CITY OF REDMOND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

November 1, 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: Joe Palmquist, Craig Krueger, Mike Nichols

EXCUSED ABSENCE: David Scott Meade, Scott Waggoner, Lara Sirois

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

Senior Planner

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

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

CALL TO ORDER

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Joe Palmguist at 7:03 p.m.

MINUTES

AS THERE WAS NOT A QUORUM, THE APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 4, 2012 MEETING WAS MOVED TO THE NEXT MEETING.

PROJECT REVIEW: MOVED TO THE NEXT MEETING

L120407, Bear Creek Village

Description: Remodel of the Bear Creek Shopping Center

Location: 17246 Redmond Way **Applicant:** Theo Manning **Prior Review Date:** 10/18/12

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

PROJECT REVIEW: MOVED TO THE NEXT MEETING

L120411, Redmond Value Village

Description: Interior expansion, update loading dock and upgrade exterior facade

Location: 16771 Redmond Way

Applicant: Will Nelson

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

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE120029, Emerald Heights Independent Living Units

Description: New independent living unit building consisting of 43 apartments on three floors over one

floor of parking.

Location: 10901 – 176th Circle NE

Applicant: Julie Lawton **Prior Review Date:** 06/21/12

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

Ms. Johnson noted that this project was back for a second time before the DRB. The proposal has been revised, showing the new independent living building, which is about 92,000 square feet. The building will be along the southern edge of the campus and will have 43 apartments over one story of parking. The units will have open floor plans, radiant floor heating, a contemporary aesthetic, and a direct connection to the campus loop trail. The exterior design of the units will include materials and detailing strategies similar to the new fitness center and multi-purpose building, both of which came before the DRB

previously. The design is mean to complement the existing campus. The design includes glass space and cantilevered elements to provide modulation along the façade. The building is broken into three masses to create an urban streetscape. The masses have been rotated to follow the curvature of the street.

The DRB previously reviewed this proposal at the 6/21/12 meeting as a pre-application. Staff says the applicant has answered the Board's concerns from that meeting with changes in the massing and façade modulation. Two different siding styles have been used. There is also a vertical element at the main entry to create greater separation between the masses. Staff has reviewed the revised proposal and is recommending some additional changes, including the material of wood slats along the north elevation. Staff is recommended that this element be carried through on the sides to create more of a prominent statement along the entry. Staff is also recommending that additional detailing should be added to enhance the lap siding through the use of additional window detailing on the mullions.

Architect Jeremy Southerland presented on behalf of the applicant. He noted that this was the third project his company has presented to the Redmond DRB. He said that there have been many additions to the Emerald Heights campus, and this most recent project is the next step. The difference between this independent living unit building and the other buildings on the campus is that this one is free-standing and across the loop road that goes around the campus. It has an opportunity to be a little different from the other buildings on campus in that it is not connected to other buildings on campus.

The applicant said that the building would be known as the Trailside Building, as it is very close to the loop trail on campus. The building is near Redmond High School, and would sit slightly above the school. The applicant showed a series of renderings to illustrate how the design has progressed in breaking up the massing using verticality, which was a recommendation of the DRB at the last meeting on this project. As regards landscaping, the applicant is using native vegetation with clusters of feature trees along the street, which will eventually relate to the massing of the building. One change proposed involves a fire lane with a hammerhead, a requirement recently brought to the applicant's attention. Thus, the entry to the parking garage has had to move. The applicant is working with the fire department to determine what landscaping material should be used here. A secondary fire lane has been provided as well.

Since the DRB saw this project the last time, the entry vestibule moved to the left slightly in order to get an accessible grade from the street. A lower lobby and upper lobby have been created and are repeated on each floor. The parking garage is underneath the building, which has storage for residents and a small elevator lobby. There are common spaces in the building that allow for natural light to come in. A sightline sketch has been provided to answer concerns from the DRB and from the residents about views around the site. The applicant wants to make sure the residents are not seeing the roof of the building from the upper floor units. A feature wall goes through the building from the elevator overrun down through the lobby.

The applicant said a lap siding would be used to step the massing down at the ends of the building. Different colors would be used to have a clean, modern look. A tile would be used on the feature wall. The canopy is a simple glass and steel canopy. By moving the entry slightly, there is an opportunity for an outdoor plaza outside the front door. The plaza will be a natural outcropping of sorts with some clean walls and a modern-looking water feature. The idea is to use some modern vocabulary in a natural context. The other entry areas have been downplayed a bit so that they may be simple and straightforward. The one exception is the addition of a window wall system in lieu of residential windows. That will create larger glass areas and more of a commercial feel. The ends of the building step back to create terraces on the upper floor. The applicant is still working on how some of the grading on the site is resolved. There will likely be some retaining walls involved and some landscape screening. On the back side of the building, the applicant is trying to provide opportunities for the residents to walk directly to the trail that is located here. The entry and north elevation have been evolving for the past several months.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Nichols:

- Asked about the window detailing Ms. Johnson had mentioned, and if she was looking for more vertical and horizontal mullions. Ms. Johnson agreed that that was indeed what she was looking for to enhance the windows.
- The applicant noted that the windows are fiberglass in the residential units. At the knuckle areas, the windows are a dark brown anodized aluminum, which matches the fiberglass window color.
- Mr. Nichols asked about the railings on the decks. The applicant said those railings would be aluminum or fiberglass, also dark, to match the window mullions.
- Mr. Nichols asked about the color of the feature wall. The applicant said the color and material does not show well on a computer screen. There are slight variations on a monochromatic palette, which should accentuate the pattern.
- Mr. Nichols said it was difficult to determine what the feature wall looked like in terms of tone, feel, and color.
- Mr. Krueger asked if the proposed change to the feature wall was due to a limitation on the color of the material. The applicant said there was some limitation in terms of color. The applicant has looked at several different tiles, and the tile presented was the best option considered so far.
- Mr. Nichols said a pop of color in the feature wall, especially at the main entry, would be desirable and would look nice. He said the colors presented in the sketches provided by the applicant do not have that kind of pop. He would like to see a different color for the tile that is out of the range of the body colors elsewhere on the project.
- Mr. Nichols confirmed the hardy panel would be a smooth panel, using an aluminum reveal system.
 The applicant proposed leaving the reveals as anodized aluminum, not painted, to give the wall more of a modern feel at the reveals.
- Mr. Nichols asked about the base of the building under the storefronts, and if that material would be concrete. The applicant said some cast in place concrete would be used, but he was not certain that material would come down that far on the building. Mr. Nichols confirmed that many of the site walls would be masonry.
- Mr. Nichols asked about the hammerhead required for the fire lane, and if the applicant might consider a grass paved product that would not stick out like asphalt. The applicant asked the fire department about that grass paved product, and the fire department does not like that material because it is slippery. Gravel would be acceptable for the fire department.
- The applicant is leaning toward using a stamped concrete that would look like stone and hopefully
 fade into the forest floor in this area over time.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked again about the entry material and the blond brick and stone that have been used in other
 parts of the campus. Mr. Kruger suggested tying in some way to those materials with this new
 building. The applicant said the brick was considered as a feature material, but the project ended up
 looking like a chimney.
- The applicant said the brick contrasted too much with the modern look of this building, and did not provide enough of a vertical pattern to break up massing. Stone options have been looked at as well, but cleaner, polished stone was considered.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the wood supports at the entry and why this detail was not repeated anywhere else on the building. The applicant said the geometry of the lobbies in the building comes out parallel to the middle section of the building.
- The applicant has been trying to integrate the lobbies into the building, and thus the roof has been allowed to come out to the same level as the lower lobby. That creates a deep overhang which would require some sort of bracket, and the applicant looked to celebrate that with the wood supports. He admitted that the concept of tying in the wood supports to the building has not been resolved.
- Mr. Krueger said that even without the brackets proposed, that could be an interesting corner of the building. He asked about the dark trim at the corners to the right of the entry wall. Mr. Krueger said that trim seems to date the building and stands out to him.

- The applicant agreed with that assessment, and said the trim is probably a holdover from an older sketch that needs to be updated.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the features over the windows. The applicant said the idea was to provide a visual break at the upper level, or an eyebrow piece of some sort. This element is a bit unresolved. The hope is to create something that is not a detailing nightmare. A sunshade system will most likely be used over these windows. The applicant does not want a giant cornice on top of the building.
- Mr. Krueger said he recognized the concern over shading these windows.
- He asked about the west perspective and the step from the street to the site provided in the landscaping. The applicant said this was simply a perception due to the nature of the sketch. The hillside will actually be a smooth, planted hillside of low ground cover, not grass. Mr. Krueger actually liked the terraced look.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the parking provided. The applicant said there was more parking than allowed by Code. Residents say there is not nearly enough parking on site. There are fifty stalls in the parking garage and another fourteen in front of the building.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the dead-end parking areas that do not have space for turning around. The
 applicant said the spots in guestion were for assigned parking areas.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked about the trim at the right of the entry wall. He said defining the corners in this area with two
 colors actually looked good to him. He said if the applicant did get rid of the trim, hardy panel with
 mitered corners would be a good choice to keep with the modern look of the building.
- Mr. Palmquist asked about the windows, and noted that are some modern-looking windows and then some windows with mullions down the center proposed. He asked why all the windows could not have a modern look.
- The applicant said that the design has recently changed from casement windows to double-hung windows, which was not reflected in the model shown to the DRB at this meeting.
- With that in mind, Mr. Palmquist said the double-hung windows would look good all the way around the residential units. The applicant said that would be the case.
- Regarding the entry, Mr. Palmquist said the tile color needed to pop out from the hardy plank color. He said if this design needed to be much bolder if it was the only place this type of tile was used on the building. He suggested defining the knuckles of the building using the tile, possibly. He appreciated defining the entry, but wanted something much more substantial.
- Mr. Palmquist said the feature wall should be taller than the mechanical screen, if possible. The
 applicant noted that the mechanical screen was 20 feet behind the feature wall, and would not be
 visible from the ground. The screen could be visible from across the street.
- Mr. Palmquist would like the feature wall to break up the massing of the mechanical screen, or perhaps raise the screen to make it into its own wall. He suggested making the feature wall more of a trapezoidal shape to make it bolder.
- Mr. Palmquist said it was difficult to gauge the view of the roof from a distance. He wanted to see an
 elevation of that roof from the perspective of a resident seeing it from across the campus. He noted
 that some residents feel very strongly about their views of this new building.
- Mr. Palmquist said the feature wall material could go around another side of the elevator inside the building, perhaps creating an L-shaped wall to create more of a magnificent entry piece. Overall, Mr. Palmquist said this project has progressed well and is heading in the right direction. He said the rest of the building was great, but he asked the applicant to improve the entry design.
- If the design could not be bolder at the entry, adding the feature wall material at the knuckles could work. However, Mr. Palmquist would really like that bolder entry piece. He said this was one of the most successful designs the Board has seen with a long, skinny entry area.
- Mr. Nichols said he would like to see how the applicant would be treating the top of the walls. If coping was used, the Board would like to see that material at the next meeting. He said this was a nice-looking project.
- The applicant said he was still looking for some matching colors for the hardy panel presented, but he could bring in some metal coping pieces for the Board to see.
- Mr. Palmquist asked for comments from the public in attendance.

Ms. Crowder- member of the public

- Arielle Crowder asked about the units in the back of the building, and if they were covered with tree shadows.
- The applicant noted that some trees would be lost in the building of this project, but trees would be replanted. In the short term, the units would get lots of daylight, but that amount of light would be reduced as the trees grow. The applicant said this was a heavily forested area.
- The applicant said more details on the landscaping could be provided at the next meeting. Mr. Palmquist said he would like to see those details. Mr. Nichols said he would like to see what specific materials and trees would be used. The Board and applicant thanked each other for their time.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE120002, Valley Furniture

Description: Construction of a 5 – 6 story mixed-use development with approximately 270 units

Location: 8200 – 164th Ave NE

Prior Review Date: 04/05/12, 09/20/12 & 10/04/12

Applicant: Lizabeth Soldano

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

Mr. Lee noted that this was the third meeting on this project. Staff has expressed stern concern to the applicant that it was not supportive of the project, as it continued to use many small gestures that did not answer staff and DRB issues. Since that time, the applicant has worked hard to come up with a new design, which has been distributed at this meeting. Staff has reviewed the new design, and is very much pleased with it. Staff is now in support of this project, but still has a few concerns. Larger windows have been added to the project, with more divisions in the windows. There is a different cladding scheme and different color scheme. Overall, the applicant has addressed many staff concerns and Mr. Lee hoped the applicant would answer the DRB's concerns as well.

Randy Gould with BCRA presented to the DRB on behalf of the applicant. From the last meeting, he determined that there were four points to focus on regarding the design: working on the corner elements, adding division to the windows, getting some texture variation on the building, and changing the canopies and their relation to the sidewalk. The DRB was concerned that at the corner elements, smaller windows were used. The applicant has increased the size of one of the windows and changed the pattern to make it more asymmetrical, which reflects a comment from the Board made at a previous meeting. The larger window is the largest one available from the manufacturer. Due to the layout of the residential unit, there would be a break to separate the rooms, using glazing. On the other corner elements, larger windows have also been added, with more glazing at the corners as well.

The windows along the façade of the building have increased in size by about 35%, and are now three-wide windows with a transom above them. A red accent band of fiber cement panel would be placed at the head of the windows, trimmed with metal. The idea is to get a difference in texture and color at that point. The applicant said the design is now simpler due to this change. Regarding texture, the applicant noted that the last proposal had hardy panel on the face of the building. There is some modulation with the recessing and color changes. However, there was a comment from the DRB to add more texture, possibly at the recessed area. That concept was in the original submittal, but after a conversation with staff, the texture has been brought to the front so that the back end recess is hardy panel now, and the front is metal wrapping into the side of that.

With the canopy, the applicant noted that more banding and vertical elements were suggested at the last meeting with the DRB. The applicant has used a "less is more" approach, as he believes that more banding on the building tended to make it more cluttered. The amount of yellow banding has been reduced, which has helped it stand out more. There is now a top piece and bottom piece around the canopy that frame the middle of the building. The canopy has been raised to create a lighter, more open feel in the lobby area. The canopy material will be a metal frame with glass on top of them to add weather protection and visual interest at the pedestrian scale. The applicant is considering a panel near the entry that simulates a wooden slat look going up the concrete face of the building. That design motif would

continue on the inside, providing some inside to outside connection. That concept would be repeated at the concrete wall, which should help tie the building closer to the entry element.

The DRB had talked about separating the corner element from the rest of the building with some sort of recess, which had been done on one side of the building. Now, that has been proposed on the other side of the building as well. Some of the concrete has been reduced on the storefront area, and columns have been thinned in this area as well. The color of the storefront has changed to a dark, anodized look to give it more punch. Overall, the applicant said the new design answers the concerns of staff and the DRB.

Landscape architect Andy Rasmussen next presented on behalf of the applicant regarding the landscaping on the north side of the building. Mr. Rasmussen said the landscape plan has been refined, but it is pretty much the same as the DRB saw at the last meeting on this project. The landscaping is modular, much like the building units. There is an angled piece of banding that carries through from the lobby out onto the north elevation and east elevation. He showed that there are long, strong bands that cut through and into the fully-landscaped parking strip. Those would be an evergreen material. The base of the building is concrete, which the DRB had some concerns about. However, the applicant likes that material because it is a nice, clean, modern material. To make the design less stark, the applicant is using larger evergreens against the building using a 12 to 18-inch berm. The applicant said that landscaping style would still allow for cantilevered stairs and floating decks. As to the concerns about growing plants underneath a floating deck, the applicant said there was a good opportunity to layer the landscaping in that area and a small void space under the decks could be filled with river rock with a warm tone.

Mr. Gould noted that there were some concerns at the last meeting regarding the color on the north side of the building. Originally, the color was supposed to be gray, but now, a warmer color has been proposed to contrast with a lighter tan color coming down from the deck recesses. Some rhythm in the color has been accomplished with this change.

Mr. Lee said staff liked what the applicant has done. He wanted to make sure the details regarding the recessed area were continued up all three floors of the building on all sides. The applicant indicated those details would indeed be continued, but were not reflected in the current drawings. Mr. Lee asked for new renderings, in color, for the next meeting. Mr. Palmquist wanted to make sure every side was covered, and he said seeing all four corners in a 3-D model might be helpful. Mr. Lee said the parapets would need good, deep returns of about eight feet. He added that the dark windows should be used all the way around the building, not just the bottom level. The applicant said the concern there was the fact that vinyl windows are proposed to be used on much of the project, which were limited in color choices.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Nichols:

- Said that the breaking up of the banding was a great idea and looks good. He likes the mix of textures, including the different metal panels and the vertical and horizontal ribs, which add some great texture and relief to the building.
- Asked about the big canopy at the main retail entry and what was underneath it. The applicant said he was not sure what material would be used, but the idea was to provide something light in dimension and color. The DRB said at the last meeting that this part of the design was too dark.
- Mr. Nichols confirmed that there would be recessed lighting in the soffit at this location as well. The applicant said the canopy would be cantilevered out with internal support only.
- Mr. Nichols asked about the railings. The applicant said they most likely would be powder-coated aluminum. The applicant said the railing pattern has slightly more texture since the last meeting.
- On the landscaping, Mr. Nichols spoke about the corner of 165th and 83rd, which was dense and nice-looking. He asked why the 164th side was simply trees and tree wells. The applicant said that was because this was a retail area. Mr. Lee said that was the standard landscaping for such an area.
- Mr. Nichols asked why the south elevation was pretty bland. The applicant responded that there are buildings in front of this elevation already, and more proposed, and it would be difficult to see.
- Mr. Lee noted that staff had an objection to the flat design on this elevation. The applicant noted that
 concern, but reiterated that the south elevation would be very hard to see from the street.

Mr. Krueger:

- Liked the changes presented to the Board, and said the applicant has listened to the DRB's concerns. He especially liked the way the applicant lightened up the main retail corner.
- Mr. Krueger liked the changes in the horizontal lines and the rhythm of the design. He said that the
 applicant has done a good job in the massing, especially around the mechanical units on the building.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the color scheme, confirming the color of the metal plates and the other
 colors of the building. The applicant said that the building will have different colors depending on the
 angle of the sun.
- Mr. Krueger said the applicant had answered many of the staff concerns on the project. He especially liked the window trim shown in the renderings and the transition between different materials. The applicant said the canopies have been thinned down, as well, which answered another DRB concern. From column to column, separate canopies have been established.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the material on the horizontal part of the canopy. The applicant said it would be some sort of C-channel corrugated metal with a drainage system. He wants to keep that design simple and let the yellow bands above it stand out.
- Metal, not glass, would be used as the main canopy material. The applicant would be concerned
 about using glass due to the residential balconies above the canopies. Overall, Mr. Krueger liked the
 project and the colors presented.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Also liked the color scheme and how it was different than many other projects recently seen by the DRB. He liked the bold, golden color for the banding, but wanted to make sure it was not too bold.
- Mr. Palmquist said it feels like there are three sides to this building and a back, and the back was very
 obvious. He noted that the future development in this area was not on the site yet. Therefore, he said
 this would have to be considered as more of a four-sided building.
- Mr. Palmquist said the back of the building did not have to be as rich as the street side facades, but
 more effort would be needed. He suggested using something other than flat panels on the back
 façade, as it would be separated from any future development by 15 to 20 feet.
- Mr. Palmquist appreciated that not much could be seen from the street right now, but noted that the building behind this site would see the back of this building every day. The concern is not just the view from the street but the view of people in adjacent buildings.
- Mr. Palmquist said he liked more of a random use of the yellow color, and pointed out the back elevation uses yellow for every balcony. The applicant said he could make a change in that pattern and agreed different colors would look better.
- The applicant said there would be some modulation in the decks on the back of the building in terms of how far they extend out. Mr. Palmquist said bringing more rich material to at least one of the step-back areas in the back of the building could improve the design.
- Mr. Palmquist said the interior elevations into the courtyard are not very visible. He would like to see the design continue around the corners a little more. He suggested more work, in general, on the back elevations of the building. He suggested bringing some of the front elements around to the back.
- Mr. Palmquist said the glazing on the corners of the building should not be a limitation for the
 applicant. He suggested putting a storefront window, or something that could turn a corner on the
 building. He recognized that idea would involve a step up in cost.
- The applicant said he was responding to a DRB comment from the last meeting to continue the siding around the main retail corner. Mr. Palmquist said another window could help set apart the retail corners. The applicant said vinyl windows were within the budget, but not a window wall or storefront.
- The applicant said the idea was to make the design as rich as possible, and said it was a big step to add metal siding, which is a cost increase. He noted that there was a DRB concern over vinyl windows, but said that was the material that fit in the budget. He added that in residential units, the use of glazing can be a challenge in trying to fit in a kitchen and other amenities.
- Mr. Palmquist said the glass did not necessarily need to turn the corner. But he noted that, in using vinyl windows, this project feels like it is a step below other similar projects in this general location. The concern would be that this project would not match up well with those other projects.

- Mr. Palmquist said the staff and DRB would be amenable to seeing the metal used at the front of the building spread around all four sides to create a cohesive design. The applicant said that would be possible.
- Overall, Mr. Palmquist said the front and side elevations have a lot going on and are headed in the right direction, but the entire design picture needs to be completed on the back.
- Mr. Lee pointed out the canopy would be corrugated metal, and wanted to make sure that heavygauge metal would be used.
- Mr. Lee said staff would be comfortable with this project coming back for an approval, in light of the comments at this meeting. Mr. Palmquist agreed, and said the application could show the detail of bringing a better design to the back of the building.
- The applicant said he was confident he could make that work. Mr. Lee noted that conditions of approval could be placed on the project at that point if there were any lingering concerns.

Mr. Sutton – a member of the public

- Asked about the lobby and how it would be structured. The applicant said it was a generous lobby with a lot of activity inside. It has a four-foot level change that would be enhanced with wood and a connection to the courtyard.
- The applicant said the lobby would be a central location for the residents of the building and would help tie together the inside and outside of the building.
- Mr. Sutton asked about the ceiling inside the lobby. The applicant said the interior design was not complete. Mr. Sutton noted that if the ceiling dropped down any significant distance, some spandrel glass might need to be added to the rendering. The applicant said he had been reviewing that possibility.
- Mr. Sutton wanted to make sure that the applicant would be able to accomplish the design presented at this meeting.

Ms. Crowder – a member of the public

- Asked if any sustainable efforts were involved in this building. The applicant said that all the current energy codes and zoning requirements would be met, which he felt were stringent.
- The applicant is not shooting for a LEED certification, but the site would be close to a LEED Silver level simply by following the code requirements.
- Mr. Lee asked for more details on the wood material presented on the site at the next meeting. The
 applicant said the material would most likely be a laminated wood similar to the Trespa brand
 product. The applicant and the DRB thanked each other for their time.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:45 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (3-0).

December 20, 2012	
MINUTES APPROVED ON	RECORDING SECRETARY