

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
November 21, 2013**

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: Joe Palmquist, Craig Krueger, Kevin Sutton

EXCUSED ABSENCE: David Scott Meade, Mike Nichols, Arielle Crowder, Scott Waggoner

STAFF PRESENT: Steven Fischer, Principal Planner; Dennis Lisk, Associate Planner;
Gary Lee, Senior Planner

RECORDING SECRETARY: Susan Trapp with Lady of Letters, Inc.

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 Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Joe Palmquist at 7:00 p.m.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2013-01332, 160th Avenue Senior Housing

Description: 75 units of affordable senior housing with a mix of studio, 1 & 2 bedroom units

Location: 8550 160th Ave NE

Applicant: Dan Landes *with* Shelter Resources, Inc.

Prior Review Date: 10/03/13

Staff Contact: Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or glee@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee noted that this was the second pre-application meeting for this senior housing project. There are some new elevations for the DRB members to consider. Mr. Lee said this project is moving in the right direction. The main difference from the last application is that the drop-off ramp in the front of the project has been moved to the back. The length of the drop-off lane in the front is still an issue. It may get longer and could affect the site plan. This would not affect the footprint of the building, however. Mr. Lee had previously made some comments about the roof line, but that appeared to have been addressed in the new elevations.

Architect Barry Hoyne with Sage Architectural Alliance presented on behalf of the applicant. He reminded the DRB that the land this project is located on is owned by the City, and the City has determined the best use for this land is affordable senior housing. The Shelter Resources team was selected to be the project developer through an RFP process. The applicant said this would be a great site for seniors due to the nearby location of the senior center, the library, shopping, recreation, and the pedestrian path. The applicant said the project would have 75 units, including studios as well as one-bedroom and two-bedroom units. There will be 8,000 square feet of commercial tenant space on the ground floor and underground parking. Some of the goals set for this project by the DRB at the last meeting included a focus on the building access to the south where the pedestrian path occurs and moving vehicles more to the north. The DRB wanted the project to relate more to the surrounding neighborhoods in terms of details and design and save existing trees where possible. The DRB asked the applicant to create a building and project that would have a community feel and thus contribute to the neighborhood.

Other issues that came up at the last pre-application meeting included moving the parking ramp. The applicant, as Mr. Lee mentioned, has moved that ramp to the rear. The applicant has tried to enhance the entrances of the building and improved modulation, colors, landscaping, and paving. The applicant has met with the Technical Committee to look at the fire lanes in order to create some differentiation between the pedestrian path, the fire lanes, and the drop-off area. Most of these ideas have been conceptually

approved, the applicant said, but the details need to be worked out. The wall toward the southeast corner, which the DRB said appeared blank at the last meeting, now has some new options.

The applicant said the drop-off area is for picking up and dropping off residents, but it is also for emergency vehicles and moving trucks. He noted that he is trying to save trees on the site, including a landmark tree in one location and a cluster of significant trees in another. There is a lot of vegetation on the north location that will be saved. Fire lanes are on both sides of the project. Landscaping has been proposed, with paths and plazas, to create various layers to the project site. The theme is to create an edible landscape where possible. Existing oaks and sweetgum trees on the back of the site, and other trees, could help create some shade gardens. Green walls and vertical trellises have been proposed.

Valerie Thiel next presented on behalf of the applicant and pointed out some of the refinements in the perspectives of the project. The building is broken down into three massing areas, or wings, in the north, central, and south. Each massing has its own character. The south wing has masonry that defines the common areas of the housing. The central and north wings will be used by the commercial tenant and would have stucco elements. The central bay is stepped back and has a courtyard. The modulation of the roof changes for each wing, as well. Each wing has its own colors and materials. The north wing has green walls and grade level parking. Large openings have been proposed for air flow. The applicant has brought more vibrant colors to the design as well. The applicant showed the DRB a color board. The accent color, a green color, has been used on the stair tower lobby and on both the north and south ends. The entries are now more visible with color, and the commercial tenant's entry has been located to the left of a cluster of evergreen trees. The south entry, or main entry to the housing, has been developed as well. The tower at this entry has been raised to create more symmetry with the north entry. On the east side of the building, there will be changes in materials and roof modulations. Trees on this side have been retained as a break between the site and some neighboring homes.

Mr. Hoyne returned to present on behalf of the applicant to the DRB. He noted that the applicant wanted to strengthen the entries, so each entry could have its own identity. The most prominent entry will be for the senior housing and will have a canopy. Some large openings have been included around the parking area to create air flow. The design borrows some elements from the nearby library with regard to those openings and the green walls. The green walls would be made from heavy duty wire mesh and will help create an identity for the site. There was a question from the previous meeting about how to terminate the fire lane on the site. The applicant is hoping to mimic what is happening across the street from the site at the City of Redmond's municipal campus and use a row of cherry trees and other garden areas.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the material used on the first floor of the east side. The applicant replied that stucco would be used here with horizontal reveals. Brick would be used on the west side.
- Mr. Krueger said he liked the changes made since the last pre-application. Some creative solutions have addressed a number of the DRB's concerns. He liked the colors and liked how the massing was broken up. He appreciated the decks and protrusions being grouped into larger massing.
- Mr. Krueger liked the variety in the modulation and the colors used. He appreciated how the colors were worked into the elevations. He had some concerns about the brick on the west and how that would transition to more of a plain stucco element, but said if some reveals were included, as the applicant has proposed, that would make sense.
- He liked the green walls and the ventilation proposed in the parking area. He asked about the south end of the building and wondered if an outdoor courtyard would be appropriate in that area. The applicant responded that the pedestrian crossing is on the south. A dual purpose fire lane is in this area as well. There is a plaza that connects to the site to the southwest.
- The applicant continued that a small wall has been included in the southwest portion of the project, creating some separation from the pedestrian path and sidewalk. A slight slope has been included in the sidewalk. The applicant said the living room area in the southwest corner will be a popular place to sit with a view of the street and the pedestrian pathway.
- The applicant agreed that more development could be done on the south of the site and the blank wall proposed at this part of the site, on the southeast corner. The applicant said the exhaust of the

garage will come out near this area. The fire lane in this part of the site will create some interesting challenges, but some landscaping and trellises may be included here.

- The applicant said that a common laundry room will create a natural place to gather in the southeast corner, and people could wait just outside the laundry room while their laundry was being done. This corner will be developed further in the future.
- Mr. Krueger liked the patio on the southwest corner. He said moving that patio closer to the pedestrian path might make it quieter. He liked the idea of the living room facing out to the pedestrian path. He asked about the access to the southwest corner for residents.
- The applicant said the residents would have their own decks in this corner, but there would be some access to the common area. Mr. Krueger liked that and the overall direction of the project as well.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked about the landscape walls and if there would be one on the west elevation where the parking stalls are located. The applicant pointed out where the walls would be set up on the site. A small planter on the east side of the building would feed a trellis element.
- Mr. Sutton asked about some columns on the west side of the project and the entry to the tenant space. The applicant said the entry has been broadened to three bays' width, and now has a much bigger canopy. This part of the plan needs more development, the applicant said.
- Mr. Sutton asked about the main entry for the senior living area and if there was a projection above the canopy. The applicant is proposing projecting bays over the entry and the common space elevator lobbies. This is a two-story high space.
- Mr. Sutton said he was not a fan of these projections and said he did not think this would gain anything for the applicant. He would prefer to see the design all in the same plane. Overall, he said the design has come a long way and he liked the direction it was heading.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked about the landscaping at the retail entry. The applicant said this design has been changing, but the desire was to make sure that separate entrances would be created for the retail areas. Green walls and other features would be included for each tenant to achieve that separation.
- Mr. Palmquist asked about who would occupy the space, and the applicant said Providence would be the main tenant. Mr. Palmquist said it might be difficult to find a tenant to take up the whole space. The applicant said the tenant would be the operator of the housing, which Mr. Palmquist said would make sense.
- Mr. Krueger pointed out that the Providence facility was a major piece of the RFP on this project.
- Mr. Palmquist asked about the drop-off area and if there was a curb separating it from the rest of the site. The applicant had proposed putting in a median here, but fire officials have said that a traffic marking would be more appropriate. Mr. Palmquist said the project has come a long way and he liked the outdoor spaces. He also liked the idea of the living room overlooking the pedestrian path.
- Mr. Krueger added that he liked the idea of bringing the first floor space out towards the sidewalk, which has worked well at Providence's Rainier Valley site in Seattle.
- Mr. Lee asked the Board if this project was ready to come in as an application. The DRB members said it was ready to begin the application process.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2013-01305, 170th Place NE Townhomes

Description: Construct 7 new attached townhomes in 2 buildings – one 3 unit building and one 4 unit building. The property will be subdivided by Unit Lot Subdivision into 7 lots for individual sale.

Location: 8081 – 170th PL NE

Applicant: Dan Umbach *with* Daniel Umbach Architect LLC

Staff Contact: Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or glee@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee said this was the first pre-application for this project. This is two lots over from the Retreat East project which the DRB has recently seen. This site, like the Retreat, has townhomes, but has a different flavor. The site plan is in good shape according to staff. Mr. Lee said he liked the architecture, which he said was different than other projects staff has seen recently.

Architect Dan Umbach presented on behalf of the applicant. The site is located at 82nd and 170th Place NE. The lot is at the top of a hill and has some sloping going down to the southwest. There is an existing house on the site now and a number of trees, some of which will have to be removed. Three of the existing significant trees would be retained, but others would come out. The site plan includes townhomes with a four-unit building in the front and three in the back. There would be a driveway on the west side and between the buildings as well. All of the four units up front would have entries off the street, three off of 82nd and one off of 170th Place. The three units in the back enter off the driveway aisle and would go out via the driveway. A pedestrian walkway could come off of 170th down to the drive aisle, which is down four to five feet from the grade of 170th. Regarding landscaping, the trees on the southeast and southwest corners of the property would be retained. Some of the others in the interior would be removed, but they would be replaced with street trees and other plantings.

A site triangle would come across the front of the building, which involved a long discussion with the City Engineering Department. What has been proposed is a lawn or low ground cover, with larger plantings closer to the building. More plantings have been proposed in the southwest corner. The four units on the front would have open space on the street. The three units on the back would have a small open space adjacent to the southeastern-most unit and common open space at the southeast corner of the property. All the units would have roof decks and balconies, so there would be quite a bit of outdoor space.

The applicant had considered a rustic look to begin with, but that design has changed slightly. The canopies are now steel instead of timber, and the amount of cedar siding has been reduced. The site now has mostly cement panel siding in two colors, some cedar siding, vinyl windows, metal canopies, and metal balcony railings. All the units have ground floor parking. There is a bonus room at the basement level with a small window and corresponding window well. The main living space on the second level has a larger balcony and master bedroom space and bonus room on the top level. The end of the building, facing east, has an entry off of 170th. One of the units in the back has a bonus room, but the other two do not. This design element is still under consideration. The floor plans are typical townhome arrangements.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked Mr. Lee if he had seen some of the new designs presented at this meeting. Mr. Lee said he had not seen these designs previously, but this still appears to be going in the right direction. He said the materials have been reversed, somewhat. The applicant said the idea was to be more urban and less rustic.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the materials of the siding. The applicant said the materials have remained the same, but the amount of the materials has reversed in some areas. Horizontal cement panel siding now plays a secondary role to the cedar siding through much of the site. The cement panel is a neutral, gray color.
- The applicant confirmed some of the green material seen to the left of the site was landscaping.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the color of the cedar siding. The applicant said it would be a natural, stained color, not the bright red that was showing up in the computer rendering.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the lower doors in the center of the site. The applicant said those would be a natural wood color as well. Mr. Krueger said the affirmation of the colors is making him feel better about the project. He said this was a cool concept and had some nice, fresh ideas. He liked the roof decks and asked about the height limit. The applicant confirmed he was well within that limit.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the window treatment between the buildings. The applicant said that part of the design was incomplete, but he would have that detail worked out at the next meeting. The dining spaces on the back of the project would have a substantial amount of glass.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the 10-foot driveway up against the west side of the townhouses which makes a turn into a 24-foot drive aisle. The applicant said this design has been working in Seattle.
- The applicant asked Mr. Lee if the driveway could be widened, in light of the setback lines. Mr. Lee said that could be possible, but three feet of landscaping would have to be in place along the property line. Mr. Lee suggested a change in width would be possible in the pullout area, and the applicant said he would be fine with adding more breathing room for drivers there.
- Mr. Krueger liked the idea of taking the walkway up the east end of the drive aisle so that residents of the three-plex would have an enhanced entry from the street. He said the project looked great.

Mr. Sutton:

- Liked the continuous roof from the previous design. The applicant said he has talked with the owner about the breaks in the roof line, and he was not necessarily sold on those breaks. Mr. Sutton liked the continuous roof gesture.
- Mr. Sutton asked about the roof elements and the vertical piece they connect with. He noted that down below, where the cedar siding is, there does not appear to be a difference in plane. Mr. Sutton said that did not work for him, and recommended a change in projection. The applicant admitted he was conflicted about this element, but did not think an overhang would be appropriate.
- Mr. Sutton suggested that the cedar could turn the corner and go up to the roof. He said the continuous roof element might help in this regard. The applicant said he put a fin element in this location because it changes the scale of the project considerably if it was taken out. That would create a massing issue, in his opinion. He said he would look into this idea, however.
- Mr. Sutton said he liked what he saw, but noted that there were a lot of elements going on, and he was not following the logic of why certain areas had different materials. The applicant said the project is still evolving.
- Mr. Sutton asked if the vinyl windows could be a color other than white. The applicant said that was possible.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Agreed with Mr. Sutton that a continuous roof line would work better for the modern design scheme. Mr. Palmquist said that would help simplify the design, which appears very busy to him right now.
- Mr. Palmquist said he was fine with either a rustic or more modern design, but said the site location might indicate a more rustic design. He said the modern design would be fine, however. He said a stone element could be used as a break, but not as a main element.
- Mr. Lee confirmed that at the next meeting, the applicant would express the materials and would have a color board for the DRB as well. The applicant said he would have a full landscape plan, too.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2013-01227, Avalon Redmond Overlake Village Block 4

Description: One 6-story mixed-use building, with ground-floor retail, five levels of residential, and underground parking

Location: 2700 – 152nd Ave NE

Architect: David Kelley *with* Ankrom Moisan Architects

Applicant: Avalon Bay Communities

Prior Review Date: 08/22/13

Staff Contact: Dennis Lisk, 425-556-2471 or dwlisk@redmond.gov

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2013-01228, Avalon Redmond Overlake Village Block 7

Description: One 6-story mixed-use building, with ground-floor retail, five levels of residential, and underground parking

Location: 2700 – 152nd Ave NE

Architect: David Kelley *with* Ankrom Moisan Architects

Applicant: Avalon Bay Communities

Prior Review Date: 08/22/13

Staff Contact: Dennis Lisk, 425-556-2471 or dwlisk@redmond.gov

The DRB decided to combine the two final pre-applications for this meeting into one discussion, as they both deal with the Avalon Redmond Overlake Village project.

Mr. Lisk said this is the second pre-application for the Block 4 project, which the DRB saw in August of 2013. This is one of several projects presented by Capstone for the old Group Health property in Overlake Village. Block 4 is in the middle of the site. The applicant is proposing a six-story, mixed-use building for this site with approximately 220 apartment units in the building and some ground floor retail units. The building has a wide open relationship to the park, which will be to the east, across 153rd Avenue. Staff has asked the DRB to look at a list of design considerations for this site, including its

relationship to 152nd Street. The hope is that the buildings respond to and interact with this very pedestrian-oriented street. The relationship of this building to its sister building to the south is an important consideration, as well. Both buildings are independent, but will need to play off each other in terms of design.

The building materials are not quite ready for a detailed look, but Mr. Lisk noted that City Code governing Overlake Village has a fairly strict standard regarding fiber cement. If an applicant wants to use fiber cement, there is a part of the Code that speaks to the administrative design flexibility that would allow that to happen. However, in doing that, the applicant would have to demonstrate that the building is providing a superior design and meeting the overall intent of the standard, which is to promote the use of high-quality, durable building materials that fit in an urban context. Mr. Lisk was also very interested in the interior courtyard space, how it would be landscaped, what activities would be happening there, and how that relates to the parking on the other side of the site.

Architect David Kelley with Ankrom Moisan Architects spoke on behalf of the applicant. He said he would talk about Block 4 and Block 7 in his presentation. Mr. Kelley said this would be one of the first developments in Overlake Village. Block 4 would account for 475 residential units, and in about three years, there would be 500-600 people living in Block 4 and Block 7. All of this would be owned and operated by Avalon Bay. There is a strong desire for these blocks to feel like a single community. With that many people, however, the project has to respond and attract the broadest demographic possible. The buildings should have a relationship to the community, but their own identity as well. Block 4 has been designed more traditionally as a way to attract a more mature tenant, including families. Block 7 would be more sleek and contemporary, meant to attract a more Gen Y audience. Both blocks would share amenities and outdoor spaces.

The applicant said he would answer two of the four points Mr. Lisk raised at the start of this discussion. At the last pre-application, the applicant focused on massing. Block 4 is to the west of the major, central park. Block 7 would be at the corner. The U-shaped massing of Block 7 relating to the park was one of the strongest options revealed at the last meeting. Two buildings have linkages on Block 7 to the south. Basically, the applicant is hoping to show the DRB the massing options presented at the last meeting with more articulation and some evolved design concepts. Materials have not been determined yet. The applicant wanted to confirm he was going in the right direction with the form. He did note that panels would most likely be used on a portion of the buildings, with an eye toward superior design. The applicant has been working on improving access for vehicles to these sites as well. Due to a steep slope, getting to underground parking is very difficult for retail outlets along 152nd as well as residents. The applicant has been working with the City, and tonight, more automobile access points have been proposed.

Jenny Chapman next presented on behalf of the applicant. She said she was excited to talk about the design process for the project and looked forward to getting the DRB's feedback. Block 4 and Block 7 are being designed together, permitted together, and will be constructed and operated together. The applicant would like to create a sense of community between the two buildings and the rest of the development while making sure the buildings have separate, unique identities. Block 4 to the north is all about embracing the park. The form of the building was developed with that in mind. It has a U-shape that opens to the park. The courtyard of Block 4 is seen as an extension of the park, and a visual connection will be made there. Block 7 will open to the north and to the spine road. A series of pedestrian experiences and activities will be provided there, as well as other shared amenities between both buildings.

Those pedestrian amenities would include nearly 20,000 square feet of retail space along 152nd. The applicant is proposing that the residential units could be accessed from grade to provide an active pedestrian experience. Lobbies and shared amenities would occur between both blocks. The hope is that all the ground level design will add up to a very active streetscape that is pedestrian-oriented. The applicant has studied parking entries with the City for several weeks. The intent is to provide something successful for the buildings but also for the entire community. Easy access to the buildings for parking will provide and ensure success for the retailers along 152nd. The full access entries are off of 28th and 26th. Partial access entries would be along the spine road, meaning a right turn in and a right turn out.

The applicant noted that, back in August, the DRB saw three main massing options for Block 4. It was basically agreed upon that a building facing the park would be the most successful option for this building. The exterior expression hopes to reinforce the concept of embracing the park and creating a focus toward the park. The exterior is more finished while the interior is softer and more delicate. The applicant wants to bring an elegant, tailored project to the community. Taking this concept further, the applicant has reviewed the massing of the building and requirements connected to that massing. For every 120 feet, the design must step ten feet in for at least 25% of the building. On Block 4, this is achieved by breaking up the massing into four main elements with three main recesses. The achieved ten-foot depth occurs from the back of the recess to the front of the projecting balcony.

With Block 4, the idea is to create a traditional massing of a top, middle, and base. The design uses the balconies as a graphic element that will stitch the outer skin of the building, seen as gray elements in the rendering, to the white core of the building. The applicant wants to celebrate the corner between 152nd and the spine road, providing a strong graphic gateway element. Bold color will be used behind the main massing. The gray outer shell is made lighter with large apertures so that the windows and materials behind it can come through. This involves weaving materials throughout the building and using colors and materials consistently. The applicant is providing a lot of active retail space along 152nd.

From the spine road, the design shows an aggressive approach towards breaking up the massing of the building. Due to the slope, there is a portion of the building that allows for an extra story. That is happening on the high side, towards the east. As the building steps down, different elements are pushed in as the skin is pulled out and away. Another strong entry point is on the east side of the street towards residential amenity or lobby space. Parts of the building can spill out and face the park. The upper portion of the eastern part of the building will form a beacon. There are two taller one-story "tower" elements, intended to be lighter in expression, which can be seen from the whole development. Through material, massing, and texture, the applicant is hoping to give an animated look to the buildings that would avoid being static and flat.

The applicant is hoping the parking entrance along the spine road will reinforce an idea of a pedestrian experience, such that the garage is seamlessly knit into the architecture. There will be street parking and ample planting along a wide sidewalk, stoops, and the parking entrance. The main vehicular access is at level two, where there are two entrances. Residents will use the entrance from the north. The one on the south will be primarily for retail, allowing customers to enter, drive in, and park and take a slight ramp from level two parking down to 152nd. This should provide convenient parking and thus success for the retail area. On level one, there will be additional parking and the retail shops themselves along 152nd. There is a subterranean parking level below level one. Up above, there is a courtyard at level three. Above levels four, five, six, and seven, there will be a green roof and a small amenity area for the two top floors.

Mr. Krueger confirmed that the applicant would display colors and materials at the next meeting. The basic idea is to have a light gray contrasted with a medium, warmer tone in the courtyard. Mr. Lisk noted that the City's Technical Committee had granted the applicant access from the spine road. Access from NE 28th Street to Block 4 has been granted on a right in, right out basis, but not full access. Staff has been satisfied that traffic circulation in the building and around the building can work with two right turn ins and two right turn outs on either end of the building. The applicant said future development might modify that traffic flow picture. The applicant said a full access point could be allowed for some period of time until more of the site is developed, at which point the right turn in, right turn out restrictions would be put in place. By allowing access from the spine road, a circulation pattern is achieved in and around the building. The applicant said when the project is fully developed, full access on 28th, with left and right turns, would not be needed for an appropriate traffic flow. Mr. Lisk wanted to make sure that the DRB kept its focus on looking at creating a strong base for Block 4, especially along 152nd.

The applicant said that Block 7 is related to Block 4, but still has a unique identity. The applicant is interested in the history of this site as well as its present and future culture. The hope is to combine those concepts into one building. The base of Block 7 would express, in architectural language, a way of rooting it into the earth and into the place that Redmond is and came from. The upper portions of the building have a sleeker, more modern direction that point to the future. There is a significant slope on this site. One way to break up this massive block is to really develop it into two buildings. It is still one building, but

visually, there is an upper and lower portion of the building that would be distinct. Looking at Block 4 and Block 7 conceptually, Block 4 is more about wrapping and embracing the park. Block 7 faces Block 4 and is more about a distinct upper and lower building supported on a common base. Both buildings share common architectural vocabularies.

The applicant has proposed a darker building above and a lighter building below with regard to Block 7. Each building is broken up with modulation and developed with a rich palette of materials. The lighter building will have Arctic whites, grays, and medium grays. The upper building will range from darker grays to midnight blues and a further range of colors. All of this modulation in both the upper and lower building is captured by a strong roof and floor line element to create a sleek, singular appearance. The lower portions of the building tie the project to the past but still use contemporary details. More crafted, bespoke, custom elements will be used. Within each building, there is a variation of texture, material, and color. The retail element along 152nd comes up between both buildings and creates a pavilion that will be an active amenity space for both Block 4 and Block 7. This will also enhance the pedestrian experience. The overall view of the project from a pedestrian perspective shows three different architectural languages.

Block 7 will have two parking entries, including a retail entry off the spine road which immediately ramps down into parking and allows easy access to retail units on 152nd. A residential entry comes off 26th and ramps down as well. The pavilion element described above is visible to the north of the project, and has a smaller pavilion on top of it. A green roof will be used on level 8. A courtyard will occur on level two.

The applicant said the two concerns of Mr. Lisk's he did not have information on would be the exterior materials and specific colors as well as the development of the interior courtyards. The applicant wants feedback from the DRB to make sure the relationship of the buildings to 152nd makes sense and that the relationship of the two buildings to each other would be acceptable. The applicant pointed out that the modulation of Block 7 is clear, in that it is split into two buildings. But the modulation on Block 4 is more subtle. The applicant is trying to show and separate the two eight-story portions at the park with a small stack of units split by a deep recess. Block 4 is more about creating a bar along 152nd and making two pavilions that face the park.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Said it almost looked like there were two teams working on this project, one on Block 4 and one on Block 7. Mr. Krueger said there are many differences between the two. However, after the presentation, he said the two buildings appear to work well together. Block 4 and Block 7 use different layering of the same elements.
- He wondered how Block 4 and Block 7 would look from the street level. He loves Block 4's cladding and materials on the outside and the changes in color. He also likes the darker cladding on Block 4, especially. On Block 7, he understands the change in architecture, but said it was a drastic change.
- Mr. Krueger wondered if, at the corner of 152nd and the spine road, there could be something from Block 4 to come over and "splash" on Building 7. He said there could be a cool way to create a gateway using both buildings, in some fashion.
- He liked how the applicant dealt with 152nd and the modulation of Building 4 along this busy road. He also thought the modulation of Block 7 was good. He asked if there would be 12-foot ceilings for the retail units along 152nd. The applicant said that height would be closer to 14 feet, and that height would step with the grade.
- Mr. Krueger said this would be a great project to see from the street. He was glad to see the right in and right out access from the spine road. He asked if the access off of 26th would be right in and right out.
- Mr. Lisk said that the access point at 153rd, where it comes into 26th, would have a temporary hammerhead feature. There is enough room in that hammerhead to provide some fire access and some vehicular accessibility to the building, which is where the garage entrance would be.
- The roadway at 26th is not a City right of way, but basically a driveway for King County Metro buses. The plan in the future would be to make this a public street.

- Mr. Krueger asked to see an east elevation on Building 7. The applicant confirmed that view would be brought to the DRB at the next meeting. Mr. Krueger liked the “beacon” elements of Building 4 and its penthouse suites.
- Overall, Mr. Krueger liked what he saw with this project and the explanation of the approaches for the two buildings.

Mr. Sutton:

- Also liked the approach taken with both buildings, especially Block 7, which is very striking. Mr. Sutton said his only area of concern was the elevations on Block 7 and how that building would be broken up. He hoped that when the materials and colors were refined, that could come together. He was very curious to see what the building’s east side would look like.
- Mr. Sutton would like to see a street level perspective of the two buildings in the same view as well as a look at the two buildings from the park side. Mr. Sutton said this project was off to a solid start.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Liked Building 7 and its C-shape, which he felt was really strong. Mr. Palmquist said the corners of the buildings were very well put together, as well, and help tie the overall design together. He said the entrance off of 152nd helped connect Block 4 and Block 7.
- Mr. Palmquist said the C-shape of Block 7 works well, but he would almost like to see the balconies not project past the building and be a little more subtle. He suggested some slight changes in design to emphasize the C-shape element of this building.
- Mr. Palmquist asked about the amenity space in the middle of the two buildings. He said, with a driveway nearby, it would be difficult to have mid-block crossing.
- The applicant said mid-block crossing would not be allowed due to the busy nature of the street. A certain amount of planting will most likely happen between the road and the sidewalk to discourage pedestrians from crossing mid-block. Mr. Palmquist added that there was not much public access on the south side of Building 4, which should help solve this problem as well.
- Mr. Sutton asked about the function of the buildings near the amenity space. The applicant said that was still under consideration, and added that any resident of this area would know the amenity space as a shared feature between the buildings.
- Mr. Lisk asked if the residents of Block 7 could use the courtyard of Block 4. The applicant said that was indeed the case, and said residents of either building could use either courtyard or roof deck.
- Mr. Palmquist asked about the upper building of Block 7 and where it disappears behind the lower building. There is a notch element that ruins the extruding element of the building. He would like to see this notch modulation played down to emphasize the formal nature of the building.
- Mr. Krueger countered that he liked the projection of the balconies from the side of the building that Mr. Palmquist did not support. Mr. Krueger said he was not an architect, but noted that the balconies looked very cool.
- The Board and applicants thanked each other for their time. The DRB agreed that both Block 4 and Block 7 could be reviewed together at the next meeting, as well.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:45 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (3-0).

January 16, 2014
MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY