

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
September 1st, 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: David Scott Meade, Craig Krueger, Scott Waggoner, Jannine McDonald

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Mike Nichols, Lara Sirois, Joe Palmquist

STAFF PRESENT: Dennis Lisk, Associate Planner; Steve Fischer, Principle Planner

RECORDING SECRETARY: Susan Trapp, 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 Chair David Scott Meade at 7:00 p.m.

MINUTES

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE JULY 7TH, 2011 MEETING. MOTION PASSES (4-0).

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. MCDONALD AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE JULY 21ST, 2011 MEETING. MOTION PASSES (4-0).

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WAGGONER AND SECONDED BY MS. MCDONALD TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 4TH, 2011 MEETING. MOTION PASSES (4-0).

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

Prior Review Date: 06/05/11 and 08/04/11

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

Mr. Fischer noted that this project was last before the Board on August 4th. Colored renderings have been prepared for the DRB, but the building owner is not happy with the way those renderings turned out. Therefore, an alternate rendering has been provided as well. In the staff recommendation, Mr. Fischer pointed out an error, on page two there is a discussion about the body, the center tower element, and the window accents. The color *terra cotta rose* is not part of the staff recommendation. Mr. Fischer showed the DRB some elevations with gray and blue colors under the windows, with hardy panel. The center portion uses a black color, and the back portion was to be left in a gray color without any accent colors added to it.

The applicant and building owner would like to keep the blue in front with the hardy panel, and the black in the center portion. The applicant has suggested some blue on the east side, as well, similar to the hardy panel in the front of the building. Staff is concerned that cutting this type of hardy material can lead to further water penetration, and could add further expense. Staff could accept that direction, but would also accept painting that east side and using an accent color on the reveals. Mr. Fischer noted that much of this building is obscured from view by a lot of vegetation, similar to another project the DRB has reviewed

recently. Staff is recommending looking at this building in a similar light, and accepting the applicant's proposal.

John Phillips spoke to the Board representing the applicant. He asked the DRB to consider the design as shown, but with the addition of the blue color on the center tower of the project and some black as well. Staff has concerns about that black color, specifically with regard to fading. Mr. Krueger reminded the applicant that the DRB had asked for a dark blue during the last pre-application meeting on this project. Ms. McDonald had suggested before that the applicant should warm up the gray color and possibly add a third color for variation.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Does not have a problem with the blue color on the center tower. He asked about the west and east elevations, and the applicant showed them, with the addition of colors and the panel detail that the DRB had expressed interest in during the last meeting.
- Mr. Krueger likes this new design better, specifically with the darker accent color under the windows. He noted that the larger, solid blue areas will be broken up by the grays.
- He suggested the ephus material on the backside of the building should remain, despite the staff's concerns over water leakage, but should be colored blue.
- The applicant noted that there are new windows around the project, and a lot of EIFS will be cut out to facilitate that. He noted that, regarding cost issues, the purchase of new hardy panel vs. replacing the EIFS is not that different in price.
- From a water protection perspective, the applicant is considering a rain screen system with reveals on top and flashing at the bottom.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Noted that Mr. Krueger had just summarized what the DRB discussed at the last meeting on this project. Mr. Waggoner says the two-color scheme, with blue and gray, settles the design issues well.
- He says everything the DRB discussed the last time has been addressed and is ready to go.

Ms. McDonald:

- Likes the rendering with the blue under the windows, in that the color helps the balance of the building, and follows the recommendations of the DRB.
- She says the black color, while it was not recommended earlier, might help with the balance of the building as well. If that color is not preferred, she would like to have a darker blue in the center.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked for a motion on the proposal.
- Mr. Meade noted that after several trips, the applicant needed some leeway to continue, and did not want to make the third color option a condition of approval.
- He says the applicant has done well with a two-color scheme, but a third color can be explored with staff.

MOTION BY MR. KRUEGER, AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER, TO APPROVE PRE110010, CASCADE VIEW EAST OFFICE BUILDING, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING CHANGES IN COLOR SHALL BE FOLLOWED.
2. STANDARD INCONSISTENCIES CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF SHALL BE FOLLOWED.
3. ON THE CENTER PORTION OF THE PROJECT AND THE EAST SIDE OF THE PROJECT, THE APPLICANT SHOULD CONSIDER A THIRD, DARKER BLUE COLOR TO ACCENT THOSE AREAS AS AN OPTION. IF THE APPLICANT DECIDES TO ADD THAT COLOR, THE ACTUAL SHADE WILL BE DETERMINED WITH STAFF.

MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

PROJECT REVIEW

Sherwin Williams Remodel

Description: Remodel of existing retail building

Location: 18014 Redmond Way

Contact: Bryan Sanders *with* Woodman Construction

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

Mr. Fischer said the project is an existing building in SE Redmond built in 1979. It has been the Agra Shop for many years. The building is getting an update to become a retail space. The applicant is proposing to remove the front awning. It is large and bulky, and supported by two metal poles. There are two small windows, a roll-up door, and man door on the side of the building that would be removed as well. The showroom windows will continue to be used in the same way. New awning and flashing will be added to the top of the building. The applicant is proposing to use a gray color for the main part of the building with a blue trim. Staff has discussed the blank wall issue with the applicant. Corporate colors have been used. Regarding the blank wall, the applicant has shown some areas where landscaping would be installed. Some scoring would be added on the surface of the wall to break up the massing. The Code regarding blank walls changed in April, which could impact the DRB's decision. Mr. Sanders spoke on behalf of the applicant, and noted this was simply a remodel of an old John Deere retail facility in an industrial park.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Waggoner:

- Asked about the material being used on the doors and windows for covering. The applicant said it was hardy board with some reveals between the panels.
- Mr. Krueger asked how big those reveals would be. The applicant noted that the protrusions in question would not even be considered modulation, but were added as a way to make the project less expensive.
- Joe McLaughlin, representing the owner, says the idea was to provide some different panels to show customers how the paints apply to different surfaces.

Ms. McDonald:

- Likes the proportions of the project. She says the canopy and panel joints look good and are well-sized for the scale of the building.
- Overall, Ms. McDonald is fine with the project.

Mr. Krueger:

- Is concerned over the look of the panels. The applicant reiterated that they would be cement fiber boards of a commercial grade.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the glass in the storefront coming down to the ground, but asked about the panel closest to the ground. The applicant explained that the panel in question was a modesty panel within the storefront itself.
- Mr. Krueger confirmed the masonry and walls would be a gray color, and asked if the color would look different on the different materials. He asked if another color could be considered for the panels.
- The applicant noted that these two colors were the corporate colors for Sherwin-Williams, but added that sun location would change the shade of the colors on surfaces with different textures.
- Mr. Krueger says the canopy is an improvement.

Mr. Meade:

- Says the project looks great, and is glad a new tenant like Sherwin-Williams is moving in. Mr. Meade asked for a motion.

MOTION BY MS. MCDONALD, AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER, TO APPROVE THE SHERWIN-WILLIAMS REMODEL LOCATED AT 18014 REDMOND WAY WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS 1, 3 AND 4, IN THAT THE SOUTH, BLANK WALL ISSUE HAS BEEN PROPERLY ADDRESSED THROUGH

LANDSCAPING, AND THAT THE EXISTING EXTERIOR BUILDING COLORS, AS PRESENTED, ARE ACCEPTABLE. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

PROJECT REVIEW

L110350, Microsoft Arcade

Description: Add 19,000 gfa of mezzanine to an existing building

Location: 17760 NE 67th Ct.

Applicant: Mark Peterson *with* JPC Architects

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

Mr. Lisk noted that the applicant is looking for approval of the site plan, building elevations, materials, colors, and landscape plan. This project is in SE Redmond, an existing 66,000 SF building that has been used as a warehouse. The building is about twenty-five years old. The applicant is proposing a complete interior renovation of the building, to include the replacement of the room and the addition of 19,000 SF of new mezzanine space. There will be very slight modifications to the exterior of the building, including filling in spaces where there were loading doors beforehand. New and upgraded landscaping is proposed around the site to comply with the Zoning Code 20% minimum requirement for this site. New parking stalls would be added in the paved areas of the site, with a basic re-stripping of the existing concrete.

The applicant last met with the DRB on July 21st, 2011. The Board asked for better landscaping at the last meeting, and asked if a landscape bed could be added in the front (west) elevation of the building to break up some massing of the structure there. The building owner indicated to staff that such a suggestion would not be acceptable. With that, staff discussed with the applicant whether something similar could be achieved with adding some planter pots in that front area. The building owner is not interested in that option, either. The other item that the Board discussed was the paint color scheme on the building. Mr. Lisk says the colors are understated, but an improvement to the look of the building. Combined with the additional landscaping, the building would look better overall. Staff is recommending approval, but would like to get the Board's thoughts on the landscape issues discussed.

The applicant noted that the color scheme has been updated to provide more variety than before, and also matches better with neighboring buildings. The new address signage for the fire department is above the main entry. The applicant says this building's horizontal and vertical elements tend to conflict, which can be a challenge. The awning over the west elevation is a design motif the applicant has tried to bring through the entire building.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Waggoner:

- Says that, compared to the original all-beige scheme, this is a much better color scheme. The horizontal banding was the right way to go, in his opinion.
- Mr. Waggoner asked about the dark mechanical screening at the top. The applicant confirmed that the screening is the same color as the base color.
- Mr. Waggoner said the landscaping plan indicates that the sides of the project have been treated heavily. He did not know how planters could truly screen the large walls of the building.
- Mark Brumbaugh, a landscape architect speaking on behalf of the applicant, agreed. He noted that a large building like this in an industrial zone would look out of scale with pots in front of them. He added that this will be a relatively short-term use for this building.
- Mr. Brumbaugh noted that the applicant is spending a significant amount of money to update the landscaping throughout the site. The back side of the building has had no landscaping in the past, and the applicant is spending a good amount of money to add landscaping there.
- The applicant noted that King County has upgraded the Burlington-Northern rail line in the back of the building. Therefore, extra attention has been paid to that area, which would be the most visible and the most appreciated by the public.
- Mr. Waggoner likes the scheme as proposed, and noted that this is a big improvement. He gives the project a thumbs-up.

Ms. McDonald:

- Likes the design of the building overall with the paint scheme. She noted that where the Board was asking for some zip at the last meeting, that has now been provided.
- Ms. McDonald likes the project's understated tone and its fresh look. She likes the direction this project has gone, and likes the way the building looks right now.
- She is glad to see some improvement in the landscaping in the back of the building, which is where it will be most visible.
- Ms. McDonald is concerned about the City of Redmond's design standard criteria, one of which deals with outdoor areas. She pointed out that a lot of attention has been paid to the back of the building, but the landscaping stops just shy of the employee lunch area.
- She says it appears the employees are sitting in a cage, according to the plans she is looking at. She asked if some existing landscape could help connect those employees to the outdoors.
- The applicant noted that there is some hardscape in the landscape area in the southeastern corner for a reason. The applicant does not know how King County will handle some of this landscaping with regard to the adjoining Burlington Northern project.
- The County has stopped in this area in terms of planting, so there are ten foot-high blackberry vines just on the other side of the property. The concern is that the applicant would put a lot of money into an area that would turn into a battle against intruding vegetation in the future.
- The applicant is hoping that maintaining lower vegetation would still provide a visual connection to the trail and a visual connection to the walkway and bike locker areas in that spot. That area is a node for bike commuters, but also a big concern in terms of the blackberry bushes.
- Ms. McDonald asked if there would be a fence around the seating area. The applicant said it would just be a pad with picnic tables.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked why one warehouse doors was not filled on the western side. The applicant pointed out that one of those doors would be functional. Shipping and receiving loads would be much less substantial with the new tenant, but there will be a time when this building is returned to the owner, and that area needs to be preserved. The applicant says this is a five-year lease term.
- Mr. Krueger likes the landscaping by the bike trail.
- Mr. Lisk pointed out that the applicant has received a permit to replace the roof, which is why the building appears to be under construction right now with plenty of fencing.
- Mr. Krueger noted that there is a public street coming in from the west, and asked if the idea of putting in some type of planters or tables would be possible.
- He likes the new color scheme with the dark shade at the base and roof. His main concern is the landscaping on the west side.

Mr. Meade:

- Says the project is looking great, in that it is both noticed and unnoticed. He likes the color scheme concept, which is much improved. The landscaping on the back of the building is a big improvement.
- Mr. Meade understands the flexibility for the function of this building for the short and long-term, so he is amiable to exactly what has been proposed. Most of the time, the people will be inside this building, not outside. He would like to see an approval for this project.

MOTION BY MR. WAGGONER, AND SECONDED BY MS. MCDONALD, TO APPROVE L110350, THE MICROSOFT ARCADE PROJECT, WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS AS NOTED, AND WITH THE COLOR SCHEME AND LANDSCAPING PLAN AS PRESENTED. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

APPROVAL OF CHANGE OF EXTERIOR COLORS:

Doctor's Plaza

Description: Exterior color change

Location: 8299 161st Avenue NE

Applicant: Michelle Mickle *with* 4-N Associates

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

Mr. Fischer noted this project is downtown, kitty-corner to the skate park. This building is currently a stucco material with a brick accent. It is painted creamy beige, other than the brick. The applicant wants to put some more life into the building. Some of the beige color would be maintained, but the arch element would have a darker color. Staff is recommended approval of colors presented by the applicant which include a base Biscotti color, a trim with an Angle color, and the top in a color of Topsoil. Typically, Mr. Fischer would hold this for another few months, but he was interested to get this approved so the applicant could get started painting in the summer.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the other elevations. Mr. Fischer said the color scheme is reflective of what would happen on the other sides of the building.

Ms. McDonald:

- Asked if there would be any work done to the green awning of the project.
- The applicant has not determined that color, but said it would most likely be black, like the arch, so it would not stick out.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked about painting the entire arch black, down to the ground. The applicant noted that if the outside of that corner were painted, a lot of chipping was possible.
- The applicant said her designer considered the building as a group of boxes, almost like Legos. Mr. Meade would like to make the entry look more like an entry. The applicant noted that the area he was seeing was a side entry.
- Mr. Meade pointed out that the idea was to point out the arch elements as entry pieces, but the geometry collides. Two colors would fight with each other and create a half-entry statement. He recommended removing a color to make the archways and the base the same.
- The applicant considered two tones, but says that look is terrible. Mr. Meade agreed that some of the renderings with two tones looked too muddy.
- Mr. Meade asked if the light and dark pieces could be reversed, possibly, to improve the look and make the arch light and base dark. He said the current proposal is too dark.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Suggested that even if just the arch was a light color, that would be an improvement.
- He said that would accent the arch properly. He said that breaking up the geometry of this project would be difficult just through the use of paint.
- Mr. Waggoner recommended giving the arch a light color to tie the project together, but not make it too busy.
- Mr. Meade suggested bringing the body colors closer together, tonally.
- Ms. McDonald suggested a reveal going all the way across around the "lid" of the building. A light, medium, and dark color could be introduced in a more horizontal way. That would create a break line to stop the colors in those areas.
- The applicant said her designer did have a rendering like that, which is what she had envisioned. She did not like the look of it, however, when she saw it.

Mr. Meade:

- Likes the goal of changing the color, but wants to make sure the entry of the project is well-defined. The applicant is hoping to add some planters to the entry to define it more.
- Mr. Meade suggested making the archways two different colors on opposite sides of the building.
- Ms. McDonald suggested using only two colors to avoid confusion.
- The applicant said that there are a lot of trees in front of the building, and there is a lot of trouble finding it. Mr. Meade pointed out that a large black element probably would not be a good idea during winter months.
- The applicant added that there was a brick wall on the project that needs something else, perhaps a trellis or attachment of some sort. Mr. Meade said that would be a separate decision for the DRB.

- Mr. Meade wanted to give the applicant some leeway to continue crafting the color scheme for the project. He did not recommend adding more landscaping, which might hide the building even more.
- He recommended the applicant look at the grids of ivy at Seattle's University Village as a possible outdoor design element.
- One of Ms. Mickle's associates asked the DRB if three colors would still be acceptable. The DRB agreed. Mr. Meade recommended getting rid of the black and going with a more subtle color.
- Mr. Krueger asked if the motion was to approve the colors, and if Mr. Fischer would then help the applicant with that decision. Mr. Fischer noted that it is not uncommon for the DRB to approve a motion with a good amount of latitude; at that point, staff steps in to help an applicant.
- Mr. Meade and Mr. Waggoner suggested that the applicant consider a different paint manufacturer to get a better spectrum of colors to choose from.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. MCDONALD, AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER, TO APPROVE THE DOCTOR'S PLAZA CHANGE OF EXTERIOR COLORS AT 8299 161ST AVE. NE. WITH TWO COLORS ACCEPTED: BISCOTTI AND ANGLE, AS NOTED IN STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS. THERE WILL BE AN OPTION FOR THE APPLICANT TO SELECT A THIRD COLOR THAT IS A TONE IN BETWEEN THE LIGHT AND DARK COLORS APPROVED, NOT BLACK. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION MADE BY MS. MCDONALD AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:27 P.M. MOTION PASSES (4-0).

November 17, 2011
MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY