

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

April 18, 2013

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, Kevin Sutton, Craig Krueger, Scott Waggoner, Arielle Crowder (arrived late)

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Mike Nichols

STAFF PRESENT: Steven Fischer, Principle Planner; Dennis Lisk, 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 Chair David Scott Meade at 7:04 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2013 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).

PROJECT REVIEW

L120411, Redmond Value Village

Description: Modification to previously approved plans

Location: 16771 Redmond Way

Prior Review Date: 11/15/12

Architect: Jim Wieben with DDG Architects, LLC

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

Mr. Lee noted that this project was before the DRB previously and was approved. The applicant has come in recently with a building permit and stated he was over budget. The applicant has come back with some modifications that need approval from the Board. The materials are the same, but the finish details are slightly different. One of the biggest differences is the design of the corner piece at the top of the entries and marquee signs. Staff has reviewed the plans and worked with the applicant to bring them up to an acceptable design level. Staff is recommending approval.

Architect Jim Wieben spoke on behalf of the applicant. He said he has been the project manager on the remodel since the first approval from the DRB. After a bidding process with contractors, the project came in significantly over budget. Mr. Wieben was tasked to find ways to do the project without losing the design that was previously approved. The idea is to keep the modifications minor in nature, which is a difficult task. The primary cost driver on the overruns were the two most prominent elements, the large feature in front of the entrance to Value Village and the large steel feature in front of Building 2. The applicant took several approaches to solve these financial problems, including a proposal to delete the aforementioned design elements altogether and create a different façade. The applicant, after talking to City staff, came to a realization that some sort of feature was needed at the entry to accomplish the original design that was approved by the DRB.

The applicant has tried to stay with the steel feature, but has scaled it back in size. The original design called for a structure 30-some feet high and 25 feet in depth in front of Value Village. There were other

well-designed features in other places along the façade at the corner by Redmond Way, at the entrance to the FedEx building and on the south side of FedEx. The applicant is proposing to modify that general design scheme into something that would serve as a larger design element. Mr. Wieben showed the DRB before and after pictures. The new entry design has a smaller roof, which still extends back over the main roof of the building, but not to the extent that it requires four points of support. The tapered columns that were a central part of the design have been retained. The structure that was presented originally has simply been scaled down to make it more affordable.

Besides the steel elements at the corners of Buildings 1 and 2, another cost-driving change is the copper-colored cement panels that were proposed with spacing at approximately 12 inches on center. With each of those pieces being cut by hand, that would be very labor intensive. Each of the joints has aluminum extrusions for flashings, which are also expensive. The applicant has sought cost reductions by reducing the spacing to 24 inches on center, which has reduced the expense by half. The applicant believes this is a change for the positive, not just a cost savings, because the design looks less cluttered and accentuates the lines nicely. The metal band proposed in the first design has been reduced in terms of width. The previous design required one full sheet of metal and then a strip of about twelve inches off of another sheet to accomplish the dimension. The proportions have been reduced such that a full sheet could be used without wasting a part of another one. The colors and materials have not been changed.

The arches on one of the buildings have been changed in three locations in response to the new design proposal. The applicant has left the one arch facing Redmond Way. The other two now have a flat parapet that the applicant believes brings together both sides of the building. The second building on the project had a three-foot projection with an arch above it. The new proposal steps up that projection only one foot with an arch on top of it as well. The applicant said this appeared to be a positive step as well and not just a cost reduction, in that the corners, previously, were simply massive without any design support. The lower height still creates a good effect with the arches without the size. The depth of the return varies a bit, generally, for structural considerations. The applicant said the smallest return is five and a half feet. The others are six to six and a half feet. The depth of the return is a function of the structural support underneath the wall.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Meade:

- Asked about the entry arch, and if it returned back to the building at all. The applicant said the top of it had a depth of eight feet, whereas the original was upwards of thirty feet and had four columns supporting it. The arch is a free-standing element.
- Mr. Meade asked if the applicant could fill in the top area around this arch, similar to what was shown at the FedEx building, where the void behind the sign is filled. The applicant said that would be tough at Value Village due to a 90-degree corner on the existing building and 45-degree columns. There is nothing in place to bring the façade out to the sign, which is substantially in front of the building.

Mr. Sutton:

- Said he liked the current design better than what he had seen before, in that it does not appear as heavy. He agreed with the applicant that the larger panel spacing is an improvement, as well.
- Mr. Sutton said he was okay with the arch design.

Ms. Crowder:

- Apologized for arriving late. She asked what the material was below the cement panel. The applicant said that would be a pre-finished metal panel with a box-rib design. He noted that that material and the colors have not changed from the original.
- Ms. Crowder said she liked the variation of the colors on the project. She did not find the free-standing nature of the arch design to be a bother. She thought that the arch design provided some good variation.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Said the original design of the sign with the arch almost seemed like it wanted to be a free-standing element. He said this new design is an improvement.

- Mr. Palmquist said the other changes, such as the panel spacing, seemed to make sense to him. That spacing could go as far as 48 inches, if needed. He said he was in favor of the changes.

Mr. Krueger:

- Said he was good with the new design. He said the proportions seem more appropriate for the building in comparison to what was approved originally. He liked the plan to scale down the corner where the Verizon store used to be.
- Overall, Mr. Krueger said the design fits in well with the building.
- On Building 2, he asked about the east and south elevations and if the only change was the fact that the larger structures were no longer depicted. The applicant explained that this was simply an issue of the graphic representation, and no changes were going to happen in those areas.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the side of the building that faces the trail corridor, and if there were any changes to this façade. The applicant said the only difference would be the lower parapets he discussed earlier.
- Mr. Krueger said he liked the larger panel spacing and thanked the applicant for his work.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Said the new design is better, simpler, cleaner, and less fussy on the details. He said removing some of the curved and bowed elements give it a more straightforward look.
- Mr. Waggoner said the project was good to go.

Mr. Meade:

- Liked the arch design better than the last one, but was still not crazy about it.
- However, he said the proposal is a massive improvement over the existing design, and he did not have any great ideas on how to make the arch bigger without making it bulkier.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST, AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER, TO APPROVE L120411, REDMOND VALUE VILLAGE REMODEL, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. **A DETAILED LANDSCAPE PLAN, INCLUDING SIZE AND TYPE OF PLANT MATERIAL TO BE PLANTED, SHALL BE SUBMITTED WITH THE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION, WHICH SHALL BE CONSISTENT WITH THE PLANT MATERIALS AND DESIGN THEME OF THE REDMOND CENTRAL CONNECTOR PLANS. THESE PLANS SHALL BE REVIEWED BY AND APPROVED BY PLANNING STAFF.**
2. **CONSTRUCTION DETAILS FOR THE TRASH ENCLOSURE SHALL BE SUBMITTED WITH THE BUILDING PERMITS FOR THE PROJECT AND SHALL NOT INCLUDE CHAIN LINK FENCE WITH SLATS, BUT MORE VISUALLY SOLID MATERIALS THAT ARE DESIGNED TO BE COMPLEMENTARY TO THE BUILDING. THESE DETAILS SHALL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY PLANNING STAFF.**
3. **THE STANDARD PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES CONDITION SHALL APPLY.**

MOTION APPROVED (6-0).

PROJECT REVIEW

LAND-2013-00178, 18300 NE Union Hill Road Garage

Description: Construction of a new multi-story parking garage to service an existing office park containing multiple buildings. Project is adjacent to Bear Creek.

Location: 18300 NE Union Hill Road

Architect: Brent Rogers *with* NBBJ

Applicant: Shawn Mahoney *with* OAC Services

Prior Review Date: 02/07/13 and 03/21/13

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

Mr. Lisk said this was a multi-story parking garage on an existing office park off of Union Hill Road. The garage would be to the rear of a couple of buildings and to the south of the shoreline buffer area for Bear

and Evans Creeks. The garage would have about 312 net new parking places onsite, which staff believes would provide a great service to the users of the office park. The applicant has been to the Board for two pre-applications previously and has made some revisions during that process. At the last meeting, there was some discussion about the roof covering for one of the stair towers, and Mr. Lisk said the applicant could discuss that issue. Planning staff and the Technical Committee have reviewed this application, and both have recommended approval pending the standard presentation materials inconsistencies condition.

Architect Brent Rogers with NBBJ presented on behalf of the applicant. He noted that the site plan and landscape plans are virtually the same as what the DRB has seen before. Comments the Board made on lighting at the first pre-application meeting have been addressed, and the lighting plan has not changed either. The goal is to focus light inward to the parking garage. The applicant presented a materials board to the DRB as well as elevations and the proposed colors. The materials for the elevator shaft are still under discussion, and may end up being concrete or CMU. A metal screen would go around the elevator shaft. Either translucent glass or cellular polyethylene material would be used for the cover for the stairs. A landscape screen would go in front of the garage to break down the massing. A poured in place concrete structural system and walls would be placed around the parking garage ramps. Steel stairs with a wire mesh railing system would be installed, with a concrete or CMU tower. A natural color concrete would be used, though the applicant was unclear if an acid etch would be used. A range of translucent materials would be used for the canopy surrounding the parking garage and the lids of the stairways, providing a glowing lantern effect for the project and a way for people to find where they are going.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about form liner for the concrete and what that would look like. The applicant said the liner looks like wide-wale corduroy that breaks down the texture of the concrete. The form liner would give some shadow and rich pattern to the concrete without being a big, bold statement.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the mesh materials and the form liner elements and at what point the applicant would decide how and when these materials would be used together.
- The applicant said the form liners would be used as the budget would allow. The same is true for the wire mesh. The applicant is still trying to figure out what exact type of mesh would be used, but a straight, simple material would be the preferred alternative.
- Mr. Krueger said the applicant had done a good job responding to the comments from the Board, and he was sure the project would look great. He liked the materials presented.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Asked about the lighting and if there would be any exterior lighting or accent lighting. The applicant said the exterior lighting would be very low-scale, with an emphasis on pedestrian safety. The lid of the garage would be lit, but would have sharp cutoffs to prevent light spill. Neither the garage facades nor the landscaping would be lit.
- Mr. Waggoner appreciated the simple, straightforward use of materials on the project. He liked the clean, crisp look of the project.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Said he liked the project, and had no other comments.

Ms. Crowder:

- Said the project looked good, and said she favors the large scale mesh.

Mr. Sutton:

- Also liked the larger mesh to align with the scale of the building. Mr. Sutton said the project looked good overall.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked about how the applicant would capture the expanded steel in a hem or how it would look. The applicant said there would be no raw edges of wild, cut metal.

- The applicant said the idea is to finesse the edge detail such that it is clean and protected, with an eye toward beautiful simplicity.
- Mr. Meade likes the expanded steel option for the mesh so that it could be a permeable visual barrier. The smaller steel would create a framework rather than a highlight piece in front.
- Mr. Meade said the Board could trust the applicant to pick a proper form liner. He said the building would age naturally.
- Mr. Meade asked about the vines that would climb the towers. The applicant said the vines would be Boston ivy, which would provide a seasonal transition, a change in color, and aggressive growth.
- The landscape architect on the project said the ivy would grow about five to seven feet a year. The vines would be three feet tall to start and would be planted five feet on center, so they should grow quite fast. An irrigation system would be in place to water the vines.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO APPROVE LAND-2013-00178, 18300 NE UNION HILL ROAD GARAGE, AS PRESENTED, WITH THE STANDARD PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES CONDITION. MOTION APPROVED (6-0).

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:45 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (6-0).

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY