

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

June 20, 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, Craig Krueger, Mike Nichols, Kevin Sutton, and Scott Waggoner

**EXCUSED ABSENCE:** Arielle Crowder

**STAFF PRESENT:** Steven Fischer, Principal 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 David Scott Meade at 7:04 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2013 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (6-0).**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE APRIL 18, 2013 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (5-0) WITH ONE ABSTENTION.**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2013 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (4-0) WITH TWO ABSTENTIONS.**

**PRESENTATION**

Mr. Thomas Hitzroth of the City of Redmond Landmark Commission told the DRB that he had a meeting on May 29<sup>th</sup> in the Mayor's office where the boards and commissions talked about their yearly dinner. The City says the cost of this event has increased but the attendance has decreased. The Mayor is hoping to make this event more effective and still get the same benefit out of it, and he is looking for ideas to accomplish that. Some ideas include changing the time of year the event is held, holding the event during Derby Days, or having a meeting at the Marriott Hotel. The general sense was to have a reception of some kind where a sit-down dinner was not necessarily needed. The Mayor is looking for some input on this matter, and Mr. Hitzroth said that if the DRB members had any ideas, he would forward them to the Mayor. Mr. Hitzroth also noted that, at that meeting, the idea was discussed of having the commission chairs meet every six months so that the commissions can share what they are doing. Mr. Hitzroth asked for information on this topic by next Wednesday from the DRB.

Mr. Hitzroth continued that Kim Dietz, from the Planning Department, sent the DRB members a note about the Historic Preservations Programs Strategic Plan, a 42-page document. He really wanted input from the DRB members on this document. He asked the DRB to pay particular attention to Chapter 2, and specifically Section 2.3, which states the goals, objectives and actions of historic preservation. He asked for input by July 14<sup>th</sup>. The staff and volunteers working on this project want to do it well, he noted, and he urged the DRB members to give their feedback on this topic soon. The DRB thanked Mr. Hitzroth for his time.

## **PRE-APPLICATION**

### **LAND-2013-00203, Redmond Multi-family**

**Description:** Development of a four-story, 120 unit multi-family residential building with parking

**Location:** 8324 165<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, 8301 166<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, 8323 166<sup>th</sup> Ave NE and 8345 166<sup>th</sup> Ave NE

**Applicant:** Reed Kelly *with* DRK Development, Inc.

**Prior Review Date:** 03/21/13 and 05/05/13

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

Mr. Lee noted that this was the third pre-application meeting on this project. The staff says the applicant has addressed a lot of the issues that the DRB raised at its last meeting. One change is that the applicant has now provided three rounded corner elements. Staff likes those elements, but says that the northwest corner on 166<sup>th</sup> might need to be toned down by leaving it square, especially because the building height has been raised on that corner. Staff is also suggesting that, if the applicant does keep the corners, those could be clad with shingles to make them more different and more residential. Staff further suggested that the new entry presented by the applicant at 83<sup>rd</sup>, on the southwest corner, should be raised off the grade of the sidewalk. There are steps inside the building, but if the applicant raises the stoop up, that would make the entry more prominent at the street so as to allow for a view over the street. Mr. Lee said the applicant has come a long way and staff likes the direction this project is going. He said this project could be ready for an application. Mr. Krueger asked about the extra height allowed on the project. Mr. Lee said that would be allowed through TDR's or the use of affordable housing credits.

Kent Smutny, architect on the project, spoke to the DRB on behalf of the applicant. He noted that, with the extra height on the north end of project, twelve units have been added to that portion of the site. The rest of the project would still be four stories, as presented before. Mr. Smutny noted that most of the discussion with the DRB at the last meeting dealt with the corners of the building, the development of the space between the building and the sidewalk, the entrance on the west side of the project, and the roof slope.

The applicant said he landed back at a barrel shape for the corners, which has been used as a unifying element. Beforehand, the project had heavy window trim and all the openings looked the same. Now, a base, middle, and cap have been created through the window openings. Brick and a cap to the barrel have been added as well. The applicant has also developed the space between the sidewalk and the building. Before, there was a continuous wall at the back of the sidewalk. That has been broken up in the new design, and the wall has been pushed back further. Landscaping now occurs at the sidewalk level and steps up in various areas. The applicant has taken the DRB's suggestion of grouping the stairs that go up to the porches, which reduces hardscape area and increases landscaping. All the porch stairs now are perpendicular to the sidewalk and create a more traditional stoop look.

The applicant has designed some differences in the bays in the center buildings versus the end buildings. At the last meeting, the DRB said the applicant should be less timid in differentiating the openings. The larger openings have more transparency at the corner building. The end buildings have more traditional openings. The applicant showed the barrel vault at 83<sup>rd</sup> and 165<sup>th</sup>, which was previously an octagonal bay. He said that barrel look provides a good anchor to that corner of the building. Just off the corner, on the west side, is the entrance added to this end of the building, facing downtown.

The DRB had commented about the service area on the site, and the applicant has reduced the blank walls in that area. Windows have been added to the upper portion and a canopy has been brought across to minimize the utilitarian garage door opening. On the north side of the service area, the entrance to the parking structure has been moved to add some landscape between the building and the ramp that goes into the parking structure as a way to add screening. The vehicle entrance has been defined with columns in the new design. The applicant has improved access for the outdoor courtyard. Before, the design called for a straight sidewalk to place people on the courtyard. Now, the applicant has created a serpentine path to soften that access point.

The northeast corner, previously, had been simply faceted. Now, the barrel element has been added. Also, in the five-story portion of the building that is here, the applicant has added trellis elements between

the fourth and fifth floors. The color has been changed to a lighter color at the top floor to help the fifth story recede from the rest of the mass of the building. The fifth floor thus acts like a cap to the building.

As regards the roof, the applicant went back to the site and shot pictures from every location where the site is visible. The most prominent view towards the site is on 166<sup>th</sup>, heading up Education Hill. The view of roof from that hill will be very well defined. The applicant said a sloped roof did not seem like a big deal when one is up close to the building, but further back, it will be prominent. That is why the applicant is calling for a sloped roof. Mr. Meade asked about a nearby building, which Mr. Lee identified as the BonTerra, which does have a sloped roof. Mr. Meade asked about the old Redmond schoolhouse, which has a flat roof. Mr. Lee said that project was not residential, but Mr. Meade said it was across the street. Mr. Lee said the design standards the applicant is working under reflect the area he is working in, the Perrigo Plat sub-area, between 166<sup>th</sup> and 164<sup>th</sup>. The schoolhouse is located outside of that sub-area.

At 83<sup>rd</sup> and 166<sup>th</sup>, the applicant has taken the entrance and separated out the steps. Before, there was a continuous set of steps from the sidewalk to the front door. That has been broken up to better transition the change in elevation between the street and the lobby. The landscape now, at sidewalk level, is quite extensive. The landscape walls are now block walls in the new design. The entrance on the west side formerly had a squared-off wall. Now, the entrance echoes the form of the barrel at the corner, which allows for much more room for landscaping. The main sign for the building would be set back from 83<sup>rd</sup> and 165<sup>th</sup>, at that would have landscaping surrounding it, as well. On the 166<sup>th</sup> side, the applicant showed a pedestrian's-eye view of the site.

The building floor plan calls for three entrance points, one getting into the lobby and amenity space and the outdoor common area. The entrance to the west brings a person into the circulation system for the building. The additional access point on the west goes straight to the courtyard. In order to accommodate the additional twelve units, the applicant has increased the size of the lowest parking level to have the same footprint as the upper parking level. That keeps the applicant above the required parking ratio of 1.25 stalls per unit. Additional units have been tied into the amenity space. The sloped roofs are very evident on the ends of the building. As regards color choices, the applicant showed the DRB a color board to show the colors of the brick, CMU, and paint on the building bays.

Jason Anderson, landscape architect, next spoke to the DRB on behalf of the applicant. He noted that some changes have been made in response to the work Mr. Smutny has done. On the corners, there is a highlight element of a sweet gum, with heather and other ground cover added. Grass and maple trees run along the streets. The applicant said he was struck with a very native plant palette, in accordance to City of Redmond Code. The DRB had suggested, at the last meeting, that more privacy should be offered for the residences. Thus, the plantings have been changed to golden bamboo, which gets to four to six feet, which will offer a little privacy to residences. There is a pet area in the courtyard with artificial turf. Along the north and east property lines, there is still a noise reduction barrier. Some of the entrances have been highlighted with some cherries that will not interfere with cars, but should still give a nice color with a vertical element.

Between the buildings, evergreen native shrubs have been added which can do well in partial shade. More plantings have been placed closer to the building which should not interfere with the windows. In some areas, the planting is really tight, and thus, some non-invasive Boston ivy has been called for to soften some of the edges on the wall. The rooftop has basically stayed the same in terms of landscaping, including a trellis, fire pit, and eye-level plantings to block the view of the sloped roof. Mr. Meade asked anyone in the audience if they wanted to comment. No one came forward.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

##### Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about Mr. Lee's suggestion to raise the west entry to make it not a flat entry. The applicant said the idea was to keep this entry as far away from the adjacent units as possible and create as much vertical separation as possible. Mr. Krueger noted that Mr. Lee's suggestion would not raise the entry too high.

- Mr. Krueger said he appreciated the work the applicant has put into this project. He said it was a big change from what the DRB saw before. He liked the richer colors and the new bay designs, as well as the landscaping and the addressing of the street. He thanked the applicant for listening and responding to the DRB's concerns.
- Mr. Krueger asked about what he perceived as a mix of surface patterns, including flat panels in the size of six-inch and ten-inch bands. The applicant said he was looking at using the panel on the bays on the end buildings.
- The primary material is plank siding, with a plan for a wider exposure at the top level to create less shadowing and a lighter appearance. The closer exposures give a heavier feeling, the applicant said. Thus, a lighter feeling will be seen at the top of the building with a heavier feeling to the middle and base of the building.
- Mr. Krueger said different materials could create different textures.
- He said he did not have a problem with the barrel look on the northeast corner, and noted it was an improvement over the previous design. He asked the applicant what he thought of Mr. Lee's idea to add a shingle look to the barrels.
- The applicant said the shingles would work well on that form. He was considering playing between the panel and plank siding, but he said the shingles could very much in place on the barrels.
- Mr. Krueger said that flat panels on the bays stick out, and noticed some trim with horizontal and vertical lines around the windows. He asked what the pattern was for. The applicant said the heavier horizontal line is a trim pattern.
- The vertical shows the size limitations of the hardy panel. That limitation means some seams must be added. Narrower battens are used, but breaks have to be included.
- Mr. Krueger asked how residents, internally, would access the courtyard. The applicant said that access would be provided through the fitness area. The common area is at the knuckle section of the building. The other stairs at the north and west ends would offer some alternative access out of the building, but the applicant said this is more of a fire exit.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the low-pitched hipped roof proposed at the north and west ends. He did not have a problem with that roof. He asked if the hip would come down and extend into a flat roof over the bays. The applicant said the bays would have a small hip in their roofs, too.

Mr. Sutton:

- Seconded Mr. Krueger's opinion that this project has come a long way.
- Mr. Sutton is still having a hard time with the corner elements, especially the southwest and northeast, especially with how the curved form would tie into the roof. He was okay with the projection pieces of the roof.
- He liked the secondary entrance displayed, which was down lower, making a distinction between the residences and the main entry, and he would not change that.
- For Mr. Sutton, his main concern was how the corners would tie into the rest of the building. The corners feel tacked on, as it appears now. The applicant said he was looking for an element to highlight the corners, as opposed to simply squaring them off.
- The applicant continued that the Perrigo sub-area plan calls for traditional elements, which led him to consider less modern designs. That is how he arrived at the idea of the barrels.
- Mr. Sutton asked if the barrel could be less bumped out. The applicant said that would present a square footage issue. The applicant is trying to take advantage of the allowance that lets a building have bays as an element that project into the setback at the street.
- Overall, Mr. Sutton said he was happy with the direction of the project, but he had a personal problem with the corner elements.

Mr. Nichols:

- Confirmed that the artificial turf is only at the pet area.
- Mr. Nichols said the project has evolved very well and looks like it is in great shape. He liked what the applicant had done with the landscaping, especially in the area between the building and the sidewalk and in the area next to the garage.
- He did not mind the hipped roof, and said the project overall looked good.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Said the project has improved, and really liked the stoops and shared stairways. He liked the layering of the lower planting walls and the rise up to the entry doors. The look is now classic and historical, and has turned into a good treatment of the difference in height between the sidewalk and first floor.
- Mr. Waggoner said that he had the same thoughts as Mr. Sutton regarding the corners. He said the corner elements appear to be stuck on to the project and are not well resolved architecturally.
- Mr. Waggoner asked if the corners might be better resolved with a full circle of a trim ring or a flying beam at the top that would tie back in rather than creating a wedge-like look.
- He suggested making the corner either not as high or significantly higher rather than just having them blend into the ridge line of the hips that come down from the roof.
- Mr. Waggoner said, however, that the window treatments, articulation, and siding have been improved. He agreed with Mr. Lee that if the curved corner was included, some siding there such as shingles would be most appropriate, perhaps with the addition of some vertical lines.
- The applicant said some hardy panel and lap siding was the original plan, bent on site to be attached to the curved wall. Mr. Meade said between the windows, the hardy panel would not be able to bend. Mr. Meade said shingle would work best around the radius, fairly seamlessly. The applicant said shingle would be a good solution.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Agreed this project has incorporated a lot of the DRB's comments and has come a long way. Mr. Palmquist said the transition to the street is working well around the building thanks to some good landscaping.
- He said the buildings have been broken up well, with different design languages used. He encouraged the applicant to keep looking at those different languages as the final design revisions are considered.
- Mr. Palmquist said the top of the rounded elements need to fit in with the rest of the building, but he was not sure how to resolve it. Mr. Waggoner's suggestion to continue a rounded element to cover the patios next to it could be an option.
- The applicant said there was difference in the southeast corner, which continues back before it cuts back in. The other corners cut back at the end of the radius, which creates a different feeling. Mr. Palmquist said this rounded element was the spot where the applicant should spend the most design energy.
- Mr. Palmquist noted that corner elements are tough, and said that the applicant has done a good job with 90% of the design. Some minor tweaks to the tops of the corners could provide a solution. He said, all things considered, these corner elements had been well done.
- He agreed that shingles would be the best option for covering the rounded elements, as suggested by Mr. Lee.
- Mr. Palmquist said that, echoing Mr. Sutton, the secondary entrance can stay on the ground because it is such a minor entrance compared to the grand entrance on the corner. If it were to be higher, the current element of the canopy could provide some separation between the entry and the units.

Mr. Meade:

- Said he would chime in on the corner elements and that everything else was looking fine. Mr. Meade asked if a canopy or wall-mounted trellis could be installed below the lower level of windows to add more of a residential feeling. The applicant said he could consider that, and has a similar element elsewhere on the site.
- Mr. Meade said a trellis of sorts between the first and second floors could add more pedestrian scale to the elevation and could be added at each of the corner elements.
- He said the corners, as Mr. Waggoner suggested, could be taller and might be resolved in that way. The applicant could have more fun with that roof form depending on height limits. Mr. Meade said the main entrance could benefit from additional height, to give it more prominence.
- He said that design change might allow for more of a roof cap, with trim happening in that area that would build it up rather than simply adding more siding. He said the entrance should be elevated to give it more of a visual draw. The applicant said that made sense.
- Mr. Lee asked if the DRB was comfortable with this project moving to the application phase. Mr. Meade said that was indeed the feeling of the DRB. He asked about the brick to be used on the site. The applicant said it would be a regular-sized brick.

- Mr. Meade asked about the window frame. The applicant said it would be a white vinyl product. Mr. Meade asked about trim around the windows. The applicant said there was trim on the end buildings, but the design on the corner building has been simplified. Mr. Palmquist noted that this idea fits with the idea of using different design languages on the different buildings.
- Mr. Meade said this project could come back again for an approval. The applicant thanked the DRB members for their time.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. NICHOLS AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:07 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (6-0).**

**August 1, 2013**  
**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

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