

**CITY OF EDMONDS
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD**

**Public Hearing on Proposed Revisions to Point Edwards Building 10 and
Associated Landscaping
Site Location: 50 Pine Street
File Number PLN20130022**

Verbatim Transcript

May 15, 2013

Board Members Present

Bryan Gootee, Chair
Bruce O'Neill, Vice Chair
Lois Broadway
Cary Guenther
Rick Schaefer
Tom Walker

Board Members Absent

Michael Mestres (excused)

Staff Present

Kernen Lien, Senior Planner
Jeanie McConnell, Engineering Project Manager
Karin Noyes, Recorder

Chair Gootee: That brings us to our main project of Point Edwards, which is the 50 Pine Street at Point Edwards. It is the last wing of the Point Edwards. May I have the Staff Report, please.

Mr. Lien: I am Kernen Lien, Senior Planner with the City of Edmonds. I am going to give a bit of a history on how we got here tonight with the whole Point Edwards Development, along with Building 10. I will go over the current proposal on Building 10, the staff's recommendations in regards to the current proposal, and I'm also going to touch on some of the many public comments that have been received tonight in my presentation.

Mr. Lien: So the Point Edwards Development was originally approved underneath the Point Edwards Master Plan. There were to files in 2002. One was the text changes, which created the MP1 and the MP2 zones, and then there was a rezone that changed the site from commercial waterfront to these two MP zones. This is the master plan, when we talk about the Point Edwards Master Plan. Any development on the site is supposed to be consistent with this master plan as it came out in the zone for the site.

Mr. Lien: The original residential development for Point Edwards was approved underneath ADB File 2002-226. This file laid out the kind of overall layout of the development up there that came with the 10 residential buildings. Originally, there was one amenity center. Later there was another amenity center added. Underneath this original approval there were 295 units that were approved for development up there in Point Edwards. In 2005 . . . From 2002 until now it's come back to the ADB for a number of reasons: modifications to some of the buildings, adding the amenity center, some landscape modifications. In 2005, underneath ADB 2005-49, this was a revision to Building 5. At that time, the developers asked for an increase in the allowable number of units up there. It got bumped up to 350 allowed residential units at the Point Edwards Development underneath that ADB. At that time, the City of Edmonds adopted the original SEPA for the site, recognizing the increase in the number of units.

Mr. Lien: Building 10, itself, has also undergone a number of iterations. This is a profile view of Building 10 from the original approval. Building 10, itself, did not have an elevation view. They used Building 4 as kind of the typical building that would be built at Point Edwards. Underneath the original approval, the western building was set up higher and the eastern building was stepped down. Both of the buildings were four stories in height.

Mr. Lien: In 2006, the developer came back with a proposal to raise the eastern portion of the building. . . I'm going to dim the lights a bit. In 2006, there was a proposal to raise the eastern portion of Building 10. So this is what it looked like underneath the original plan, this was the western side, four stories, and it's stepped down to the eastern side. In 2006, they applied for and were approved raising the eastern side to line up with the western side. This design was approved in 2006. The number of units here, according to the building permit that came in after this approval, there were 69 units in the 2006 version of Building 10. I could never find a unit count for the original version of Building 10.

Mr. Lien: In 2012, the last time it went before the ADB on this, this was the proposal for Building 10. It was a redesign of the building over the rest of the buildings at Point Edwards. We had a public hearing on this on December 19th in 2012, and it was referred back to the applicant to make some changes. This version of Building 10 contained 89 units.

Mr. Lien: Now we are here today. This is the current version that is before the ADB for review tonight. This version of Building 10 responds to some of the comments from the December 19th meeting and this version of Building 10 holds 85 units. A few units were lost when they stepped back the top floor.

Mr. Lien: I wanted to touch on why we have a new application for Building 10 over December. When we were here in December, that was File Number PLN20120040. We held a public hearing on that. The ADB continued the public hearing for the applicant's to make some changes to Building 10. In between changes being made to the building there were some issues that arose, particularly in regards to SEPA. I touched on SEPA a little bit earlier. Originally, the City issued a Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance. This was associated with the original ADB approval underneath ADB 2002-246. In 2005, that original MDNS was adopted, and that was for the increase in the number of units when the Point Edwards Development was approved for 350 units. At the last ADB meeting, I had indicated that this SEPA would cover the current version of Building 10, the 2012 version of Building 10. After that meeting, it was pointed out that one of the conditions in the original MDNS contained \$22,000 for traffic signalization at Pine Street/SR-104. The signalization at that intersection was tied to the Edmonds Crossing Project, the ferry terminal that was going at that site. The \$22,000 was Point Edwards' fair share of it. With the ferry crossing project basically going away or into the very distant future, the need for signalization at that intersection no longer existed. So we have this very specific condition in the MDNS that no longer needed to be met, but was being applied to Building 10. The City determined that SEPA needed to be redone for Building 10.

Mr. Lien: With SEPA needing to be reissued, it raised several potential procedural concerns. Without going into great detail about that, we could have ended up with holding two open record public hearings, which is a no no in land use. To avoid the procedural issues that were raised, the applicant's withdrew their application (PLN20120040) and submitted a new application that basically reset the process on this. So while, technically, we are looking at a new application before the ADB tonight, the applicant's have responded to the comments from the ADB at the December 19th meeting.

Mr. Lien: Underneath the SEPA review, there was an updated traffic impact analysis that was done on Building 10. Traffic was one of the concerns that was raised last time and whether or not there was a traffic analysis that was done when it went from 295 units up to 350 units. It turned out that there hadn't been an analysis done at that time. So with the new SEPA review, there was a new traffic impact analysis that was done for SEPA. The City issued a Determination of Non-Significance on April 12th of this year, and that kind of brings us up to where we are tonight.

Mr. Lien: At the December 19th meeting, the ADB made four recommendations to the applicants. One, the design of Building 10 should be more consistent with other development approved and constructed at Point Edwards and with the Point Edwards Master Plan. Two, additional landscaping should be provided along the rockery or in the parking lot

along the south side of the surface parking. Three, the applicant should take into consideration the following design elements present in the existing Point Edwards Buildings: residential fenestrations, broad overhangs, more human scale, distinct floor-to-floor heights, and Pacific Northwest elements and materials. The final recommendation was that the applicant must submit samples of the proposed materials that are being used.

Mr. Lien: So this is what the applicant came up with in response to the December 19th meeting. In staff's position, it's a vast improvement over what was originally proposed. One of the main concerns last time was how Building 10 fit in with the rest of the Point Edwards Development, particularly in regards to design standards. I'm not going to go into detail about how the architects responded to those conditions. I'll leave it up to Joe to touch on those, but generally, staff feels this building is much better tied in with the rest of the Point Edwards Development as far as overall design, colors, materials, and look. It doesn't look exactly like the rest of them, but it's tied in much better with the overall Point Edwards Development.

Mr. Lien: One question of consideration for the ADB tonight is the modulated roof design. So the base height limit in the MP1 Zone is 35 feet, and buildings can achieve an additional five feet in height if they have a modulated roof design. The code language references ECDC 20.10 for modulated roof design. There's no mention of a modulated roof design in 20.10. The Comprehensive Plan does have a little section on modulated roof design. So design objectives for roof modulation: to break up the overall massing of the roof, creates human scale in the building, use roof forms to identify different programs or functional areas within the building, and provide ways for additional light to enter into the building. That is basically the extent of our guidance of what a modulated roof design is. They have added the peaks to the roof, that comes up. And there's some fluctuation to the building that adds some modulation to it. So if the ADB finds that this is a modulated roof design, the height calculations that have been submitted with this application meet the 40-foot height limit with that additional bonus. There's a longer discussion in my Staff Report on how height calculations were done for this, and I won't go into detail on that unless you guys want me to.

Mr. Lien: Another condition was with regards to landscaping, particularly in regards to the surface parking area. Staff's concern was how this was screened. This was a big change over the 2006 and the earlier approval on that. The original surface parking area had like 25 parking spaces out there, and currently there is 77 or 74 surface parking stalls out here. So it was a large increase in the surface parking area. There's a rockery that exists along the southern boundary here, which makes it difficult to screen the parking area, particularly from the house to the south here. One of the recommendations from the ADB was to include some trellises within the parking area, and the applicants have added trellises within the parking area. The thinking is that as you are looking down on top of the parking lot, that helps buffer that.

Mr. Lien: The Town of Woodway submitted some comments on this, with the recommended condition that a trellis be installed along the top of the rockery. At the last ADB meeting, a similar suggestion came up and I had indicated that a trellis would be a structure and would have to meet setbacks. We talked this over with the other planners, and the condition that I recommended for approval on this, that a trellis no taller than six feet be installed along the rockery or the applicant work with the neighboring property owner to come up with some landscaping there. The change in thinking of that was that we are basically treating the trellis kind of like a fence because it is helping to screen the property. Fences up to six feet in height do not have to meet the setback requirement and that's why the change in the condition for the trellis there. So that was one recommended condition that we added.

Mr. Lien: A lot of the comments that were received had to do with on-street parking. As I mentioned before, the original overall layout of Point Edwards was done in 2002, and that's when all the on-street parking and all that was looked at. As part of this proposal, originally there was a driveway cut that came into underground parking here one of the other versions of Building 10. That driveway cut is being removed with part of this proposal, so there will be access to underground parking up over here, and then the surface parking lot over here. Some street improvements were going to need to be done to eliminate this driveway, so staff has recommended that, as part of the street improvements, this on-street parking area that is just east of the driveway be extended up to provide possibly three additional on-street parking areas there.

Mr. Lien: Staff has also recommended that the eastern portion of the proposed Building 10 be stepped down to four stories. I'm going to elaborate on my thinking behind that and would be willing to change that condition a little bit. Within the Staff Report I highlight a number of policies that I felt backed up that condition, and touching on a few of them here. From the Point Edwards Master Plan, in the upper yard governed by the proposed MP1 zoning, the residential buildings will be designed to fit into the terraced hilltop and hillside. From the Comprehensive Plan Design Objectives, integrate buildings into the site by stepping the mass of the building along steep, sloping sites. Also from the Design Objectives, retain a connection with the scale and character of the City of Edmonds through the use of similar materials, proportions, forms, masses or building elements. And there are also design objectives for massing, encourage human scale elements in building design, reduce the bulk and mass of buildings, and masses may be subdivided vertically or horizontally. There's a number of policies in my Staff Report that kind of talk to the same thing.

Mr. Lien: So with these policies, my simplistic way of addressing those was to lop out one of the floors in the eastern portion of the building. The condition also says . . . I will just read what the condition says. So the proposed condition was that the eastern portion of Building 10 shall be stepped down to four stories in order to conform to the Point Edwards Master Plan and the City of Edmonds Design Standards. The overall design of the building shall remain substantially the same, with the top floor stepped back and the modulated roof design retained as depicted in Attachment 3. So this is an image from Attachment 3. My thought was that by eliminating a floor from down here, or this level, and just stepping it down to four stories over there but keeping the overall design standards would address those design policies from the master plan and from the Comprehensive Plan in there and would bring the building kind of more back to what was originally proposed in 2002, how the building flows with the hillside a little better.

Mr. Lien: With that said, if the same affect can be achieved through other design techniques while still maintaining five stories, staff would be supportive of that. So the condition is not limited to its got to be four stories over there. The main gist of that condition, and the thinking behind that condition, was that the eastern portion of the building would be stepped down a little bit to flow with the hillside and reduce the mass of the building a little bit and kind of be more consistent with the rest of the Point Edwards Development.

Mr. Lien: I'm going to touch on a few of the public comments that were received. As of the time I was writing the Staff Report, there had been 57 comment letters received, and those were included in the Staff Report. I have provided the ADB with comment letters that have been received since the Staff Report was issued up to about 6:30 tonight I received the last comment, and that is included in the letters I gave to you.

Mr. Lien: A number of recurring topics came up on these, so I'm going to address them in a little bit. One was the number of parking spaces being provided up there. There was a concern that there might not be enough and then the development is going to overwhelm the on-street parking. The Staff Report notes that the proposed development complies with the City's parking standards. And some of the purposes of the City's parking standards are to reduce street congestion and overcrowding of on-street parking and to protect adjacent property from the impact of use with inadequate off-street parking. By meeting the City's parking standards, given the purpose, the thought is that does not impact the on-street parking.

Mr. Lien: Some of the other comments with regard to parking had to do with putting more of the parking underground. I did electronic searches of our code and the Comprehensive Plan, looking for references to underground parking. The only references that come to undergrounding have to do with utility lines and what not. There was no code, no policy statement nor anything that had to do with requiring parking to go underground. The development complies with the City's parking standards.

Mr. Lien: Another concern that was raised was in regards to the number and the size of the units that are being proposed in Building 10. I've talked a little bit about the number of units that were allowed in Point Edwards. So they've been approved up to 350 units. To date, 261 units have been built. So with the additional 85, we're at 346 units. So we are still within the number of units that have been allowed up there.

Mr. Lien: One of the concerns with the smaller units in there is that this building would be more of an apartment building as opposed to a condominium like the other buildings up at Point Edwards. Apartment buildings and condominiums are both considered multi-family development. Multi-family development is a permitted, primary use in the MP1 zone, so even if it is an apartment building, that still complies with the zoning standards. It's a multi-family development.

Mr. Lien: There was also with regards to the number and size, some comment letters that referenced a 1,500 square foot unit size for the apartments and the proposed condos. This number came from the master plan. But when you read the context of this 1,500 average size of apartments up there, that discussion was within the MP2 zone discussion, which is the lower yard area. They were looking at how many units might be worked in with the commercial development in the lower yard. In the upper yard, the number of units was determined by permitted density of 2,400 square feet per dwelling unit. The whole upper yard area was just over 24 acres, so 24 acres divided by 2,400 square feet gives a potential density of 419 units. All that was spelled out in the master plan. So they have been approved for 350, which is underneath the 419 that was envisioned in the master plan, so it is still within the overall density up there.

Mr. Lien: I touched on traffic impacts a little bit already. There was an updated traffic impact analysis that was done with SEPA. The traffic impact analysis basically found no significant increase in traffic. All the intersections in the area would still meet the City's adopted level of service. With the Building 10 building permit, they will be assessed traffic impact fees according to the City's traffic impact fee ordinance.

Mr. Lien: That's the extent of my Staff Report. If there's any questions before you want to hear from the applicant.

Chair Gootee: Yes, that brings us to questions of the Board. Do you guys have any questions.

Board Member Broadway: I have one question. If the eastern portion were reduced to four floors, has there been a calculation of how many housing units that would decrease.

Mr. Lien: I think the applicant's will probably be addressing that. They've looked at ways to do that and are having trouble meeting that condition. I'm sure they may address that.

Board Member O'Neill: Can you define what the eastern portion is?

Mr. Lien: This is Pine Street here, and this is the Town of Woodway down here. There's a break in the building here. This is the western portion, this is the eastern portion.

Board Member O'Neill: Show that on elevation.

Mr. Lien: This is the western ring of it. Up there looking down from the top, there's a little bend in the building right there. This is the eastern portion of that, and there's the bend in the building right there.

Board Member Schaefer: Kernen, the total number of parking stalls for Point Edwards would be brought to what, again?

Mr. Lien: For . . . Let me get my Staff Report here. Where did my Staff Report go? There it is. So I don't know for the total Point Edwards for development, but for Building 10. Building 10 was required to have, per the City's parking standards, 136 parking spaces. They've provided 144.

Board Member Schaefer: I'm going up . . . Throwing that on top of what's there to date. I'm looking at . . . What I'm getting towards is sort of the ratio of underground parking as opposed to surface parking.

Mr. Lien: All the other buildings have their parking underground and Building 10 had a surface parking lot. Building 10 was originally approved with a surface parking lot, although not of the size that we're looking at tonight.

Board Member Schaefer: I was just trying to compare that to the ratios that were in the Design Guidelines.

Mr. Lien: Right, so the same ratios that were in the Staff Report as far as the number of parking spaces required, those same ratios applied to all the other buildings. When the building permits were reviewed, it was confirmed that they met the parking standards. I didn't go back and see how many total parking stalls were required. But the same ratio in the Staff Report would apply to each individual building.

Board Member Schaefer: I was just looking at the split between . . . There was some surface parking provided for in the Design Guidelines. Somewhere in the order of about 10%. I think we're probably still below that in terms of an overall . . .

Mr. Lien: Overall. As I said, I don't know the total parking spaces provided.

Board Member Schaefer: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Gootee: So let me get this clear. On the east, its height compliant or within code as five stories.

Mr. Lien: Yes.

Chair Gootee: Staff is suggesting to four stories or modulation?

Mr. Lien: My recommendation was four stories, but that recommendation could be altered. The gist of it was to get a step down in the eastern portion of that building so it flows better with the hillside, so the mass of the building was not up so high. If that can be achieved by other design standards and still have five stories, staff would be supportive of that.

Chair Gootee: Thank you. More questions of the Board? Alright. That brings us to the applicant. Do you want to come forward? Please state your name, relationship to the applicant if not the applicant. And your address please.

Mr. Gifford: Well, good evening. My name is Rick Gifford. My business address is 23901 Edmonds Way in Edmonds, and my residence address is 9309 – 192nd Place Southwest in Edmonds. I represent the property owner, Edmonds Pine Street LLC. I have advised the developers of the Point Edwards project from inception, now more than a decade ago. My client, John Goodman, the Principal in Edmonds Pine Street, is here tonight. I'd also like to introduce the project architects, Joe Kolmer and Myer Harrell, on my left here, with Weber Thompson. Forrest Jammer, who is a landscape architect with Tom Rengstorf. TLA and Weber Thompson have been involved with the project from inception, also. We also have with us Tom Rickman, Rick Tompkins. I'm allowed, I'm 59. Rick Tompkins is an engineer with Triad Associates. They've been civil engineers on the project also from the beginning. Normally, we wouldn't bring a civil engineer to the project, or to the hearing, but a number of questions have been raised that bear on that, and Rick is going to speak briefly and be available to answer particular questions if the Board has some or if members of the audience have questions.

Mr. Gifford: Before we move into the substantive presentation, which is going to be primarily handled by Joe Kolmer of Weber Thompson, I want to supply some additional, relevant background and context as a framework for your consideration tonight. I'd also like to reserve, if I can, if it's necessary for me to specify, up to 15 minutes for rebuttal at the conclusion of the public testimony portion of the hearing this evening.

Mr. Gifford: Kern correctly noted that the history of Building 10 is a long one. It's as long as the history of Point Edwards, now exceeding 10 years. The structure, the plan for this site, has generically been labeled Building 10 from the beginning. The pads were all numbered, and for ease of reference we'll also refer to it as Building 10, sometimes by

the address, 50 Pine Street, at the top of the project. Nine multi-family buildings have already been erected in Point Edwards, plus two amenity buildings for use by residents, one of which was required. A second was volunteered by the developer to provide additional amenity facilities for the Point Edwards residents. As an aside, the applicant notified the Point Edwards Homeowners Association late last year that this new building, Building 10, will not be part of that association. This was principally in response to concerns expressed by the association board and by some Point Edwards residents that access by the new residents of Building 10 to the amenities would overtax them. So to eliminate that concern, we decided it would be appropriate to simply not have Building 10 be part of the homeowners association and its residents, therefore, won't have access to the amenity facilities.

Mr. Gifford: The history of Building 10 goes all the way back, as I said, to 2002-2003 when the Point Edwards Master Plan Development was conceived. This is the second public hearing on this particular iteration of the building in the last five months. We were here in mid December before the Board. It's the fourth time overall that the Board has been involved in a public design review process affecting development at 50 Pine Street, the Building 10 site. Building 10 was part of the initial 2003 development review for Point Edwards. A skeletal concept of the building was shown at that time. As Kernan mentioned, most of the images of perspective buildings in the project were of Building 4. One was simply picked. It was shown as a typical building. There was one elevation, which . . . Oh, Myers is ahead of me. Great. This shows the original site plan presented in 2003, conceptually Building 10 inside the Pine Street loop at the top of the hill. A large elbow building with surface parking behind, essentially the same building footprint that we're now talking about today, though the current footprint is considerably smaller and the overall mass of the building is 25% lower than previously approved.

Mr. Gifford: As you can see, the design packet was considerably less sophisticated than today's materials, but it also was more of kind of a broad overview of Point Edwards since site-specific designs were not being presented at that time. There were also . . . If you want to move onto the next screen. These rough cross sections of the building, Kernan had a couple of them up earlier, just cuts through the building. We're looking east/west through the building, with Pine Street below the building down slope. The original general concept of the building was four and four—four floors on the west wing, four floors on the east wing, with the east wing stepping down a little bit as generally conceived.

Mr. Gifford: All of these images . . . You can move on to the next one, too. Again, another cross section showing the buildings stepping down the hill. You don't have to take my word for it; but at the time this project was being discussed, most of the conversation about towing the buildings into the slopes, stepping the buildings, referred to stepping them down the hill as they necessarily do, tying them back into the slope, thereby keeping the buildings at or below code height limits and anchoring them more solidly into the building, as well. That's what we see working up and down the slope, that stepping kind of concept or towing of the buildings into the hill.

Mr. Gifford: As I said, the current proposal quite closely resembles that original Building 10 concept in structural form, in layout, and in scale. But the new building has a smaller footprint, less mass overall, and it is towed (stepped) into the hillside as I mentioned. There are two visible floors on the Woodway. There are in the west wing, four visible floors; in the east wing, five visible floors on the down-sloped side. You have to turn and look up from the project to see that face. Looking down through the project, lines of sight are preserved. Those were some of the kind of premiere view considerations at the time, retaining views over the buildings in the forefront and view corridors through the buildings as they were placed across the site.

Mr. Gifford: As Kernan also mentioned, the original approval was for 295 multi-family living units for the entire project, although the MP1 zoning would have allowed 419 units on the site, 44.5 acres in total. That maximum unit count was later increased to 350 units by the Board's action in 2005, still below the 419 code limit. In 2006, the Point Edwards developer submitted the first particular or specific design proposal for a building at 50 Pine Street. It initially did mirror the 2003 concept, two four-story wings, different roof elevations for those two wings. But a design change was then proposed, a stand-alone design change, requesting a level roof with the eastern and western wings at the same elevation, which was allowed under the City's codes and development standards and was not prohibited by the master plan or approved design guidelines and planning policies. That redesigned building, with five residential stories in the

east wing, four stories in the west wing, contained 69 units. Among other things, site context views were presented to staff and the ADB, (You can go to those now Myer) clearly showing the differences between the original stepped roof and the proposed level roof. The entire point of that redesign and public review to the ADB was to adjust the roof design. They are a little hard to see. Somebody help me out here a little bit. Maybe you can, Joe, but I believe the large building in the foreground of the sketched form of Building 10 is Building 8 in the center of the project. Do you think that . . . It's either Building 4 or Building 8. I was just trying to give people some perspective if you know anybody in the audience. But the project at this point was under construction. Building 6 and 7 allowed wrapping around up toward Woodway. Not yet constructed Building 9 . . .

Someone in the audience: You are talking about Building 65.

Mr. Gifford: That's the address. I don't know if that's 8.

Someone in the audience: Building 8.

Mr. Gifford: Building 8, yah, okay. I thought it was 8. But the point of our drawings was to show on the left the original plan, which has the east wing of Building 10 moderately stepped down and then on the right hand side, the proposed redesign, raising the level of that east wing one floor or approximately one floor, producing the building on the right. Can you go to the next one Myer? It's essentially, oh . . . Gesturing isn't effective, is it? So, there you go, wow. That's the redesigned 2006 building that was approved by the ADB. Try the next slide. I think it's just a different perspective. Again, context view from above. You see the first house towards the ridge, is it Doctor Inadomi? Behind that the Whiting residence, and I'm not sure who owns the third home. But again, showing the proposed Building 10 in the foreground on the left, the original plan, somewhat stepped on the right, the proposal that was approved with a level roof, five stories on the east wing, four stories on the west wing. And then the final slide, the concept depiction. This is just a view of the north elevation as approved. It's the bottom half of the image that Kernan showed earlier. He showed the comparison, the before and after. This is the after. This is what was applied for and approved by the ADB in 2006.

Mr. Gifford: After the formal design review, the ADB entered the finding that the revised building design, as presented, was "consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other adopted City policies" and approved the change from a stepped roof, with four stories in each wing to a level-roofed Building 10 consisting of five floors in the east, four floors in the west wing. If you want a specific reference to the Board's finding and decision, I refer you to Attachment 6 in Kernan's Staff Report. And then again, just briefly, on the north elevation, again, we're looking at a building that was 25% larger in overall bulk than the building that we're proposing, slightly higher, not substantially higher, but a little bit, with a 25% larger building footprint. Overall a considerably larger and more massive building.

Mr. Gifford: Also, the developer at that time, who secured approval for the redesign in 2006 did apply for a building permit and was granted a building permit for the revised design by the City in 2008. But that building permit expired. That brings us forward now to 2012, the second site-specific design proposal for this building. It was actually presented to the City a year ago. Applicants are encouraged to go through pre-application design review, which we gladly did. The architects prepared thorough going materials (floor plans, site plans, everything required under the City's pre-application process) and submitted those materials initially a year ago in May of 2012. Again, basing the overall design, the skeleton of the building, that sort of hinged look along Pine, on the original design as modified by the 2006 ADB approval.

Mr. Gifford: The first iteration of the building that came from Joe's team (Joe and Myer) in 2012 was different in appearance from the building that we're presenting tonight. It was cleaner. It was somewhat less modulated, and the Board commented on that. We talked quite a bit about that last time. It was visually different. But again, it was hung on the same framework, the same structure, the same layout, the same skeleton as this Board approved in 2006. Like its 2006 predecessor, it included a level roof, a five-story east wing, a four-story west wing. The governing MP1 zoning standards, the relevant Comprehensive Plan provisions, including the UDG's, are all unchanged as they apply to this proposal from 2006 when it was approved to now.

Mr. Gifford: In addition to the materials required to be supplied by the applicant under the City's own guidelines, and by the way, the City charges applicants for pre-app design review. In addition to the required materials in the City's publication Number B58, and you can actually pull that up, I think that's coming next. Let's step back for a minute. I don't know if anybody can read that. That is an excerpt from Kernen's review report, actually from the September 13, 2012 pre-app meeting. We had two of them. We came with a full design package, supplemented with additional material to very clearly and comprehensively show the appearance of the building in all respects in May. And then we went through meetings with the City. We went back and did redesign, refined the design a little bit, but really it remained largely the same throughout the six/seven month pre-app process. We returned to the staff in an all-hands pre-app meeting in September and presented additional, moderately refined materials showing the building again to the staff.

Mr. Gifford: These were the comments relating to design that came out of that second pre-app meeting, under design review . . . I'm actually going to read from my paper version. It's a little easier to see. There are some significant differences which would require the proposal to be reviewed by the ADB again. Particularly, the number of parking spaces in the exterior lot increased from 26 to 76 spaces and the proposal includes a water feature/patio area that was not included in the original proposal. A condition of approval from ADB 2006-97, that's the original 2003 approval and was adopted in the 2006 approval, staff shall confirm the landscape plan has not significantly changed from the current proposal or it must return to the Board for final approval. The addition of a water feature in an area previously identified for landscaping and the substantial increase in the number of parking stalls in the exterior lot required that this proposal be returned to ADB for further review.

Mr. Gifford: So the only comment that was made by staff after the initial four months of review, two design reviews, a modified iteration in response to staff comments was you've got some changes in landscaping, we do. We deem them significant changes, and a specific condition of the Board's 2003 approval was if there are such changes then staff needs to bring this back for us to review them. Us being the ADB. And that's what staff had to say in September of 2012 about our design revision, which at that time, we assumed was going to be the design we presented to the Board with the support of staff.

Mr. Gifford: Now to the pre-app process, Number B58, if you can grab it Myer. That process is outlined in the handout that I mentioned, Number B58, with which I assume many of you are familiar. The purpose is to extract necessary information from applicants, on the one hand, and then inform them of significant substantive and procedural issues early in the process. I underscore "early in the process" when they mean something. I have yellow highlighted here the key language. The idea is timely disclosure of major items, to help applicants navigate the City's permit and approval maze. The goal of the meeting is to identify major issues and process and procedures applicable to the project, which are helpful for an applicant to determine feasibility, design issues, timing and various processes required for a project. The whole point of the drill is to avoid bad surprises. You know, to give people advance notice, and it works both ways. The City demands notification of the contours of development and they got it from us in spades. And then the City's responsibility, staff's responsibility, is to talk with us informatively about any issues of concern and problems that they see in the proposal. In this case, the case had ample opportunity to do that, two full all-hands meetings. And what came out of those meetings was expressed concern about the two landscape features that I mentioned. We've got an increase in surface parking, and staff wanted some additional landscape screening. We've worked them to do that. There was a water feature/patio feature, and staff wanted the Board to look at that. There really was no discussion of that. It's a nice amenity. I think that issue has been. . . We've passed over that.

Mr. Gifford: Although staff provided very little comment on design, and I'll say, too, that I got involved in the process when we were encountering questions, issues and uncertainty about how the heck we were going to do this. Namely, who was going to do it? Would it be staff? Would it be staff working in conjunction with ADB? Would it be ADB in a public meeting? Would it be ADB at a public hearing? And we kind of went back and forth, back and forth, back and forth. And I was asked to come in and referee. We finally determined, yah, we need a public hearing. And that's what got us in front of you the first time. It would be an ADB decision, with input from staff, but made in the public hearing context.

Mr. Gifford: While we got very, very little comment and virtually no help on design in the pre-app discussions, those discussions did allow us to confirm that the correct number of total units was 350. Originally staff still thought it was 295, and we had to deal with that in the May meeting. I say we, the architects. The pre-app process also served to identify the two landscaping changes that I mentioned. They were identified. We were aware of them, but they were highlighted. They were specifically mentioned. We appreciated that. Staff also verified, though incorrectly, that the City could and would rely on its SEPA analysis from 2002/2003. As Kern mentioned, there was an initial MDNS for the project as a whole. Staff relied on that in subsequent approvals, including the 2005 increase in density to 350 units and told us it would be able to do so again. So we went forward on that basis. There were further discussions, and we got things straightened out. We filed the formal application in early November of 2012.

Mr. Gifford: We knew that this was a project of great concern. You can see there's a room full of concerned Point Edwards residents. That's good because they like their town, their city. They love their project, and they're understandably concerned about it and want to follow it and see what's going on. There were a lot of comment letters received for the first hearing, probably not as many as tonight. The citizens weren't as organized then as they are now. But there was a lot of comment, a lot of concern, a lot of issues were raised. They were understandable, but a lot of them did have to do with issues ruled not germane to this process, to design review. They were building permit related issues, concerns about unit count, about unit size, apartments versus condos, parking and traffic matters. Things that either have already been resolved in project approvals or will be fully addressed at the building permit stage. Storm drainage, for example.

Mr. Gifford: And by way of reminder, this new building came back to the ADB last December under two express conditions of the original approval. The one I've already mentioned and I've got those two here. I've got . . . Try going to the next one. Well, I can summarize them. The first condition was with regards to significant changes in landscaping. Staff identified a couple and said we would have to take those up with the ADB. And then, in the Staff Report, Mr. Lien identified a second condition, which provided that the materials and colors used must be consistent with the design of the development or they have to come back for ADB review. So we're talking landscaping and we're talking colors and materials. Those were the conditions that were cited by staff in the Staff Report, and again tonight on Page 1 of the December 13th Staff Report and on Page 1 of the May 19, 2013 Staff Report.

Mr. Gifford: I don't know what the general rule is, but in each case, we didn't see a Staff Report until six days prior to the hearing, with a weekend in between. And as I'll outline, in each case there were substantial shifts and additional items raised for the very first time in these staff reports. They had never been raised with us. They had never been flagged in the pre-app process. They had not even been implied. And we saw them for the very first time six days before the hearing last time, and unfortunately, it happened again tonight. That's something, regardless of the outcome of this hearing, that needs to be addressed. Again, I go back to the pre-app process, which is designed to help applicants identify and address significant issues in a timely way at the outset, not at the 11th hour and 59th minute. That defeats the purpose, runs it backwards.

Mr. Gifford: But as I stated on the record in December, and I'll reiterate it tonight, we assert that, technically, the scope of this Board's review, its authority, is defined by and is limited to those two conditions. That's the framework—significant changes in landscaping and changes in color and materials. With all due respect, we submit that these targeted conditions just don't allow the City and this Board to reopen and flyspeck every aspect of the project. From our perspective, that's what it seems like. Multiple bites of the apple, new issues popping up all the time, intrusive and unduly burdensome requirements.

Mr. Gifford: Staff . . . I think staff would even acknowledge that it went far afield, far beyond these conditions. The applicant didn't object. Well, privately we did. We reserved our rights, we reserve them tonight. But the thinking was that so long as the additional matters were sensible, enhanced the design, weren't overreaching, didn't demand excessive things from the project or the applicant, were fairly presented, we would work them. We've always worked with the City. This has been a collaborative effort from day one. It remains so. We don't have any intentions of changing that,

and some of the things we've done, the extent to which we've gone in the redesign of the building in response to comments that go far, far beyond the expressed conditions that brought this matter forward, that reflects our commitment to work with the City now and in the future. That remains the applicant's position, and that's reasonable accommodation in an effort to reach an acceptable design for Building 10, to finally complete the build out of the Point Edwards project, arguably the most important project in the history of the City of Edmonds, certainly the biggest.

Mr. Gifford: It was in this spirit that the applicant received the Board's several comments at the end of December. Some of them related to the conditions, many of them didn't. We didn't argue. We didn't complain. We received those comments and then went to work to redesign the building in response to your comments. That's what we did. Again, after long scrutiny by staff in a design process that ran seven months, without any substantive comments beyond the two noted regarding particular landscape items, then came the December 13th Staff Report, full of surprises. All kinds of comments. All kinds of criticisms. A formal conclusion that recommended denial and that the Board have the applicant redesign the project. After six months of nothing. Mr. Lien for the first time identified several design questions and criticisms not brought to the architect or applicant's attention in a timely fashion during the pre-app review. After flagging just those two landscape matters for review, after acknowledging that the building colors appeared acceptable, Mr. Lien then recommended that the Board require changes, a lot of them, to make the design more consistent with the surrounding project in a number of different aspects. Notably, he didn't say a thin about stepping the building down. Not a thing, ever. Well, until six days ago.

Mr. Gifford: As I said, in addition to Mr. Lien's remarks and the applications presentation, there was a lot of public comment. Understandable. And then the Board opened things up, asked questions, and we engaged in a dialogue. We had a good exchange, and we finally received what we considered the first constructive guidance that we received from anybody at the City with respect to the design. That's why we didn't complain. The things you said made sense. We might not have agreed with all of them. Architecture and design is a subjective field. You guys know that. But they were good ideas. They made sense. They reflected fairness, and we didn't complain. Instead, the architects got busy to redesign the building in accordance with the specific guidance that you provided. Again, nobody said anything at all about stepping the building down. In fact, I think it was at that time Vice Chair O'Neill who said, "issues relating to the scale of the building are outside the scope of the Board's authority." We're not talking about building scale. We're not talking about mass. We're talking about design. At the tail end of the open hearing, just before the Board issued its comments, Mr. Lien again reiterated that the building met all of the height standards of the MP1 zone and was in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan with regard to height. Now there was a great opportunity. If you want to talk about lowering the building, stepping the building and possibly pulling off a floor, you might mention it then. But it never came up. Not even remotely.

Mr. Gifford: I'll be honest with you. We didn't anticipate this at all because we were working from an approved design plan by this Board in 2006 that specifically looked at that issue and passed on it. And the City then passed on it and issued a building permit. So it certainly wasn't on our radar screen at all. We were fully reliant on staff, if there was a concern like that, to address it with us, and to do so with reasonable timeliness.

Mr. Gifford: Skip ahead to what we're presenting tonight. Well, just briefly, this has been a challenging process. It's been made infinitely more difficult by all kinds of procedural gyrations, and Kernen's talked about a few of them. We were told that the City would rely on the SEPA review from 2003, and then there were newly discovered facts related to the \$22,000 fee that was paid voluntarily by the applicant to the City for signalization improvements at Pine Street. Never needed, never will be needed, and the City came and said, well gosh, we've still got your money. We said, that's not a problem, now what. You can reimburse, give it back. They said, yah, but there's more, because the fact that we still have your money and that condition was never fulfilled and it applied to Point Edwards, that 2003 MDS is invalid now and we have to do another one. Well, we were in the middle of a process already. We'd come to you and had a hearing, and now we're being told we have to step back and do SEPA.

Mr. Gifford: And as Kernen acknowledged, and I will tell you he worked hard. We all did. The City Attorney and I, we spent a lot of time going up and down that tree trying to figure out what to do, being out of sequence and having a

new requirement like this thrust into the middle of an on-going project. Ultimately, we felt we had no choice. With the City's concurrence, we stepped back and withdrew the first application, and we started over and did it right, strictly in accordance with the City's code. A full, new environmental checklist, SEPA determination issued by the City, notice of that given, no appeals filed in the two-week wait period. AS part of that a full, new traffic analysis done for the stand-alone building. No problems there. Impact fees will be paid. That will all be determined at the appropriate time, building permit phase.

Mr. Gifford: When we first got the news of the changed circumstances in the City's new requirements, again, there was a lot of discussions. We stepped back. We realized that technically meant this was a new application, but everyone knew that we were proceeding ahead. We were in the middle of a redesign of the building already in reliance on the information and comments that you had given, and so we continued. Then that brings us back to you tonight. We've waded through all that new process, started over again, did additional steps, waited out the SEPA review period. All completely in the open, working with the City, conceding to the changes, and then Joe and Myer and their colleagues redesigned the building. Addressed fenestration, addressed colors, addressed step back of the top floor, addressed roof modulation, addressed northwest style design, addressed coherence with the already constructed buildings in Point Edwards. Did their level best to respond to every single comment that the Board made, and the Board offered those comments in light of the surprising criticisms that were leveled against the first design for the first time by staff in the Staff Report. Again, we didn't yip about that. We redesigned the building. And like that 2006 initial approval by the Board of a very similar but larger building, and like the 2012 first iteration of this current proposal, this version again conforms with all applicable development standards: height, bulk, lot coverage, parking. And the Staff Report acknowledges that. That's never really been an issue. It is demonstratively responsive to all of the input that we got from staff, from the Board to date, with the one exception. It's a pretty glaring one, this new request that we step the building down.

Mr. Gifford: We gave up four units in the redesign. The changes that we've made certainly weren't trivial. They were based on direction that we got from the Board, the staff input. They are not insubstantial. It takes a lot of time to redesign a building, a lot of time, a lot of money. In refining the design, admittedly, as the City knows and we all know, the architects didn't go fully back to the drawing board, but they did fairly revisit the exterior of the building, its presentation, its integration with surroundings, built and unbuilt, within and without the Point Edwards Development as urged by the Board in the December hearing. The Board said, take these things under advisement. Go away. Come back and we'll continue the hearing. That's what were expecting to do until everything changed and we wound up having to start over. But we've brought back to you the very same design we would have in a continuation of the initial hearing, one fully responsive to everything you asked us to do, in our view.

Mr. Gifford: The overall thrust of the redesign, and I'll leave it to Joe to really highlight it in his inimitable style, but the overall thrust, in accordance with your commentary the first time around, was to make the building's design "more consistent with the other development approved and constructed at Point Edwards under the Point Edwards Master Plan. And staff agrees that it is. It's a much improved design in staff's view, responsive to what you said, more coherent, more compatible. You know, it's tricky. We're working with some, well, let's say some design guidelines that have a natural tension. They say, make it fit, but they say make it unique. Give it architectural integrity. Well, we think this is a building that fits, but its architecturally distinctive, just as the design guidelines ask us to do. You didn't tell us, do a cookie cutter. You said, give consideration to these issues, and that's what we did.

Mr. Gifford: We know it's impossible to satisfy everybody completely. A lot of the citizens have said, well, nice try, but not nearly enough. And I guess I wouldn't expect them to say anything else. We know that every constituency has a perspective, and that's fine. We're glad that the Point Edwards residents care about where they live. I mean, we built it. We're very happy about that. But this fact that you can't satisfy everybody all the time is exactly why we have design guidelines, and its why we have code provisions, and its why we have pre-application review processes, and its why those processes call for disclosure of complete and accurate information in a timely way. We didn't get any of that. We go the information piecemeal. It came sporadically, and it came late. And it seems as though staff has reserved the biggest issue for the last. This is the hardest one, and we've waited until the last round of the second review (well, the

fourth review, but the second specific review) of this design. Honestly, I'm at a loss. I've asked, but I haven't really gotten a good answer. I don't know why in the world this came up now. For the life of me, if it is so critical and so central, then it should have been the first thing out of the block. I just . . . We don't understand it, and I suppose at this point it doesn't matter. But for future reference, it needs to matter.

Mr. Gifford: A lot of work was put into the revised design. We withdrew that first application on March 25th. We resubmitted the new application (full package, checklist, new traffic study, redesigned building) on March 26th, several weeks ago. Staff didn't comment substantively on the new application or on the design revisions. The City issued its Determination of Non-Significance (DNS). No appeals. And then we started working with the City to schedule these proceedings. We got them set for tonight. Then, unfortunately, when the second Staff Report came out six days ago, it happened again. Staff said we like the design, it's responsive, you've tried real hard, it's a whole lot better, it's acceptable to us with a couple of minor things. Add a couple of parking spaces in the street if you can. No problem. We'll do that. We don't have to, but we'll do it. Add some additional landscape screening or work with the neighbor up above. We're happy to do that. In fact, we think it's probably better that we do that because Doctor . . . Is it Doctor Inadomi? Doctor Inadomi is obviously concerned about that. We don't know exactly what he wants and what will help, but we're going to talk with him, and I'm sure we'll work something out.

Mr. Gifford: Those are fine. Those conditions are fine. And then the bomb dropped. Take a floor of the building off. Yes sir.

Chair Gootee: I'd like to . . . It's a very good presentation; but with all due respect, you have some more of the applicant's time that we need to have here. We're going to have time we're going to be needing or other public comment so . . .

Mr. Gifford: Right. I'll move it along.

Chair Gootee: I'm not trying to rush you too much, but I want to button up and get on to the next applicant here. Not to take away from your presentation.

Mr. Gifford: I understand. No, you are right. We have limited time. And believe me, we're probably in a bigger hurry than anybody in the room because we've been on this case for a year.

Chair Gootee: Understand.

Mr. Gifford: We've gone through pre-app review, a full public hearing, with a second public hearing. And now we are facing a new issue. And understandably, we're not happy for different reasons than the residents aren't happy. But we want to move it along, and we want to get done, and we want to get the building built, and we hope we can have your support in that process.

Mr. Gifford: Again, I'm going to leave it to Joe to speak to the details of the design. It's a superb design, as far as we're concerned. Staff seems to like it. There's absolutely nothing in the code, nothing in the Comp Plan, nothing in the UDG's, nothing in the history of the review of the project or the Board's own determination that even suggests that we have to step the building down or should. We think it's perfectly suitable for the site. It's within code to meet height standards and every other development standard applicable to the project. We submit it fully meets the standards of the master plan and the Urban Design Guidelines. With that, I'll draw my lengthy presentation to a close. I thank you for your attention, your patience. Let me just say, if I haven't, I do want to make sure that the written materials, which summarize what I've presented to you and the images which accompany that, which you have, are submitted into the record. Again, if possible, if time permits, we'd like to reserve rebuttal at the conclusion of the public portion of the testimony.

Board Member Schaefer: I would ask that the audience be respectful of the speakers. We're trying to move it along, but we need some cooperation. Thank you.

Mr. Gifford: And so, I'll introduce for the substantive part of the presentation and the discussion of the design, Joe Kolmer of Weber Thompson.

Mr. Kolmer: Thanks Rick. I have an addendum that we threw together over the last week after receiving the staff report.

Chair Gootee: Hold on just a minute. Go ahead and state your full name, your relationship to the applicant and your address, and I believe please use the podium please, too, for your presentation.

Mr. Kolmer: Okay. My name is Joseph Kolmer, I'm with Weber and Thompson Architects. The address is 225 Terry Avenue North, Suite 200, and it's in Seattle, 98109. As I mentioned, I've got an addendum that I'd like to circulate to you all. We'll also be reviewing it on the screen and a materials board.

Mr. Kolmer: My presentation will be slightly shorter than Ricks. I would like to start off presenting the addendum, if that's all right, and then move straight on to the ADB packet. Yah, so you are familiar with this image by now. Some of this information will be redundant, and I'll try to speed through it. I apologize that some of this information in the addendum didn't make it into the original packet. As abundantly noted, we've had about a week to throw some of this together, so . . . This Page 1 shows ADB and City staff approved design concept, and it's from 2006, which resulted in a permit for the project. The current proposal, as noted, has a 25% smaller above average grade . . . I'm sorry, smaller above-grade footprint than the permitted building from 2008. One thing that was not noted was that one floor has been removed from the façade on the south side of the east wing. If you look on Pages 48 and 49 of the ADB packet, you will note that the approved building actually showed three stories there, and we had reduced it to two.

Mr. Kolmer: I feel the following documents will show the proposed building designed as a microcosm of the Point Edward Building as a whole, or of the Point Edwards Development as a whole. Is that as focused as these get? Well, I think we're all pretty familiar with the site. This is an enlarged image from the packet, in any case. The proposed building is shown here in the Point Edwards Development, whose shape mimics, to a degree, the landscape and tree line above. As with the surrounding buildings, façade heights of the proposal vary relative to their position on the hillside. For example, the northwest corner is three stories, the northeast corner is five stories, and the entire south façade is two stories.

Mr. Kolmer: This next image is a view from Edmonds Marsh Trail, showing a cluster of Point Edwards Buildings, some of which are in the neighborhood of a mere 60 feet apart. Portions of this development combine to show in upwards of six stories of building construction, uninterrupted by natural features or significant landscaping. The proposed structure is surrounded by Pine Street, which allows for a significant amount of horizontal relief. It proposes only 25% of its façade at five stories, and whose backdrop will be mature, greenbelt vegetation.

Mr. Kolmer: Here's the last cluster image from the northwest direction. It's a view from the marina parking lot along Admiral Way. Another example of massing for the project. The next slide is just an electronic record of the materials board you have in front of you. The intent is to provide a scheme that is analogous with other Point Edwards Buildings. To the right are examples of modulated roof designs taken from the code. These actually come from the BC section of the code, but are relevant to taller structures, as well.

Mr. Kolmer: I would like to briefly go over some broad strokes between the design submitted last December and the new proposal, which incorporates changes the ADB wanted to see implemented. Window panels have been broken down to a scale and layout similar to other buildings found at Point Edwards. The windows specified for the project are the same manufacturer who provided product for the adjacent buildings. You'll note that the architectural language for

the project has changed significantly from the clean, modern lines of the previous iteration to more traditional and ornate vernacular, including northwest craftsman details and prairie-style forms noted numerous times by the ADB.

Mr. Kolmer: Modulation of a more vertical nature has been modified in favor of a more horizontal emphasis. This has been accomplished with floor-level accent banding, top-floor setbacks, material and color distribution.

Chair Gootee: Excuse me just for a minute. Do we have a pointer here? Just so you can fully describe it to the folks.

Mr. Kolmer: I think this one has slightly better batteries. If I can find my place again.

Chair Gootee: Awe, it's okay. I just thought we had a tool here to help you designate your differences.

Mr. Kolmer: And to clarify further, when I get into the actual ADB packet, I'll describe in greater detail what these elements are. We just wanted to do a side-by-side comparison. It's a pretty significant change from building to building. These are just broad strokes that I'd like to go over. I guess I'll start back over. Modulation of a more vertical nature has been modified in favor of ore horizontal emphasis. It's been accomplished with floor-level accent banding. Lois Broadway talked about emphasizing, you know, each floor level with the building design. So we've gone through with some detailing, which again, I'll describe in greater detail.

Mr. Kolmer: Next slide please. This is a view from the northeast, which shows the same strategy for material distribution and fenestration as the previous image. Please also note the setback at the top floor and an assortment of overhanging roof forms. Gable roofs have also been incorporated or sprinkled in for variety. Next slide. This is the last page of the addendum here. This is a view from the southwest, which has introduced hip-roof forms, which replace the shed roof assemblies in the previous iteration. Trellises and supplemental landscaping have been added at the surface parking area, which we'll review in greater detail with the ADB packet. That being said, we can go ahead and move onto that packet.

Mr. Kolmer: Let's go ahead and jump to Page 4, please. Nothing exciting here, but this is the project summary sheet. Not much has changed here, with the exception of the reduction in unit count from the last building iteration of 89 units down to 85. This modification has allowed for increased square footages for the units and building setbacks at the top floor. Jump to Page 7. This is a familiar diagram from the last ADB packet, which compares current building with the approved 2008 building permit set. A dashed line indicates the 2008 building. As previously noted, the building footprint for the new design has been reduced by 25%. Again, the south façade of the east wing was reduced from three stories down to two.

Mr. Kolmer: Page 9. Again, another familiar diagram from the last meeting. Here we find the design cues for the site taken for the most part from existing Point Edwards Structures and landscape elements, and forms from the residents to the south, also. The site is flanked to the south by a mature greenbelt. Next page. Found here are design cues specific to the diagram on the previous page, which have been included in the building and site design, landscape elements, modulation, materials and color.

Mr. Kolmer: This is the familiar view of the project from the northwest. A variety of colors and textures are shown that are typical of the project, for example, lap siding to match other Point Edwards Buildings, which will be installed with 4, 8 and 12-inch exposures, depending on color. Again, the horizontal banding at the floor levels. Roof overhangs. The deep roof overhangs were accomplished by being able to set back the top floor. These help to emphasize a horizontal building orientation. As is typical along the north side, we've set back on both wings these units. We were able to actually do this just be eliminating four units. The banding, again, occurs at each floor line here. The balcony assemblies and the fenestration are all more horizontally oriented than the previous iteration. Yah, the south side is back here, and then this is the north. So the north side is the hot topic.

Mr. Kolmer: Cedar shakes won't be included in the pallet. Metal siding accents found in the previous design have been eliminated. Again, metal and glass rail systems utilize the same materials as the surrounding structures. Oh, we can go back . . . We've already discussed briefly one of the improvements at grade has been the replacement of the secondary garage door, which occurred down here. That has been replaced with more residential frontage, increasing pedestrian safety and opening up the option for supplemental street parking.

Mr. Kolmer: A more detailed look from the northwest, which better shows the components, such as light shelves, which are found on the top floor. These are north facing units. You know daylighting during the winter time comes at a premium. These help light penetrate further into the units as does the fenestration strategy. Sliding glass door assemblies at the living and dining areas. Glazing strategies, again, include these light shelves. These are elements that are encouraged by the design guidelines, most specifically Design Guideline D.3.d. The shallow hip-roof forms shown are common to the prairie style architecture noted numerous times by the ADB and fit well with surrounding buildings while embracing the design guidelines for both diversity and design and individual identity of the buildings. Building forms, the bay designs, for example, these elements here, are reflective of some of the design elements found at other Point Edwards Buildings.

Mr. Kolmer: Let's jump to Page 14, please. This is a detailed view of the east wing or the five-story wing along the north side of the building. The approach used here with colors, materials and details are a common theme with the building design. The variety of roof forms found here help to avoid monotonous and repetitive building elements, which is consistent again with the City's design guidelines, in particular, C.8.a in this case. Here's a view from the southeast adjacent to the greenbelt, some of which is now shown here for clarity. This is one of the views from the southwest, showing more hip roof forms, which again, have replaced the shed roofs of the previous building iteration. A surface parking lot remains at the south side of the building, which is consistent with Design Guidelines, C.2.c. A number of trellises and landscaping have been added to the surface parking lot, which Forrest will touch on shortly. At the lower left hand corner of the image, very difficult to see, especially when it is blurry like this, but you'll note the garage door, which has been placed approximately 40 feet back from the property line has been screened by plantings and finished grade, which parallels standards, noted are Design Guidelines C.4.c and C.5.b. A roundabout located here will also be utilized at the adjacent vehicle entry to aid in pedestrian safety and screening of harsh visual elements.

Mr. Kolmer: Looking on this page is a view to the exterior of the main building lobby, color and roof form of which vary slightly from the surrounding adjacent residential uses. So it's this form right here. A covered drop-off area has been added and has been designed for convenience and increased pedestrian safety in line with Design Guidelines C.9.c and C.5.b. That being said, these references, there's a summary of these design guidelines found on Pages 34, 35 and 36, which describe these particular design guidelines in greater detail. Hedges shown flanking this area provide privacy and a visual barrier between different uses consistent with the Design Guidelines C.14.a and b.

Mr. Kolmer: Functions of the east amenity areas remain the same, though the level of northwest craftsman details has been incorporated to tie in better with the new building design, as noted by these more gabled-shaped roof forms. Prior to that we were reflecting the shed roofs on the building, and had metal roof forms rather than wood. The water feature, which is similar in scale to others found at Point Edwards, will provide a pleasant white noise and additional visual interest to the area.

Mr. Kolmer: Here we find the fitness space patio, located at the middle of the building's north face. Gabled-roof forms and stone accents found at the building entry and east amenity areas and some other portions of the building. These mimic . . . They help to provide some additional human scale to the property. You'll note here that there's an operational window wall, which sort of blurs the line between interior and exterior spaces when weather permits. With that, I'll turn the presentation over to Forrest, who'd like to present the rest of the project and landscaping for the next hour or two, I think. Thank you.

Mr. Jammer: Good evening everyone. I'm Forrest Jammer. I'm with Thomas Rengstorf and Associates. We're the landscape architects for this project. We're located in Seattle, 911 Western Avenue, Suite 202. Obviously, as Joe has

said and Rick had indicated earlier, my portion of tonight is the landscape. If you would go to the big site plan. We'll be able to run through this, and I promise, we won't take more than an hour, as Joe had indicated. I'm kidding. What we've got, which isn't really any different than previous submittals, but we have several different areas here, and I'll start with our street trees flanking along Pine Street. It's to maintain the continuous theme throughout Point Edwards that we have. The project, as an overall theme, we've got these great street trees that add nice color and variety to it. Waves of color, or drifts if you will, of shrubs, perennials, grasses, conifer, evergreens, and deciduous plant material. We're maintaining a lot of that same kind of motion throughout this project and just continuing it as we come through here.

Mr. Jammer: trying to add a little bit of interest and a little bit of variety, we swapped it out. We alternate with plant material. We've got shrubs, or actually we've got perennials and grasses a little closer to the sidewalk to give us more of a close residential feel, followed more of long panels in there so that, if you wanted to, you could certainly walk out there. That's continued through here. Some patios actually have access onto the grass areas, and others have the benefit of the shrubs and the perennials and grasses directly adjacent to them.

Mr. Jammer: As you can see in the patios on the north, as well as the south side, we've got vegetation. Typically, plant material that will offer a certain amount of screening to these individual spaces. It's more of just kind of a visual relieve so that if somebody were to step out of their unit, they don't necessarily have to look at the guys dirty barbeque grill that's laying next door. And as I said, we've got the same thing on the south side, up in here. We've got a little bit more heavily vegetated along in here, as Joe had eluded, to kind of create more of a visual barrier between cars and residential units, but also to help develop or show the way into one of the main entrances into this facility.

Mr. Jammer: One of the next areas that I'm going to talk about is this whole parking area. We've added two trees out here per parking island, which the parking islands also have a combination of deciduous and evergreen shrubs, perennials, grasses, that also maintain kind of a continuous theme throughout. We're using very similar, if not the same plant material, in certain cases at Building 10 here. One thing that has been noticed, and we've covered this before, is the trellises that we've added in this parking to give it a little bit of vertical relief. I know that Board Member Lois Broadway mentioned that, and we certainly took that queue and feel good about how those are going to feel in there and how they are going to work with our project.

Mr. Jammer: Down along the south property line here, it had been mentioned before, we've got a retaining wall, a big rockery over here. It's right on the property line. What we are doing because it's there, because that's a difficult place to be able to grow some plant material, we are providing a certain amount of vines, some green space in there, that we can pocket plant and allow it to begin to cover some or all of that rockery as it begins to mature.

Mr. Jammer: Just to the east of that, where the retaining or the rockery ends, we've got more of a kind of visual relief buffer that we have along the south property lines that obviously continues to the east and around the corner at the far east end of the building here. Again, we're using a mixture of deciduous and evergreen shrubs, perennials, grasses, mostly deciduous trees that are more along the line of an ornamental or flowering variety to give us some nice color in different parts of the seasons. Then wrapping over here into our amenity space. The amenity space we have is going to have a fire pit, outdoor grilling area, gathering spaces for multiple tables, chairs for just enjoyment of the views that you'll have from here, primarily obviously northern views of the Puget Sound, as well as a connection down to the street so you can walk along some of the overlooks that do exist as part of the Point Edwards Development.

Mr. Jammer: As we've talked about, we've got the water feature over in here to help kind of create some background noise that will help diminish any other type of, you know, like cars driving by or anything. It also gives you a certain amount of relaxation, you know, hearing the soft noise from the water. As I've mentioned, we've got an outdoor grilling area that we want to include, as well, and including a fire pit in here, more circular in nature. Other things that you will see on here, we've got different pavement treatments in here so it's not just simply grey concrete. We're going to have some color relief in here, whether it's going to be integral color or it's going to be pavers, we'll decide that. But we are going to provide some interest. And again, all this area we've got surrounded by more plant materials that maintains the

theme that we currently have and designed for Point Edwards as a whole. I think that about covers it. I'm going to turn this over to Rick Tompkins, civil engineer for the project.

Mr. Tompkins: Good evening. Yes, I'm Rick Tompkins, not Tom Rickens. I'm a consulting civil engineer with Triad Associates, speaking on behalf of the property owner. Triad Associates' business address is 12112 – 115th Avenue Northeast, Kirkland, 98034. Really, I'm here today to be available to answer questions you may have on site civil related issues, anything external to the building. Hopefully, I can tackle that for you. Beyond that, I want to briefly describe some of the civil elements that are pertinent to the site. You're all pretty familiar with the site plan at this point, but the point I want to make is that the building is really plugging into an infrastructure that's existing that was extended and provided previously with the build out of the earlier phases, the building out of Pine Street. So, for example, surface water runoff from the surface parking area is collected in a system of catch basins and pipe and conveyed to an existing storm stub from a catch basin on Pine Street located right here.

Mr. Tompkins: Roof drainage from the various roof elements are collected in a couple three different places and discharged to stubs, to existing catch basins, gain, stubbed into the site from facilities on Pine Street. Similarly, the sewer stub was extended into the site here above mid frontage, and all the project wastewater will be conveyed to that point and will be delivered to the sanitary sewer via that existing stub. Water . . . There was an earlier fire vault installed, again as part of the infrastructure improvements or the earlier phases. That will supply fire flow to the building, which will enter somewhere in this location here. That's fed from the main that's in Pine Street. Domestic water will be served from a new meter service, that's this right here. Again, I can't remember if we're actually tapping in there again with the stub, but the water service will be delivered to a meter here and will supply the building.

Mr. Tompkins: Really, from a civil standpoint, there's not a lot of new infrastructure being constructed to serve the property. There are some minor street improvements. For the earlier-approved project, curb cuts were developed in this location and this location, as well as right here in what is an additional garage entrance at this location. Those curb cuts need to be adjusted. There will be some repair and adjustment, relocation of the curb, gutter sidewalk, to accommodate these new access locations that are pretty minor. There has been discussion tonight about extending this on-street parallel stall assembly here to the west because we've got to repair or replace this other curb cut anyway. So we'll take advantage of that to accommodate some additional on-street parking, which we have no objection to at all.

Mr. Tompkins: I guess, beyond that, there's really not a lot going on from a civil site improvement standpoint. Move on to the overall context slide. Thank you Myer. Sorry, this is a little blurry, but I just wanted to give you some additional context with respect to storm drainage. Here is Building 10. I mentioned how we're collecting water from the site, from the surface parking, from the roof drainage, and connecting to the existing storm system in Pine Street. That system all drains through the lower division or lower phases and is treated in a large, wet pond. The drainage is treated in a large, wet pond in this area here that was sized initially for the entire development. We need to do a little work to confirm that the scope and scale of improvements here are what was anticipated for. If we're not commensurate with what the original design called for, we may need to do some minor enlargement of this pond, or perhaps we'll provide some on-site stormwater treatment facilities. Stormwater detention is not a requirement of this project because of our proximity to the Sound. It's really all I have to say, unless there's some questions.

Chair Gootee: Is there any more presentation from the applicant? I think that brings us to questions of the Board. So are there any questions from the Board?

Board Member Broadway: I have one, while you're still standing up there. As you described the catch basin patterning, will you confirm that the drainage from the surface lot is primarily from the southeast to the northwest, where you're picking it up at the catch basin. Did I understand you correctly?

Mr. Tompkins: If I understand your question, yes, there's all of the parking lot drainage sheet flows . . .

Board Member Broadway: It goes in one direction?

Mr. Tompkins: It actually drains towards . . . Current concept, it drains towards the building and is intercepted in a real shallow pavement swale directed to catch basins, where it enters the pipe system and is delivered here to the stub that exists.

Board Member Broadway: Okay. Let me see if I can phrase this question correctly. It is going with the grade and the fall of the lot?

Mr. Tompkins: Yah, the parking lot is graded to accommodate that.

Board Member Broadway: So the grading falls lower towards the northwest?

Mr. Tompkins: The low point is right here. It's not a single point. It's a series of low points where the catch basins are the four signal points. If these should plug . . . Maybe your question has to do about . . .

Board Member Broadway: What I'm trying to determine in my mind is where is the high point on this site. Is that the southeast area of the lot?

Mr. Tompkins: The high point is right along the base of these parking stalls.

Board Member Broadway: Okay, that's all I wanted to confirm. I'm sorry.

Mr. Tompkins: No problem. Any other questions before I sit down?

Chair Gootee: I don't think there's any questions for anything on civil. Anything architecturally?

Mr. Tompkins: Thank you.

Board Member Broadway: I do have one question architecturally. On Page 46 of this book, your spiral book, your new east wing rendering shows some shadow lines, on the upper floor it shows some shadow lines that would indicate, as your renderings do, that the top floor is set back. What is that setback dimension.

Mr. Kolmer: It varies. Can you all hear me? That varies anywhere from 3.5 to 5 feet, depending on which unit it is. I don't have an average number, but . . .

Board Member Broadway: That's good enough.

Chair Gootee: I had a question for clarity. Can you briefly, we're all anxious here, can you briefly show the 2006 elevation approved, then briefly show the 2012 elevation, and then address real quickly, again, the ADB comments that were addressed to the current elevation we have now proposed. That's 2006 approved? Because you were saying in 2006 it was approved. I want to see that elevation . . .

Mr. Gifford: I believe that's from the 2008 building permit package, which was based on the approved 2006 design, so you are right.

Chair Gootee: Okay, that's what we're looking at here. Fast forward to 2012, it was presented in December.

Mr. Kolmer: That would be in the addendum, Myer. They're separate documents. Again, we had to throw this together in a week.

Chair Gootee: I understand. That's kind of why I wanted to see . . . For the folks out there, I wanted to see keenly what the . . .

Mr. Kolmer: There's not a flat elevation . . .

Chair Gootee: That's okay. So there on the left is 2012, reviewed in 2012. Now please address clearly on the current elevation the stuff that was addressed for the ADB.

Mr. Kolmer: Actually, if we could just back to the addendum images. There you go. So sort of difficult . . . You'll probably have an easier time if you look at your packet rather than the screen. One of the obvious things, though, are the roof forms. In this case here, we've got shed roofs, and in some cases, no traditional roof forms at all. It's more of a modern design approach. You'll also notice that we've stepped back the top floor along both facades, or I should say, both wings. The fenestration has been broken down into forms that are more representative of the other Point Edwards buildings. Material orientation is more horizontal with the new design, whereas with the design that was proposed back in December is oriented more vertically. As far as detailing and what not, in December we presented this more modern, clean-line approach, which was deemed unacceptable. So we went back to a more traditional approach. Lois Broadway wanted to see something more along the lines of prairie style and northwest craftsman motif, so we've included that. There's some images where we zoom in on the building, and you are better able to appreciate those.

Mr. Kolmer: The bottom line is just if you read the Staff Report and the meeting minutes, there were, it basically had to do with changing the architectural style. The orientation or visual representation of the building being more horizontal as opposed to be broken down vertically. The ADB wanted to see the window treatments broken down further into something that appeared a little bit more residential, and of course, that's really getting into semantics there because there are obviously various forms and components that are residential. But these, obviously, are more consistent with the adjacent buildings.

Mr. Gifford: They're the same windows, aren't they?

Mr. Kolmer: Yes, these will be the same window. VPI, I believe, is the window manufacturer. So the same manufacturer for this building as the other Point Edwards buildings. I don't know, am I missing anything? I think those were the broad strokes that we addressed in any case.

Chair Gootee: Any more questions from the Board? Anything about the east wing?

Mr. Goodman: I think by stepping back the building like Lois . . .

Ms. Noyes: I don't have your name.

Chair Gootee: You need to state your name and your address.

Mr. Goodman: Oh, I'm sorry. My name is John Goodman. I'm at 281 Alaska Way, Seattle, Washington. I think by stepping the building back we wanted to give it more relief on that upper floor so it didn't look like a straight wall at five stories. I think that was . . . We took to heart everything that was presented to us and tried to come back with exactly what we thought would be acceptable, irregardless of what we thought.

Chair Gootee: Any more questions? We need to keep this moving. It's now come that time for public comment. So when you approach the podium, please respect. It's only three minutes. We have our little light that goes off. So please make it as brief as possible and to the point. We'll try to get through this as quickly as we can. Everybody wants to go home eventually.

Mr. Lien: Just a comment on the light, it starts flashing at 2.5 minutes, and once it starts flashing, you've still got 30 more seconds to wrap up your comments. Then when it goes solid is when the three minutes is up.

Chair Gootee: Go ahead and form a line or approach by row.

Ms. McDonald: I just have a question.

Ms. Noyes: What's your name?

Ms. McDonald: Megan McDonald, 75 Pine Street, number . . .

Ms. Noyes: I don't need addresses, just your city of residence. So Edmonds?

Ms. McDonald: Yes. I just was wondering if we could see the 2006, view all three together, and then I actually had a question for the builder. What was the thinking changing from the 2006 architectural structure to the 2012 structure?

Chair Gootee: Can somebody address that? I think she's asking why the design change from 2006.

Commissioner Schaefer: The applicant can address that in their rebuttal.

Chair Gootee: Okay, fair enough.

Mr. Wagner: I'm Tom Wagner, a resident of Point Edwards Condos, Edmonds. I'm going to proceed fast and, hopefully, can honor your time limit.

Chair Gootee: Please state your exact address for the record.

Ms. Noyes: I don't need addresses.

Mr. Wagner: 65 Pine, 103.

Ms. Noyes: I don't need addresses. Just the City of residence.

Chair Gootee: My overkill. My apologies.

Mr. Wagner: I'd like to address just three points that are interrelated: the size, bulk of the facility, the conformance to the site and the community, and third, the expectation of roof modulation. This is the proposed building. You've seen this picture before. This is the one that's on the cover, and it gives an incorrect picture of this proposal. This is only the west wing at a slant, a nice pleasant three-story, and it slopes down to four story. Why would anyone complain about the bulk and the size and the mass of this? This is the rest of the story, the east wing that goes from four story to five story. These two units are segmented but loosely connected in the middle, laterally, about 320 feet up and down Pine Street.

Mr. Wagner: The new proposal, this is a composite, we are not presented with a profile of the north face of the building, so this has been constructed from the two segmented profiles that you've seen. Why the fuss? We have 57 respondents, 670 petitioners that say no, this simply doesn't work for Point Edwards. The public percept, too massive, does not fit the community, doesn't fit the neighborhood, doesn't fit the terraced hillside, inappropriate, not small scale as referred to in the master plan, and is too dominating on the skyline.

Mr. Wagner: Just too big, but why? We have two conflicting concepts: the engineering concept of height and what I'd call the commonsense, citizen definition. In this case, they're grossly different. The commonsense, most of us say height is top to bottom, what you see is what you get, but let's take a look at do the math. The public expectation is that

the height is from the top to the bottom, what you see is what you get. You measure everything, and the engineering formula simply doesn't tell us what the height of this building is. Let's jump ahead. This is the legal building, legal building with modulation, leading building below grade, which adds to 58 feet, and from the 12.5 to 13-foot rise from the adjoining sidewalk, a 71-foot structure. This is what we see, not a 35 or a 40-foot building.

Mr. Wagner: Okay, go ahead, jump ahead. These are your profiles. I don't want to dwell on that again. Flat roof. . .

Chair Gootee: Let me interrupt for a minute. You are down to three minutes, so the limit is three-minute presentations.

Mr. Wagner: I'm sorry. I thought the thing came on at 2.5. I've just got one more after this, if I may.

Chair Wagner: Please make it brief.

Mr. Wagner: Flat roof, the lack of modulation, skylight enclosures, don't compute. One more. This was your 6206 profile. Let's just say no to flat roof and go back to the 2006 design if we really want modulation in both the siding, as well as the roof. Thank you.

Mr. Yocum: Jeff Yocum, 45 Pine Street, #108, Edmonds. I commend to you my letter of April 23 for and extensive discussion based on the ADB's own comments in approving the original design plan. I also want to commend the staff. The recommendations in the report reflect a clear, cogent and comprehensive evaluation. Given the limited time, I'll focus on the application at 1674. While one of the common elements of the Edmonds Bowl is slope, this topography at this site is unique. To assure clarity in the methods to measure on this slope, the code specifically provided three illustrations and examples, A, B and C. In both the illustration and the language, it is clear that the rectangle used for the height calculation is to encapsulate the walls of the building. To these non-engineer eyes, those lines surround the walls. The site master plan states, "to encourage appearance of smaller building masses, building height will be calculated separated for each clearly separated portion of the building." This is also expressed as Footnote 2 in 16.75.020. As a consequence, I believe that the height ought to be measured with two rectangles, one for each building segment. In doing so, the eastern portion allowed height drops from what is presented.

Mr. Yocum: The applicant has used one rectangle, and that rectangle has been expanded far toward the rockery, which is the high point of this site. That significantly increased the apparent mass of the building from the northern exposure. The argument is that the underground parking is part of the building; therefore, the rectangle is expanded out past it. If one considers servicing elements part of the building, why not include underground electrical, piping or anything else that requires soils to be moved. That does maximize height, but that was not the intent when the master plan was approved or the referendum passed. As a matter of fact, the stated intent was the exact opposite in the application of this code. Staff reports that the expansion of the triangle was allowed at the Gregory development at 5th and Walnut. With all due respect, that property is not MP1 zoning and doesn't present anywhere near the topographical challenges that this site has. And in comparison, it is not appropriate.

Mr. Yocum: If you look at Page 6 of the proposal, the applicant, under the original, which through no fault of the applicant is the only package that was available for public review and comment, they've reduced the mass of the building by 25%. But in looking closely at that page, you'll note that they have excluded the bolt-on decks and the subterranean garage. Apparently, it's not part of the building, so why does the rectangle circumvent the underground garage. The proposal should not be accepted by the ADB, with the height being one of many reasons. The ADB should find the building proposed too long, massive, unbroken and monotonous, as is to be avoided under 20.11.030(4).

Mayor Nichols: Good evening. I'm Carla Nichols, Mayor for the Town of Woodway. Obviously, I live there. I want to start by pointing out that I did hand you a letter. I'm not going to read it, but I am going to refer to it a couple of times because there are some important points. I want to start by first recognizing the importance of your Board. We don't have one of these in Woodway, but I think it's important that you are here because you can preserve a community. So

we're glad you're here, and I'm sure the residents of Edmonds are glad you're here, as well as the residents of my town, Woodway.

Mayor Nichols: So 12 years ago, the Mayor of Woodway, or the Mayor of Edmonds, Gary Haakenson, came to my town and asked that we make some adjustments in a development that we were in the process of approving, and that was the Woodway Highlands. Part of the request, or one of the requirements, was to have a walking path between that development and Twin Meadows. Edmonds residents didn't want that. The Mayor asked that that walking path be deleted. We listened to that, and I guess people in Edmonds didn't want people in Woodway walking next to their backyards. That seems kind of small compared to what we are dealing with now—a five story building and 74 parking stalls about two or three yards away from resident homes in Woodway.

Mayor Nichols: Again, we were here in 2002 when the master plan was before the City of Edmonds. We were asked to weigh in on it. We did agree with that plan, but we feel that what you are reviewing now is a very significant deviation. You've heard tonight how the new proposal has been more responsive to several of your conditions, but I don't think all design objectives are the same. It seems pretty clear that the primary issues of consistency and scale to the Point Edwards property haven't been adequately addressed. The Staff Report repeatedly sites this, and I think that's important to remember. Changing the color of the building, changing the roofs are not the same and they don't address the scale and the consistency.

Mayor Nichols: I want to quote from your City's Comp Plan, Page 93, Urban Design Element, General Objectives. This is the concept behind why you're here and why we're all here. "Good design and site planning improves access, minimizes potential negative impacts to adjacent development." In this case, that would be Woodway and Point Edwards. "Good design and site planning reinforces the character and activities within a district." That refers to the master plan. And "it builds a more cohesive and coherent physical environment." That would refer to the sloped topography. In your design objectives in the Comp Plan, there are many that really speak to this proposal. They're on Page 2 of my letter, C.8.a and c, C.10.b, C.13.d, C.14.a and d.

Mayor Nichols: I know I have to hurry, but we would support the approval of this project with conditions if the following conditions were added. The first one is that you drop the height of the building from five stories to four and go from there. That's really a deal breaker for Woodway. If that doesn't work, then the rest really don't matter. But they are the trellis should be required. The lighting for Building 10 and all of Pine Street should be decorative, architecturally-appropriate lights. Not cover lights on a huge pole. We didn't want that in 2002 and we don't want it now. Lastly, traffic impacts to Woodway and Chinook Road, really, we don't know yet what those will be. I would like the developer to be required, once it's spelled out, for us to look at any significant impacts and to look at a traffic device at the intersection of Chinook and Pine. Finally, and lastly, let's just remember the big picture here. A private party has been granted a right for a number of dwelling units in a development, but that has to be balanced with the rights of a community. That community has taken time to figure out what's important through design objective. So please use them as you make your decision. Thank you.

Ms. Elstrom Bauer: Hi, my name is Lisa Elstrom Bauer. My address is 21919 McCaw Road in Woodway. I come here as other residents of the community for both Woodway and Edmonds. Public speaking is not my favorite thing to do, so . . . I can't say it any better than our Mayor Carla and/or some of the residents that are here to speak from Point Edwards. But I do have a few things to say on some additional points that maybe some people have not considered, and that's the Puget Sound area and the Puget Sound corridor, itself. Point Edwards, Edmonds and so forth is not the skyline of downtown Seattle, and I don't think it should begin to look like that. I think a lot of people perhaps need to come down the corridor of Puget Sound in a boat and look at the greenery and the landscape and the buildings that have been put in place as you come down there. How far out is this infrastructure going to change coming out to Edmonds. I clearly don't see that now, and I would really hate to see that in the future. Lastly, as far as the building process goes, the submittal process, the changes that have to happen. You guys are the big building guys. That's your job. Edmonds is not here to make your buildings, your changes, and so forth and so on. They're here to make sure you do it right. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Swenson: I'm Ralph Swenson of Building 45, #205 in Point Edwards. I want to note that Building 10 is very large, with unusual numbers of extra cars to park. Building 10 is equivalent in number of condos to three other buildings across the street in Point Edwards, but has 2.5 more times as many small condos, with only one parking space per small condo. I want to say that again. Building 10 is equivalent in number of condos to three buildings across the street from it in Point Edwards. It has 2.5 more times as many small condos, with only one parking space per small condo. Many of these 54 small condos will have two working people per condo, and in many cases will have two cars per condo. That will mean there may be 20 to as many 40 extra cars that are not accounted for in the regular parking system. The three or six off-street parking spaces suggested by the developer or the planners are simply not enough. Few other off-street parking spaces are available on this particular street. Other parking and bus service is far away. There is room to add up to ten more spaces on Pine Street next to Building 10. After all, the sidewalk can be redone and it is part of the 15-foot separation area in the front setback. Now is the time to have the developer do this. The ADB should definitely reject the developer's minimal offer of only three spaces. That is really ludicrous when you consider all these small condos. The ADB should require as many spaces as possible and to recognize the unique parking needs of this isolated, short, hilly street with many extra cars.

Ms. Cufley: Kristy Cufley, Building 51, Unit 309. Good evening members of the Board.

Ms. Noyes: Could you spell your name?

Ms. Cufley: Kristy Cufley, C U F L E Y. I have a letter, which I want to submit for the record. I'm going to go right to the gist of it. You've heard a lot of the points I make in the letter tonight. Basically, I would just echo that when the City of Edmonds first granted approval for the Point Edwards project, it did so based on the good faith belief that the developer would create a beautifully-landscaped project with a total of 10 similarly, situated similarly, appearing buildings. The developer was true to his word for nine of the buildings but for the tenth building has unfortunately deviated drastically and unacceptably from the original concept. This action has created suspicion and anxiety and frustration among the residents of Point Edwards as to just what the impact on us will be and has fueled community opposition, which would have otherwise been nonexistent. We wouldn't be here if the developer had stuck to the original plan of even 60 units in that last building. I can't believe when the City approved the increase in units in 2005 that it ever dreamed that all of those increased units would be crammed into the last, final building. I don't think that was the message.

Ms. Cufley: What happened to the original representation that Point Edwards was to be developed and built as an aesthetically-pleasing and uniform residential community, consisting of 10 comparable structures? What happened to following the model, which is still on display in the sales office for Point Edwards, which clearly shows 10 little buildings all the same? That mockup of the completed Point Edwards project was relied on for years to demonstrate the finished product and also help set the expectation for all of us who purchased homes here that future buildings would be similar to those already constructed. Indeed, the very designation B-10 implies that it is the tenth building in a series.

Ms. Cufley: Why is the final building such an explosively different creature? How can we not be worried about the disruptive impact on our Point Edwards community and about the negative influence on our property values? Instead of welcoming with open arms into our community a building full of new neighbors, is it any wonder that we now worry about the divisive impact of an additional 85 families, which will not be part of the HOA, on the existing amenities, which instead of being shared, must now be somehow segregated and their use policed? Is it any surprise that the residents of Point Edwards now feel deceived and misled? Will the next topic of discussion involve making the existing Point Edwards a gated community?

Ms. Cufley: There's no question that there are legitimate business interests in developing properties, and there's no question that a developer is entitled to realize a reasonable profit in doing so. What is questionable, and what has become deeply objectionable, is the insistence on deviating from the original concept and intent. Rather than design the final building to slip perfectly into place, the crown jewel, as the final piece in the beautiful Point Edwards puzzle, the

developer has, instead, chosen to construct an 85-unit, bloated monstrosity, which will adversely change the tenor and character of our neighborhood. It appears insatiability for monetary profit has trumped commitment to creating one cohesive neighborhood, with the consistency of design. There are 500 people that live in Point Edwards, and we ask that you carefully consider all of the information you've been provided. Thank you for providing us the opportunity to address you this evening. More importantly, in doing so, in considering this issue, you're asked not to lose sight of the bigger picture and not to ignore notions of commonsense to reach an appropriate conclusion. Thank you. And this letter, I would like to be included in the record. And I also would invite you to come look at the Point Edwards site and see for yourself.

Ms. Anttila: Hello, my name is Jenny Anttila, and I live in Edmonds. I don't live in Point Edwards, but I was here the night City approved the Point Edwards plan. It was sort of presented in a way of Brightwater or Point Edwards. Of course, everyone wanted Point Edwards. The decision of 47 feet at the time was based on the oil tanks that were there. This serves notice to Edmonds, to any citizen in Edmonds that cares about the City, and that is the skyline would be deeply affected with this plan. How it got changed to 350 units in 2005 probably nobody knows here why. But I think we all have to consider how it will impact Edmonds, as a city, the look of our city. It's going to look like Kirkland, and it's also going to set a precedent. I think that we really need to consider the size of this building, not just for the Point Edwards people, but I feel for them, but for how it looks in general. It's going to be dominating skyline building. It's going to affect people in Woodway, and I think it's just going to affect the whole of Edmonds in general. It shows the citizens of Edmonds that when we're talking about the Harbor Square Development, how you really need to know at the beginning what is the proposal, and what are the details of the proposal. Obviously, the Point Edwards, when it was approved by the City Council, nobody really thought of the hill factor and should the top buildings, the one we're talking about now, should it have been proportioned so that it wasn't this massive scale. Now you have got a problem presented back to you with basically a new proposal because they had to start again. So it is back in your court to look at this building for the sake of Edmonds and Point Edwards people. Thank you.

Mr. Inadomi: So I'm David Inadomi. I'm from Woodway. I live in the south residence there. I spoke last time. I thought it was kind of funny. Is it Rick who's the counselor for the developer who was up here kind of sounding like the victim in this situation? I kind of feel the same way. That's one thing we have in common. I wrote a list of my grievances already to the Board. You've probably read them, and I don't want to rehash them. But I did want to list a couple of things that I have a saying motif, it's kind of, just because you can do something, doesn't mean you should. I think the density and volume of the units at Building 10 are too big for the real estate. I think when the allowance was made way back when to go from 300 to 350, I don't think the spirit was to have it all concentrated on one piece of property there. So again, just because you can, doesn't mean you should.

Mr. Inadomi: Going back to what Kernen was saying about the underground parking. Yeah, you can do a 50/50 split, so you're doing 70 something/70 something. But the rest of the units at Point Edwards are not that way. It's primarily underground. By doing that conscience decision, you're affecting me, in particularly, directly a lot of traffic right in front of my house, with the attendant noise, volume, unsightliness with the lighting, and that decision not to have enough space for adequate vegetation creates some of the problems for concealment. If you have more underground parking, maybe if you went 70/30 or even more than 90/10, there would be more space available. So again, just because you can, doesn't mean you should. And I would be very interested in working with whoever is doing landscaping, whatever the outcome of this because, obviously, it affects us to a great degree. Thanks.

Chair Gootee: Are there anymore public comments? I think at this time, it is an opportunity for rebuttal. For the applicant, if you so choose. For staff, I've got a quick procedural question on the rebuttal. Is there a time limit? There's no way to address all this stuff in three minutes.

Mr. Lien: They asked for 15 minutes, which seems reasonable.

Chair Gootee: Make it as brief as possible.

Mr. Gifford: Yah, I think we can be pretty brief. We appreciate the comments, the testimony that everybody has submitted and the concerns. One perhaps quick clarification. There was a comment made about the on-street parking proposed by the developer. We didn't propose that; it was suggested by staff that we add two to three on-street parking spaces where the replaced driveway cut was, and we're happy to do that subject to whatever code and engineering limits might exist. We're happy to do that. But that wasn't our idea, but we're agreeing to proceed in that way. Happy to work with the Inadomi's on the landscaping issues.

Mr. Gifford: Again, we come back to the provisions of the code, the provisions of the Comprehensive Plan, the Urban Design Guidelines, the master plan approved for the project—all in place for over a decade. This building is fully in conformance with code and development standards. It meets the requirements of the Comp Plan. It meets the City's approved planning policies and objectives, in our view. We've tried very hard to accommodate the request of the City staff, the Board and even the citizens. I know that's not fully appreciated, and we don't expect it to be, but that's been our effort. We believe we have a fully-compliant building. We hope you will approve it.

Chair Gootee: Thank you. I guess that brings it to time for Board deliberations.

Board Member Schaefer: Is there any more public comment?

Chair Gootee: Any further public comment? So it's now closed and that brings us to . . .

Board Member Walker: It looks like there's someone . . .

Chair Gootee: Come on up, please state your name, city of residence.

Ms. Martin: Monica Martin, 41 Pine, Unit 309. There's a couple of things that weren't brought up that I think are important. I walk a lot around that area. I ride the Sounder train. I'm an avid walker. I know this terrain. I see a lot of people with pets. I see a lot of people walking around. That area is high sloped, it's not wide, there's a lot traffic, a lot of parking. The thing is that the grade where you come up around 45 down to Eagle's Nest is a blind spot. I've seen often people coming over, coming up and coming down Woodway, and increasing the amount of traffic based on this building doesn't compute. Even as it exists right now, it's a safety hazard. I've seen people almost hit. I've seen cars almost run into each other coming over the slope, and I see none of that addressed in this proposal. I'm just taking it from a person that lives there that sees basically, because a lot of people drive, but I walk everywhere. So I see what's happening to the safety, given the traffic implications of the building as it exists right now without any additions that are part of this proposal. I think that needs to be addressed, and I don't see it being addressed now. Thank you.

Chair Gootee: Okay, I'll do this one more time. Is there any more public comment? With that, it's officially closed for public comment. That brings us to Board deliberation, comments, questions? Where do we begin?

Board Member Schaefer: Well, I'm never afraid to jump in, so I will.

Chair Gootee: Please do.

Board Member Schaefer: As one of the commenters mentioned, the big starting point is on the mass, the height of the building. If that gets dealt with, then a lot of the other things around that issue can be resolved. A few things with the mass. One is relying on the 2006 Board review, as far as height, needs to be tempered. The fact that that maximum height was calculated differently than it was calculated for this proposal. There is a difference right there. And so, I guess take the 2006 decision with a grain of salt, the approval, because it wasn't be approved to the same elevation. IN other words, five stories in 2006 is not the same as five stories today. We're talking about, it's a few feet, but a few feet is a half a story. That's something to keep in mind in terms of what was relied upon before. That's going to the process discussion that we heard.

Board Member Schaefer: It may have, and I haven't measured it. It may have a smaller horizontal footprint, the building. But that's because they've moved parking out of the building and put it out in surface parking. So we really . . . A lot of this situation, the issues, have been created by trying to skinny and raise that building and shove parking out into the side yard. And then raising the east side, I guess where I'm starting to go toward thinking about staff's suggestion about dropping the east wing down a story. When you look at it in context, and I'm going now to the design guidelines, which are looking at in comparison . . . I remember the presentations when it was first proposed, and it was this Italian-style hillside terrace concept. I remember the phrase there. And that didn't describe a castle on top. It was this stepping. The problem is if you look at the photo here that was presented in the amendment package, you can see the stepping up (and I can't remember all the building numbers here) and you go from Building 6 to Building 9 to the west wing is one thing, but the jump going from Building 5 to Building 8 and then jumping up to the east wing is considerably different. That's where we lose our terracing and conforming to the hillside in this layout.

Board Member Schaefer: (audience clapping) That's not what we are here for. We're deliberating at this point. This is just the Board. I'm speaking to everyone, but this is a Board deliberation at this point. Thank you.

Board Member Schaefer: That's kind of . . . We hear this morphing of the design over time, but that's the general movement I've seen in the design over time has been that the content of the building has changed and the shape of the building has changed. Moving some of this stuff out into a flat space out back at the high point of the site is causing some of this problem.

Board Member Broadway: I feel like I'm kind of being pulled into a love triangle. I'll explain what I mean by that. As Kernan has explained, the design meets the code. We, as ADB members, so long as the design meets the code and the ordinances within the zoning code, any other comment is outside of our scope. That's one leg of this three-legged stool that I have. I feel like to comment on height when it's meeting the code is going beyond our responsibility. On the other side of that, I do appreciate what the doctor said about "just because you can doesn't mean you should" because there is a conscientiousness about design. And I have to commend you guys with the design that you've come back with because I was adversely against the design that you showed us in December. I do appreciate how you articulated the design this way. I appreciate the conscientiousness that you've put in the redesign, and I know that was not a small feat at all to do that. The third part of this love triangle that I'm struggling with is an image in my mind that comes with the Medici family commissioning Michelangelo to carve David and he's working with this solid slab of marble, and he knows it's got to be this wide and this big, and he gets to the finish carving David and the Medici family comes along and says, no, he's a foot too tall, cut the head off.

Board Member Broadway: I'm struggling with that because the building envelope and how you determine building envelope, and you make that definition is one of the first things you have to do. You have to design, how big is my box? And then you fill up the box, and you articulate the box. But you've got to nail down the box first. What we're asking them to do is completely finish the design and then change the box. I'm struggling with that.

Chair Gootee: Back to dovetailing on that, Rick, and I apologize, I was not here for the December and April meetings. I'm trying to . . . We strive to be consistent, and you're concerns about stepping back, are we going above beyond what we requested in April. Again, everybody here respects this. We strive to be consistent, and we've given the message to a developer in April, here are your parameters, and one reason I want to repeat them again up there. I'm struggling with the fact, although it is very massive to me in my opinion, I'm struggling with the fact that we can't keep moving the goal posts here. But I don't know, since I wasn't here in April, I want to get that clear. I don't know . . . Are you bringing upon a new parameter to this developer?

Board Member Schaefer: I guess kind of to address both. One is, code is not the only thing that the design board is charged with. We also have design guidelines to interpret, and that's why there's a Board. Woodway does not have a board, which was mentioned. All they have is code. We have design guidelines and district plans and that sort of thing to work with. We have project-specific guidelines, and those are what I'm point out is where this design has jumped from what it had been envisioned to be back a decade ago, and now has suddenly gone in a different direction. Now,

when did that happen? The whole process, we've heard a long litany from both staff as well as from the applicants on that. But, to me, it's gotten out of bounds in terms of how it sits on that site. That's just how I . . . I just look at this image. It's nice to see the photograph where much of this development mirrors those original concept sketches, but this is an anomaly out of that. So we do have to consider something more than the code, and I do have an appreciation for projects that change. I'm a design professional. I have brought rocks before and been told no, a bigger rock, a flatter rock, no a blue rock. But as far as my interpretation of the design guidelines and this project is a mismatch.

Board Member O'Neill: I would agree more with Lois and your guidelines, too. We've given them guidelines. The City, the staff, has given them guidelines. They've met those guidelines. They met the criteria that we gave them on the last, in the December meeting to change the design and bring into what we thought was more appropriate. But we never stated that their box had to be smaller. It's within code, and we've given them guidelines all along, and I don't think that we have the opportunity now to change the parameters for them. I think they did an admirable job in changing the concept and the design of the building. I'm also looking at the height thing, and I don't think they've varied from the 2006 height to the new height. In fact, it may be shorter by a couple of feet in looking at the elevations. That being said, I don't see how we can change the guidelines of the code and the guidelines that we've given them in the past.

Board Member Walker: I'll just echo that and say that I agree with what you guys have said, Bruce, Bryan and Lois, about . . . I feel like we were all pretty much in agreement last time with the very specific things that we asked them to do. In terms of changing building size, it wasn't mentioned. I understand this is a Board discussion at this time, and I don't know if it is appropriate to ask staff to address why they've made the recommendation they have at this point. Maybe that can give us more information to work with from your end. I don't know if that is appropriate or not. But I tend to agree with what you guys have said.

Board Member Guenther: I also agree that back in December there was no mention of the bulk. We all agreed that it met the code, the zoning code, as far as height. But I see it's inappropriate now to start talking about pulling the floor out of the east side of that. I don't think that's part of our discussions. I think it's been outlined that we're, again, to talk about the consistency of the building with the rest of the site. Another point is that we had a discussion about the landscaping and the design materials, and we got to see a sample board that we requested. I feel like, you know, the whole discussion about height should not be a topic tonight. I feel like the building is approaching being consistent with the rest of the site as far as materials. It's not a cookie cutter, it's not meant to be. The materials, the scale, the articulation of the façade, is more appropriate with the rest of the site. The landscaping. I think you may want to look at the drive when you go into the entrance for the underground parking. There's a couple of trees there that I think is blocking some views. We're talking about pedestrian safety, I think you need to look at that. Design elements, I think we're right on now. That's how I feel about it.

Chair Gootee: Okay, anything else? Anymore . . .

Board Member Schaefer: I have stated what I thought, but I'm not getting any traction.

Chair Gootee: I think it's time for a motion. Any of the Board Members would like to come forward with a motion?

Board Member O'Neill: I'll make a motion. I move that the Board approves PLN20130022 with the following conditions: 1) On-street parking is required to be added at the location of the existing northern driveway approach which is no longer being used by Building 10. 2) A trellis no taller than 6 feet with associated plantings should be installed adjacent to the top of the rockery on the south side of the surface parking area, and the applicant should work with the adjacent property owner to provide additional screening landscaping. 3) 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. 4) Height calculations are required with the building permit application in order to demonstrate that the project complies with the height requirements of the MP1 zone.

Ms. Noyes: Can I clarify one thing. So, on the one about the trellises, you wanted to replace “or” with “and.” You said “and” instead of “or.”

Board Member O’Neill: I want “and” instead of “or.” . . . and the applicant shall.

Chair Gootee: Is there a second?

Board Member Walker: Second.

Chair Gootee: Time for a vote. All those in favor, say aye.

Board Member O’Neill: Aye.

Board Member Walker: Aye.

Board Member Broadway: Aye.

Chair Gootee: Aye.

Chair Gootee: All those opposed.

Board Member Schaefer: No.

Chair Gootee: This motion passes.

I certify that this verbatim transcript is complete and accurate to the best of my ability.

Karin Noyes
May 23, 2013