

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
February 18th, 2010**

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Heather Tomlin, Vice Chairperson, Joe Palmquist, Janey Gregory, Sadia Hasan, Lara Sirois, Scott Waggoner

EXCUSED ABSENCE: David Scott Meade, Chairperson

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Fischer, Principal Planner; Carl McArthy, Code Enforcement Officer, Thara Johnson, Associate Planner

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by the Vice Chairperson of the Design Review Board, Heather Tomlin, at 7:00 PM.

MINUTES

There were no minutes to approve.

PROJECT REVIEW

SIGN PROGRAM

L100029, RED160 SIGN PROGRAM

Description: Exterior signage for mixed-use building

Location: 16095 Cleveland Street

Applicant: Brian Wimer *with* Vertical VS Inc.

Staff Contact: Carl McArthy, 425-556-2412, cmcarthy@redmond.gov

Mr. McArthy introduced himself to the newer members of the DRB as a code enforcement who has worked in Redmond for the past 17 years. He noted the project in question is located at Cleveland Street and Redmond Way, where two towers are currently being built. This is in the Old Town District. Tonight, two of the architects involved will be speaking with the Board. The applicant is asking for approval; staff is recommending approval for this project. The code indicates that in multiple tenant building complexes, and multiple tenant buildings, applicants need to come forward with a sign program to be approved by the DRB. That, then, becomes the sign code for that site, which all subsequent tenants would have to meet.

The City has worked with the architect on this project, and has made some changes. Mr. McArthy says the City believes this proposal is appropriate for the current building architecture and site conditions. The proposal brings a mix of signage needs to the site. There will be commercial signage as well as retail bays that would have their own signs. A vicinity map will be provided by the applicant at a later time to show how the streets will be located around the signs of this project. Mr. McArthy says the Building 1 elevation is not really needed; the second group of drawings shows the signs sufficiently. Based on review of the Community Development Guide, the staff is recommending that the DRB approve the Red160 Sign Program, from the elevations to the wall drawings and all the text provided.

Angela Levenda and Brian Wimer from Vertical spoke to the Board on behalf of the applicant. Ms. Levenda showed the Board the layout of the proposed exterior signs, illustrating the signage specifically on the east and west elevations. The applicant would like to have one sign per elevation to help identify the building. The east building uses Sign Type 1, an illuminated sign with push-through letters that meets the City requirements for size. Sign Type 2 will be installed on the west building, on the east elevation for the retail and leasing office entrance. This is also an illuminated sign with push-through letters that would

be directly mounted to an awning above the entrance. Sign Type 3.1 would be the wall-mounted signs, which will be attached to the façade of the building, on the west building's north elevation. All of these types of signs would be above the awning level. The east building will have some of these signs as well.

Sign Type 3.3 will be on the west building on the west elevation, which people driving on Redmond Way would see coming down the hill. The letters are the same as Types 1 and 2. Ms. Gregory asked about the sign placement for 3.3, and how it overlaps the window plane, just slightly. Ms. Levenda says the drawing is to scale, and that sign should have been moved up. There is still some question as to where the signs should be placed for highest visibility. There is some anticipation that Cleveland Street will be a two-way street in a few years, so more signs have been added in areas around the project. A directory parking sign will be placed in the project as well, to show parking garages for retail, as well as the spots where tenants in the residential area should park. Sign Type 4 will be installed at the entrance of the east building. Sign Type 5, the smaller version, will be for the residential parking. The west building has mixed parking uses, for retail and residential, and that will be reflected on the sign.

Sign Type 6 is a monument sign that will have some artistic components. It will be placed next to a seating wall, at the west entrance, and will serve as a piece of art in the courtyard. It will also help mark the main entrance to the site. There will be some red lights shining up on this sign at night, and will be made from aluminum.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Ms. Tomlin:

- Asked about the parking signage. Was concerned about the sign meant for residents only, and noted that *Residents Only* should be disclosed on the signage. The applicant said that could be easily remedied, with those two words at the bottom of the sign.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Says the project looks to be of high quality, and has a modern, hi-tech look. Asked about the face material; the applicant says it will be horizontally brushed aluminum. The letters pushing through will illuminate red and white; and will be red and black during the day.
- Mr. Waggoner asked about the blade signs, and wanted to see what the size of the text was on the signs themselves. The applicant pointed out that the signs in question were in an alleyway, and would be visible to people in that area.
- Mr. Waggoner asked about the buried lighting around the monument sign. The applicant says those would be can lighting, with two or possibly four around the monument at night. The idea is to create something modern, but not overpowering.
- Mr. Waggoner confirmed there would be a curb around the monument; he would like to make sure the lighting below the monument would be LED's. The applicant noted that she is trying to tone down the lighting. Beyond that, Mr. Waggoner says the project looks good.

Ms. Gregory:

- Asked about the building materials in relation to the signs. The applicant pointed out a number of different textures on the building. Three different colors of brick are involved, as well as cream and red-colored hardy plank.
- The applicant says much of the signage matches with a brushed metal look on the interior.
- Ms. Gregory asked about the storefronts colors; the applicant says they would be black or bronze.
- Ms. Gregory would like to see the tenant signage echo the other signs in the project. The applicant noted that the tenants will have their own choice, but tenants will be urged to have the same style of signage, with some variations.
- The applicant says tenants with metal canopies will be allowed to put signs above or below those canopies. The tenants with fabric canopies will be allowed to have signs inside their stores.
- Ms. Gregory says the monument sign is a nice touch that adds an artistic dimension to the project. The artwork involved here is similar to a piece outside the Comcast Arena in Everett.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked about *Open* signs for tenants. Those signs are not noted in the packet, but the applicant says the main rule would be no neon.
- Mr. Palmquist says that may be an issue for some stores, especially the ones on Cleveland. The applicant says she would not be against having that neon for those storefronts, but she would urge them to mirror the overall signage of the project.
- Mr. Palmquist likes the project overall.

Ms. Hasan:

- Likes the artwork and colors. Says the project adds a great piece of color to the project.

Ms. Sirois:

- Also likes the artwork, but reiterated Ms. Gregory's desire for more context of the surrounding buildings and how they fit into the signs.

**MOTION TO APPROVE L100029, RED160 SIGN PROGRAM MADE BY MS. GREGORY, SECONDED BY MS. HASAN, WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE PARKING SIGNAGE REFLECT THE AREAS FOR TENANTS ONLY AND RETAIL, AND THE CONDITION THAT OPEN SIGNS CAN BE INCLUDED, WITH DETAILS TO BE WORKED OUT WITH STAFF.
MOTION PASSES (6-0).**

PROJECT REVIEW

L070572, Hawthorne Lane PRD

Description: Review of one triplex structure to be constructed as part of a 33 lot subdivision of 7.31 acres

Location: 17241 NE 116th Street

Applicant: Fredrick H. Burnstead *with* Burnstead Construction Co.

Staff Contact: Thara Johnson, 425-556-2470, tmjohnson@redmond.gov

Ms. Johnson says this development is in the North Redmond neighborhood, immediately south of NE 116th Street, and east of 172nd Avenue. The applicant is proposing subdividing an existing 7.21-acre site, that is zoned R-4, into 32 detached single-family units, and one triplex unit. The proposed triplex is located in a cluster of four single-family residences, which are accessible through a tract of an internal street. The front elevation of the triplex includes one entrance, and the west and east elevations also include two additional entrances for each of their respective units. The triplex has a 10' side yard setback, in order to achieve a 15' building separation from adjacent single-family residences, and is located close to the front yard setback in order to allow for a larger backyard and landscape buffer along NE 116th Street. This also enhances pedestrian access to each unit in the cluster.

The triplex has an interior living space oriented towards NE 116th Street. The elevations provided have variations in features and treatments, using horizontal bevel siding as a primary siding material. Board and batten siding is the secondary material, along with cultured stone veneer to accentuate the front elevation. The elevation has a single-story front porch to distinguish each entry. The trim details pick up details proposed for the single-family residences. The colors for the triplex complement the colors proposed for the remainder of the development. Staff has reviewed the proposal, and finds that it complies with the City's design standards, and therefore recommends approval subject to standard conditions of approval as reflected in the staff report.

Steven Ehrlich presented on behalf of the applicant. He is the designer of the triplex, and says that building was created to meet the affordable home portion of a neighborhood development. The triplex is in the northwest corner of the property. A 10" side yard is provided, to create the 15' side yard setback with the house next door. That leaves 7.5' of planting as a screen to the driveway accessing houses to the site. Mr. Ehrlich says he tried to move the triplex as far up as possible to preserve the front yard parking possibilities for the tenants in the unit. This should provide a large rear yard, and would tie it in with the norm of the house next door. The triplex is designed to look like a house in the neighborhood; the three units are pulled under one roof. The colors for the front include a darker color for the board and batten area; the horizontal area will be a lighter cream. Cultured stone will anchor the center portion, bringing the eye to the center, which is the entry to the center unit. The two end units have their entries rotated around to the eastern and

western sides, providing architectural detailing on multiple elevations. The house steps down as the topography steps down, also providing architectural detail.

The landscape plan shows the benefit of the placement of the house on the site. There are three trees, as required in the land development plan. Those provide some screening for the houses, but low and medium-sized screening has been put in place, too. The planter strip near the driveway allows for medium and large-sized screening vegetation. The driveway and paving elements have been broken up as much as possible, responding to each garage entrance. This also helps tie the project in to the feel and access common throughout the neighborhood. The rear yard has been oriented to provide diagonal views from inside of the house, so the outdoor living space is accessed and directed to each unit. There is a feeling of life along 116th, without the homeowners sensing they are living along a very busy street. Mr. Ehrlich showed how the triplex related to the single-family residence adjacent to it as a point of context. He has tried to blend this project in with the rest of the neighborhood.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Ms. Sirois:

- Asked if there was any engagement to 116th at all. The applicant says the rear yard will be kept separate from that road, so as to make that yard more livable. Vehicles on that road travel quickly, which can be intimidating for the homeowner.
- Ms. Sirois would like to see more on the rear façade facing 116th for drivers passing by. She suggested adding some extra detail in that area.

Ms. Hasan:

- Said the back of the triplex appears like one big house, and asked if that was an intentional design. The applicant says that is a specific guideline to appear like one house in the neighborhood. However, the aspect of the garage doors being separate is a difficult element to overcome, he noted.
- The applicant showed the DRB the front of the triplex in comparison with the front of the other homes in the area; it is a difficult thing to design, but he has attempted to make the massing of the building similar to the neighboring homes.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked if the residents of this complex would be able to put up fences, perhaps dividing the rear yard. The applicant says there is no proposal right now to put fences in. On the landscape plan, there is intent to have a fence to provide the initial screening between the two units, especially the center unit, which might encroach into the rear yard.
- Mr. Palmquist asked if there were some rules preventing the erection of fences in this area. The applicant was not aware of CC&R's for this project, and does not know if they have been prepared. He says that could be written into the CC&R's; he has not crossed that bridge yet.
- Mr. Palmquist says the applicant has come up with some good solutions regarding the setbacks required.

Ms. Gregory:

- Is also concerned about the view from these homes, all looking at 116th, which appears a little backwards. The applicant admitted there was a dichotomy there. But, Ms. Gregory says the design extends the personality of the home inward to the neighborhood and community, which is wonderful.
- Ms. Gregory says for Redmond, she would like the board and batten on the two lower elements should have a vertical application with the colors recommended to improve the look there.
- The applicant admitted that would add more personality to the project. Ms. Gregory says the project looks one-sided now, in some respect. The applicant said that could help keep the building consistent with the front of the structure.
- Ms. Gregory recognizes the *Northwest Craftsman* style, but would like the applicant in the future to push himself to elaborate on that style, to expand and elevate it.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Says he has seen many projects like this, where homes have a backside on the street. He appreciates the details that have been added there, especially with window trim.

- Says the variety of colors and materials should make for a good-looking development.

Ms. Tomlin:

- Agreed with Ms. Gregory about the visual interest in the back of the project. She would like the applicant to go with her suggestion.
- Overall, Ms. Tomlin likes the project, and appreciates the move to step down the roofline to help with the massing of the buildings.
- Ms. Gregory asked if other triplexes would be added to the project. The applicant noted that in the early design phase, three cottage units were recommended. The idea never caught on; they faced 116th and did not mesh with the neighborhood. The idea with this site is to bring the homes inward and have all the units fit together.
- The applicant notes that only one triplex was added to meet the minimum affordable home requirement.

MOTION TO APPROVE L070572, THE TRIPLEX WITHIN HAWTHORNE LANE PRD, PRD MADE BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MS. GREGORY, TO INCLUDE THE STANDARD STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ABOUT INCONSISTENCIES. THE APPLICANT WILL ALSO WORK WITH STAFF TO IMPROVE THE DESIGN OF THE BACK NORTH ELEVATION, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE COMMENTS FROM THIS EVENING'S MEETING. MOTION PASSES (6-0).

MEETING CLOSE

MOTION TO CLOSE THE MEETING MADE BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MS. GREGORY. MOTION PASSES (6-0).

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE100009, POINT REDMOND RESTORATION

Description: Renovate exterior of existing 12,370 sf single story retail building with new materials and finishes. Renovate site with new landscaping, sidewalk/curb repair and Parking area seal and coat/stripping.

Location: 16651 Redmond Way

Applicant: Castlerock Investments

Staff Contact: Asma Jeelani -556-2443, ajeelani@redmond.gov

Mr. Palmquist recused himself from this pre-application, as he works for the applicant.

Mr. Fischer noted that this project was in for its first pre-application. This property has been before the DRB a number of times under the name Victoria Center. It was developing into a multi-story shopping and office building. Ms. Jeelani is the planner on this project; Mr. Fischer is filling in for her tonight. The existing buildings on this site have developed organically over the years, so there is no theme or consistency to their structure. One concept behind this latest application is to bring some of that consistency to the table. This application does not contemplate a demolition and new construction, but would like to put a new skin on the existing structures to bring it up to a more contemporary design. The staff covers Comprehensive Plan policies and Code issues; staff has noted that the adjacent streets are Redmond Way and Cleveland on the east end of downtown.

Staff says this design meets the minimum Code requirements for a building remodel; but the design itself is very dated and appears to look like a strip mall. Staff would like to have a conversation with the applicant, and get the DRB's thoughts and suggestions as to how to bring this design up to a higher standard. Staff has met with the architect to discuss some of these issues, and staff is expecting a revised set of elevations, which have been provided tonight.

Mr. Rick Grimes spoke on behalf of the applicant. He works with an architectural firm, Freheit and Ho, in Kirkland. The new owners, from California, hired the architects to remodel the existing site. The proposal before the Board includes what Mr. Grimes calls a *quick facelift*. He says this site is ripe for redevelopment. The idea for this project is to do some maintenance on the building, including a new roof. New exterior skin will be provided to bring it up to speed a little bit and make it a viable project to attract some tenants. The only way to do that is to raise the standards.

The architects are proposing a minimal number of things outside the project, including taking out the existing sidewalk fronting the building. A couple of the striped stalls in that area will be removed as well. The applicant says the sidewalk has a whole variety of different textures and colors of concrete; the applicant would also like to provide ADA accessibility to the building, which is not available now. The applicant will re-stripe and put in some curb cuts to help connect the building with one level sidewalk. The plan is add new landscaping around the existing monument sign, which would be repainted and refaced. The existing, 12' pole sign would be removed, and new landscaping would be added to the areas that have landscaping now. The landscaping is old and overgrown, and the applicant wants to bring something new in. That landscaping will not get a lot of landscaping, as it would be north-facing, so the applicant is considering some hardier vegetation. Also, along the front of the building, an area will be re-landscaped as well.

There are three buildings on the site, including Jersey's Restaurant, which is an old house that has become a wine bar of sorts. The tenant has just re-signed a relatively long-term lease, and the tenants do not want to change colors or textures; in fact, they do not want to spend any money at all. The applicant says that restaurant is on its own. The first building on the site was built in the early 40s, freestanding, with CMU block. The other building is a separate structure, which is not evident from many of the drawings; one has a steel structure, the other is wood. On the north end, the applicant would remove the existing striping to be able to provide handicapped accessibility to the two tenant spaces in that area. A third tenant could gain access there, as well.

On the south side, the building has been pushed almost to the back end of the sidewalk, but not quite. Some existing street trees have been cut down in this area, and the applicant would like to add some trees in this area. Also, the plan is to remove some existing concrete and put in some landscaping on the south side of the site, to soften the look of the building. On the southwest part of the building, there is dead landscaping and broken-up asphalt. The asphalt would be removed, and landscaping would be increased. The trash enclosure is not pictured. There is a cubbyhole carved into the building, where a three cubic-yard container slides in and out. So, the applicant wants to build a new CMU trash enclosure, put in some new landscaping around it, and re-stripe some spaces while adding wheel stops.

Regarding the building, the applicant plans to do very little. He would like to take out an existing pair of wood doors facing east, and put in a standard pair of storefront doors to match the other doors within the center. An existing overhead door and an existing solid wood door would also be taken out, replaced with storefront door. An opening that was once covered up would be re-opened, to provide another storefront entrance to provide more visibility to the tenant in that area. There is an alley with a roof over it constructed after the buildings were put in. The applicant wants to take out two windows, replacing them with a door to create space for storage. The applicant says the building is very odd, with very strange materials used.

The outside of the building is not in bad shape, but not in good shape either. The idea is to clean the entire exterior up. On the south side, the applicant wants to remove the three triangular points there, because they are falling off. An existing opening where the trash sits would be filled in, and doors would be added for use as a storage room. On the north elevation, the applicant wants to strip off the mansard metal roof. It is not in good condition, and has no gutters. The upper portion would be replaced with more metal roofing, and a gutter with hidden downspouts. The walls will be patched in this area, as well.

The applicant wants to update the building, but do it cheaply. The building will be torn down in about 5 to 10 years. He is working with \$150,000, \$50,000 of which will most likely be spent on the roof. The applicant calls his project "putting lipstick on the pig." The south elevation would get three different paint colors, and some vertical corrugated metal. Vertical signage would be added, as well, a steel structure that could be bolted easily into the concrete structure. The building has no life that is brought to the street, especially on the south elevation, according to the applicant. He is not sure if that signage would work under the City Code, but he wants something on that south end, like a banner, that would give some character to this face of the building.

Three tenants can fit on the east façade; five tenants can be on the north façade. The idea is to provide metal panels across the exterior to break up the visual massing of the building. The current colors of the

building include painted orange brick, painted white brick, horizontal metal siding, and black, bronze, and silver storefronts. Some windows are very thin, and framed in black; others are white vinyl. The applicant wants to leave that variation alone, and let that existing modulation stay. In terms of lighting, there is no pole lighting. There is some street lighting along Redmond Way. The applicant wants to leave the existing down lights, but will make sure they are actually functional.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Ms. Sirois:

- Likes the colors, but says most of her comments would involve a bigger budget. The applicant showed the DRB the orange color of the metal, the dark green that becomes a signage band at the top, and the lighter green and gray that serves as a base color.
- Ms. Sirois asked about possible signage. The applicant is not sure they will be signs or works of art. Mr. Fischer recommended the applicant should get in touch with Mr. McArthy about the signs he might be planning.
- Ms. Sirois recommended making the orange metal panels a little taller, to create some better variation. The applicant had no issues with that idea.
- Ms. Sirois confirmed that the applicant would not paint the windows, but rather leave them all the different colors. Most of the windows are dark bronze.
- Ms. Sirois says the signage will be critical to the project; the applicant believes that signage with individual lit letters, which will be required, will add a lot to it. Ms. Sirois recommended the applicant review the sign program that was reviewed earlier in this meeting for ideas.

Ms. Hasan:

- Is concerned about the access to the shopping center, and would like to see directional signage. She feels the center is too enclosed.
- Recommended adding more trees to add more life to the project. The applicant plans to add some trees in the front of the project, such as a columnar, tall, deciduous tree. He says the narrow sidewalk and planting area will be a challenge.
- The applicant noted that soon, the City will be making Redmond Way and Cleveland two-way streets, which will add to the planting area, within a matter of years. Ms. Hasan would still like to see some vegetation, especially trees, added for the applicant's project.
- Ms. Sirois recommended a vertical trellis; the applicant says there is not much of an opportunity for that. Also, he does not want to block off the windows of the retail spaces.

Ms. Gregory:

- Likes the south elevation, the back of the building, much better than the mansard roof. The applicant says he will replace just the metal of the roof, so he could something that would last longer. Ms. Gregory asked if he could add some variation in that roof area, and not have to rip off the mansard.
- The applicant says he is constrained by budget concerns, and noted that Ms. Gregory's suggestions might end up costing too much. He says this building has a lot of issues with roofing, but he cannot afford to do much more than adding a new metal skin to the roof.
- The applicant and Ms. Gregory worked out an idea to add more variation to the roof structure. She admitted his plans were a big improvement.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Said this project was a big challenge, but was concerned about putting plants under some of the overhang areas. He would recommend creating some landscaping areas out in the parking areas, rather than having plants covered up.
- The applicant says the building managers he has hired will take care of the plants.
- He added that the site has more than enough parking, by code. The restaurants and coffee shop use several parking stalls on this site, and the applicant does not want to lose parking to landscaping, as Mr. Waggoner suggested. Staff has recommended that idea, but the applicant is not warm to it.
- Mr. Waggoner asked if a planter opening might be added along another façade of the project; the applicant says that could be a possibility. Width could be an issue there, but the applicant is open to that idea of adding vegetation.

- Mr. Waggoner recommended a modulation to keep the windowsill heights uniform around the building, possibly with a brick veneer. He would recommend a dark color beneath those windows to give it a good base.
- The applicant said that could work, running a base all the way to the white brick, then starting again with the base after the brick, and wrapping it around to the green panel. Trim might be added as well, to create some continuous lines through the building and give it a more unified feel.
- Mr. Waggoner would like to move some of the vertical elements to the north side; the applicant said that might work, to continue that idea around the entire building.

Ms. Tomlin:

- Agreed with Mr. Waggoner's idea to provide continuity through the elevations.
- Overall, considering the budget constraints, Ms. Tomlin believes the applicant has made some nice improvements.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION MADE BY MR. PALMQUIST, AND SECONDED BY MS. GREGORY, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:17 P.M. MOTION PASSES (6-0).

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY