

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
August 4th, 2011**

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, Scott Waggoner, Lara Sirois, Mike Nichols, Jannine McDonald (arrived at 7:03 P.M.)

EXCUSED ABSENCE: David Scott Meade

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Fischer, Principal 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 7:02 P.M.

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 Benoiel *with* Spencer & Malone, LLC

Prior Review Date: May 5, 2011

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

Mr. Fischer noted that this project was before the DRB back in May. The applicant is exploring a change in exterior paint color. This building went through an addition and remodel in 1999, which involved breaking the massing up into three different volumes. Each volume had its own distinct paint color, which was the style at the time. The applicant would like to upgrade the facility, make some minor window repairs to prevent water leakage by removing some tiles, and repaint the building. The color scheme presented back in May involved a blue color for all three volumes of the project. Mr. Fischer showed the DRB several different views of the building to indicate the changes proposed. Mr. Krueger noted that on a recent trip by the site, there are some large cedars in front of the building that block much of it from view. Mr. Fischer pointed out that three colors are presented in the new proposal at this evening's meeting. Two original colors have been retained and a red color has been added, a color which had been discussed by the DRB. Mr. Fischer says the idea with the new color was to add more life back to the building, which he believes has been achieved. The metal on the building will not be touched. The applicant attended the meeting to answer questions.

COMMENTS FROM DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the west elevation. Mr. Krueger said he understood why tiles would be removed for leakage problems on the front of the building. But he noted that the back of the building has some stucco material changed out for hardy panel between the windows.
- Mr. Bob Christiansen, the applicant, said that change was in line with the DRB's suggestion to make the design of the building more edgy. By doing that, the applicant says he is able to tie the three masses of the building together with a similar horizontal design motif.

- The applicant added that the original color scheme was his preferred alternative, as well as the owner's. Mr. Krueger thanked the applicant for the color samples provided. The applicant says other architects he has consulted with like the original color scheme of blue and gray.

Ms. McDonald:

- Noted that when the DRB was originally looking at this color scheme with just two colors, there was a desire to add more dynamics. She said that the three colors give a more complete tonal range.
- Ms. McDonald said that the original scheme of blue and gray would look good if it had some lighter colors or darker colors. She recalled that the DRB had even suggested black as a possible color at its last meeting, as opposed to red, which is a more medium color.

Ms. Sirois:

- Agreed with Ms. McDonald that the colors presented appear to be too close in value. Ms. Sirois is concerned about the coolness of the palette. She said a lot of gray would be used, and she suggested warming the palette up somehow.
- She recommended a darker color of blue to make it a punchier color scheme.
- Ms. Sirois asked about some portions of the project, on the mid-level, that do not follow the motif the applicant is trying to establish throughout the design. In some cases, there is a gray paint between the windows, rather than the blue color.
- The applicant responded that where the hardy panel is proposed, on the elevation Ms. Sirois was seeing, is where tile is currently located. The idea was to simply remove the tile and replace it with hardy panel. Ms. Sirois asked if the panel could be painted blue to tie the design together.
- The applicant responded that the hardy panel could be painted, but it would look different due to its open joints and other features. Ms. Sirois acknowledged that, but said that painting that panel blue would help match it up with the project.
- She noted that she wanted the same rule applied to the entire mass. The applicant understood this, but then said that such a plan would involve too much red coloration, in his current proposal. Ms. Sirois said the color did not need to be red, nor did it have to be the shade of red presented.
- The applicant said he has gone through 40 different paint combinations, and he felt what he was proposing met the owner's approval and the DRB's requests from the last meeting.
- Mr. Fischer asked the DRB for better guidance regarding colors at this point to help speed the painting process.

Mr. Nichols:

- Said the colors do not bother him. Mr. Nichols is concerned, however, that there are design ideas that are not followed through over the entire building.
- On the south elevation, he noted that some of the panels would need to match the wall colors to provide continuity, echoing Ms. Sirois' concerns. The applicant noted, again, that the idea was merely to replace the tile in those areas with hardy panel.
- Mr. Nichols reiterated the idea about color that Ms. Sirois had raised earlier, pointing out the same design issue on the east elevation. The applicant noted that he was following the DRB's wishes to add some accent colors to recessed areas.
- Mr. Nichols confirmed the applicant was not happy with the red color, and suggested a different tone of the blue that would bring more punch to the elevations and break up the gray.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked if hardy panel would truly add the edginess that the DRB was hoping to add to this project. Mr. Krueger asked if different colors could accomplish the same goal. Ms. McDonald noted that she brought up a similar suggestion at the last meeting.
- The applicant noted that the shape of the building was set by the previous architect; he is merely painting what is there. He noted that the back of the building, in particular, has a lot of horizontal elements and not much verticality.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Admitted this building was a challenge, in that it has been developed over several decades. Trying to tie several design ideas together with paint is difficult, he noted. Mr. Waggoner added that he can understand the applicant's frustration.

- Mr. Waggoner said that this building is not in such a key location of the City, but he also understands the comments from the DRB about trying to rectify design issues on the site.
- Mr. Waggoner recommended a less busy color scheme from the original proposal, in that it draws less attention to the disjointed design of the building.
- Mr. Krueger asked Mr. Waggoner if a medium blue color could be added to the palette to lighten it up and add the variety the DRB is looking for. Mr. Waggoner said that could be a subtle blend between the colors proposed, and he liked that train of thought.
- Ms. McDonald said the blue could be richer and deeper to add a fuller range of color tones.
- Ms. Sirois noted that the gray would have to be warmed up in that scenario to provide a better complement to that deeper blue.
- Mr. Fischer summarized the DRB's points as follows:
 1. Keep the current color scheme.
 2. Keep the slate blue color for the center portion.
 3. Eliminate the red and replace it with a richer, deeper blue color.
 4. Warm up the gray color.
- Mr. Fischer noted that the suggestions are more in line with the original proposal, with an eye toward warming up the overall color palette.

Mr. Krueger:

- Agreed with Mr. Fischer's summary, as did other DRB members. Mr. Krueger suggested taking a look at changing the pattern on the back of the building, such that darker colors might be used above and below the window areas.
- The applicant said that he has experimented with other colors, but did not bring those renderings to tonight's meeting.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Did not like Mr. Krueger's idea, in that the horizontal language of the building on the back side would be disrupted.
- Mr. Palmquist said there is so much formal design to this building that he would suggest one solid gray color on the back of the building that might be a few shades different than the gray that is proposed.
- On the front of the building, there is some verticality that would support the two-color scheme. He suggested making the back wall color a beige or other third color to complete palette. He added that this back wall is mostly hidden from public view.
- Mr. Palmquist suggested that staff could work with the applicant to find that third color. Mr. Krueger said he would like that suggestion. Mr. Fischer was fine with that suggestion too, but asked for more direction on color from the DRB.
- The applicant summarized that the DRB might want the back of the building to be all one color, perhaps a warmer gray. The center building would be something different, perhaps a darker blue. The front of the building would have the gray color, but would include a third color between the windows.
- That would be the same scheme as what is on the site now, but with different colors. The DRB agreed to that assessment. However, Ms. Sirois noted that on the south and east elevations, that pattern of painting should continue between the windows. The recesses would stay the same color.
- Mr. Krueger agreed with that idea, in that it accented the massing rather than the detailing of the building.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. SIROIS, AND SECONDED BY MS. MCDONALD, TO APPROVE PRE110010, CASCADE VIEW EAST OFFICE BUILDING, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE STANDARD INCONSISTENCIES CONDITIONS SHALL APPLY.**
- 2. THE COLOR SCHEME WILL BE ALTERED TO INCLUDE A DARKER BLUE AND WARMER GRAY, TO BE WORKED OUT WITH STAFF.**
- 3. THE TWO-STORY PORTION WILL BE PAINTED ONE SOLID COLOR, A LIGHTER AND WARMER VERSION OF THE PROPOSED GRAY BODY COLOR, TO BE WORKED OUT WITH STAFF.**

4. **THE PATTERN ESTABLISHED ON THE THREE-STORY PORTION OF THE BUILDING WILL BE CONTINUED AROUND THAT ENTIRE ELEMENT. A THIRD COLOR WILL BE ADDED IN THIS ELEMENT, AS WELL, VIA A LIGHTER BLUE SHADE RATHER THAN THE RED COLOR PROPOSED TO BE WORKED OUT WITH STAFF.**

MOTION APPROVED (6-0).

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION MADE BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:42 P.M. MOTION PASSES (6-0).

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY

DISCUSSION

Joint City Council & DRB Meeting

Staff Contacts: Steve Fischer and Gary Lee

Discussion not recorded by request of staff.