

APPROVED

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

February 2, 2011

Chair Kendall called the February 2, 2011 meeting of the Architectural Design Board to order at 7:00 p.m., at the City Council Chambers, 250 - 5th Avenue North, Edmonds, Washington.

ROLL CALL

Board Members Present

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

Board Members Absent

Lois Broadway (excused)

Staff Present

Gina Coccia, Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER MESTRES MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 15, 2010 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

No changes were made to the agenda.

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:

No minor projects were scheduled on the agenda.

MAJOR PROJECTS:

File Number PLN20100075: Application by Woodhaven Veterinarian Clinic to construct a new single-story 4,956 square foot veterinary facility to replace the existing 2,379 square foot building that was constructed in 1962. The site is located at 23204 Edmonds Way in the Neighborhood Business (BN) zone

Ms. Coccia presented the Staff Report. She announced that after the Staff Report was mailed out, the City received an email from Leslie Longaker, an adjacent residential property owner, expressing support for the project. She labeled the correspondence as Attachment 10. She invited those present in the audience to place their names on the sign-up sheet to become parties of record, and staff would mail them a copy of the ADB's decision.

Ms. Coccia advised that the proposal is for review and approval of the site, landscaping and proposed building design of the Woodhaven Veterinary Clinic located at 23204 Edmonds Way in the Neighborhood Business (NB) zone. The existing 2,379 square foot building would be demolished and replaced with a new 4,956 square foot facility. She thanked the applicant for preparing a very thorough application (Attachment 3), which contained an explanation of what they are proposing to do, colored renderings of the site and landscape plans, etc.

Ms. Coccia explained that the proposal is a Type III-B development application, which requires Architectural Design Board (ADB) review. The ADB will review the design of the proposal and make the final decision on whether it is consistent with the design review criteria found in Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC) 20.11 (general design review), ECDC 16.45 (zoning ordinance) ECDC 20.13 (landscaping) and the Comprehensive Plan. She further explained that because of the number of parking spaces, size of the building and proposed grading and fill, review under the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) was required. The City issued a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) on January 18, 2011 (Attachment 5). No comments or appeals were received, and both the City and the applicant have complied with the SEPA requirements. She advised that notices of application and hearing were published and posted as required by the code. In addition, notices were mailed to all property owners within 300 feet of the site. She reported that the application was reviewed and evaluated by various City Departments. At the request of the Engineering Division, the applicant verified the proposed parking configuration (Attachment 4). She reviewed that the topography of the site is relatively flat and there are no critical areas on or adjacent to the property.

Ms. Coccia referred to Attachment 9, an email from Linda Nomellini dated January 20, 2010, voicing concern about the bus stop that is located at the southeast corner of the property within the public right-of-way. Ms. Coccia reminded the Board that any work within the public right-of-way would require a permit from the Engineering Division. The City's Traffic Engineer has indicated that the applicant would be required to contact Community Transit if they need to do any work that would impact the bus stop. To address this issue, staff is recommending a condition that the applicant contact not only Community Transit, but the Engineering Division and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) because the subject property is located along a major highway. She suggested the applicant may want to address her plans for this corner of the property as part of the presentation.

Ms. Coccia advised that ECDC 17.50.020.B.4 requires one parking space per 200 square feet of building floor area for veterinary offices. The 25 parking spaces proposed by the applicant meets this code requirement.

Ms. Coccia said the applicant has not submitted a sign permit application. However, the logo and wall signs are shown on the elevations. She reviewed that a low (3-foot tall) monument sign is proposed near the east side of the site along Edmonds Way (Page 21 of Attachment 3). The monument sign would be permitted in the setback area based on its height. Wall-mounted signs have been proposed for the east and west elevations, and the veterinary clinic's logo would be placed on the trash enclosure. She explained that because the art shown on the trash enclosure is the logo, staff believes it qualifies as a sign. Therefore, the applicant is proposing a total of four signs. She explained that the primary public entrance to the proposed new building is approximately 85 feet in length, affording the applicant with 85 square feet of signage. The code says this signage can be divided between wall and free-standing signs, but the total number of signs allowed per site is limited to three. She reminded the ADB that they have the authority to modify the requirements of the sign code if certain findings are made (ECDC 20.60.015.B.1):

- *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. Ms. Coccia noted that the site fronts on two streets and has a unique configuration.

- *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.* Ms. Coccia stated that because of site constraints, it could be argued that the site conditions do not afford it an opportunity to provide signage consistent with similar properties in the vicinity. She noted that properties across the street in Esperance have a massive amount of signage.
- *The design of the proposed signage must be compatible in its use of materials, colors, design and proportions with development throughout the site.* Ms. Coccia expressed her belief that the sign design is compatible with the building through its use of materials, design and proportions.
- *In no event shall the modification result in signage which exceeds the maximum normally allowed by more than 50 percent.* Ms. Coccia observed that the applicant would not be requesting relief of sign area, just the number of signs permitted on site.

Ms. Coccia recommended the ADB consider granting the applicant relief from the sign code requirements to allow the logo to be placed on the trash enclosure as shown. Staff believes the proposed design complements the building and site.

Ms. Coccia referred the Board to the landscaping requirements found in ECDC 20.13, which are intended to go hand-in-hand with the Comprehensive Plan's Urban Design Guidelines. She noted that the applicant's landscape architect provided several pages of materials for the Board's review (Attachment 3). She explained that ECDC 0.13.000 specifically allows the ADB and Hearing Examiner to interpret and modify the landscape requirements, if appropriate. She said she believes the applicant has tried to comply with the landscaping chapter and she supports the proposed landscape plan. However, she suggested the ADB and applicant discuss how the small areas of artificial turf and entry planters would help the site achieve the intent of ECDC 20.13. She noted that the artificial turf areas along the south property line should not be noticeable or visible from adjacent properties due to the fencing and landscaped screening. The area of artificial turf near the north property line is shown to be screened by a medium hedge. The applicant has indicated the artificial turf is necessary in areas where heavy dog use would preclude the successful growth of lawn or ground cover. Potted planters and other hardscape features would be used in areas where they anticipate heavy use by dogs to keep dogs from marking the building siding. She said she believes the planters offer a good compromise near the entrance to the facility. She said she also supports the applicant's proposal to use artificial turf and noted that these areas would be small in comparison to the rest of the site, and they would be screened with fences and/or hedges.

Ms. Coccia summarized that this application is the most thorough she has seen, and she recommended the ADB approve the project with the following conditions:

1. The street tree species shall be re-reviewed and approved by both the City of Edmonds Parks and Recreation Department and WSDOT prior to building permit issuance.
2. The bus stop near the site should not be impacted by the demolition and construction of the new Woodhaven Veterinary Clinic. If it becomes clear that the project will disrupt this bus stop, the City should be contacted immediately (as well as WSDOT and Community Transit) in order to find a solution so that bus service is not interrupted. Work in the right-of-way requires a permit – owner/applicant will need to contact the Engineering Division for details.
3. The trash enclosure shall be permitted to be designed as shown with the Woodhaven logo (and not text), in order to further complement the building and site. It is understood that this will not count against the number of signs permitted on the site.

Vice Chair Schaefer asked if the definition of a sign code includes signs that are not visible from off site. Ms. Coccia answered affirmatively. Board Member O'Neill asked if the proposed signage meets the square footage requirements based on the length of the front façade. Ms. Coccia answered that staff has not calculated the total sign area proposed by the applicant. This would be done as part of the sign permit application process. However, the proposal exceeds the number of signs allowed per site.

Ann Brudvik, owner of Woodhaven Veterinary Clinic, said that when she and her husband, John, purchased the clinic 19 years ago, they knew that improvements would be needed at some point in the future. She noted that the building is nearly 50 years old, but it is not likely to be considered a candidate for the Edmonds Register of Historic Places. She said they initially thought they could expand the practice and improve upon the existing building but later learned that this would require them to upgrade to meet all current code requirements. Several years ago, they made the decision to replace the building with a new hospital.

Ms. Brudvik said early in the process, they hired Architect Jeffrey Keast, from Animal Arts, to design the project. Mr. Keast has a clear understanding of how to design specifically for veterinary clinics. Later in the process, a local design team was formed that includes Landscape Architect Susan Jensen, JensenGreenDesignGroup; Consulting Architect Rick Utt, Cornerstone Architectural Group; Engineer Brock Long, Lovell-Sauerland and Associates, Inc.; and graphic designer Clayton Moss, Sign Tech. Ms. Brudvik summarized that while they want a larger practice, they do not want it to be huge. They want the new building to be at the appropriate neighborhood scale, and she believes the proposed plans accomplish this goal.

Rick Utt, Cornerstone Architectural Group, said he feels fortunate to help the Brudvik's with this phase of their project. While he did not do the original design, he has had some input, and he is excited about the current proposal, which he believes addresses all elements of the code even though the site is extremely tight. He explained that, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, the site could certainly have been rezoned to Community Business (CB), as is the property north of the site. Under BC zoning there is no requirement for a 20-foot street setback, which would have allowed the building to front directly on the street sidewalk. This would have provided a greater buildable area. However, the applicant did not feel a rezone would be necessary because they desire the clinic to be constructed further from the street within a garden-like environment.

Mr. Utt explained that the footprint of the proposed building follows the site shape and is further influenced by the setback requirements. The parking will be located behind the building. While they would like to put the trash enclosure behind the building, as well, the setback and parking requirements do not allow sufficient space for this to occur and still provide adequate service access. Therefore, they are proposing a trash enclosure that is an integral part of the building design. He recognized that City staff considers the proposed trash enclosure logo to be a sign, but he emphasized that the proposed design is much more attractive than a typical chain-link trash enclosure.

Mr. Utt said the applicant may be required to install a fire water line that may temporarily impact the bus stop area, but steps could be taken to ensure that people still have access to the bus. All the remaining work should be contained on site. He noted that a new sidewalk would be constructed on 232nd Street. Mr. Utt said the application submittal also includes civil engineer drawings to explain why it is necessary to use a stormwater retention system rather than a detention pond.

Mr. Utt said he admires the work done by architects at Animal Arts because their design uses every bit of space to the clinic's advantage. The existing clinic is very cramped, and their current staff level is more appropriate for the size of building being proposed. The clinic is merely trying to catch up with their current needs. He provided colored samples of the proposed building materials including the wood siding, metal roof, window frames, and glass.

Vice Chair Schaefer said he was pleased that the applicant is proposing infiltration of stormwater in some locations because the soil in this location clearly allows for this to occur. He asked if the proposed artificial turf would be placed in areas that are used by animals. He questioned the maintenance requirements of the proposed material. Mr. Utt answered that the artificial turf proposed by the applicant has been used successfully by the City of Kirkland for some of their smaller public areas.

Susan Jensen, JensenGreenDesignGroup, said she worked hard with the owner of the Woodhaven Veterinary Clinic to provide a new landscape design that:

- Features a variety of ornamental and native plant species to provide seasonal interest throughout the year, which are hardy to the Pacific Northwest and easy to care for.
- Compliments the elevations of the handsome new building and provides an attractive street frontage and surface parking area.
- Meets the City's landscape requirements and standards.
- Provides a positive user experience for the staff and human clients, as well as accommodates the needs of the animal patients of the thriving veterinary practice.

Ms. Jensen said the clinic owner requested a landscape design that looks great year round and provides seasonal interest as well as contrasting colors and textures. She prefers ordered landscape where plants of various heights, colors and textures are arranged in layers to compliment the building elevations. She referred the Board to the proposed landscape plan and particularly pointed out the following features:

- **Edmonds Way Frontage** – Type III Landscaping has been proposed in this area, which will include a traditional lawn strip with maple street trees adjacent to the sidewalk. The applicant will work with the Parks and Recreation Department and WSDOT to verify that this species is an acceptable street tree in this location. A layered look would be created in back of the lawn by using evergreen groundcovers followed by linear masses of low shrubs like dwarf red twig dogwood and rhododendrons. Medium height evergreen plantings of Japanese holly and pieris would be planted along the building. Most plantings along the street frontage will be lower to avoid screening the windows, provide safety, and meet the sight distance requirements. A monument sign will rise out of the ferns and will rest on a low grass berm. A 4-foot-wide accessible concrete walkway would provide direct pedestrian access from Edmonds Way to the clinic entrance.
- **Parking Lot Landscaping** – The proposed parking lot landscaping will exceed the code requirements and will include trees and low plantings on each side of the parking entrance. The trash enclosure will be screened with an architecturally-compatible wood enclosure and enhanced landscaping of evergreen trees and shrubs.
- **West Side of Parking Area** – Type II Landscaping is proposed in this 4-foot wide planting strip. Due to a restricted site area, it is difficult to provide enough width to accommodate trees adjacent to the stalls. To meet the intent of the code and create a visual separation between similar uses, the applicant is proposing a 4-foot high wood fence and rows of evergreen shrubs. Two narrow trellis sections will be added on top of the fence, and green clematis would be planted to create a vertical green screen.
- **South end of Parking Area** – The applicant is proposing to create a sitting area with benches around the focal point of a large specimen Japanese maple. As recommended by the City's code, they hope to relocate the existing 20-foot maple tree from the site to this location. If that is not possible, a new tree would be planted.
- **West Elevation** – A continuous wide concrete path along the west elevation of the building would serve clinic users. While the City's landscape requirements call for four foot wide foundation plantings along the building, except at entrances, they are proposing a slightly different but equally attractive series of landscape solutions due to the unique nature of the clinic and the habit for dogs to mark territory. An arrangement of granite stones reclaimed from the current site will be set in river cobbles at the north end of the building. A combination of modern raised planters with year-round plants and seasonal color will be placed near the entry, along with a bench. She provided an illustration of the type of planters that could be used. At the middle of the elevation, just outside the comfort room, the applicant is proposing a comfort garden of rocks, ferns, nandina and bamboo in large planters. A simple evergreen hedge of Japanese holly will be planted along the south end, where less pet traffic is expected.
- **Artificial Turf Areas** -- The applicant is proposing to use high-quality artificial turf in three limited site areas where they think heavy dog use will preclude the successful growth of lawn or groundcovers: directly north of the northwest building corner, at the south end of the parking lot, and a strip south of the building in the enclosed fenced area. She provided a sample of the type of turf that is used for sports fields and a sample of the material that is proposed for the clinic. She explained that the proposed material has been used successfully at other veterinary clinics in the United States and is typically installed over top of crushed rock or gravel to allow

water to infiltrate into the underlying soil. She explained that this new material looks like real turf, withstands heavy foot and dog traffic, and limits the amount of mud being tracked into the clinic. It can also be easily cleaned by hose.

- **South Area Landscape and Buffer** – Type 1 Landscaping is required along the south edge of the property where the project abuts a residential zone. The residential property contains a solid row of mature trees that already provide effective screening. The applicant is proposing two additional rows of evergreen trees and a six-foot solid wood fence along the south property line. Trees, large shrubs and ground cover will be added to create a park-like setting. An open style four-foot metal fence will be installed at either building end to the south property line to create a secure area for staff to use.
- **Existing Vegetation** – Redevelopment of the clinic precludes saving any of the existing vegetation in place. However, the owner is consulting with tree spade companies to dig and relocate some of the trees and shrubs (Japanese maple, Hinoki cypress and Alaskan weeping cedars) to her property next door where they can be heeled in and saved for relocation at the new clinic. Final commitments will be made once estimates and valuations from arborists are in hand.
- **Irrigation System** – The entire landscape area will be served by a new automatic irrigation system.

Board Member O'Neill requested more information about the proposed turf surfaces. Ms. Jensen said the surface is designed to allow water to drain through the rock and infiltrate into the soil. Board Member O'Neill asked if the Engineering Department has certified this material as pervious. He noted that the City may not classify crushed rock as pervious surface. Ms. Jensen clarified that the underlying rock would likely be pea gravel. She noted that the surface would not be designed to support vehicular traffic, so the material should allow for adequate drainage into the underlying soil.

Vice Chair Schaefer questioned how the wood fencing would transition to the metal fencing proposed at both ends of the south side of the building. Ms. Jensen said the metal fence is intended to provide visual security and would be painted to match the wood fence.

NO ONE IN THE AUDIENCE EXPRESSED A DESIRE TO ADDRESS THE BOARD, SO THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Board Member Mestres said he supports the proposed artificial turf. He noted that surfaces of dog parks are typically constructed of rock or artificial turf. The proposed materials would be a preferred alternative to either of these options. Regarding signage, Board Member Mestres recalled that the Board previously approved the weather vanes at the PCC property, which included a logo, without counting them as part of the total sign package. He said he does not regard the logo proposed for the trash enclosure as a sign, but as an affectation of the design of the enclosure.

At the request of Board Member O'Neill, Mr. Utt reviewed that two wall signs are proposed on the east and west elevations, and a monument sign is proposed along Edmonds Way. In addition, the applicant is proposing to place the clinic's logo on the trash enclosure, and the City has determined this would constitute an additional sign. Ms. Brudvik pointed out that the logo was used as a placeholder to illustrate the proposed location of some type of animal graphic. She indicated she would not be opposed to replacing the logo with some other type of design that includes neither a logo nor text.

Board Member Mestres said he does not believe the Board could justify allowing an additional sign just because the property is located adjacent to Esperance where more signage is allowed by Snohomish County. The City of Edmonds has different sign code requirements that should apply to all properties in Edmonds. However, he disagreed that the graphic proposed for the trash enclosure could be defined as a sign. Once again, he referred to the weather vanes at PCC, which were previously approved. The logos were considered embellishment and not signage. He said he would be in favor of allowing the proposed trash enclosure graphic without classifying it as a sign. Board Member O'Neill said he would support the graphic, also, particularly if it does not include either the logo or name of the business.

Board Member Gootee suggested the applicant use some other type of artwork rather than the clinic's logo to avoid the issue of whether it is a sign or not. He cautioned against setting a precedent for allowing more signs without compelling arguments to support the change. The applicant agreed that artwork could be used in place of the logo.

Vice Chair Schaefer observed that the function of the trash enclosure design is to tie the site together, but it is not seen from the street. He said he is confident the sign consultant can come up with a design that is appropriate. Using some other type of graphic in place of the logo would allow the applicant to avoid a situation where the graphic is characterized as a sign.

Chair Kendall said she was impressed with the customized aspect of the proposed project. The architectural renderings and storyboards are wonderful, and the colored material samples are lovely. She commended the applicant for preserving the appearance and functionality of the building and landscaping and making it animal friendly. She concluded that the application is exceptional.

Vice Chair Schaefer referred to the two large trees that are proposed on either side of the entrance to the facility. He expressed concern about visibility for vehicles and pedestrians. Ms. Coccia pointed out that the Engineering Division would address this issue. Ms. Jensen added that the trees would be limbed up like street trees to allow for six to seven feet of visibility.

Board Member Mestres pointed out that there is no prescribed street tree for this location. Vice Chair Schaefer clarified that approval of the proposed application would not authorize an exception to the street tree requirements.

Board Member Walker asked if a barrier would be placed around the bamboo plantings. Ms. Jensen answered affirmatively.

Ms. Coccia referred to Board Member O'Neill's earlier question about whether or not the Engineering Division has reviewed and approved the proposed artificial turf application as pervious surface. She explained that the Engineering Division is currently working to improve this section of the code, but the existing code language does not specifically address this type of material. The material would be reviewed by the Engineering Division at the time of building permit application.

Ms. Coccia entered the planter concepts submitted by Ms. Jensen as Attachment 11.

Ms. Coccia read the current definitions for "sign" and "wall graphic" and expressed her belief that the proposed logo on the trash enclosure would meet the definition of a "wall graphic." That means it must be considered a sign. The Board could either allow it as a fourth sign on the site or the applicant could change the graphic to some other type of artwork that does not include the logo or text. At the request of Board Member Walker, she explained how the City calculates the total sign area allowed and how each sign area is measured. She said staff would like to work with the Planning Board at some point in the future to improve the sign code.

Ms. Jensen said the applicant is not wedded to the idea of placing the logo on the trash enclosure. However, they would like the Board's support for using some other type of artwork. The Board concurred that as long as the artwork does not contain a logo and/or text, it would be classified as artistic treatment rather than a sign.

Chair Kendall observed that the applicant received a glowing endorsement of the proposal from a neighboring residential property owner, which is not always the case when businesses are located next to residential neighborhoods. She commended the applicant for being a good neighbor.

VICE CHAIR SCHAEFER MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE FILE NUMBER PLN20100075 WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THE STREET TREE SPECIES SHALL BE RE-REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY BOTH THE CITY OF EDMONDS PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT AND THE WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (WSDOT) PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT ISSUANCE.
2. THE BUS STOP NEAR THE SITE SHOULD NOT BE IMPACTED BY THE DEMOLITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE NEW WOODHAVEN VETERINARY CLINIC. IF IT BECOMES CLEAR THAT THE PROJECT WILL DISRUPT THIS BUS STOP, THE CITY SHOULD BE CONTACTED IMMEDIATELY (AS WELL AS WSDOT AND COMMUNITY TRANSIT) IN ORDER TO FIND A SOLUTION SO THAT BUS SERVICE IS NOT INTERRUPTED. WORK IN THE RIGHT-OF-WAY REQUIRES A PERMIT – OWNER/APPLICANT WILL NEED TO CONTACT THE ENGINEERING DIVISION FOR DETAILS.
3. THE TRASH ENCLOSURE SHALL BE PERMITTED TO BE DESIGNED WITH A DECORATIVE ELEMENT, BUT NOT WITH THE WOODHAVEN LOGO OR TEXT, IN ORDER TO COMPLEMENT THE BUILDING AND SITE. IT IS UNDERSTOOD THAT THIS WILL NOT COUNT AGAINST THE NUMBER OF SIGNS PERMITTED ON THE SITE.

BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS:

No public hearings were scheduled on the agenda.

CONSOLIDATED PERMIT APPLICATIONS (No Public Participation):

No consolidated permit applications were scheduled on the agenda.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

Ms. Coccia announced that the City received an application that may be scheduled for Architectural Design Board review on March 2nd. The Board Members asked that when staff sends out the agenda for future meetings, they should also solicit feedback to find out how many Board Members can be present. This will allow them to ensure a quorum is present at the meeting.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

The Board welcomed new Board Member, Tom Walker.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.