

**CITY OF EDMONDS
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MINUTES**

August 5, 2009

Chair Kendall called the August 5, 2009 meeting of the Architectural Design Board to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers at 250 5th Avenue North, Edmonds, Washington.

Board Members Present

Valerie Kendall, Chair
Rick Schaefer, Vice Chair
Bryan Gootee
Michael Mestres
Bruce O'Neill

Staff Present

Jen Machuga, Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

Board Members Absent

Steve Bullock (excused)
William Summers (excused)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

VICE CHAIR SCHAEFER MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JUNE 3, 2009 AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

BOARD MEMBER MESTRES MOVED THAT THE AGENDA BE ACCEPTED AS PRESENTED. VICE CHAIR SCHAEFER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

No one in the audience expressed a desire to address the Board during this portion of the meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA

There were no items on the consent agenda.

MINOR PROJECTS

File Number ADB-2009-40: Application by Elton Roundhill for a new projecting sign at Rory's of Edmonds, located at 105 Main Street. The applicant is requesting a modification to the maximum allowed sign height of 14' so the sign could be mounted to the existing mansard roof at approximately 16'8" above the ground level. The site is zoned Downtown Business (BD-2)

Ms. Machuga presented the staff report and noted that the applicant, Elton Roundhill, was present in the audience. She advised that the subject application is for design review of a new sign for Rory's of Edmonds. While design review for a sign permit would typically be administrative, the applicant has requested a modification to the maximum allowed sign height, which requires ADB review (ECDC 20.60.015.B). She explained that the proposed sign would be mounted on the mansard roof and would be considered a projecting sign. It would comply with the maximum allowed size of 16 square feet for projecting signs within the BD-2 zone, as well as with the maximum allowed total permanent sign area for the site of 60 square feet. She reminded the Board that the maximum allowed height for projecting signs within the BD zones is 14 feet. However, the applicant has proposed that the height of the sign to the top of the anchor be 16' 7½". The Board has the authority to approve the proposed modification to the maximum allowed sign height as long as they can find that the following four criteria are met.

- The request is for signage on a site that has a unique configuration, such as frontage on more than two streets or has an unusual geometric shape.
- The subject property, building or business has site conditions that do not afford it the opportunity to provide signage consistent with or similar to other properties in the vicinity.
- The design of the proposed signage must be compatible in its use of materials, colors, design and proportions with development throughout the site.
- In no event shall the modifications result in signage which exceeds the maximum normally allowed by more than 50 percent.

Ms. Machuga said staff believes the proposal is consistent with the criteria. In particular, the Rory's site is unique because it fronts on two streets and because the topography of the site causes an approximate 3½-foot change in elevation from east to west along the southern façade. Additionally, the proposed sign design and colors are consistent with the design of the existing building and provides a nautical theme, which is compatible with the property's close proximity to the ferry terminal and Puget Sound. Lastly, she emphasized that the applicant has not requested a modification to the maximum allowed size for the sign, so the fourth criteria would be complied with, as well.

Ms. Machuga summarized that staff finds the proposed sign would comply with the modification criteria of ECDC 20.60.015.B. She recommended the Board approve the proposal with the following conditions:

1. That the height of the sign shall not exceed 16' 7½" from ground level to the top of the anchor.
2. That the sign comply with all other applicable sign code standards.
3. That the applicant must apply for and obtain all necessary building permits.

Board Member O'Neill questioned how staff measured 14' 7½" as being the average height when it is clear in the code that height is defined as the average of the four corners of a structure. Ms. Machuga answered that height for the building would be measured using the average of the four corners that make the smallest rectangle around the building. However, because signs are two-dimensional structures, their height is measured based on an average of the two points that project down from the sign. She referred to ECDC 20.60.020.J, which describes how sign height is measured. She concluded that, as per code, sign height is measured differently than building height. Board Member O'Neill referred to ECDC 21.040.030 where height is defined as the average elevation of the downward projections of the four corners of the smallest rectangle that encloses the building. Again, Ms. Machuga pointed out that signs are considered separate from the building structure and are measured differently.

Chair Kendall inquired if measuring the height of the sign based on the four corners of the building would allow the applicant a greater height. Board Member O'Neill answered affirmatively. He referred to ECDC 20.60.020.A, which states that the highest part of the sign shall not be above the mansard roof. Ms. Machuga reminded the Board that the code gives the ADB the ability to modify the sign code, and a modification would be necessary in order for the proposal to move forward. Board Member Gootee agreed with Board Member O'Neill's observations regarding how height is measured. He suggested it would be helpful for this issue to be clarified in the code. Ms. Machuga suggested the Board

APPROVED

could approve the proposal with the condition that the top of the sign be no higher than the top of the mansard roof, with only the anchor sticking above.

Vice Chair Schaefer observed that building height is not really relevant in the case of signs. The sign code identifies a specific number (14) as the maximum height allowed for signs. Ms. Machuga agreed and added that sign height is measured as the greatest vertical distance from the highest point on the sign to the finished grade below.

Board Member Mestres inquired if the applicant is proposing any lighting for the sign. Mr. Roundhill, the applicant, answered that no lighting has been proposed.

Elton Roundhill, applicant, Woodway, explained that his previous sign was damaged in early June, and he constructed the proposed sign with the intention of putting it up on the mansard roof. He said he was not aware of the height restriction when he fabricated the sign. He noted there are already satellites and other things located on the roof so he didn't think the anchor would be an issue. He asked that the Board give some consideration for allowing him to center the sign over the door where the roofline is 14' 7½" in height. He noted that even if the sign were flush with the top of the mansard roof, it would still be in violation of the height limitation. He concluded that the staff report provided a good summary of all of the significant points related to the application, and he added that the satellites would be pulled back so they would not interfere with the silhouette of the anchor, which is intended to be the focal point of the sign.

Board Member Mestres inquired if the applicant's previous sign was vandalized. Mr. Roundhill answered that not only was the sign vandalized, but the menu board has had to be replaced twice. He said he would like the sign to be high enough that people cannot vandalize it as they leave the building. He added that before he replaced the rooftop panels, there was a sign facing west. He does not plan to replace that sign, so the proposed new sign would be the only sign on the building.

Chair Kendall said she likes the nautical design, including the anchor. The anchor would be small and would not have a solid background. Mr. Roundhill pointed out that no part of the anchor is greater than 1" in diameter. In order to make it more visible, he would move the other rooftop items back so they cannot be seen from the street.

Board Member O'Neill asked the applicant to share why it would not be possible to lower the height of the sign to comply with the code. Mr. Roundhill answered that the distance between the top of the gutter to the top of the coping is the exact distance of the elliptical sign. He said he plans to keep the sign as low as possible, but his attachment method would require a few inches of additional height.

Board Member Gootee suggested that the anchor element be placed it on the front rather than the top of the sign. Mr. Roundhill said this would not be possible given the way the sign was put together. He said he had to do a lot of fabricating to keep the anchor solid. Board Member Gootee said he is not convinced that altering the sign design and location to meet code requirements would present a financial hardship for the applicant. While it may cost something to modify the sign, it would not be an impossible endeavor. He said he does not see a solid reason for approving a modification to the code requirements.

Chair Kendall expressed concern that the sign was not brought before the Board for review before it was constructed. While she likes the proposed design, she has concerns about granting a modification that could give an advantage in this location. On the other hand, the proposed new sign would be an improvement over what previously existed. She suggested that perhaps the anchor portion of the sign could be attached to the front without ruining the effect. Board Member Gootee agreed that this would give the same intent and message for very little cost, yet it would keep the sign code compliant. Board Member O'Neill expressed his belief that more attention would be drawn to the anchor if it were mounted on the front of the sign rather than the top. Vice Chair Schaefer said he would be opposed to modifying the sign code requirements without some compelling reasons to support the action. Because the sign could be modified to become code compliant, he sees no reason to grant a modification as requested.

APPROVED

Mr. Roundhill explained that if he were to remove the anchor and center the sign over the entrance door as proposed, the sign would still exceed the height limit allowed for projecting signs. Vice Chair Schaefer suggested the sign could be moved to a different location on the roof. However, he also noted that the design guidelines state that it is important to define the entrances to buildings, and centering the sign above the entrance would make some sense.

Board Member Mestres agreed that the Board is compelled to execute the code, as written, unless there is some compelling reason for a modification. He sympathized with Mr. Roundhill's need to raise the height of the sign to prevent vandalism, and he agreed that centering the sign above the entrance would be aesthetically appealing. He noted the building has two fronts, which could also be part of the argument. However, the Board is compelled to interpret the codes the same for everyone. Ms. Machuga pointed out that even if the sign is not placed above the main entrance door and it fits within the dimensions of the roof, it would still be above the 14-foot height requirement. Vice Chair Schaefer noted that moving the sign to the east where the top of the mansard roof is 14 feet above the ground would be compliant. He said he is not inclined to approve the application in any form.

Board Member Gootee requested staff provide code clarification regarding the way sign height is measured. Measuring height based on an average of the four corners of the building would give the applicant an advantage. He also said that in the absence of technical drawings, it is difficult to know whether the proposed sign would even fit on the mansard roof in the location proposed. He said he finds no compelling reason to modify the code requirements to accommodate the anchor portion of the sign.

The Board agreed they are reluctant to approve modifications to the sign code requirements. Board Member O'Neill referred to Attachment 8 and observed that if the height were measured from the sidewalk, the sign would be below 13 feet in height minus the anchor, which would meet the code requirements. He recommended the Board approve the proposal to allow the sign a height of no more than 14' 7½", with no part of the sign extended above the height of the mansard roof.

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL MOVED THE BOARD APPROVE THE PROPOSED NEW SIGN TO BE LOCATED AT 14'7½" WITH NO PART TO EXCEED THE HEIGHT OF THE MANSARD ROOF. THE MOTION DIED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.

Board Member Gootee said he does not see a hardship, which is a necessary criteria in order for the Board to approve a modification. Choosing a different location and relocating or removing the anchor would still allow the applicant effective exposure, and the changes would not be costly, either. Vice Chair Schaefer agreed he does not see a compelling reason to grant an exception to the code requirements. While it would look nice for the sign to project above the mansard roof somewhat, the Board must enforce the code as written.

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL MOVED THAT THE SIGN BE APPROVED WITH THE CONDITION THAT NO PORTION MAY BE HIGHER THAN THE MANSARD ROOF OR GREATER THAN 14 FEET ABOVE THE GRADE BELOW THE SIGN. BOARD MEMBER MESTRES SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Roundhill said he appreciates the Board taking the time to review his application. He said he also appreciates their need to enforce the existing codes. He observed that the only reason he paid the money to have his application reviewed by the Board was the chance for a modification from the normal code requirements. Had he known there was no chance of the Board ever granting a modification to the sign code, he would probably not have gone through the time and effort to present his application.

File Number ADB-2009-15: Application by Bob Gregg for revision of the street-level awnings at Old Milltown. The site is zoned Downtown Business (BD-1).

APPROVED

Ms. Machuga presented the staff report and noted that the applicant, Bob Gregg, was present in the audience. She advised that the subject application is for design review of a proposed change to the previously approved canopies for the Old Milltown Building located at 201 -5th Avenue South. She explained that, currently, the applicant's approved plans are for metal canopies over the two main entrances and fabric canopies over the first floor windows along both facades. The applicant has proposed to remove the metal canopies over the two main entrances from the plans and to replace the fabric canopies over the first floor windows with fabric awnings resembling those shown in Attachment 4 of the staff report.

Ms. Machuga reviewed that the site is located in the BD-1 zone and is subject to the design standards of ECDC 22.43 for the BD-1 zone. Staff reviewed the proposal for compliance with those standards that are applicable to awnings and canopies. Of particular note, ECDC 22.43.040.B.2 states that awnings and canopies shall be open sided. However, the proposal shows that the awnings would be closed sided, which would not be consistent with this standard. Additionally, ECDC 22.43.040.B.5 states that awnings and canopies shall be located within the building elements that frame storefronts and should not conceal important architectural features. Awnings or canopies should be hung just below a clerestory or transom window, if one exists. She noted that the proposal does not specify where the awnings would be mounted, but if they are mounted directly above the windows, the architectural detail of the windows would be concealed. If they are mounted higher so the base of the awnings are at the level of the top of the windows, they would conceal the architectural detail of the façade just above the windows.

Ms. Machuga observed that the approved plan for the canopies over the main entrances and windows is consistent with the design objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed change would provide less weather protection at the main entrances, block light and air into the upper portions of the windows and cause the building entrances to be less defined. For these reasons, and those discussed in the staff report, she recommended the Board deny the proposed revision to the approved canopies.

Board Member O'Neill referred to Attachment 3, which provides illustrations identified as a previous submittal view and the current submittal view. He questioned the differences between the two. Ms. Machuga explained that the canopy design has already been revised once. The photograph identified as the "previous submittal" is the applicant's original proposal, and the photograph identified as the "current submittal" is the second proposal, which was previously approved by the Board. The current proposal is a new version that is not shown in Attachment 3.

Bob Gregg, applicant, Edmonds, recalled that the Old Milltown Project has been a frustrating venture, and this is the first time he has ever been up against a staff recommendation of denial. He said he just received the staff report today, and in conversations with Mr. Clugston, it became clear there was some confusion. He emphasized that he does not care where the awnings are placed on the building, but he needs some clear direction from the Board. He said he is not present to argue with the staff's recommendation, but to resolve the confusion.

Mr. Gregg referred to Attachment 6, which provides a view of the building as it currently exists. He explained that he has solicited the opinion of several groups of people about where the awnings should be placed on the building, but he has been unable to come to a conclusion. He noted the grade change that exists on the subject property, as well as the fact that the buildings are not symmetrical on both sides. The height of the glass is not consistent on both sides of the building, either.

Mr. Gregg explained that staff's interpretation of the code would require that the awnings on clerestory or transom windows must be placed midway down the window at a height of 7½ feet, which would not be possible or practical in this situation. He noted that while staff referred to the panes of glass as clerestory or transom windows, they are neither. There are large storefront openings that could have single, large pieces of plate glass, but the original tenant wanted the windows to open. The control line that staff referred to was placed in this location because it was the largest open window they could buy. Rather than being clerestory or transom windows, they are simply mullions in large plates of

glass. If this was a tall, one-story building, the upper windows would be considered clerestory, but that is not the case. A window divided by mullions would not be considered either clerestory or transom.

Mr. Gregg said he does not have a problem with any of the alternatives for awning location, but his recommendation is to place them at the top of the windows. The awnings would extend out 5 feet and down 3½ feet. He suggested that the consistency of running the awnings at the top of the windows on 5th Avenue and Dayton would be the most pleasing alternative.

Mr. Gregg pointed out that the new proposal would use a triangular awning. Staff initially indicated this change would be acceptable. They later learned that the code requires open ended awnings, which he would not be opposed to. He noted there would be very little space between the awnings, which would be divided by brackets for flower baskets. The awnings would almost appear to be continual.

Mr. Gregg said his current proposal would also eliminate the canopies at the two entrance locations. He said it was recently noted that the City's light pole would be located closer to the building than 5 feet, so the canopy that was originally approved would no longer be possible. The approved canopies would also be a violation of code because there are transom windows over the door, which would require that the awnings to be located underneath. He noted there is already an overhang to provide weather protection at the entrance, and the entrance design is fairly spectacular and doesn't need metal to draw attention to it. The same applies to the approved canopies at the minor entrance.

Mr. Gregg explained that the concrete walls were originally supposed to be preserved and used to hold up the building. However, the structural engineers found there was no rebar in the concrete walls and they were not structurally capable of holding themselves up let alone anything else. They built a steel frame inside the building, and the black pins on the outside of the building tie the concrete back to the original frame. The structural engineers have indicated that the approved cantilevered steel canopies are too heavy and a lighter solution is needed. They are now proposing that the awnings be constructed of aluminum frames and Sunbrella fabric. Rather than being flat, they would be triangular.

Board Member O'Neill inquired if awnings are proposed for the north side of the building, and Mr. Gregg answered affirmatively. He emphasized that the proposal would not change the number of awnings on the building, but the frame material would be changed from steel to aluminum.

Vice Chair Schaefer clarified that in addition to asking for a change in the awning materials, the applicant is also asking that the canopies over the corner entrance be eliminated altogether.

Board Member O'Neill referred to the staff report, which states that "by changing the linear canopies to standard awnings and removing the metal canopies entirely, the building does not have the same form or function. The canopies were an important part of the design and review processes throughout the project and their removal would simply detract from the finished product at Old Milltown." He suggested that this statement is very pertinent to the Board's discussion regarding the current proposal.

Board Member Mestres recalled that the reason the Board was in favor of the transparent awnings was because they were minimal in nature and would not take away from the building's architectural elements. While the design guidelines for the BD-1 zone do not require transparent awnings, the Board agreed that the building would benefit from this feature. Chair Kendall recalled that in a previous discussion, the Board agreed that the Sunbrella fabric would be acceptable.

Board Member Mestres referred to Mr. Gregg's comments about the structural integrity of the building fascia. Because none of the Board Members are structural engineers, they must rely on the information provided by the applicant and staff to verify this statement. He agreed with Mr. Gregg that the building has a group of fascias that make a unified solution for awnings difficult to accomplish. Mr. Gregg emphasized that the current code language allows both awnings and/or canopies.

Vice Chair Schaefer observed that not only must the Board review the current proposal based on the code requirements; they must also consider the lengthy process they went through when approving the original design. He recalled there was a lot of discussion regarding canopies versus awnings. However, he acknowledged the original approval did not identify a uniform mounting height for the canopies. Whether the windows are clerestory or transom, the Board was interested in drawing in a historic look. This was also part of the original presentation made by the applicant's architect. The awnings do not necessarily have to be placed at the mullion; they could be placed in between the mullion and the top of the window to get the clerestory effect.

Vice Chair Schaefer said he would be opposed to eliminating the canopies at the two entrances since this would be a step away from the design that was originally approved. He said he does not consider this part of the proposal to be minor in nature. He said he would support the proposal to change the awning materials, as long as they are open ended so that light can still get through. He said he is not so worried about symmetry of the awnings since they will help break up the look of the building, which is also a concern that was discussed as part of the Board's review of the original application.

Board Member Gootee suggested that cost is driving the current proposal. After the original project design was approved, the applicant found that the structural integrity of the wall would require a significant cost to implement the approved design. While it would be possible to move forward with the approved canopy designs, it would be very costly. Mr. Gregg emphasized that it is structurally impossible to place 1,000 pound cantilevered iron canopies on the existing walls.

Vice Chair Schaefer pointed out that the proposed new awnings would be closed in rather than open ended. Mr. Gregg clarified that the awnings would actually be open ended to comply with the current code requirements. However, they would be pitched rather than flat. Chair Kendall pointed out that flat canopies would have a more historical look than pitched awnings. They would also provide more access to the building. Both she and Vice Chair Schaefer felt this was a significant design change.

Board Member O'Neill expressed concern that the lack of specificity in the code with regard to awnings and canopies is a problem. Mr. Gregg agreed. He said his first choice was to use canopies, but they later found it was not possible at the entrance because of the City's required light pole. Board Member Mestres observed that the Board has not specified canopies or awnings for any other development in the City. He said that while he would prefer a canopy, the Board must defer to input from the applicant's structural engineer and staff to determine whether the existing structure would preclude the canopy design that was originally approved.

Mr. Gregg pointed out that the original design identified louvers underneath the canopies. They did not like the looks of the louvers and they chose to replace them with glass, which was a more expensive option. In addition, they had to create a way to get air into the building, which was accomplished by two 14-foot penetration shafts. The building looks much better without the louvers and with full glass, but they had to take a step back with the awnings.

Vice Chair Schaefer asked if it would be possible to flatten the pitch of the awnings. Board Member Gootee explained that there may be issues related to load capacity if the awnings are flattened. Vice Chair Schaefer said he is interested in preserving the look of what the Board previously approved. Mr. Gregg suggested the Board could make their approval subject to the manufacturer making the awning pitch as shallow as possible.

Board Member O'Neill said he would like the applicant to provide more specific drawings of what the canopies or awnings would look like. Board Member Mestres agreed that less of a pitch would be better aesthetically. Mr. Gregg agreed that the angle of the pitch is irrelevant to him, as long as the awnings are structurally sound.

Board Member O'Neill questioned if it would be possible to construct awnings that have more architectural detail. Mr. Gregg answered that the iron canopies were designed to look massive and heavy, which is a difficult look to obtain using

aluminum-framed awnings. Board Member O'Neill suggested it may be possible to provide some architectural detail that is compatible with the aluminum frame awnings but still consistent with the design that was originally approved.

Chair Kendall summarized that the proposed changes are significant alterations to the appearance of the building and the Board would like to see more detailed drawings to illustrate how the proposed changes would look before making a decision. She said she believes the Board and applicant could easily resolve the issue regarding awning location, but eliminating the awnings at the two entrances is a more significant modification that would completely change the appearance of the building. She recalled that the original approval followed a significant public process, and the canopies at the entrance was a major element in the original design. At the same time, she tends to listen and follow the advice of structural engineers in her line of work. Modifying the awnings to make them work would require a significant amount of design and cost. She concluded that she does not believe the Board is ready to make a decision on this issue until they have more detailed drawings.

Vice Chair Schaefer agreed that location of the awnings is a solvable problem, but elimination of the canopies at the entrances is a much bigger issue. Board Member Mestres pointed out there is already weather protection at the two entrances, and the location of the light pole eliminates the ability for a five-foot awning at the corner. However, an awning could be added at the secondary entrance.

Board Member O'Neill said he doesn't have a concern about eliminating the canopies at the entrances, because they are already recessed to stand out from the other canopied areas. Mr. Gregg expressed concern that wrapping the proposed awning around the entire building would make the entrances less visible. He noted that the entrances are already recessed with lighting and definitely stand out.

Board Member Mestres observed that the original canopy was preferable because it would have been unobtrusive and would not have hidden any architectural embellishments that the applicant worked hard to maintain. He would like the new proposed awnings to be as unobtrusive as possible, as well.

Chair Kendall questioned if the Board Members are concerned that eliminating the canopies at the two entrances would significantly reduce opportunities for shelter from the weather. She noted that people tend to congregate on corners, and that means the recessed entrance would provide the only weather protection. Mr. Gregg agreed that the purpose of the open space is for public gathering and the project provides shelter that was non-existent before. Chair Kendall agreed but noted that the shelter space would be reduced if the canopies are eliminated.

Board Member Gootee felt the recessed entrances provide sufficient shelter without the canopies, and Vice Chair Schaefer concurred. Board Member O'Neill said he does not see why an applicant should be required to provide shelter along the entire side of a building. Board Member Mestres felt that even if the codes do not require shelter along the entire expanse of the building, it is definitely encouraged, and the proposed awnings would satisfy this need. Vice Chair Schaefer noted that the design guidelines do require shelter, and Mr. Gregg pointed out that the project would provide 128 feet of shelter plus the two recessed entrances.

Chair Kendall suggested the Board entertain the idea of shortening the canopy at the entrance to accommodate the light pole. Board Member Gootee said his understanding is that the canopy was part of the original intent of the Board and they should stay consistent with that original design. Mr. Gregg pointed out that the canopy at the entrance was actually proposed by the applicant and was not a Board requirement.

Board Member Gootee said he still believes the issue is a financial one for the applicant because anything can be done with enough money. The argument is more about practicality, and it is not practical to do the canopy. He suggested the applicant come forward with new elevation drawings showing the awnings with as minimal a slope as possible. He felt it would be possible for the Board and applicant to come up with a solution that does not compromise the intent or look of the structure. Perhaps a more practical solution would be shallow awnings. Chair Kendall agreed she would like the

applicant to present an alternate proposal with some detail because the entrance is a significant architectural feature. The canopies are not required by code, and the applicant has indicated they are not practical. The Board could consider the option of eliminating the canopies since they were actually proposed by the applicant in the original design. Again, Board Member Mestres suggested the Board must defer to the staff and the applicant's structural engineer to provide feedback regarding the structural integrity of the building.

The Board postponed their decision on ADB-2009-15 to the September 2, 2009 meeting. They invited Mr. Gregg to bring back drawings for the north and west elevations that clearly illustrate his proposal for code compliant awnings at a practical height above the windows and with as little slope as possible. They also invited him to provide drawings to illustrate what the two entrance locations would look like if the canopies were eliminated as proposed.

Mr. Gregg invited the Board Members to visit the site and observe the different alternatives for the awning location. He expressed his belief that they should be able to work out a solution that is code compliant.

Ms. Machuga said that from staff's perspective, however the windows are defined, the code standards state that awnings or canopies shall be located within the building elements that frame store fronts and shall not conceal architectural details. Vice Chair Schaefer noted that the location in the original proposal would have created a clerestory effect. Mr. Gregg said that if the awnings were flat, this would make sense, but they are not.

APPROVED

MAJOR PROJECTS

No major projects were scheduled on the agenda.

CONSOLIDATED PERMIT APPLICATIONS

No consolidated permit applications were scheduled on the agenda.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Work Session on ADB Job Descriptions

Chair Kendall recalled that a previous Board Member thought that participating on the Board would provide an opportunity to express his personal vision of art and architecture, which was problematic in terms of the comments that were provided on projects. She suggested the job descriptions should somehow address this concern. Board Member O'Neill said he believes it is the Board's responsibility to enforce the code. As a Board Member he tries to avoid telling people whether their design is good or bad; his job is to make sure the code requirements are enforced. The Board Members must make it clear when they are stating their opinions as opposed to what is required by code. Board Member Mestres observed that their comments must be defensible and comply with the Development Code and Comprehensive Plan, and personal preferences are not relevant in the Board's review process.

The Board postponed their discussion regarding ADB Job Descriptions to their next meeting.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBERS COMMENTS

Chair Kendall commended the Board for handling well the two complex and sophisticated issues that came before them tonight.

Board Member Gootee inquired if it would be possible for the Board to meet in a different format to discuss issues and then come back to the public meeting to present their findings. Chair Kendall recalled a training session she attended where the City Attorney made it clear that the Board Members cannot discuss matters privately. She noted that the City Attorney even cautioned them not to discuss applications and other items before them in their email communications. However, he suggested that if a meeting gets heated, the Board could adjourn for a short time to collect their thoughts and then reconvene the public meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

APPROVED