

CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AND LANDMARKS & HERITAGE COMMISSION
May 5th, 2011

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

BOARD AND COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: David Scott Meade (Chairperson—DRB), Craig Krueger, Lara Sirois, Joe Palmquist, Scott Waggoner, Janine McDonald, Mike Nichols, Thomas K. Hitzroth (Chairperson—LHC), Miguel Llanos

EXCUSED ABSENCE: None

STAFF PRESENT: Thara Johnson, Associate Planner; Gary Lee, Senior Planner; Steven Fischer, Principle Planner; Kim Dietz, Senior Planner

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

The Landmark and Heritage Commission is appointed by City Council to designate, provide additional incentives to, provide review of changes to, and provide expertise on archaeological and historic matters pertaining to properties qualifying for either a national, state or local register status.

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

LANDMARK AND HERITAGE COMMISSION

The meeting of the Landmark & Heritage Commission was called to order by the Chairperson of the Commission, Thomas K. Hitzroth, at 7 p.m.

ELECTION OF CHAIR

Mr. Hitzroth noted that the election of a chair is an annual requirement for City Code; he currently holds this position. Mr. Llanos would be the other person eligible for the position. Mr. Llanos said that he would not like to run for the position, as he is not as knowledgeable as Mr. Hitzroth about landmark regulations in Redmond and in King County. He suggested that Mr. Hitzroth to serve another term.

MOTION BY MR. LLANOS AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO NOMINATE MR. HITZROTH AS CHAIR OF THE LANDMARKS AND HERITAGE COMMISSION. MOTION APPROVED (9-0).

DOWNTOWN'S HISTORIC PROPERTIES

Mr. Hitzroth noted that May was Preservation Month in Redmond, and two tours will be taking place downtown to mark that occasion. One for the public will be held May 15th at 1:00 P.M. On May 22nd, there will be a special tour for City boards, commissions, and staff that provides more depth on the buildings themselves, and details about the preservation landmarking done last year through the interlocal agreement with King County. On the tour, Mr. Hitzroth will explain what makes the Brown Building a *historical landmark* and what distinguishes the Perigo House as a *community landmark*. Mr. Hitzroth encouraged the DRB members to attend that tour on May 22nd, if possible.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE TO THE COMMUNITY CHARACTER AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT & NATIONAL PRESERVATION MONTH

Kim Dietz showed the Commission some draft recommendations for the Community Character and Historic Preservation Element. This is just one of the 2010-2011 refinements to the Comprehensive Plan, and the City Council intends to review the entirety of the Plan by the end of this year. Ms. Dietz will be working with the Planning Commission starting May 25th on this Element, which will include a public hearing on June 8th as well. She says this is an opportunity for the Commission to consider what has

changed since the last update of the Plan in 2005 as well as incorporating the City's sustainable principles and addressing consistency with the City's Interlocal Agreement for Preservation Services with King County. Ms. Dietz would like the Commission to review the Element draft recommendations and get back to her with comments. She reviewed some of the highlights of the recommendations:

1. Sustainability
2. Zoning Code updates
3. Park Plan update, considering trails, public events, and community gatherings
4. Working through the interlocal agreement with King County to ensure consistency

Regarding sustainability, Ms. Dietz says this Element is in good standing, and she noted that there was community interest in community gardens (often described as P-Patches), corporate gardens, and more opportunities to gather downtown. Also in Redmond's downtown, the public is looking for more opportunities for passive and active recreation. There is some public interest in having outdoor seating, even in wintertime, at street side cafes, for example.

Regarding the recently updated Zoning Code, this is mainly a review of terms and definitions. PSRC has recommended that this section include *environmentally sensitive designs*. Ms. Dietz says Redmond currently offers a green building program, and the Element could help promote that. Overall, the City is changing the term *gateway* to *entryway* when describing the entrance into a neighborhood, such as those places that help make a neighborhood more welcoming. Ms. Dietz says creating those entryways in the City would involve neighborhood stewards to get involved in design and maintenance. Mr. Fischer asked Ms. Dietz to make sure the City's Street Tree Program was included in this section, which Ms. Dietz has added. Another change involves *design districts*, which are now designated as *zones*.

Also in conjunction with the Zoning Code, Agricultural zones have been changed in the Code to Urban Recreation zones and the Landmarks and Heritage Commission is now the Landmark Commission Ms. Dietz will send another email to the Commission to discuss these changes. The terms *historic properties* and *historic landmarks* have been recommended as additions to the Comprehensive Plan Glossary in this section. Mr. Llanos asked the DRB members about some language proposed to be taken out that refers to design districts as a means of retaining historical character or significance of an area. Ms. McDonald asked if striking language like this was a matter of removing redundancy. Ms. Dietz agreed with Ms. McDonald, in that the City is trying to streamline the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Dietz will review why that policy was recommended to be removed. Ms. McDonald asked about why design standards in another section were suggested for removal, as well. Mr. Meade asked about a section speaking to transitions between uses in the City, and why that was struck from the Code. He asked about a sidewalk paving standard that deals with the City's historic areas. He would like the quality of that paving to be elevated, in that the sidewalks outside some older buildings, while historic, are in poor repair. Ms. Dietz said she would work with Gary Lee on that issue.

Mr. Krueger asked about why some apparently major points about the downtown were taken out. Ms. Dietz says there may be some other comments from her staff that could help in this area; Mr. Hitzroth says he would like to see that further insight. Mr. Meade asked if the whole Commission could consider trying to find a way to remove the metal siding off the old Redmond Hotel building. Mr. Hitzroth agreed. Mr. Meade would like to support, with design standards and other influences, ways to bring that building back to its original state. Mr. Hitzroth says if the siding were removed, it would have a better chance to be designated as a landmark. The original material under the siding is wood, and Mr. Hitzroth has seen it in a tour about seven or eight years ago. The Commission thanked Ms. Dietz for her time.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. SIROIS AND SECONDED BY MR. MEADE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING OF THE LANDMARKS AND HERITAGE COMMISSION. MOTION APPROVED (9-0).

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CALL TO ORDER

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Chairperson David Scott Meade at 7:25 p.m.

MINUTES

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. SIROIS, AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 17TH, 2011 MEETING. MINUTES WERE AMENDED TO READ THAT MS. MCDONALD MADE A MOTION REGARDING KEY BANK THAT WAS SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS, NOT “MR. MCDONALD.” MOTION APPROVED WITH AMENDMENT (7-0).

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST, AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7TH, 2011 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (6-0) WITH ONE ABSTENTION.

PROJECT REVIEW

PRE110010, Cascade View East Office Building

Description: Replace existing windows and replace existing wall tile with cement fiber panels and paint entire building

Location: 16310 NE 80th Street

Applicant: Bob Christiansen

Contact: Jeff Benoliel *with* Spencer & Malone, LLC

Staff Contact: Steve Fischer, (425)556-2432, sfischer@redmond.gov

Mr. Fischer told the DRB that this is a small two to three-story office building on 80th Street that was built in 1983. It was remodeled in 1999. The building has three components: a front, middle, and back. The front portion is brown, the middle is green, and the back is a yellow color. Under the windows on the buildings, there is some square tile used. The applicant wants to replace those windows, replace the tile due to water penetration, and repaint the building. Staff does not have a problem with the window replacement. While the tile was a decorative part of the front of the building, if it has to be removed due to water penetration, staff says that is understandable. The staff has concern over the color changes. The newly-revised Zoning Code speaks to this issue, in that brighter colors may be approved where appropriate. The colors for this project are a slate gray and blue, to make the buildings more uniform from front to back. However, Mr. Fischer says contextually, the site is in three pieces that had different colors in the past, which helped break up massing and provide some interest. Staff is recommending the DRB would encourage the use of breaking the colors up to match the form. However, if the Board feels the colors are fine, staff has prepared a recommendation matching that sentiment.

Robert Christiansen, the applicant, spoke to the DRB. He noted the tile needed to be replaced, and the colors need to be updated. He does not understand why three different colors would be needed. He says the forms themselves separate the buildings. He believes the entire site could use the cohesiveness one color could provide. The applicant says the colors he has provided are residential, but help tie the building together front to back. He noted that there were galvanized steel “fins” on the site that help provide some visual breakup of the project, and the blue and gray colors would match well with that steel.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked about the layout of the building, and if it were close to 60 feet by 100 feet. The applicant says that would be a close estimation.

Ms. McDonald:

- Asked why the colors looked different on different buildings, in that the blue accent color was under the windows on one drawing, but on the side of the building on another drawing.
- The applicant says the north side of the building, the blue color would look better as a more dominant color, horizontally. Ms. McDonald says the vertical elements were taken away with that color, but the applicant believes this method helps distinguish the three buildings from each other.

Mr. Meade:

- Says he hears what the staff and Board are saying, but overall, believes this project is not quite where it needs to be yet. He believes a third color might help, or a revised application of those colors. Chips of those colors would be helpful for the DRB in making a decision.
- Mr. Meade says there is an opportunity to take this building to the next level. It was an edgy building before, and Mr. Meade would like the applicant to consider being cutting edge, now. Adding a black or red color might help in that regard.
- As it stands now, Mr. Meade says a black and white photo would show just one color intensity with the colors the applicant is suggesting. He says a holistic scheme could be involved, as the application is suggesting, but the applicant may need to start with a clean slate.
- Mr. Meade says a base, shaft, and cap color might help identify the project and make it look less like a business park.

Ms. Sirois:

- Likes the idea of breaking up the massing using different colors. Ms. Sirois says some element, however, could tie this project together, be it a color or pattern.
- Ms. Sirois says she understands that the present colors are dated, but she does not want to throw away the concept of treating the masses differently.
- Jeff Benoliel with Spencer and Malone addressed the Board, and noted that the owner of the site believes the proposed color scheme is still complementary to the three buildings, yet still provides enough distinction between the three.
- The applicant added that it would be detrimental to lock the owners into a design philosophy in the future than allow the flexibility to pursue the simplified colors they are proposing, at a lower cost.

Mr. Meade:

- Says that the applicant should not feel stuck. But he noted that where the building had something interesting to start with, the proposed design is uninteresting.
- Mr. Meade recommended finding another color and integrating them in a way, as Ms. Sirois suggested, that would not involve such a simple color scheme. He wants to make sure the applicant respects the fact that this is an interesting building.
- The applicant says that the colors will look different in different levels of sunlight. He added that the existing Code calls for muted colors, and that he was not aware of the Code revisions.
- Mr. Meade says the colors proposed could be awesome, but he needs to see some color chips to make a better judgment. The applicant asked if the DRB thought the current colors of the site were appropriate.
- Mr. Meade responded that the current Board was not in place when this project was first approved, and he says the applicant now has a chance to make a choice for a more timeless color palette.
- The DRB agreed with the applicant that his proposed colors were good, but Ms. McDonald and several other members said another accent color would be needed. She noted that a better color scheme would help attract tenants more easily.
- Mr. Meade suggested keeping the metal fins on the site, and adding a darker color to ground the two lighter colors that have been proposed. He says the applicant has not missed the mark by much, but some other schemes should be provided.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the blocky-looking east elevation. Mr. Meade noted the discussion for the Board to consider was mainly focused on color, and should have a holistic approach to solve that issue on the east side.
- Mr. Meade added that some hardy panel could be used instead of tile.

Mr. Nichols:

- Confirmed with the applicant that the hardy panels would have a reveal at the joints.
- Mr. Nichols says that the applicant should put more thought into the east elevation, and might perhaps be modeled after the west elevation.
- Mr. Meade says he wants to make sure the applicant knows he is off to a good start. Mr. Meade would like the applicant to come back with a better scheme, color chips, and photos. He believes, at that point, the project would be a slam dunk for approval.

PROJECT REVIEW

L110130, St. George Coptic Orthodox Church

Description: Construction of a new 19,739 square foot church with 81 parking spaces

Location: 13216 NE 100th Street

Applicant: Father Angelos Sarkis

Architect: Wayne Ivary *with* Ivary Associates

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

Ms. Johnson noted this project is in a newly-annexed portion of the City, with about 19,739 square feet split almost evenly between the two floors. The DRB reviewed this project on October 21st of last year, at which point the Board members had several comments on the Eastern style of the architecture. Staff says the proposed project meets the goals of the neighborhood design requirements, as well as City design standards. Staff is recommending approval with standard conditions.

Architect Wayne Ivary spoke to the DRB on behalf of the applicant. He noted the pyramid forms on the spires, a cost-saving measure, have been replaced with domes, which is more in line with the Coptic tradition. The DRB had commented that the spires looked squatly before, so the applicant has created some new shadow lines to combat that image. Another change involves a one-story colonnade entry porch, which is now a vaulted entry. A metal roof, with the same champagne color of the steeple, will be used instead of shingles. Mr. Ivary says that should help the project blend into the neighborhood a bit better. He reviewed the project for members of the DRB who were not on the Board during the first pre-application meeting. Stucco, natural wood, and concrete are the main materials to be used. The crosses on the steeples will be close to the same height as the center cross. The center cross may be removed. The three domes are the signature of the project.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Meade:

- Asked about the columns supporting the entrance. The applicant says those are concrete; on the side, the material for the columns is metal, of the same color as the roof.
- Mr. Meade asked if the roof form is projected. The applicant says it is gabled. He added that the window frames are aluminum and masonry, with some white vinyl molding.
- Mr. Meade asked about exterior lights. The applicant says there will be some lighting, but the domes will not be lit from the exterior. The steeple face will be illuminated.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the concrete columns in front. The applicant says they will most likely be painted; he is concerned about using stucco in that area.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the domes, which the applicant says will be made of fiberglass with a copper color.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the orange tone of the arch. The applicant says that will be tile, to match the tile color in a nearby recessed area. He is considering an umber color for that tile. The applicant says he recessed area has oak with battens in the design.
- Mr. Nichols would like to see a rendering with the true colors provided. The applicant says that will be determined closer to the time a contractor is chosen.
- Mr. Meade says he is good with the project as presented; if there are minor changes, the applicant can bring them to staff and take care of them.
- Mr. Meade says the roof revision, and the other changes, make sense in general, but are tough to represent with a rendering. The applicant is hoping the richness of the forms and materials makes a statement the DRB can agree with.
- Mr. Meade says the applicant had a good project to start, but has now added some of the DRB's comments to make this project better.
- Mr. Krueger and Ms. Sirois agreed, and noted that the entry is a better, taller portal to the building. Mr. Meade says the project appears very elegant.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Says the domes are a great improvement. He likes the horizontal trim lines on the towers by the entry. He says the metal roof will give a higher-quality look to the building, overall.
- The applicant says the three arches on the project will have a good look on the inside, as well.
- Mr. Waggoner is comfortable the applicant will make a good choice on the tile color at the entrance.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Likes the design much better. He says the applicant has even improved upon what the DRB suggested earlier.
- Mr. Palmquist likes the window forms at the top of the towers, which reflects the Coptic history. Mr. Meade says the applicant hit this out of the park. The applicant noted that the landscape plan had not changed since the last meeting.

MOTION BY MR. NICHOLS AND SECONDED BY MS. MCDONALD TO APPROVE L110130, ST. GEORGE COPTIC ORTHODOX CHURCH, INCLUDING BUILDING ELEVATION, MATERIALS, LANDSCAPE PLAN, AND LIGHTING PLAN, WITH THE STANDARD INCONSISTENCIES RECOMMENDATION FROM STAFF. THE TILE COLOR AND DESIGN WILL BE WORKED OUT WITH STAFF IN THE FUTURE. MOTION APPROVED (7-0).

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE110006, Redmond Square Apartments

Description: Two 5-story apartment buildings with two levels of parking; total 202,100 square feet

Location: 7941 170th Ave NE

Applicant: Oscar DelMoro *with* Cosmos Development Company

Architect: Robin Murphy *with* Stricker Cato Murphy Architects

Prior Review Date: 03/03/11 & 04/07/11

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

Mr. Lee noted that this was the third pre-application meeting for this project. He says what the DRB is seeing tonight is significantly different, and improved, than what has been presented in the packets mailed to them. Mr. DelMoro spoke to the DRB on behalf of the applicant. The applicant says his architects are working twenty-four hours a day on this project, and he would like to move quickly with the City on getting this project built. The City of Redmond has given a favorable review to vacate the alley that is in the center of this project, which has allowed the development of the "muse" concept of the site, as well as other opportunities.

The building is a floor shorter than it was before. The building has been repositioned, as well. A prow has been introduced to the building at its main corner. The project is horizontal in nature, and very sophisticated, in the applicant's opinion. Brick is the base material; modern detailing has been added, including wood, to set off that brick. A rhythm on the project, using decks and windows, has been established to tie the whole building together. The building has a strong, horizontal presence, but has been lifted up on the hillside. The applicant says the units give tenants a territorial view, yet the project is integrated into the landscape. Several open areas have been developed.

Architect Robin Murphy next spoke on behalf of the applicant. He told the DRB that the design has been refined, and speaks to the input from the Board at the last meeting, especially the prow detail on the main corner of the project. Mr. Murphy reviewed the project details, including the fact that the building has 157 units with 197 parking stalls on two levels. Some of those stalls are on the street; bulbs have been placed at the street corners to protect that parking. The common and open space analysis shows that 20% of the lot area needs to be dedicated to open space, which would end up being 11,000-12,000 square feet. The proposed open space on the project is slightly less than that, so the applicant would need to go through an in lieu purchase process to get around the open space issues. There will be some credit given for private open space.

The main open space is the plaza between the buildings, at residential level one, just about street level. On the third floor are two rooftop areas that are open to the community. There is an interior amenity space attached to that as well. The vacated portion of the alley will be considered as open space as well,

with unique benefits for pedestrians. The main entry lobby inside the project has not been claimed as open space. The private open space involves patios (at least eight by eight feet) and balconies (at least five by five feet). The fourth floor may have French doors rather than sliding doors. The corner balconies have been pulled in to fit better with the architecture of the building. The architecture involves three stories of brick. Windows span two floors of the building, and in between them is a metal panel. The windows are surrounded by a brick detail, which Mr. Meade is concerned could create problems for water leakage. A small amount of cement board panel has been used on the exterior. A 2.5-foot overhang sits atop the building with a twelve-inch fascia and pine soffits. The site has groundwater issues; the parking lot has been pulled up to offset those issues. That move has reduced the height of the floor level just above the parking.

The applicant showed the DRB the entry plaza and the proposed furnishings there. A brick wall was initially placed on this plaza, but that has now been removed to create more open space in front of the building. A green wall with vines has been added in the plaza area. The lobby it leads to is two stories tall, with stairs the second floor and an elevator that leads to all stories of the building. There are breaks in the horizontal lines of the building at the fourth and fifth floors. The alley leads into the parking level and the pedestrian areas. Those areas would be kept separate using bollards, which would be removable for emergency vehicles to prevent vehicle traffic. The rotunda on the project has been raised a foot higher than the last time the DRB saw this project.

Mark Weisman, the landscape architect, next spoke on behalf of the applicant. He walked the DRB around the building to better understand its meticulous design. The landscaping has to follow a strict pattern due to that design, he says. He says this is an ordered project with landscaping in the middle and more exuberant plantings on the ends. Some natural rocks border the project at the street level. On 170th, there is an area between two buildings with green walls that will spill out to the street to make an engaging, contemporary space. On the south end of the project, there are stoops that will have pots and small planters. Layers of plants will lead up to the building to soften the edges. The street trees will support the building architecture and rhythm from the street level.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Meade:

- Thanked the design team for a great presentation. Mr. Meade said the fact that a story has been taken away from the building makes a huge difference. He is also impressed with the study of the design and landscape.
- Mr. Meade is concerned that the rotunda will look like the Leaning Tower of Pisa, due to its monochromatic nature. He would like to see the black color used elsewhere on the project under the windows on the rotunda to create a different image. Beyond that, Mr. Meade liked the project.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Noted that top floor appears to notch into the rotunda on one drawing. The applicant says that it will be slightly recessed to avoid any setback problems.
- Mr. Waggoner asked about the center courtyard, and if the walls on both sides are three stories high, with the top two stories set back above that. The applicant confirmed that detail.
- Mr. Waggoner liked the idea of taking out the entry wall on the lower plaza. He asked if the walls next to that plaza would appear too tall, and if those lower floors might be set back a distance.
- Mr. Waggoner asked about the detail on the step walls on the street side, and if that had been simplified. The applicant says what is represented is a balance in the project, which attempts to create a proper pedestrian interface with an eye on cost for the step walls.
- Mr. Waggoner says the layers of plant materials will provide a good look for the project.
- He asked about garage vents on the street side, and if they would be louvered to provide a better look from the street side. The applicant says he will consider that detail, and screen the lights from the street side view. Mr. Waggoner said that would be a good idea.

Mr. Nichols:

- Asked about the roof material. The applicant said it would be a flat metal roof with painted metal coping.

- Mr. Nichols says the scale of the project is much better with one floor fewer. He likes the articulation, colors, and materials used. He says the landscape and green screens helping soften the walls at the ground floors. He likes the project overall.

Ms. McDonald:

- Also likes the reduction of stories of the building and the proportion. She says the project has come a long way. Ms. McDonald says the project is more comfortable and less bulky.
- Ms. McDonald asked about the two-story glass in the lobby and asked if the look appeared too commercial and not residential enough. She would like more refinement in that area to provide a better sense of scale for the street front.
- The applicant says the landscaping should help in that way, possibly with more grasses. He said that perhaps a window-door with a wood frame could create a good visual break.
- Ms. McDonald agreed that the rotunda did look like the Tower of Pisa. She recommended more balcony space toward the top of the building to help add some decoration.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked why that top floor appeared to have a faceted look and was set back slightly. The applicant admitted it was difficult to design. He said that element could be refined.
- Mr. Krueger noted that if the design at top echoed some of the elements of the lower floors, the overall project might look better.
- Mr. Waggoner suggested that some of the space on the top floor did not have to be enclosed, and could be a patio or trellised area.

Ms. Sirois:

- Says that setting that top story back slightly gives the project a more historical look. By bringing it forward, she suggests, the project could have a more contemporary feel.
- Ms. Sirois says a window or awning projecting out below the roof could provide some visual interest.
- Mr. Meade noted that nearby on Cleveland Street, there is a similar project underway with a silo going up several stories. He says he likes the setback of the top floor, but said some roof plate could change to create more drama and excitement. He recommended against having a straight cylinder.

Ms. McDonald:

- Commented on the landscape that if the building has a darker tone, if some of the flowering trees would have some lighter colors.
- The applicant says there is a combination of flowering and non-flowering trees that will provide a lively contrast to the brick of the building.

Mr. Krueger:

- Likes the materials, colors, and the idea of designing a shorter building. He asked if some color could help lighten up the fourth and fifth floors and help the overall perception of height.
- Mr. Meade says the color is already light, and the champagne color of the metal will reflect a lot of light and virtually change colors over the course of a day. He believes the balconies will provide some breakup of the massing as well.
- Mr. Krueger asked if the depth and width of the building met with City standards. Mr. Lee said he had not measured it; the applicant estimated that length was around 140 feet, which is longer than the City standard but could be allowed through design flexibility by the Board.
- The applicant noted that the original building was much longer than that. Mr. Lee asked if the DRB would support that design flexibility. Mr. Krueger said he would support that.
- Regarding open space, Mr. Krueger asked if there was an interior exercise room or other such space.
- Mr. Lee asked if counting the alley, or muse, as open space, was acceptable to the Board. Mr. Meade says it is hard to tell from the renderings how the muse would be used. He asked if some recreation opportunities, like soccer goals or basketball hoops, might work in this space.
- Mr. Krueger and Mr. Meade agreed that space could be very active. Mr. Krueger asked if having two sets of bollards to block off this muse would be a good idea. The applicant says he is trying to convince the Fire Department inspectors and Public Works Department to approve that.
- Mr. Nichols says the people who live in the units by the muse would use it all the time.

- Mr. Meade and other Board members agreed that the muse could be counted as outdoor space. Mr. Meade also was in favor to allow a variance to the length based on the design. He noted that the evolution of this project was amazing, and he expects it will be a cornerstone of the neighborhood.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the north elevation of what the applicant is calling Building A, and said it was a very stark design for people on 80th to look at from the street. The applicant agreed it was static, but noted that the building beyond that elevation provides a much better view.

Ms. Sirois:

- Was concerned about the scale initially, but says the applicant has struck a nice balance between breaking up the massing and keeping the design simple. She likes the clean, crisp look.
- Ms. Sirois says the materials palette will really last, which she likes.
- Ms. Sirois asked about the vinyl windows and if fiberglass might be considered. She noted that those vinyl windows can sag in a matter of five years, especially with the dark-colored windows on the south side, which will attract a lot of heat. She would like the applicant to consider another option.
- Ms. Sirois asked about the outrigger detail and how much could be seen from ground level. Overall, she says the applicant did a very nice job.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Likes the soldier course of brick above the windows and lintels, but would like to pop them out a little for a better look and perhaps better protection of the windows.
- Regarding the tower, Mr. Palmquist asked if the first and second floor windows, as well as the third and fourth floor windows, could be ganged together much like the brick. That could give some vertical feel to this very horizontal building.
- Mr. Palmquist suggested going away from the outrigger idea at the top of the tower. He suggested repeating the detail seen on the fourth and fifth floors at the top. The coping, about two feet wide, might need to be toned down and thinner around the tower area.
- Mr. Palmquist says the fifth floor could step out a little bit so it looks less like a wedding cake at the top. That way, it would feel like a top, but the applicant could get more usable space.
- The DRB agreed in general that the outrigger might be too fussy and perhaps not needed. Mr. Palmquist likes the outriggers elsewhere on the project, but not on the tower itself.
- Mr. Palmquist says the project has come a long way, and he likes it. Mr. DeIMoro says he is anxious to begin building in the current economic climate, and would like to start building in August. He is hopeful for an approval at the next meeting.
- Mr. Meade queried the Board and found the members were ready to approve it at the next meeting in two weeks. Mr. Meade said creating a solution for the prow corner is one issue the applicant should address. He noted, however, that the design has improved significantly since the DRB first saw it.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION MADE BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MS. SIRIOS TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:50 P.M. MOTION PASSES (7-0).

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY