

**CITY OF REDMOND**  
**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AND LANDMARK COMMISSION**  
April 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012

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:** Joe Palmquist (Vice Chairperson—DRB), Mike Nichols, Scott Waggoner, Craig Krueger, Lara Sirois, Tom Hitzroth (Chairperson—LHC), Miguel Llanos

**EXCUSED ABSENCE:** David Scott Meade (Chairperson—DRB), Jannine McDonald

**STAFF PRESENT:** Steve Fischer, Principal Planner; Kim Dietz, Senior Planner

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

The Landmarks 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 COMMISSION**

The meeting of the Landmark Commission was called to order by the Chairperson of the Commission, Thomas K. Hitzroth, at 7:00 p.m.

**HERITAGE RESTORATION AND PRESERVATION GRANT**

**Project:** Odd Fellows Hall - Restoration of Odd Fellows rings

**Description:** Grant Application

**Applicant:** Tim Short

**Staff Contact:** Kim Dietz, 425-556-2415, [kdietz@redmond.gov](mailto:kdietz@redmond.gov)

Ms. Dietz walked the Landmark Commission through the packet of information regarding the Odd Fellows project. There have not been substantive changes since the last time the Commission looked at this application. Ms. Dietz noted that there may have been some confusion among the Commission members regarding the paperwork surrounding this project, specifically the Certificate for Appropriateness, which has been added as Attachment E to the Commission's report. The application has been included in the report as well. She let the Commission members know that their decision about this project regarding this application would go on to the City Council. Ms. Dietz reviewed the applicant's request to restore the rings with the Commission, noting that the rings would be placed in an area that is different than from where they have been in the past. She pointed out the Certificate of Appropriateness paperwork as well.

Mr. Short clarified that the Commission had already granted him permission to relocate the rings at a previous meeting, and noted that this meeting was more about the restoration process. Mr. Hitzroth clarified that the topics under review included the grant application process and the approval of the staff report. Ms. Dietz confirmed that was true, and noted that the relocation of the rings had indeed already been approved by the Commission at a previous meeting.

Mr. Hitzroth asked about a paragraph in the funding restoration report. The language in question talks about restoration of the rings in years one and three, and possibly more restoration work in year seven. He asked who would manage that process for follow up. Ms. Dietz said that these recommendations were something that Mr. Short should keep an eye on. She said that the restoration techniques used for these rings would mean that any additional restoration would not have to occur for another seven years, if determined necessary by way of annual inspection. Another layer of paint or clear coating might need to

be added at some point, but another preservation process involving the Landmark Commission would not need to happen to occur. Mr. Short said he would be working to clean the roof of the building on a yearly basis, and could inspect the rings at that time. Mr. Hitzroth asked about the last paragraph of page three of the application, which notes that the rings would be repaired and preserved to the Secretary of the Interior's standards of repair. Mr. Hitzroth noted that there were only four categories in the Secretary of the Interior's standards. Ms. Dietz noted that the Secretary of the Interior's website has information that was included in the text of the application. Mr. Hitzroth asked if this were not a situation where a standard for *restoration* was being applied, with repair as a rule under that. Ms. Dietz agreed that there was not a specific standard for repair and referenced standard was within the category of restoration.

On page five, paragraph three, line two, Mr. Hitzroth noted some language that spoke to the history of the region he found confusing. Ms. Dietz noted that this language was taken from the record of the site and referred to the original homesteading of Redmond. Mr. Krueger asked where the money would come from for this grant. Ms. Dietz clarified that the funds were set aside in the City's general fund and set aside in the Community Treasures Fund for grants of this nature. This budget is determined on a biennial basis. Ms. Dietz said she believed the amount remaining in the Fund was approximately \$71,000.

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. LLANOS AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE THE HERITAGE AND RESTORATION GRANT APPLICATION FOR THE REDMOND'S BAR AND GRILL RESTORATION OF THE RINGS OF THE ODD FELLOWS RINGS. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0).**

The Landmark Commission report will be forwarded to the City Council. There were no objections from the Commission members on this point. Mr. Krueger noted that the report was well done. Mr. Hitzroth said it was comprehensive and detailed.

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. NICHOLS AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO APPROVE THE REDMOND LANDMARK COMMISSION REPORT FOR APRIL 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2012 REGARDING THE FUNDING FOR RESTORATION OF THE ODD FELLOWS RINGS. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0).**

Ms. Dietz noted that May is National Preservation Month, which she said is an opportunity to share, with staff and City officials, historic preservation and its different elements, especially in the Downtown area. On May 10<sup>th</sup>, from 5:15 to 6:30 p.m., Mr. Hitzroth will lead a tour along with Brian Rich of the Redmond Regional Landmarks Commission. The focus is on Downtown through a different lens, that of adaptive reuse, economic development, and sustainability in an urban center that is emerging and evolving quickly. On May 14<sup>th</sup>, from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. at City Hall, there will be a speaker session with Mr. Hitzroth, Mr. Rich, and the chair of the Design Review Board. The focus will be on the same topic of adaptive reuse as a way to pull together the City's economic development staff and City officials. The idea is show how places in Downtown today can help the businesses of tomorrow, possibly adapting old structures to newer needs.

Ms. Dietz noted that older buildings can be refined and made to work more efficiently for current needs. She asked if there were some incentives that property owners could look to, including grant programs and tax abatement, to re-use those old buildings. Mr. Hitzroth noted that Mr. Rich has written several papers on adaptive reuse and he is very highly qualified to speak on that topic. Mr. Llanos confirmed that members of the public would be able to ask questions about specific projects that involve landmarks. Mr. Krueger said the programs sounded great. Mr. Hitzroth said the programs exemplified how Redmond is leading the pack in terms of creating conversations about landmarks between property owners and staff. Ms. Dietz asked Commission members to contact her for more information about the topics that will be covered at these events.

#### **ADJOURNMENT OF LANDMARK COMMISSION MEETING**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO ADJOURN THE LANDMARK COMMISSION MEETING AT 7:24 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (7-0).**

## **DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Palmquist called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 7:25 p.m.

### **MINUTES**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MS. SIROIS AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE MARCH 15, 2012 MEETING. MOTION PASSES (4-0) WITH ONE ABSTENTION.**

### **PROJECT REVIEW**

#### **L120117, Bella Bottega – Building A**

**Description:** Master Plan approval for store front concepts

**Location:** 8900 – 161<sup>st</sup> Ave NE

**Applicant:** Rick Utt

**Staff Contact:** Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or [glee@redmond.gov](mailto:glee@redmond.gov)

Mr. Fischer noted that the Bella Bottega Shopping Center is looking at a facelift to a number of its facades. This portion of Bella Bottega is over by the movie theater, near the newly-renovated medical center building. The bakery in that area recently had a façade improvement. The owner of the shopping center would like to consider and approve a master plan so that each storefront would not have to come before the DRB for approval. This master plan is similar to what the DRB has done with Town Center in that a set of designs is approved, and then as tenants change out, staff can address new tenants administratively, which is an efficient way to do business. Staff has one concern in the master plan, which Mr. Fischer believes has been updated by the applicant. Mr. Krueger confirmed this is a new master plan for Bella Bottega, not a revision of an existing one. Mr. Fischer noted that was indeed the case, in that there has never been a master plan to update a strip of buildings in this center for new or existing tenants.

Rick Utt from Cornerstone Architectural Group in Kenmore presented to the DRB on behalf of the applicant. He is the regional architect for Bella Bottega, and says his work on this project has been a lifelong career. He reviewed the history of the Shopping Center, going back to 1993. At that time, it was a strip center with all the storefronts looking the same. There was glazing with anodized aluminum frames. The awnings were also all the same. The owner now wants to update this site, but does not want to make radical changes to the building structure, which is tilt-up concrete. The idea is to create individual street sidewalk storefronts to encourage more pedestrian activity. The bakery in this area has already been updated, as well as a yogurt shop nearby. The colors of the existing building would not be changed. Nothing radical would happen with the shops. The applicant has proposed several design schemes for various shops. The larger space in the application may involve some applied elements. The applicant does not want to alter the retail building, but does want to find opportunities to use taller elements that would project a strong presence. He is proposing taking some existing awnings off and using traditional fabric-awnings. However, the applicant does not want to invent anything new, in that the awnings would be the same colors and design as what is already on the Charles Schwab retail facility.

The upper perspectives show where the awnings are used and where the facades are changing. The owner sees the University Village shopping center as an inspiration. The idea is to create an architectural rhythm throughout the project, but also some diversity in the storefronts. Some food-oriented establishments have gone in many of the storefronts already. The storefronts have been pulled back into the space to create more diversity for the outside spaces. The applicant said the parking area could be diversified, as well, where more pedestrian walkways could fill in, and even some housing in the future. The applicant is hoping to create more openness and outdoor dining possibilities. He said this master plan concept is the first step toward implementing some architectural changes to Bella Bottega.

## COMMENTS OF THE BOARD MEMBERS:

### Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked Mr. Fischer if this project was up for approval. Mr. Fischer said Gary Lee's report indicated a desire to approve the master plan as proposed with two conditions, that the future storefront remodel would fit the character and style of the elevations presented, except for Suite 165, which Mr. Fischer alluded to earlier.
- Mr. Fischer continued that the storefronts would be reviewed and approved administratively by the staff through subsequent building permit reviews.
- He noted that future storefront remodels not adhering to the general style and character of the plans presented may be reviewed and approved by planning staff during subsequent building permit reviews. However, planning staff may defer the review and approval to the DRB.
- Mr. Fischer noted that a redesign of the Suite 165 space was submitted to staff after Mr. Lee's comments were written, and that the redesign submitted would work with staff. Staff is therefore recommending approval.
- The applicant said he has been working closely with Mr. Lee on this project to make the changes involved.

### Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the *existing exterior elevation* note seen on the Building A presentation. The applicant confirmed that the rendering was of the proposed changes, not the existing elevation. The existing elevation was included to show what has been changed. The applicant noted some of the changes in materials, including windows and exterior cladding.
- Mr. Krueger thanked the applicant for the clarification, and asked what would go into Suite 165. The applicant noted that this would be a pizza place.
- Mr. Krueger said he liked what the applicant was proposing, and said University Village was a good model to use. He liked the idea of what Bella Bottega could be in the future, particularly making some changes to the hard surfaces to add pedestrian improvements.
- He suggested bringing in some landscaping to the parking lot such that it would reflect University Village even more. The applicant said he hoped that would be part of the future of this project as well. He noted that the owner liked to keep his properties and build for the long term.

### Ms. Sirois:

- Appreciates the intent of breaking up the façade, which she says is a good idea. She is concerned that there might be too much breakup. She recommended having a unifying element perhaps like a coping all the same color.
- She said she would prefer a metal suspended canopy consistently used from space to space, as well. The applicant said he was trying to keep uniformity with some touches of individuality.
- Ms. Sirois said the cloth canopy on the Suite 165 space was a concern. She asked why cloth was added, instead of remaining consistent with the rest of the awnings. The applicant said the idea was to create a visual break, but not create a radical change.
- Ms. Sirois said the heavy black cloth canopy appeared jarring to her. She recommended using the same canopy as seen elsewhere on the project, but perhaps lifted to another location. The applicant said he had some schemes like that.
- Beyond that, Ms. Sirois said this project was an improvement and she was glad to see the applicant looking at the site holistically and consistently.

### Mr. Nichols:

- Agreed with Ms. Sirois that the canopy presented seemed rather heavy. He said it would look fine with the existing canopy seen across the façade currently to create a continuous length. He said he did not care for the current presentation.
- Mr. Nichols asked if the materials for the new storefronts would include wood or other products. The applicant said the materials would be predominantly wood, but there would be some with steel elements added.

- The applicant was hoping to use some wood materials wherever possible, barring concerns over using combustible material. Mr. Nichols supported that idea as a way to create a richer look for the project.
- The applicant said he was trying to find a balance between the existing uniformity and creating some individual facades. Mr. Nichols said he was supportive of the project with the same condition that Mr. Lee noted about being thoughtful about the Suite 165 storefront.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Said he had a positive reaction to the project, and liked the variety of the storefront elements and door types and window breakups to individualize the stores.
- Mr. Waggoner said a uniform cornice or cap across all the storefronts might create a good profile. With the metal awnings on 80-90% of the remaining storefronts, he said one or two stores could have a break in that monotony and could pull in some elements from adjacent buildings in the same center. That could tie the whole complex together.
- Mr. Waggoner said the project would be successful in the long run. He said the current colors are palatable and have a nice, current feel that are neutral enough to be attractive to most visitors.
- He said there was an opportunity in the scheme for different signage types to match the materials that would be in the individual storefronts. Mr. Waggoner wanted to make sure the individual storefronts should have a wider range of variety and flexibility. The fixed elements, like the cornice and the majority of the canopies, provide the continuity that holds the place together.
- Mr. Waggoner reiterated that he was supportive of the project. The applicant noted that the light fixtures on the facades that would go over the signs on the storefronts could provide better lighting for the site overall.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Disagreed over the canopy idea brought up by Ms. Sirois. He liked to see the different canopies. He said he is asking why there has to be one big canopy. With that design, it appears something is lacking.
- Mr. Palmquist said that as other tenants come in, there may be spots for other canopy options. The applicant said the little canopy presented might turn into a bigger awning, but he wanted to provide some diversity and flexibility.
- Mr. Palmquist encouraged the applicant to not feel tied to leaving the canopies. He said it might help to emulate University Village more closely, where all the stores get to add some flavor to their canopy.
- He added that, to make the project look more like individual parts, the storefront could come up in some places. He said the front could go up as little as two feet, with a metal panel matching the storefront, to create varying storefront heights without cutting into the building.
- The applicant said he is considering adding more elements to the façade as well, including designs like Irish knots around a pub on the site.
- Mr. Palmquist said ideas like that would help. As tenants come in, each could work to create their own flavor. He would encourage not just looking at signage to provide that flavor, but allowing the tenants to use different canopies and the look of different storefront heights, for example.
- The applicant said he was confident that the owners of this project would be responsive to the comments of the DRB.
- Mr. Palmquist said the project was ready for approval with the two conditions noted.
- Mr. Krueger confirmed that what the DRB was approving was how the buildings may look.
- Mr. Fischer said that the renderings presented were not intended to be exact, but in keeping with a general master plan. If a façade improvement was requested by a tenant, the elevations would have to adhere to that master plan in order to earn approval.
- If the elevations presented did not match the master plan, the staff could reject it or refer it to the DRB for review.
- Mr. Krueger likes the idea of the awning and the canopy, as Mr. Palmquist suggested. He would like to see the awning expanded on the second floor to match the lower floor.
- Mr. Krueger asked if the applicant had considered another color for the new awning other than black.

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WAGGONER AND SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS TO APPROVE THE MASTER PLAN APPLICATION FOR L120117, BELLA BOTTEGA BUILDING A, WITH CONDITIONS AS NOTED BY STAFF. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).**

Mr. Fischer asked for more clarity, in that the staff recommendations included concerns over Suite 165. The applicant believed that the approval was for awnings as he presented at this meeting, subsequent to Mr. Lee's comments. Mr. Waggoner said the supplemental presentation was definitely an improvement over the original materials, and it was his intention to include Suite 165 in the approval, but with staff working out details on what Suite 165 should look like.

**MR. WAGGONER AMENDED HIS MOTION SO AS TO INCLUDE SUITE 165 AS APPROVED AT TONIGHT'S MEETING FOR THE MASTER PLAN APPLICATION FOR L120117, BELLA BOTTEGA BUILDING A. MR. NICHOLS SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).**

The applicant said he would send the rendering he presented at tonight's meeting to Mr. Lee so as to include it in the record and make note that it was approved.

#### **DESIGN AWARDS UPDATE**

Mr. Fischer said that the Redmond Design Awards would happen at 7 p.m. on Tuesday, June 12<sup>th</sup>, at a City Council study session. There will be a reception in the lobby at 7 p.m., with the awards ceremony at 7:30 in Council chambers. He asked the Board to consider the transit center that is next to the skate park, which is basically a way station for buses. Staff is recommending that the center should be removed from the list of award considerations, as there is not much of a structure to it. DRB Chair Mr. Meade had expressed his agreement with this sentiment, Mr. Fischer noted. Mr. Palmquist said he was ambivalent about that structure, so he was okay with it being dropped. Ms. Sirois said her only caveat would be that projects that are not just structures should be included in design award considerations. Landscape improvements and outdoor spaces should be eligible for awards. She was fine with pulling this project out, but does not want to pull out projects like this as a rule. Mr. Fischer agreed. There were no Board members who spoke in support of keeping that project on the awards list, and thus it was removed.

#### **ADJOURNMENT OF DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MS. SIROIS AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:02 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**RECORDING SECRETARY**