

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

May 9, 2012

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, Joe Palmquist, Craig Krueger, Scott Waggoner, Mike Nichols

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Jannine McDonald, Lara Sirois

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Fischer, Principle Planner; Thara Johnson, Associate Planner; Judd Black, Manager; Dennis Lisk, Associate 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 David Scott Meade at 7:00 p.m.

PROJECT REVIEW

L120106, Emerald Heights Multi-Purpose Building

Description: Construct a new 10,772 square foot building

Location: 10901 – 176th Circle NE

Applicant: Julie Lawton

Staff Contact: Thara Johnson, 425-556-2407 or tmjohnson@redmond.gov

Ms. Johnson noted that this proposal came before the DRB as a pre-application request at two prior meetings, on February 16th, 2012, and April 5th, 2012. At the April meeting, the Board requested some additional details. The applicant has submitted a revised package that addresses these comments. The changes to the elevations include addressing screening and noise attenuation requirements surrounding the proposed generator, providing additional detail about the siding on the building, and including a horizontal element to tie together the masses. Staff is recommending approval of the building elevations, colors, materials, and landscape plan for the Emerald Heights multi-purpose building with the standard conditions of approval. Staff has included an additional condition which addresses landscaping around the generator, which should comprise of evergreen and not deciduous material.

Mr. Meade asked the Board members if the applicant had properly responded to their concerns regarding this project. The Board members agreed. Mr. Meade asked for a motion to approve the project.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WAGGONER AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE L120106, THE EMERALD HEIGHTS MULTI-PURPOSE BUILDING, WITH COMMENTS AS SUBMITTED BY THE PLANNER. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).

The applicant thanked the Board for their comments over the last two meetings, which have been very greatly appreciated by the designers and the owner. The DRB thanked the applicant team for their time.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE120012, The Retreat

Description: Construction of 14 new townhomes on 21,450 square foot lot

Location: 8384 & 8400 167th Ave NE

Applicant: Natural and Built Environment, LLC

Prior Review Date: 04/05/12

Contact: Robin Murphy

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

Mr. Lisk said that this was the second pre-application meeting for this project. At the last meeting, there were a number of issues the Board discussed with the applicant. The project is a townhome development of fourteen units within four buildings situated around a central courtyard alleyway. The site is off 167th Avenue NE just south of 85th Street. At the last Board meeting, it was undetermined where the northeast building would be located, as it was unclear if the slopes on the site were man-made or not. Mr. Lisk said those slopes are indeed man-made. Therefore, the applicant is able to tuck the northeast building into the corner of the site, which is what the DRB was hoping for. In doing that, there is a five-foot setback involved.

The site plan shows a stairwell feature on the north side of the building in question. Staff, initially, incorrectly assumed this would be a structured stairwell, which would normally not be allowed in a setback area. However, the design indicates that the stairs would be tucked up against the slope, like the building. The slope is running uphill on the north side of the stair. So, the stair and the grade next to it are basically the same as one would step up the hill. In that way, staff would consider the stairs more of a walkway, which would be allowed in the side setback. The board had some other comments on building details, colors, materials, and ways to individualize the different buildings as a way to give more of a row house feel to the project. Mr. Lisk said the applicant has responded to those concerns.

Architect Robin Murphy spoke on behalf of the applicant. He noted that the design team has made several minor adjustments to the project that he believed will make a big difference. The applicant reviewed the comments of the Board from the last meeting. Ms. McDonald had noted that the roof form should respond to the neighborhood, and that different roofs and windows should be considered. Mr. Meade had said he preferred the brighter color scheme provided. Mr. Waggoner had pointed out that the individual identity of the buildings was important, and had liked the bolder colors as well. Mr. Meade had asked for something other than white trim, darker tone windows, and the idea that not every trim board would need to be painted. Colored garage doors were requested at the last meeting, with glass incorporated in them, which the applicant has responded to. Mr. Meade had also mentioned that the front deck covers should be more substantial, so those covers have been wrapped around slightly.

A person enters the project off the sidewalk, goes under a trellis that forms a semi-public barrier, and then goes into the private areas of the individual patios that overlook the street. The applicant believes the patios are elevated enough that a resident would feel ownership of them, even though they are open to the street. The central unit on the site now has a trellis that breaks up some of the massing of the porch. Cedar siding has been placed at the low entry areas, which is a quality, stained material. Wood lap siding would go above that. Each unit would read color by color, according to the applicant. The windows would now have a bronze tint to them. The interior of the window would be white, but the exterior would be bronze. The window trim and fascias would be dark. A black wrought-iron railing has been added, with vertical columns of wood to provide individuality to the units as well. Wood trellises are in the alleys as well, which helps unify the units.

There would be two unit types and the cedar unit would have more width to it. There would be a narrower unit with entries at front and back. The cedar unit has stairs going up to its side with a formal entry off the alley. The front units on the street would have two entries, one off the street and one off the alley. The alley units would have one entry, preferably a side entry off the alley and possibly with a roof overhang and trellis involved. The idea is to put more detail into the more expensive materials that could be seen from the street. The applicant said he had worked hard to bring the DRB's comments into account. Mr. Meade said the hard work involved was clear and very much appreciated. He said the package looked amazing.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Waggoner:

- Said that the applicant presented higher quality materials and clear details like the wrought-iron, wood caps, knee braces, roof decks and separate trellises that make the site look like a quality project.

- Mr. Waggoner still said he got the feel of two big houses from the two front buildings, but noted that the units in those buildings are pretty big.
- He noted that the applicant did break up those units with the siding and color, as well as the roof gables. He said those units would look bigger on the outside.
- In general, Mr. Waggoner said the applicant responded well to the DRB's comments and said that the project was ready for a regular application at this stage.

Mr. Nichols:

- Really liked the materials presented, especially the cedar siding at the lower levels where they would be seen. He liked the breakup between the shingle and lap siding on the project.
- With the colors, Mr. Nichols liked them all and said it was a nice palette presented.
- Overall, he liked the project and said it looked great.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Said the black trim totally changed the project. Mr. Palmquist said the project looks good, especially with the warm colors. He said even a bronze trim could even work.
- Mr. Palmquist liked all the colors except for the green presented, which was a little too wild. He said forest green was simply not working for the project. The rest of the colors, he was in support of.
- In general, Mr. Palmquist believed this project was ready for approval.

Mr. Krueger:

- Said he really liked the changes, especially the trim. He said this was a good design that fits in well in the woods, especially with regard to the roofs.
- Mr. Krueger said the two larger structures facing the street creates a look of a larger house rather than a row house, but he said this site is a transition from the urban nature of downtown and the sloping woods behind it. He said the project fits in well with the wooded area.
- Mr. Krueger would like to keep the green color presented. He said the red color looked overly bright to him. He said the applicant could decide on that issue.
- He asked the applicant about the material on the drive alley lane and the landscaping within that alleyway. The applicant said the materials in the alley at the entry level are the same as the ones at the street elevation. Each unit would have cedar shingles at the entry area.
- Mr. Krueger clarified that he was talking about the horizontal surface of the alley itself. Mr. Robert Pantley spoke on behalf of the applicant and said landscaping has been placed in the alley wherever possible, including green walls. Mr. Pantley noted that there are some limitations due to back-out requirements from Redmond Public Works.
- Regarding the roadway, Mr. Pantley noted that he would like some flexibility between asphalt and concrete, but suggested a three-foot apron of concrete around the project with asphalt in the middle. He noted that the asphalt tends to stay cleaner. Pavers are problematic because this is a wellhead area, according to Mr. Pantley.
- Mr. Krueger agreed that the concrete apron would provide good balance to the project. Beyond that, he said the applicant responded well to the DRB's comments and likes the materials and trellises involved. Mr. Pantley said he was very excited about the project.

Mr. Meade:

- Also likes the idea of the three-foot concrete border, which he said would create an opportunity for pedestrians to walk more easily amidst car traffic. Mr. Meade said there could be a detail in the main intersection of the project, such as a drainage structure.
- He said the project was ready to come back for approval. He said the changes made have all been positive, and moving the building was a powerful statement.
- Regarding colors, he would approve all the colors provided. He said the green color could lean a little more toward olive. He said what the applicant has done so far makes sense. He asked the applicant to hurry back for approval. The applicant thanked the DRB for its input.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE120013, FedEx Ground Distribution Facility

Description: Single-story package distribution center; 212,000 square feet

Location: 188th Ave NE & NE 73rd Street

Applicant: Jill Marcotte

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

Mr. Palmquist recused himself from this project, in that he works for the applicant's architect. Mr. Lisk said this was the second pre-application for this project, which is located on the Taylor Union Hill property in southeast Redmond, adjacent to the future 188th Avenue NE. It is a 23-acre property, and the applicant is proposing a 212,000 square foot facility for FedEx Ground. At the last meeting, the DRB discussed how to break up the horizontal massing for such a long structure. Also, the administrative office portion of the project was discussed, and how that could be treated differently to call it out more. Landscaping was big topic as well, in that it would be needed all around the site to shield the buildings, create some sound attenuation, and dress up the site. The applicant has taken those comments into account and has responded to them in different ways. In the updated design, architectural panels would be added to portions of the building as well as a new color scheme with more of a red tint. The applicant has also provided some perspective sketches of the intended landscaping.

Architect Rick Grimes presented on behalf of the applicant. The applicant noted that the design started with the corporate program of FedEx, involving specific colors, white doors, and minimal canopies. The DRB had suggested that the applicant come back with some different ideas to break up the massing and the look of the building. The applicant kept the height of the building at the standard 33 feet. The applicant has modified the colors on the upper portion of the building, using a terra cotta color for the majority of the height of the building. A lower level, or base of the building, is a neutral color. The doors remain white, which is what FedEx likes to do. The applicant has modified some of the panels along the south and east facades of the building, raising them an additional three feet up to about 36 feet in height. These are still tilt concrete panels, but they have a different reveal pattern and a darker color. The other primary change involves a modification of the office area. The parapets have been lowered. The office structure will now be a steel frame structure rather than a tilt concrete structure. That allows for linear columns along the façade of the building that reflect the steel structure that is behind it. The new structure also allows more windows into the office, which is what the DRB had asked for. Canopies have been added to the primary entries. Lights have been added to emphasize the pilasters put on the building along the office area.

Along the east façade, raised panels have been added. The applicant said wherever those panels could be placed, they have been added. The existing door openings have limited the areas where the panels could be installed, but the applicant has tried to maximize the number of panels and set up a rhythm along the façade. On the north façade, there is a solid wall of doors. The applicant has eliminated the vertical panels, but the dark terra cotta and light base and white doors have been put in place. A continuous canopy over the four-foot high dock doors will be painted the accent black color. The west façade and south façade have the raised panels, again. He noted that the elevations presented show a perspective that is much closer than the public would ever be to the project.

Mark Weisman spoke to the DRB about the landscape plan for the site on behalf of the applicant. He noted that the landscape plan is still somewhat conceptual in nature, but has a reasonable solution in terms of tree and shrub massing as well as retaining walls and berms. Planting in the service areas will be very limited, but the perimeter areas would be planted in a code-compliant way, with one tree for four parking stalls, for example. The lots on the south and north would be lushly planted and would provide the layering and screening for the building. Landscaping will be very important to this building, and the applicant has selected four views to show the DRB to indicate what it would be like to drive past the site. No planting has been provided in the utility easement, as that is really not allowed. Driving northbound, the applicant wanted to emphasize the office function, but noted that the view was buried behind trees. The applicant has massed evergreen trees and flowering trees to provide a foreground to the office piece and some peek-a-boo views. A retaining wall in this area is about five feet high and about a hundred feet long. It is a neutral color to blend into the landscape. Driving southbound, people would see a detention pond and a layering of trees. A range of tree sizes and types would be used, with an attempt to cluster trees in the most important areas to create instant impact.

The last view is from the west looking eastbound up the leading edge slope that now has a lot of brush. A reasonable amount of planting would be placed right at the top of the slope, which the applicant said would be the most effective place for screening. A single line of trees is indicated in this area now, but more will be added where possible to increase the massing. Placing a big tree on the engineered slope in this location would be very difficult, the applicant said. There is some planting near the building, but due to all the truck traffic in this area, it is doubtful a tree would live. On the west of the project, the applicant is working to put more landscaping in to break up the massing of the building. Deciduous and taller trees would be involved as well to break the monotony down.

The applicant said he has made great progress on this project. He did not have many details on the detention pond on the site, but said there could be some dead water storage in the pond area. He admitted that this issue is not completely resolved. He noted that several street tree and median plantings have already been approved, but said there may be some minor changes in those plantings when the project moves forward. The applicant said, with the DRB's guidance, he would start to choose materials and species. Fencing will go around the entire facility, and the applicant is looking into some acoustical issues to protect the residential area near this site. It is not clear yet where acoustical walls might be required. Solid panels and open panels would likely be used, with a way that would involve landscaping to break up the massing. Overall, the applicant said he looked forward to gaining insights from the DRB.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the grading and topography of the project and where walls and detention ponds were located. The applicant displayed the site grading. The building creates some depression in terms of grade on the site.
- The applicant added that the grade pins the building in some locations. The grade has to drop quickly to stay with the road near the site, and so a retaining wall has been added. It supports the site at the corner where the building comes in close.
- The applicant said the wall would not be higher than four or five feet, but said that this is a big focus of this site, in that people would be looking up at the building from this angle.
- Many layers of landscaping would help avoid multiple berms on the site, the applicant said.
- Mr. Krueger clarified that the landscape drawings represented what the site would look like after five years of growth. The applicant said that eight to ten or ten to twelve-foot trees could be planted, but some small trees would be planted as well to provide a range of heights. The leading edge of the west would be an important edge for planting, but other sides would get attention as well.
- Mr. Krueger liked what the applicant had proposed at the main entry of the building, in that there would be a good connection to the front door.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the noise the applicant is trying to prevent. The applicant said the trucks coming into the site are the main noise generators. An acoustic expert will measure sound levels across the street, and the applicant said he would respond as needed.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the west view and the narrow strip of landscaping presented there on the short side of the building. The applicant said this would be a challenging area, in that a future road might get punched through this spot. The plantings here would most likely be on an interim basis, but the applicant said he would look at this spot carefully to make sure there was enough landscaping.
- Mr. Krueger liked the changes to the site since the last meeting, especially with the colors added. He clarified the color hues with the applicant. Mr. Krueger liked the lower wall colors and appreciates the lighter shade closer to the white doors, such that the doors do not stand out too much.
- The applicant said he was trying to get away from a monochromatic scheme, and noted that six colors have been presented rather than the three used at the last meeting. He said the colors help break the visual aspects of the building up.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the canopies on the site and wanted to know about their form on either side of the building. The applicant noted that the actual canopy structure has not been determined, but the basic idea would be to use a simple steel canopy.
- The applicant said the canopies off the back side of the building are defined by FedEx. They will be metal and they will be painted. The building is simple, and the idea would be to keep the shapes as simple as possible.

Mr. Nichols:

- Said that the building has to be the shape it has to be to do the job it needs to do. He appreciates the accent panels on the building and the detail on the office building.
- Mr. Nichols supports the lighting on the pilasters and the canopies, as well. However, he notes that it will be all about the landscaping in terms of buffering this structure from the public.
- He said a fair number of evergreen trees should be employed to keep the site shielded during the winter months, etc.
- Mr. Nichols asked about the roofing system. The applicant replied that it would be a white TPO roof sitting on rigid insulation. There will be very few penetrations to the roof other than plumbing vents. There will be some exhaust vents, but they will be small.
- The applicant said there will be no HVAC units on the roof, as there is no cooling inside the facility, only heating. The parapets on the walls will screen the mechanical elements on top of the office building.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Agreed with Mr. Nichols' comments in that the building is too big to hide with architectural gadgets. He likes the rhythm of parapets added, as well as the accent colors.
- Mr. Waggoner said the lighter-colored based helps reduce, visually, the overall height of the project.
- He added that the landscaping will be the right place to put the money into, especially on the sides, where landscaping different rows will be very important for screening, even beyond code requirements. He suggested more evergreen density in those areas as well.
- Mr. Waggoner said the project was trending in the right direction and he appreciated the response the applicant has provided in this latest iteration of the design.

Mr. Meade:

- Said the building has improved, but echoed his fellow Board members in that the landscaping will have to do the job of screening the site.
- Mr. Meade said more landscape height and massing on the side of the building that is closest to the street would be important. He would like some bigger plantings on that side. He appreciated the applicant's attempt to add varying heights to the landscaping.
- Mr. Meade said he was interested in the fencing and gates, and the main detail that could be seen by the public. He would like to see something special with that gate detail.
- Mr. Meade applauded the use of color and noted it was a big step from where it was before. He reiterated that this was all about the landscaping.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the panel designs, and how they might change to fit the building's operational requirements, as noted in the staff report. Mr. Lisk said that comment was not relevant in light of the statements made by the applicant at tonight's meeting.
- Mr. Meade confirmed with the Board that this project could come back to the next meeting for approval. The applicant thanked the DRB members for their time.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE120014, Legacy Town Square

Description: A six-story mixed-use development with 200 apartments and structured parking

Location: 160th Ave NE & NE 83rd Street

Applicant: Michelle Kinsch

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

Mr. Lisk noted that this was the first pre-application for this project. He said this was a six-story mixed use building on the vacant property just northeast of the corner 160th Avenue NE and NE 83rd Street. This site is in the heart of downtown, and thus very visible, but it has been vacant for years. Mr. Lisk said any project at this site will have high visibility, and the City should make sure this application results in a good project. There are about 180 apartments proposed in this application, including several ground floor live-work units on the 160th side of the building. Ground floor retail would wrap around the corner of 160th and 83rd. Parking would be provided in one level of underground parking as well as a mezzanine level. The building would have a second story outdoor courtyard, which Mr. Lisk said would provide significant modulation along the longest façade of the building. The applicant has provided a building massing

concept. Mr. Lisk commented that the drawings appear similar to other buildings the DRB has seen built recently downtown, a direction which may work within the design standards. However, Mr. Lisk said some other options might be pursued within the standards that could take the massing in a different direction. He would like the Board's help with that issue.

Mr. Lisk also has a concern about the relation of the project to the street front along 160th and how the live-work units will make that street front active. Other live-work units are right across the street from this project, and those units are not as active as the City would like. The City is looking for good pedestrian activity along the street front with this new project, as Redmond is becoming a more urban city. Mr. Lisk was looking for more input from the Board on this issue. There are also some design standards to consider with regard to the corner of 160th and 83rd. The corner has been identified in the Code as a special corner in Downtown Redmond that needs to become more active. One suggestion to make that happen is to create a corner entrance to the building. Finally, Mr. Lisk said the building materials and colors have not been determined, but he would like some general direction from the DRB for the applicant on those topics.

Bob Tiscareno spoke on behalf of the applicant. He said the focus of his presentation was to provide a design overview and provide the site analysis, conceptual plans, and elevations for Legacy Town Square. He showed the DRB the context of the site in the context of Downtown Redmond. The site is 50,915 square feet, an area that is zoned TSQ for Town Square, with multi-residential and sales and services allowed. The proposed building is six stories tall with mixed uses, including 175 apartments, five live-work units, and three thousand square feet of commercial retail space. The proposal has been reviewed by staff in a prep meeting, and the plan is compliant with the Zoning Code. There are some deviations from the Code related to building projections over the sidewalk, deck quantities and locations, residential separation requirements in the court. Given the proximity of the transit center to the site, the applicant is considering reducing the amount of parking spaces that would be provided. Generally, however, the project is code compliant.

The site is in a prime spot, located right next to Downtown Redmond at the edge of the TSQ Zone, with the SMT zone across the street and the TR zone just a half a block away. The parcel is a quarter of a very large block with 300 feet of frontage on 160th and 150 feet of frontage on 83rd. The site has a thumb due to the deeper lot at the north end. Both the streets are Type 2 streets, which require wide sidewalks and on-street parking. Where the streets intersect, there is a valuable retail location. The lobby of the building could be on either street. The applicant believes the best spot for the parking garage access would be at the north end, or mid-block point. The zoning and site constraints include a requirement for transparency for non-residential uses at grade. Some high-density upper residential units can be massed on the site. The buildings surrounding this project are three to four stories. There is a medical office building to the east and residential buildings across 160th and 83rd.

The proposed building would stand above its neighbors and have a recognizable city profile. It has good views in all directions, but the west is the best view. The floor plate is much deeper than the typical residential plate requirements. Therefore, a courtyard has been proposed with residential wings. The site is fairly flat and both sides of 160th and 83rd have an established pattern of street trees and buildings that front the street. Parking lots edge the site on the east and north side. There is a mix of residential and commercial uses near the site, as well as City Hall and transit sites. The architectural styles in this area are very diverse, from the classic '70's to very urban. Nearby civic buildings are outwardly modern and expressive. Mixed use buildings in this area tend to have carefully modulated facades in response to design standards.

With staff, the applicant identified several priorities from the downtown design standards, including the relationship to the street, the building materials, and addressing corner lots. The massing concept includes a podium structure at the base with non-residential spaces edging the sidewalks. There are residential floors above that. There is a courtyard on the west side to break up the massing on 160th, provide residential open space, and take advantage of good solar access. The mass has three wings off a central spine. Two wings are on 160th, and are a composition of angle forms that extend out over the sidewalk. The roof forms break up the mass and create tall ceilings on the top floor. The result is a strong urban expression. The central expression off the court has an amenity space.

On the southeast side, the corners are expressed and then transition to a longer eastern façade. The façade modulation on the east elevation will be accomplished through building shifts, material changes and deck forms. The parking garage is open to the east, allowing in light and air and creating perhaps a greater sense of security. A mid-block path will provide a connection between 83rd and 85th street. From the northeast corner, the building faces a medical building parking lot. The parking drive is defined on either side with a sidewalk to link with 160th. There are tighter building adjacency conditions here, and this will be a cue for the east wing. The mass has stepped down and the first floor has been opened up, with corner decks proposed. The decks will go to less than 100% of the units, which is a deviation. About half the units will have decks. The units will generally have large windows and significant interior and exterior common spaces will be provided. The applicant says this change will lead to façade design flexibility and help differentiate this project from others downtown.

The ground floor plan has retail at the corner, where it is highly visible and complements the pattern of other retail spaces at this intersection. The building has been set back five feet on two streets to provide the required sidewalk width for a Type 2 street and allocated space for a mid-block path. The combined area of these two allocations is about 5,000 square feet, so it is less than the 50,000 square foot area. The residential lobby is off the street. Five two-level live-work units would extend the commercial activity at the street, repeating the pattern across 160th. A thirty-foot wide garage access lane is at the north edge, and there would be a sidewalk on one side and a landscape strip on the other. Parking is at grade, buffered by retail, lobby, and live-work spaces. There is additional parking on one level below grade. The parking layout offers direct connection from stalls to the elevator and sidewalk.

On the upper level floors, there is a double-loaded corridor scheme with mostly one and two-bedroom units. The idea is to provide simple, direct connections from the parking stalls to the units. One challenge with high-density residential developments downtown is maximizing the parking at or above grade. This keeps subterranean levels above the water table, which is common downtown. The live-work units have entrances from the sidewalk and the parking is out of sight. The courtyard has direct access to a club room, an open space residential amenity. Some units at the top floor would have mezzanine spaces and perhaps vaulted ceilings.

The architectural concept comes from buildings nearby and compliance with the design framework of the design standards, as well as the vision to create a building with a unique identity on this important site. Other design cues come from the expression of the interior functions creating superior residential and commercial products for our competitive market. There is a defined building base. The retail and lobby areas will have significant street level transparency, expressed structural elements, and accent storefront materials. There are two striking towers, each as a singular expression with angled walls at the corners extending over the sidewalk. The building base and towers are tied regularly in vertical planes, contrasted by projected corner bays. Window openings and deck recesses provide detailed articulation in both the horizontal and vertical directions. This approach would continue around the facades, though the theme and composition might change.

The upper levels are clad with materials including metal and fiber cement panels to further define the surfaces. The decks would have glass and metal finishes. The sloping roofs and metal cornice create a unique profile, while the lower parapet and cornice change up the scale and create strong relationships to a building across the street. The base of the building will have retail at the corner, and the shops will have floor to ceiling glass to create a sense of openness and will have accent-framed entry. The building will be different than the other two at this intersection, with a lot of retail pizzazz built in. The storefront also fades back at the corner to accentuate the angle above. The upper level projections create living space, with four units above providing integrated overhead weather protection and highlighting the corner of this key Downtown intersection. The lobby will be set off from other ground floor spaces. The façade is slightly stepped back from the street for a transitional space between the street and the interior. There will be a steel canopy, tiles, and wood.

Looking south on 160th, the site will have signage, landscaping and materials to make the live-work units and retail spaces visible, distinctive, and attractive to both tenants and possible customers. There is some definition between the base and the residential tower. The live-work units are expressed with frames clad

with masonry, which could be stone or brick. Steel canopies would express the signage, and lighting will highlight the accent elements. Above the street level, there is an upper level courtyard that will be an attractive community space for residents.

The central expression at the court defines an important focal point and there is an expressed cornice line midway up the building to create scale relationships to lower buildings nearby. That element repeats itself on other facades. The residential parts of the building could have a sleek, lighter look due to the large windows, decks, and materials. The colors would support the direction, though they have not been specified. The return of the wings creates a reduction in the minimum courtyard separation from 55 feet to about 20 feet, which is a deviation. But the applicant said that the other courtyard nearby would offset that.

Landscape architect Thomas Rengstorf next presented on behalf of the applicant. He said that on the main level, there are trees, a bench, and a light pole. Those will be kept. The other predominant feature is an existing four-foot path which goes along the backside of this area that, from a code standpoint, will be doubled to eight feet. A brick band element will be picked up to mirror the existing courtyard and create an eight-foot, mid-block crossing that continues north. The applicant will have street trees and tree grates in the live-work areas. There are raised planter and stoops going up to each individual entry and the main entry. More details on the paving design and scoring will be provided later. There will be planting along the drive, including a massing of planting along the base of the building with the garages and vents. A low ground cover of evergreen shrubs would be used. There is an existing open space and play area for a daycare on the site. A small fenced-in area has raised beds off of the existing building.

In the upper courtyard, the applicant is proposing an open patio to provide spaces for the individual tenants divided by planters. CMU or cast in place concrete planters might be used. Each unit would thus have a small patio, spilling out to a covered structure with a fireplace, a bar, barbecue, and sink area. People from the street would be able to see there is an architectural element up above them. There will be a fire pit and seating as well to create a good community feel to the open space. On the roof, there will be a small space, about 750 square feet, of a wood or concrete deck. There will be a fire pit around a seating area. Festival lights would be provided overhead. The applicant added, as a final note, that the lobby could be located off of 83rd rather than off 160th.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Nichols:

- Said the building was interesting looking, and liked the angular façade. He said the overhangs over the sidewalk will add interest, as well as the street-level canopies.
- Mr. Nichols would like to know more about the specific materials for, including the glass deck railing that are being planned for the building.
- Regarding the colors, he was not sold on what the applicant had presented, but was willing to listen to the rest of the Board on that issue. The applicant said there were no colors proposed, and that this was just a massing discussion.
- Mr. Nichols said the landscaping was looking good so far, but he would like to hear more about the evolution of the materials, specifically with the street trees. He would also like to know what the view of the street level would look like from the elevated decks.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked about the live-work units, and if the applicant would consider putting the storefronts together and put the walk-up parts together to create a more substantial bit of storefront. He thought this area might be more successful with more storefront area, to give it more of a retail front look.
- Mr. Palmquist said the corner was a good start, but did not think the whole building needed to address that corner. That technique can sometimes look like a foreign object is attached to the corner of a building. He would like to see that the massing for the whole project does not change because of that one requirement at the corner.
- That said, he noted that something special would have to be done below the canopy at the retail level. The project across the street might be a good example with a decent-sized canopy. He would

like to see that area developed, but the whole corner of the building should not have to be used to meet the corner requirement.

- He would rather have the applicant focus on where people would be, on the lower portion of the corner or the first 15 to 20 feet of the building.
- Mr. Palmquist liked the roof forms and said the project is heading in the right direction, so he would hate to see the applicant take away from that on the corner.
- He noted that the second-floor courtyard has a symmetry that feels a little forced. He said the north side would get the light and the south side would be entirely shaded by the building. He would like to see the design here reconsidered to take advantage of access to the sun.
- He liked the covered element on the courtyard and how it leans over the edge to make a connection with the street.
- Overall, Mr. Palmquist said the project was off to a great start and he was looking forward to seeing it again.

Mr. Krueger:

- Really liked the direction the project was going, especially the raised courtyard off the street. He liked the wing walls and the angling done with them to create wider sidewalks.
- Mr. Krueger said the shed roofs at the top were another good element.
- He agreed with Mr. Palmquist that the emphasis with the corner element should be concentrated at the street level. He liked the decks above that corner as well.
- Mr. Krueger would like the applicant to avoid making the decks and their railings too obvious. He would like the decks to be a bit more subdued.
- He was interested in the materials and colors, especially the stone and brick along the street edge.
- He asked about the live-work units, referring to Mr. Lisk's concern that the live-work units across the street are not successful, due to closed blinds and other issues. He asked how the live-work units proposed would be transparent at the street level.
- The applicant agreed that the storefronts at the two other projects across the street could be more successful. He said the approach was to have more glass to help read the depth and create more attractiveness for commercial occupancy.
- Kitchens would be put at the back of these units, and having two levels would keep the scale at a point that would be consistent with a commercial look. Commercial canopies and large blade signs would be used as well to make these units special.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the mezzanine area. The applicant said that was a loft area, or living space, with a small business downstairs. There is a two and a half foot grade change with these units, so pedestrians would not look directly into these units.
- Mr. Krueger said he hoped these units would be successful, as he sees a demand for these types of units. The applicant said the idea was to make these very active store fronts.
- Mr. Krueger liked the shading element on the courtyard above and how it just out over the project. He said he was looking forward to the next iteration of the project.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Said the project has a lot of potential and great components. He liked the live-work units and how they shield the parking and create a lot of street frontage. He liked the raised courtyard as well.
- Mr. Waggoner said the project almost looks like multiple buildings, and he said that each of the towers could be treated differently and do not necessarily need to have the same design. The towers could have their own character, which could make sense if there were separate lobbies.
- He liked the upper overhang that was visible from the sidewalk, which he said was a unique element not seen often in Redmond.
- Mr. Waggoner said the smaller segmented canopies could be joined together to create a continuous element of glass or some other translucent covering to provide more winter protection. This could also tie together the complex horizontally, especially the live-work units.
- He agreed with Mr. Lisk's opening comments about the familiarity of some of the architectural elements, especially the butterfly roof that seems to be the thing to do. He would encourage looking into a range of different options to deal with the roof area, and reiterated that the tower elements could look different from each other.
- Mr. Waggoner said the decks are the wrong thing to do at the corner. He believes they weaken the corner. In his opinion, floor to ceiling windows or something that comes out to the property line to

create an edge would be preferable. That would allow the applicant to move the decks to different locations on the sides and create some real separation from the vertical elements.

- Overall, Mr. Waggoner suggested that the applicant mix it up and consider some alternatives. Generally, however, he said this project has a lot of good components and good potential. He said it was a great start.

Mr. Meade:

- Suggested more continuous weather coverage for the potential retail spaces would help them be more successful and encourage pedestrians to walk in that corridor.
- Mr. Meade said that lines going across the street are so internally focused that the live-work units in this neighborhood seem like a throwaway. There are a few exceptions with restaurants on the corners, but otherwise, Mr. Meade said live-work units have not been working.
- He said the live-work units look too residential, and he would not bother to put a business in there because it would flounder without parking, for example. He would like a more retail look to the live-work units if they are going to work.
- Mr. Meade said the main corner of the project and echoed the other Board members' idea to deal with it at the lower level, especially at the ground plane and maybe even with a landscape element in front. He would like to see that corner activated, with an extraordinary window or art piece or an entry element.
- Mr. Meade spoke about Mr. Lisk's comments about the organization of the towers with the courtyard between and the breakup of the massing. Because this design has been done before, Mr. Meade suggested that the applicant react to what neighboring businesses have done.
- Part of that, Mr. Meade said, would be to activate the courtyard space. A cover is one thing, but he would like to see this area be a little bit more alive. He said that would be a challenge, but he suggested adding lush landscaping and partially visually permeable railing with an urban texture.
- He liked the roof forms and massing. He liked Mr. Waggoner's idea to break the towers into more than one expression to help divide the building.
- Mr. Meade said joining the entries for the live-work units and creating a combined stoop area to expand the windows would provide some different rhythm.
- Right now, he said the project was off to a good start, and he was excited for it. He would like to see more expression of materials at the next meeting to get a better feel of what the quality of the building would be.
- Mr. Meade added that the street frontage is critical, and he would like to see some lush landscaping effort in that area.
- Mr. Waggoner agreed with Mr. Meade about the retail level corner. He said it looked like a big retail space now, but he noted that mainly smaller tenants are moving into spaces like these. Multiple entries off the corner could create a good hub of activity and a focal point for that intersection.
- Mr. Waggoner said without good focus at the corner, a person would be left to look down the sides of the building for a door, and there would be a question as to what those doors would lead to, a business or a residential unit. He suggested concentrating on this entry zone area.
- Mr. Meade said the project was off to a great start. The applicant thanked the Board members for their time.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE120020, BJ's Restaurant

Description: Demolition of existing Desert Fire Restaurant and construction of new 7,453 square foot freestanding building with outdoor patio and associated site improvement.

Location: 7211 – 166th Ave NE

Applicant: Jared Taylor

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

Mr. Fischer said this is the first presentation for BJ's Restaurant, which would be located in Town Center. This would go into the current location of Desert Fire. The old building would be demolished and a new building would be erected. The building is 25 feet in height with an entry tower of 28 feet. The building would be made of stone, tile, and stucco with black metal canopies. This design would be similar to other restaurants in this chain. This site is unique in that it has prominence on all four sides, and does not have a back area that is not visible. The north façade faces towards Town Center. The south façade faces out

to Bear Creek Parkway. The east façade faces out onto a parking area that is close to one of Town Center's internal streets. The west façade faces out onto a plaza. Mr. Fischer noted that this plaza was part of the Master Plan for Redmond Town Center. There is a pedestrian pathway that is landscaped which takes you from the center of Town Center to two restaurants, Claim Jumper and now BJ's. Between the two restaurants is a plaza space, and Mr. Fischer asked the Board to consider if there was a way to activate that plaza space.

The applicant is proposing outdoor seating on the north side with the entryway more centered into the north façade. Mr. Fischer asked how that seating could engage the plaza through some sort of adjustment. The entryway is somewhat removed from the plaza, and it addresses more to the parking lot than the plaza. Staff recommends that the Board look at the south and east facades to find ways to add interest to these facades and break up the massing there. The landscape plan includes smaller material such as grass and shrubs, especially on the south façade. There are shore pines and other street trees, but closer to the building, there is a lot of low-growing material. Mr. Fischer wanted the Board to address the issue of the height of that landscaping.

Mr. Fischer showed the DRB some photos of the site to orient them to the pedestrian walkway, the plaza, and the restaurants. He noted that Claim Jumper does not have outdoor seating, but there are windows that look out on the plaza to engage that space. The Desert Fire site, which is planned to be demolished, had outdoor seating. The parking along the north façade has a tree that is proposed to be removed so as to put more parking spaces in. There will be a dumpster enclosure put out in a parking area, and therefore, the applicant is proposing to remove a tree to make up for those parking spaces.

David Bocock from Macerich Real Estate Company presented on behalf of the applicant. He said he understood the concerns of staff. He noted that the front doors of both restaurants facing the plaza are hidden by the landscaping. He would like to keep that landscaping to look natural, and he felt that the proposed location of the BJ's front door would help that restaurant have a strong presence. He added that the plaza, while very usable, is not something that needs focus for placement of the entrance. Regarding the rearrangement of the parking spaces, the applicant noted that the dumpster location currently takes up two parking spaces. That situation has been shifted over to the BJ's proposal. The parking spaces in front have been added due to the location of the front door, and due to the fact that the applicant does not want to lose any of the parking ratio. The applicant said there was a possibility to replant some additional trees or vegetation around the property as a way to make up for any trees that would be lost. Overall, Mr. Bocock was on board with BJ's plans.

Joan Leguay of BJ's Restaurant next presented to the DRB on behalf of the applicant. She noted that there were some unique site constraints. Desert Fire was a uniquely configured restaurant, in that it was placed at an angle. The parcel lines appear to be created around Desert Fire. BJ's, as presented, would have a clipped property line. There is not a perfect rectangle where the Desert Fire entrance was. The Desert Fire entry clips the corner, and that is exactly how the property line is placed. BJ's has asked the landlord to square back out the property line, which has been agreed to. This does limit the ability to wrap the patio around the plaza side, in that it would be beyond BJ's property line.

The applicant is aware of the City's desire to look at how BJ's entry is oriented, and how essential that is for development. She said the entry, while facing the parking lot, will be very grand. It will include tile and the patio will be across the front. Overall, the applicant will not lose any parking stalls with the proposed entry location. The patio will have the same tile and will be covered, allowing use in more of the year. A fireplace element will be added, as well as a stone wall with glass above. She said the patio should really activate that corner of the site. There is a significant setback on Bear Creek Parkway, so there is not much of a possibility for the building to shift and maintain the parking required.

The applicant is aware that staff would like to protect as many trees as possible. All the trees along Bear Creek Parkway will be protected. A group of trees by the service yard area would have to be removed. The intention is to remove nine trees and replace four trees, but the applicant is working on a place to plant five more large trees within the property to make sure there is no net loss of large trees.

The plan complies with the Redmond Town Center Master Plan, the City Center Neighborhood Plan, and the Redmond Design Standards. The applicant spent a lot of time with the compliance process in terms of articulation and the inclusion of changes in the elevations. The floor plan shows some of the articulation, including some pilasters that create a non-rectangular footprint. The front elevation integrates a number of natural stones and slates. The bottom of the building has a stone wainscot and the entryway and much of the front of the building has stone as well. Pilasters, reveals, canopies and cornices are used, and the roofline is varied on all four sides of the building. The main dining room will face into the plaza area, which the applicant said would activate that area. The elevation facing the street will have a mural with pilasters framing it. A screen wall will have a continuation of the stone used on the building, and will help obscure the service doors from the public. The east side of the building will have the service yard, which will be fully screened in a way to match the colors and materials of the building. The applicant showed the DRB photos of a similar patio design for reference. A series of three murals will be placed around the restaurant, and the stone and slate used outside the building will be used inside as well to create a rich color palette throughout.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Waggoner:

- Asked about the plaza and how the restaurant has a somewhat inward focus rather than outward. He noted that sides that do have windows are facing the plaza and look outward toward the entry side.
- Mr. Waggoner said the plaza could use a revamp itself with the landscaping and overgrowth that is there currently. He spoke about supporting a route to the main campus and creating some clarity of pedestrian circulation.
- He said some aspects of the site are beyond the property line, and thus beyond the applicant's control. He was not certain how the landlord could improve that situation.
- He said that compared to some other restaurant brands, he said that the design of BJ's has become fairly well-refined over the years. He liked the look and feel of the materials and suggested bold colors to add some punch to the project.
- Mr. Waggoner wondered if a lack of visibility for Desert Fire, and lack of strong colors, might have contributed to its demise.
- In general, he said the building fits in the size of the pad the applicant is working with. He did not think the DRB would be forcing too much change on the well-identified BJ's brand.

Mr. Nichols:

- Said the color scheme was complementary to the colors of Redmond Town Center.
- He was concerned about the landscape height, especially at the south elevation with a long run of turf and street trees. He said that elevation needs some softening, and he would like some taller landscaping there to break up that façade.
- Mr. Nichols disagreed with the applicant's comments about activation to the plaza. He said the four-foot stone wall really separates the restaurant from the plaza and creates a barrier. He said a wrought-iron railing might give a more inviting appearance.
- He noted that on the west elevation, there was an opportunity to increase the glass in a similar way to Claim Jumper, in that the face looks out on the plaza. Extending the glass might give more interest and visibility to the plaza area.
- Beyond that, Mr. Nichols likes the overall shape and form of the project.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked if the patio was required for the restaurant. The applicant replied that it was typical for BJ's restaurants. Mr. Palmquist noted that for many restaurants, patios are furniture storage for nine months of the year in our climate. Mr. Meade agreed.
- The applicant said the patio was not necessarily a program element, but BJ's has studied patios and has improved them to make them more inviting and climate-controlled. The restaurant has looked into the latest trends in furniture, style, and fireplaces, and would like to have a patio in this location.
- The applicant said the patio would be a strong feature in Redmond Town Center. Two other restaurants with patios in the Center get some strong activity.

- Mr. Palmquist said that patio is in the spot where the entry needs to be. Claim Jumper is a good example, in Mr. Palmquist's opinion. He suggested taking the whole western half of the building, west of the entry, and moving it back.
- Mr. Palmquist said that move would give BJ's and Claim Jumper a way to form an end to the promenade. He noted that the promenade currently does not really go anywhere. He said shifting the building would put people who were waiting onto the west side of the entry.
- Right now, customers would be forced into the parking area to the north, which would not be a good place to wait. Moving the entry would help define the patio area, as well.
- Mr. Palmquist noted that there was no good reason to walk past these restaurants to the street, so he suggested creating an end to the plaza, as Claim Jumper has done.
- He suggested creating some separation between the parking and the west side of the building, which would make a more inviting public space. The entry would stay where it is, but the west half of the building would move back to create a deeper space between the parking and the building.
- Mr. Fischer confirmed that Mr. Palmquist was suggesting the entry would stay as is, but the western piece, west of the entry, would move south. The outdoor seating area would be the same depth and size, but a deeper wider walkway would occur between the parking space and the outdoor seating.
- Mr. Palmquist said that move would solve a lot of issues on the site, especially when big crowds come to the restaurant and need a place to wait. He suggested having another door on the west side to provide another entry.
- Beyond that, Mr. Palmquist said the design was bold and he liked the color palette and the style presented. He said finding a different place for the patio could be a solution, as well. Mr. Meade suggested moving the patio as well, into the dining area.
- The applicant said all the operational efficiencies would have to be balanced, in that the interior seats are used the most. It would be difficult would be to give those up. Mr. Palmquist suggested moving the patio to the south end. The applicant said it could not be serviced from that end.
- Mr. Palmquist said the four-foot wall might serve to push people away rather than bring them in.

Mr. Krueger:

- Liked the low wall around the patio, which he agreed was counter to some other opinions. He said the wrought iron did not appear as much of a solid presence as the stone wall.
- Mr. Krueger asked about how the patio would be covered. The applicant said there would be a nearly flat shed roof with a similar horizontal line to the front canopy. Mr. Krueger asked where it would tie in.
- The applicant said that would happen just above the window such that it would appear as a natural extension of the building. There would be some dark-colored columns for support intermittently spaced, matching the trim color.
- Mr. Krueger said he never used the patio at Desert Fire or Claim Jumper. He wondered if the plaza could be used for additional seating as a way to bring life to the plaza area. Mr. Meade suggested a vendor cart, possibly, in that area.
- Mr. Krueger liked the materials and colors proposed, and how the perimeter streets have been addressed. He suggested adding some windows to the west elevation without disrupting the interior.
- He said the entry area looked truncated to him, relative to the site. He suggested going higher with that entry piece. The applicant said that could be considered, within height restrictions. Mr. Krueger was looking forward to more detailed landscaping plans.

Mr. Meade:

- Said that if the patio cannot move to the plaza side, the windows need to be expanded on the west.
- Mr. Meade liked Mr. Krueger's idea of changing the entry, possibly creating another line to help unify the upper section of the building.
- Mr. Meade said some transparent lower panel would be needed on the patio. Right now, it appears like a fortress to him and does not invite people in.
- He echoed Mr. Palmquist's comments about dealing with overflow crowds and making a better connection between them and the plaza area.
- Mr. Meade liked the murals and said there might be a spot for another mural.
- The applicant accepted the comments and said the design team would look closely at creating a different patio wall element. The DRB members thanked the applicant for the work put into this project.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION MADE BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:00 P.M. MOTION PASSES (5-0).

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY