved through other design techniques while still maintaining five stories, the proposed building may still be found in compliance with the design standards and Point Edwards Master Plan.

⁴ Record at 0130 - 0131.

⁵ May 15, 2013 Verbatim Transcript Page 4