

APPROVED

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

June 5, 2013

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

Board Members Present

Bryan Gootee, Chair
Bruce O'Neill, Vice Chair
Lois Broadway
Cary Guenther
Michael Mestres
Rick Schaefer

Board Members Absent

Tom Walker (excused)

Staff Present

Jen Machuga, Associate Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

VICE CHAIR O'NEILL MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF MAY 15, 2013 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS SUBMITTED. VICE CHAIR O'NEILL SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS - MAJOR PROJECTS:

Phase 1 of Public Hearing for Fifth Avenue Animal Hospital located at 310 – 5th Avenue South. The site is zoned Downtown Mixed Commercial (BD2). (File Number PLN20130027)

Board Member Guenther disclosed that he was once employed by Architectural Werks, Inc., the applicant's architect for the proposed project. He recused himself from the hearing and left the building.

Ms. Machuga advised that the proposal under review is an application by Christopher Garg for design review of a new veterinary clinic to be located at 310 – 5th Avenue South. The site currently contains a parking lot, and the proposed two-story building would be 6,000 square feet with a parking garage below. The site is located in the BD2 zone, which requires district-based design review under the provisions of Chapter 20.12 of the Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC).

Ms. Machuga explained that proposals that require district-based design review and a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) threshold determination are reviewed by the ADB in a two-phased hearing process. Tonight is the first phase of the two-phased hearing process. She briefly reviewed the process for the hearing, which would include a staff report and presentation by the applicant, followed by an opportunity for members of the public to address the Board. The ADB will then have an opportunity to review the Design Guideline Checklist and provide further direction to the applicant as to which guidelines are high and low priorities and which are not applicable. She emphasized that the ADB will not be making a design review decision following the Phase 1 hearing. Rather than closing the hearing at the conclusion of the meeting, the ADB will continue the hearing to a date certain for Phase 2 of the process.

Ms. Machuga referred to the preliminary project plans submitted by the applicant (Attachment 4) and explained that the subject property is relatively level with a general downward slope towards the west. There is no existing vegetation on the site. The applicant is proposing a two-story building with underground parking. However, the second floor will only be over a portion of the first floor. The building is proposed to be constructed up to the northern, eastern and southern property lines, and access to the parking garage would be from the west.

Ms. Machuga also referred to the Staff Report, which provides a brief analysis of the codes and standards applicable to the subject proposal, such as height, setback and parking requirements. She noted that these standards are in addition to the design standards and objectives applicable to the proposal. Because the purpose of the Phase 1 hearing is to establish priorities for the site and not to make a final design decision, a detailed analysis of compliance with all applicable standards has not yet been done. This will be done with Phase 2 of the process.

Ms. Machuga reminded the Board that for Phase 1 of the design-review process, the Board must make factual findings regarding the particular characteristics of the property and prioritize the Design Guideline Checklist (Attachment 5). She noted that copies of the checklist were provided to each of the Board members for quick reference, and some copies were also available for members of the audience. She explained that as the Board fills out the checklist, they will need to explain why each item is or is not a priority.

Again, Ms. Machuga reminded the Board that the hearing will not be closed at the conclusion of the meeting. Instead, it will be continued to a date certain for Phase 2 of the process, where the applicant will return with more detailed design drawings and the Board will make a final decision on the design proposal.

Jeff Clark, Architectural Works, Inc., Kirkland, said he was present to represent the applicant, Christopher Garg, VMD. He said his company is a small firm that specializes in designing veterinary and animal hospital facilities throughout northwest. He said he understands that before he can really design a project, he must evaluate the biggest concerns, which are typically related to being good stewards and neighbors. To address potential concerns to adjacent property owners:

- The second floor space would be minimized to address impacts on views from properties to the east. The eastern portion of the building will only be one story, while the western portion will be two stories.
- The building will be designed to minimize the impacts to shade and shadow on the property to the north so the current uses can continue to function.
- There are various techniques the applicant can use to address sound issues and concerns from residents of the multi-family development to the west of the subject property.
- The facility will be an animal hospital. There will be no overnight boarding facilities or large outdoor kennel areas. All uses will be contained inside the building.
- The front of the building (east façade on 5th Avenue) will be designed to be consistent with the City's design standards, which are traditional in style. However, it must also be designed to represent a modern, high-quality facility that can deliver the best patient care available. He noted that there is a hodgepodge of older, traditional

development on one side of the subject property, and more modern development on the other. Their goal is to blend the two styles and still have the image they are looking for.

- It is necessary to provide a way to get the animals into the facility and introduce them back out to the public zone safely. Although parking is not required for the project, the applicant is proposing an underground parking area with seven spaces. It would be accessed from the alley on the west property line. The applicant believes the parking garage is necessary to get animals in and out of the facility, particularly in emergency situations.
- The goal is to also create a great walking environment so that people living in the community will have an opportunity to access the facility without driving a car.

Mr. Clark said the building will have a masonry base to anchor it to the ground and project the image that it will be around for a long time. The entryway will be recessed so it is easily identifiable to both pedestrian and vehicular traffic. A canvas awning will be placed above the entryway, with projected-steel canopies on either side to provide weather protection for pedestrians and to give the building a boutique look, similar to other buildings in the downtown. He noted that Fire District 1 will require that the property frontage be designed to provide emergency access. Decorative, indirect lighting will be placed at the entry along 5th Avenue to identify the entry and to provide pedestrian safety. He specifically noted that 75% of the 5th Avenue façade will be constructed of transparent glazing materials to foster a stronger visual connection between the public areas of the new hospital and the street. The proposed building will be set back about 25 feet from the alley, and the driveway to the underground parking, as well as the trash enclosure and transformer, will be located within this area.

Mr. Clark said the applicant has not decided on a color for the horizontal panel system on the building façade, but it will be both modern and in keeping with the tradition the community is known for. Although not shown in the proposed preliminary design, the applicant's intent is to wrap the horizontal panel located on the front façade around to the east and west sides of the building to provide interest. At the same time, they must ensure that the fire resistant wall meets the code requirements.

Mr. Clark noted that the building will be long and narrow, and the applicant is proposing to use skylights and other window treatments to bring natural light into the building. The ground level portion of the building will be used for the clinic treatment areas, and offices will be located on the smaller second story. The applicant is proposing a balcony off of the second story on the west side of the building.

Mr. Clark summarized that the applicant's intent is to eliminate the potential for noise, address shade and shadow issues, provide interest in the building, and get light into the building. The proposed design will break up the horizontal and vertical mass of the building. The ground floor will have a ceiling height of 12 feet, as required by the City's code; and with the exception of the western side, the building will be constructed lot-line-to-lot-line, with no setbacks on the east, south, and north sides of the building.

Mr. Clark advised that the applicant is proposing that a sign be located above the awning, with gooseneck fixtures above to provide indirect lighting. In addition, the applicant is proposing two blade signs to help identify the building to pedestrian and vehicular traffic. He noted that blade signs appear to be a theme in the downtown area already.

Board Member Schaefer referred to Drawing A8, which shows a setback from the south property line. Mr. Clark said the proposed building would be constructed at the property line, but the existing adjacent building is set back. Therefore, there will be some space between the two buildings.

Board Member Broadway commented that, in the best world, the property to the north will also be developed soon. She asked Mr. Clark to share his thoughts about what could be done with the northern façade to make it more aesthetically pleasing in the meantime. Mr. Clark said the applicant's good-neighbor policy begins by making friends with adjacent property owners and accommodating their desires within a realistic budget. He suggested that the north façade could be designed to include windows, a change in materials or color, wall tile, murals, etc. He concluded that the applicant would meet with the adjacent property owners to discuss the proposal before any final design decisions are made.

Chair Gootee asked Mr. Clark to share what he has in mind for the blade sign locations. Mr. Clark answered that the blade signs would be located on both sides of the entrance under the two steel canopy structures. The applicant believes they are necessary to identify the building to pedestrians who are walking under the awning. The sign above the awning would be dimly lit with a gooseneck fixture that would not cast glare on adjacent properties.

Chair Gootee asked what the applicant has in mind for windows on the upper story. Mr. Clark said the upper story would be designed using as much glass as possible to allow natural light into the building. Using windows on the upper story would also break up the façade and make the building more aesthetically pleasing for the residential property owners to the west. Again, he said skylights would be located on the roof to allow natural light to penetrate into the treatment areas, too.

Board Member Broadway said she recently worked on a project that was located next to a veterinary clinic that provided cremation services to pet owners. She asked if the applicant proposes this use for the subject property, as well. Mr. Clark answered that cremation services are primarily provided by animal shelters and rarely by clinics. Cremation facilities will not be part of the proposed project.

Board Member Broadway pointed out that both the Arista Wine Cellars and C'est La Vie businesses have ramps to enter the buildings. She asked how the applicant would deal with the topography change from north to south. Mr. Clark agreed that there is a bit of a transition from north to south, but the entrance of the proposed building will be located at grade.

Board Member Broadway asked how the applicant would direct customers to the underground parking area. Mr. Clark explained that they do not want to direct all of their customers to the underground parking area, which is intended to be used for employee parking and as emergency parking for owners with temperamental pets. The goal is to minimize the traffic in the alley by limiting the underground parking. He said most people with an emergency situation will call ahead, and clinic staff can direct them to the emergency parking area at that time.

Vice Chair O'Neill asked what the applicant is proposing to do with the large roof area on the east side of the building. Mr. Clark said mechanical equipment would be located on the roof area and would be screened as per the City's code requirements. In addition, skylights would be located on the roof to provide natural lighting to the ground floor. Board Member Broadway asked if the applicant has a sense of the height, scale and location of the proposed mechanical equipment. Mr. Clark pointed out that the spaces inside the proposed building will be relatively small, so large equipment will not be necessary. He said the mechanical equipment would be no more than is typical for an office building in the area, likely about 2 x 4 feet. Again, he said the mechanical equipment would be screened. Board Member Broadway said she would like the final design to clearly identify the proposed screening. Mr. Clark agreed to prepare a three-dimensional rendering of the proposed roof design.

Board Member Mestres suggested that it would be helpful for the applicant to provide a 15-minute parking space in front of the building for pet owners to use to drop off their animals. Mr. Clark said the applicant would be glad to pursue this option further with City staff.

Blaine Crawford, Edmonds, said he lives across the alley from the proposed new building. He asked if any elevation drawings are available to inform him of what the building's west façade will look like. Chair Gootee explained that elevation drawings were not required for the preliminary hearing, but they would be provided for the final hearing. Mr. Clark reminded the Board that the building would be setback 25 feet from the alley. The applicant is proposing a trash enclosure, the transformer, a driveway to the underground parking, and a balcony on the second story within the 25-foot setback area. He agreed to provide more detailed elevation drawings at the next hearing. He said he would also be glad to meet with property owners to discuss their concerns before the next hearing.

Mr. Crawford asked where the dog run would be located. Mr. Clark answered that there would be no outside space for the animals. All activity at the clinic would be conducted indoors. The area around the transformer and the trash enclosure would remain as open space. Rather than enclosing the utilities inside a gate, the applicant is proposing to screen them.

Jim Hart, Edmonds, expressed concern about the proposed increased use of the alleyway. He noted that the bedrooms in the condominium development all back up to the alley. There is already an existing business in the area that uses a forklift in the alley, making it hard for the residents to sleep in. He asked how many employees would work at the proposed clinic, what the hours of operation would be, and how much noise the proposed use would generate. In addition, he asked how much noise the transformer would make. Mr. Clark answered that the transformer would not be a high-voltage unit; just a 400 amp unit similar to transformers located in residential areas. Mr. Clark shared some of the things that could be done to limit noise to adjoining properties. However, he said he does not anticipate a significant amount of noise from the proposed use since the applicant is not proposing to shelter animals overnight. Again, he said all activity will take place inside the building. If the structure is designed properly, the adjacent neighbors should not be able to hear dogs barking.

Christopher Garg, VMD, said he intends to use the facility as more of a general practice veterinary clinic and not as a 24-hour urgent care facility or surgical center. The latest he envisions the clinic will be open is 9:00 p.m. if the demand dictates. However, the hours of operation could be extended, upon occasion, if an emergency comes up. He anticipates that employees will arrive at the clinic around 7:00 a.m., and the clinic would open at 8:00 a.m. Mr. Garg said he does not anticipate the proposed project will result in a significant amount of additional traffic in the alleyway. They are not required to provide an underground parking garage; it is intended to be used by clients who need special assistance and by clinic employees. He said he intends to encourage his employees to use public transportation when possible to leave the parking spaces open for clients who need them. He said he would love to talk with City staff to explore the idea of providing a drop-off parking space on the street in front of the building entrance. He said there is generally a fair amount of parking on 5th Avenue in the morning.

Kit Hart, Edmonds, said her bedroom window looks directly across the alley at the proposed balcony that would be added to the second story of the building. She asked that the application provide more information about what the western façade of the building would look like.

Board Member Broadway asked if a generator would be needed for the clinic. Mr. Garg said most general practice clinics do not have back-up generators. There is nothing involved in veterinary surgery that cannot operate without electricity. While the situation would not be ideal, it is not something that would create an immediate emergency. He said he does not anticipate a need for a generator at this time.

Colleen Lo, Edmonds, said she also lives in the adjacent condominium development. She said she moved to her condo a few years ago after living in Tacoma for 40 years. They love Edmonds, but the proposed new building frightens her. She said she does not know why another animal hospital is needed in Edmonds when they have a beautiful facility just up the road. She asked if any of the Board Members have ever walked along the alley between 5th and 4th Avenues. It is always dangerous, and it is not wide enough for two cars to pass. It is not safe at all. She said she has two grandchildren who love to play in the parking lot area, and not long ago someone broke a section of the fence behind her condominium. She expressed concern about having a balcony so close to her bedroom, and she questioned the need for another veterinary clinic. She suggested that another retail use would be better. She summarized that the subject property is small, and the alley is already very crowded and bumpy. She said she cannot imagine having more traffic on the alley.

Janet Tofting, Edmonds, said she also lives in the condominium development located across the alley from the proposed new building. While the applicant's proposed design sounds good, the residents are worried about increased traffic on the alley. From what the applicant has said, there will be limited traffic on the alley, as most clients will park on the street. She expressed concern that another site adjacent to the subject property will likely be redeveloped, as well.

She said they must hope for the best. She expressed her belief that there are already too many veterinary clinics in Edmonds, and she was surprised by the applicant's proposal for another one.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CONTINUED TO THE PHASE 2 HEARING.

Board Member Mestres clarified that it is the responsibility of the Planning Board and City Council to decide the types of uses that are allowed in each zone. The ADB's job is to review proposals to make sure they are in conformance with City codes and design standards.

The Board reviewed the Design Guidelines Checklist and provided the following direction to the applicant and staff in preparation for Phase 2 of the public hearing process:

1. Site Planning

1. **Reinforce existing site characteristics.** The Board agreed that this standard is **not applicable** to the proposed project. Because the subject property is currently undeveloped, there are no existing site characteristics.
2. **Reinforce existing streetscape characteristics.** The Board agreed that this standard is a **higher priority**. Hopefully, the applicant will draw on existing architecture in the area, not the least of which is Old Mill Town. It is important to provide connectivity between the businesses along 5th Avenue. Currently, there is a gaping hole where the subject property is located. Providing some landscaping and street trees could warm up the area a bit.
3. **Entry clearly identifiable from the street.** The Board concurred that this standard is a **higher priority**. The applicant's suggestions for entryway design are reasonable and consistent with the design standards. Board Member Mestres pointed out that although sign design was not included in the preliminary package, it is important for the applicant to keep in mind that the Board does not approve variances to the sign code.
4. **Encourage human activity on street.** The Board agreed that this standard is a **higher priority**. It was noted that 5th Avenue is a pedestrian corridor and anything the applicant can do to enhance the pedestrian experience along the street would be good. The applicant's proposed design for the entryway appears to be consistent with the design guidelines in terms of canopies, recessed entryways, etc. The applicant's proposal to provide canopies and awnings for pedestrian weather protection is also consistent with the design guidelines.
5. **Minimize intrusions into privacy on adjacent sites.** The Board concurred that this standard is a **higher priority**. It was noted that the citizens who participated in the hearing expressed concern about privacy. Board Member Mestres pointed out that the building would be constructed lot-line-to-lot-line on the north and south sides, with no setback required. While it would be neighborly for the applicant to provide an attractive façade on the north side of the proposed building, he questioned the Board's ability to single out this one proposal and require special accoutrements to satisfy a need that may have to be removed when the property to the north is developed. The Board agreed but felt the applicant should specifically address the west façade adjacent to the alleyway, which is visible from the condominiums. Board Member Schaefer suggested that perhaps landscaping could be used to soften the north façade.

Board Member Broadway cautioned the applicant to be considerate of the residents in the residentially-developed property to the west of the subject property. For example, while some lighting is necessary for the driveway into the underground parking, the applicant should keep in mind that the bedroom spaces in the adjacent residential units are located just across the alley. Chair Gootee expressed his belief that the Board would carefully scrutinize the western façade when the application comes back for the Phase 2 public hearing.

6. **Use space between building and sidewalk to provide security, privacy and interaction (residential projects).** It was pointed out that this standard is only applicable to residential projects. They agreed that this standard is **not applicable**.
7. **Maximize open space opportunity on site (residential projects).** The Board agreed that this standard is **not applicable** as it is related to residential projects only.
8. **Minimize parking and auto impacts on pedestrians and adjoining property.** Again, Board Member Mestres recommended the applicant pursue the potential of including a 15-minute drop off parking space in front of the subject property. Board Member Broadway suggested that this standard should not be a high priority, given that the only parking, other than the seven underground parking spaces, will be located on the street. The applicant is bound by real estate. The Board agreed that this standard is **not applicable** to the proposed project.
9. **Discourage parking in street front.** Board Member Schaefer explained that this standard is intended to discourage developers from creating off-site parking along the street front. It is desirable to have associated parking located behind the building, instead. The Board agreed that this standard was **not applicable** to the proposed project.
10. **Orient building to corner and parking away from corner on public street fronts (corner lots).** The Board agreed that this standard was **not applicable** to the proposed project.

B. Bulk and Scale

1. **Provide sensitive transitions to nearby, less-intensive zones.** The Board agreed that this standard refers to bulk, scale and height allowed in each of the adjacent zones, which is the same as what is allowed on the subject property. It was agreed that this standard was **not applicable** to the proposed project.

C. Architectural Elements and Materials

1. **Complement positive existing character and/or respond to nearby historic structures.** Board Member Mestres noted the street front character of Old Mill Town, and Board Member Shaefer noted that immediately to the south streetfront character is being encouraged. The Board agreed that this standard is a **higher priority**.
2. **Unified architectural concept.** The Board agreed that this standard is a **higher priority**.
3. **Use human scale and human activity.** Board Member Mestres pointed out that the building is consistent with human scale as it is primarily a one-story building. The Board agreed that this standard is a **lower priority**.
4. **Use durable, attractive and well-detailed finish materials.** The Board agreed that this standard is a **higher priority**.
5. **Minimize garage entrances.** Board Member Mestres asked how much space would be occupied by the underground parking structure. Mr. Clark answered that seven spaces would be provided underground. In addition, the entrance would be 22 feet wide, which is the minimum allowed by the Engineering Department. At least one of the parking spaces would be marked for emergencies only. Chair Gootee noted that citizens have expressed concern about the western façade. Therefore, it is important for the applicant to consider opportunities to minimize the appearance of the garage. Board Member Broadway agreed but pointed out that because the garage entrance would be located along the alley, the applicant has eliminated the need for a street entrance. In addition, the applicant has reduced the width of the proposed entrance to the minimum allowed by code. Chair Gootee suggested that perhaps the applicant could soften the western façade. Given that the garage

would be located 8 feet underground Vice Chair O'Neill suggested that the standard would not be applicable to the proposed project. Mr. Clark reminded the Board that the western façade would be located nearly 25 feet from the alleyway, and perhaps it could be softened with landscaping. He said they want to create a nice, attractive entry that is minimized as much as allowed by the Engineering Department. The majority of the Board concurred that this standards is **not applicable**.

D. Pedestrian Environment

1. **Provide convenient, attractive and protected pedestrian entry.** The Board concurred that this standard is a **higher priority**.
2. **Avoid blank walls.** Board Member Schaefer reviewed that this standard specifically applies to facades that face the streets, which means the standard would only apply to the 5th Avenue façade. Chair Gootee said that although the north façade would be placed at the property line, it would still be visible and needs to have some character. The Board concurred that this standard is a **higher priority**.
3. **Minimize height of retaining walls.** The Board agreed that this standard is **not applicable**.
4. **Minimize visual and physical intrusion of parking lots on pedestrian areas.** The Board agreed that this standard is **not applicable**.
5. **Minimize visual impact of parking structures.** The Board agreed that this standard is **not applicable**.
6. **Screen dumpsters, utility and service areas.** The Board agreed that this standard is a **higher priority**.
7. **Consider personal safety.** Board Member Schaefer said this standard has to do with whether or not the design elements detract from or reinforces the feeling of security for residents, workers, and visitors to the area. Examples include lighting, sight lines, etc. Board Member Broadway observed that the most vulnerable space created by the proposed project is the narrow setback area that the adjacent neighbor is not using. This creates a small passageway where people can lurk, dump trash, etc. However there is nothing the applicant can do to address this problem. The Board agreed that considering personal safety is a **higher priority**.

E. Landscaping

1. **Reinforce existing landscape character of neighborhood.** It was noted that there are street tree guidelines that must be followed, and the area would definitely benefit from more landscaping. Chair Gootee pointed out that other than a few street trees, there is no space for landscaping on the site. The Board agreed that this standard is a **lower priority**.
2. **Landscape to enhance the building or site.** Board Member Schaefer said this standard has to do with using landscaping to soften the form of the building, screen blank walls, etc. He suggested that landscaping is just one option the applicant can consider to address the northern façade. The Board agreed that this standard is a **lower priority**.
3. **Landscape to take advantage of special site conditions.** Board Member Broadway pointed out that landscaping could be used to address the northern façade. The Board agreed that this standard is a **lower priority**.

Ms. Machuga said she spoke with the applicant prior to the meeting about potentially scheduling the Phase 2 public hearing on August 7th. She noted that two public hearings are already scheduled on the July 17th agenda, and the Board expressed a concern about holding a meeting on July 3rd, right before a holiday.

BOARD MEMBER SCHAEFER MOVED THAT THE BOARD CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING ON FILE NUMBER PLN20130027 TO AUGUST 7, 2013. VICE CHAIR O'NEILL SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Gootee complimented the applicant on a great presentation. He said he clearly understands the concepts the applicant is proposing. At the Phase 2 public hearing, he suggested the applicant focus on softening the design on the second story and on the west wall. Mr. Clark said the applicant will also pursue a meeting with adjacent property owners to discuss their concerns. He explained that the balcony that is proposed for the west side of the building is intended to break up the wall. It is not meant to be an observation place, but a way to open a door or window to let in the natural environment.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

There were no administrative reports or items for discussion.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

Board Member Mestres recalled that he was appointed to serve on the Board in January of 2006, and the first piece of business was the Old Mill Town development, which was very tumultuous. He said that participating on the Board has been interesting and a great opportunity to serve the community. However, after seven years, he felt it was time to give another citizen the opportunity to participate as a lay person. He announced that he would resign from the Board effective immediately. He said he has appreciated working with all of the members of the Board.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.