

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

October 3, 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, Craig Krueger, Mike Nichols, Kevin Sutton, Scott Waggoner

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Joe Palmquist, Arielle Crowder

STAFF PRESENT: Steven Fischer, Principal 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 Chair David Scott Meade at 7:02 p.m.

MEETING MINUTES

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 22, 2013 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (4-0) WITH ONE ABSTENTION.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SUTTON AND SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2013 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (4-0) WITH ONE ABSTENTION.

PROJECT REVIEW

LAND-2013-01656, ICOR

Description: Proposal to modify exterior building and add a second floor on the west side, matching height of the existing north wall

Location: 18080 NE 68th Street

Applicant: Muhannad Attili *with* Attili Design & Engineering, Inc.

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

Ms. Johnson said the Islamic Center described in this project is located at 180th Avenue and NE 68th Street in Southeast Redmond. It is surrounded by, primarily, manufacturing uses and was approved as a religious facility in 2010. In that year, the applicant modified an existing warehouse building that was about 10,000 square feet under a tenant improvement. There were minor modifications to the exterior that did not come through DRB approval. The site also has about 105 parking spaces. Currently, the applicant is proposing to add a second floor on the west side of the building, which would be included in the existing building envelope. The height of the structure will increase approximately two feet near the south end of the building, which meets the required height in the MP zone. The applicant is also proposing the addition of two skylights and adding CMU block along all the garage door openings. The CMU block would match the existing color and shape of the current building.

Muhannad Attili, the applicant, presented to the board on behalf of the ICOR project, which he called a Phase 2 tenant improvement. The building is about 10,500 square feet. In the first phase, about a third of that space was worked on. Now, the second phase is in process. The applicant is proposing to add a second floor on the west side. The applicant showed the DRB an illustration of the building, noting that the second floor would be about 24 feet into the building and would go up about two feet, thus matching

the height of the parapet in the back. On the east side of the building, the applicant showed the DRB the color of the CMU and how it would match the rest of the building. On the west side, the applicant showed the DRB how the height would match the parapet on the north wall. The applicant said there would not be many changes to the building with the proposed changes. The main idea was to match color, pattern, and height.

The site plan showed the improvements of Phase 1 and the proposed Phase 2. On the site, the landscaping has been completed and water lines and alarm systems have been installed. Those items have already been approved. There are two skylights. One is about 20 feet in diameter. The second one is about 14 feet in diameter. The applicant said the shallowest skylight he could use while remaining structurally sound would be about three feet in depth. The larger skylight would extend about a foot above the line of the roof. The smaller one would match the roof line. The applicant said he was trying to minimize the effect of the skylight on the building. The second story would be in the envelope of the building, and the new addition would be, basically, a two-foot wall on the building. CMU blocks would be used around the garage. The applicant provided a sample of the CMU. One type of block would be smooth, and another would be rough-faced. The same three colors of white, tan, and blue would be used for the bottom wall, the top, and the downspout area.

The applicant said his proposed project should blend in with the existing building and should not have a major effect on the shape of the building or its look. The skylight, in the future, may be revised. The main idea now is to provide some sunlight into the building. The applicant showed a comparison between the existing design and the new design. He said CMU would be best used on the front elevation instead of wood because it would be more structurally sound and would match the existing building. The applicant said the garages on the project have had stucco on them. He is proposing to use CMU, which he believes has a better look and matches the existing building. On the main floor, the applicant showed where the second story would come in. That story would serve as a classroom. The roof additions will be made of wood and will accommodate two skylights. Overall, the applicant said the changes he was proposing would not have a dramatic effect on the building and should improve the look of the building.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Meade:

- Asked if there was any public comment, as there were many people in the audience. Seeing none, he asked Mr. Sutton for his comments.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked the treatment over the top of some new double doors that appear to have been proposed. The applicant said there would be two double doors. He said the header would be a concrete beam. The door itself would be recessed into that opening.
- Mr. Sutton said the elevation appeared to be of rough stone. The applicant said that stone would be taken out. In a previous design, there was a stone arc on top of the doors, and that was removed.
- Mr. Sutton asked about the finish on the two feet that are being added as the second story. The applicant said it was the same finish as the existing building below it.

Mr. Nichols:

- Asked about the material on the base of the skylight. The applicant said that base would be wood, and would have flashing added around it. Mr. Nichols confirmed it would be a roof curb.
- Mr. Nichols asked if the block to be installed would be painted. The applicant said that was the case, and the painting would match the existing finishes on the building.
- Mr. Nichols said the second building adds some asymmetry to the overall building, which does throw it off a bit. However, in the building's location, he did not think that made a big difference. Aesthetically, he said the building would look much different than the way it looks now from the parking lot.
- He asked if the existing light fixtures would be going away. The applicant said the light fixtures would be the same as before, with probably a little more lighting. Mr. Nichols wanted to make sure there was adequate lighting throughout the site.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Asked about the colors shown on the 3-D rendering. The applicant clarified where the white, tan, and blue colors of CMU would be used to match the current conditions.
- Mr. Waggoner confirmed that the parapet would be the same color as the part of the building it is next to. He said the extension of the parapet accentuates where the pilasters are at the quarter points along the elevation.
- The applicant said that part of the design could be stepped down, possibly. He noted that in Phase 3, the same extension would happen on the other to make it look the same to match it up. He said the building could look more like a castle than have simply a straight edge.
- Mr. Waggoner said the castle look might not be the best choice. He asked about how far off Phase 3 would be. The applicant said that would probably be next year.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked if the west end addition would involve adding some windows. The applicant said windows would be added, and would match the rest of the building.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the parapet, and confirmed the additions around it would be the same material and color as the existing material on the building.
- Mr. Meade asked if the building were up for an approval, and asked the DRB members for a motion.
- Ms. Johnson noted that the applicant's modified elevations would need to be provided to staff as an additional condition.
- Mr. Fischer said the motion could be an approval for the modifications proposed and the elevations proposed at tonight's meeting. The applicant could apply that to the building permit and move forward.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SUTTON AND SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS TO APPROVE LAND-2013-01656, ICOR, WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE DESIGN MATCH PRESENTED AT TONIGHT'S MEETING. THE STANDARD INCONSISTENCIES CONDITIONS WILL ALSO APPLY. ANY OTHER DETAILS WILL BE WORKED OUT WITH STAFF. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).

PROJECT REVIEW

LAND-2013-00203, Echelon

Description: 5-story, 120 unit, multi-family residential building

Location: 8324 165th Ave NE, 8301 166th Ave NE, 8323 166th Ave NE & 8345 166th Ave NE

Architect: Kent Smutny *with* Veer Architecture

Applicant: Reed Kelley with DRK Development, Inc.

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

Mr. Lee said this project had been presented to the DRB under another name previously as Redmond Multi-Family. This project has been before the Board three times and is now ready for approval. This project is kitty-corner from the Valley Furniture project site behind the 7-11. Minor suggestions were recommended in the past meetings, including putting some shingles on the barrel elements and perhaps extending the roof at the corners. The applicant has done those things, and staff is recommending approval.

Architect Kent Smutny presented to the DRB on behalf of the applicant. He showed the DRB the final elevations for site plan entitlement. The main change has been made to the barrels in response to the DRB's comments at the last meeting. The applicant showed the DRB some before and after perspective views. The main corner of the building shows the change in the material on the barrels from lap siding to shingle. That has happened on all three corners where there are barrels. One barrel has been raised such that it is the same height as the bays on either side of it. The barrels on the southwest and northeast corner have been extended further. The radius has not been changed, but those barrels have been wrapped a bit further to make them less wedge-like in appearance. There are five windows across on the elevation, as opposed to the narrow shape proposed before that only accommodated four windows. The north end of the building has the same treatment, with a barrel that is wider in appearance and less wedge-like. The plans are the same other than the profiles of the barrels.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the west elevation and asked why the entry was not raised, as Mr. Lee had suggested. The applicant said that was discussed, but he said to raise that would put the door closer to the residential unit above, which could present a conflict.
- Mr. Krueger asked about a white element he saw near that entry. The applicant confirmed it was a door, and said its white color was merely an oversight in the design drawings. He said the door would be one of the lighter earth tone colors to make it fade away.
- Mr. Krueger asked if he saw a green color in the upper building on the right side. The applicant said that color was more taupe than green. Mr. Krueger said the DRB liked the color palette presented by the applicant. He wanted to make sure some color was added, such that it was not just earth tones.
- Mr. Krueger said he liked the project, but did not know how the barrels would work at the ends. He did not know how they would look from a diagonal perspective. He liked the shingled look of the barrels and how they were expanded but he was still a little concerned about them.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Said he had missed some meetings on this project, but shared Mr. Krueger's curiosity about the corner barrel elements. He said the curved corners do not seem to fit in with the rest of the design of the project. The cutoff of the barrel at the top, with a return at a 90-degree corner, would perhaps be better served with a rounded element, or perhaps a hexagonal bay.
- Mr. Waggoner said he might have a personal problem with the barrel design. Overall, he said the composition of the whole project has been settled. He said the color palette will be muted and should not call much attention to it. He said the brick at the base gave the project a solid quality.
- Mr. Waggoner liked the idea of providing different surface treatments.

Mr. Nichols:

- Appreciated the addition of the shingles to the corner barrel elements.
- Mr. Nichols said, in general, this was a good looking project and was ready for approval.

Mr. Sutton:

- Said he was disappointed with the corners. Mr. Sutton said the increase of the radius seemed to help in the renderings, but it simply appeared as a wedge, just a bigger one with 90-degree transitions to the building instead of circular elements.
- Mr. Sutton said the barrel elements could still be improved.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked if there were some way to return the barrel elements further to improve offsite views, such that they would look more like complete towers. The applicant showed some before and after design drawings to illustrate the main living space for the units and how they related to the barrel.
- The applicant said the concern over bringing the barrel shape back was that an opportunity for outdoor deck and porch space would be lost for the corner units, which are some of the best units in the project.
- Mr. Meade asked about the roof plan, which the applicant provided. The applicant said the roof is basically flat, draining back to the main building roof. The barrels would connect with flat roofs. Mr. Meade did not think there was an option for the barrels to return.
- Mr. Sutton asked if the radius could be tightened up to allow for a return. Mr. Waggoner shared that idea, and suggested a circular rooftop element to help finish the barrel form at the roof level. He said an octagon shape could work, as well.
- Mr. Waggoner said he liked the treatment with the taller windows on the top floor and the changes in siding, but the overall geometry of the three barrels did not seem to be integrated with the rest of the design. The 90-degree returns are the parts that make the barrels look like wedges.
- Mr. Sutton said even extending the form back at the roof level would help and would not compromise the units below it.
- The applicant asked if that would be a trim element. He said the barrel element had been pulled back further in previous presentations to the DRB, and he showed the Board some of the previous designs. He said the southwest and northeast barrels now match up better with the main entry barrel.

- Mr. Waggoner said the hip roof and flat roof elements, with all the other orthogonal design, create a collision of pieces that does not appear, to him, to read as a whole. He said that if other DRB members were in approval on this project, he could let it ride. However, he said this design has stood out to him throughout the discussion of this project.
- Mr. Waggoner continued that the idea is for developers to fit in as many units as possible, but again, he wanted the design elements of the project to work together.
- Mr. Sutton said he would like to see more study on the barrels and said there was more opportunity to finish those elements. He said those barrels could be more unique elements with more of a curved design.
- Mr. Meade confirmed with Mr. Lee that there were no height limits to be concerned about with the building. Mr. Meade said a halo element, as Mr. Waggoner suggested, would help resolve the form in the roof area.
- Mr. Krueger said he would be bold, and asked if a small, squared-off tower element could be used with the corner barrels. The applicant said the original design had an octagonal corner, which the DRB had expressed concern about.
- Mr. Sutton said he could support a halo element. Mr. Meade said that could work and said that the applicant could play with the height and help resolve the radial shape of the barrels.
- Mr. Lee said this project review was for approval, and noted that staff could review the plans with the condition the DRB members are discussing. Mr. Meade said he was in favor of an approval with a staff review of the design. If staff has concerns, those concerns can be brought back to the DRB. That could be a good incentive for the applicant to improve the design as discussed at this meeting.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. NICHOLS AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER TO APPROVE LAND-2013-00203, ECHELON, WITH THE CONDITION THAT FINAL DESIGN FOR THE RADIUS ROOFTOP ELEMENTS WOULD BE REVIEWED BY STAFF. IF STAFF HAS ANY CONCERNS, THOSE WILL BE REVIEWED WITH THE DRB BEFORE FINAL APPROVAL. THE STANDARD INCONSISTENCIES CONDITIONS WILL ALSO APPLY. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).

PROJECT REVIEW

LAND-2013-01488, Retreat East

Description: Construction of 8 LEED Platinum townhomes

Location: 8080 169th Ave NE

Applicant: Robert Pantley *with* Natural and Built Environments, LLC

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

Mr. Lee said this project has been before the board before. This townhome project is similar to The Retreat, which is on the other side of the elementary school. The Board was feeling comfortable at that previous meeting to bring this project in for review and approval. The applicant has addressed the few issues brought up by the DRB, and the project is in front of the DRB for approval at this meeting.

Architect Robin Murphy presented to the DRB on behalf of the applicant. This is an eight-unit townhome project. There were nine units to start, but that has been reduced because the design was too dense. With eight units, there is more open space for the tenants. There are two buildings back to back in the design. There is an apartment building to the south of the project, and there are some single-family homes and multi-family developments nearby, as well as a lot of open space. Three different configurations for the site were considered. The option proposed has good access to the units, more open space, and more private space. The applicant had previously shown the DRB a design where the center units had single-car garages and the end units had side-by-side, two-car garages. Since then, the applicant has discovered that two-car garages must be provided for each unit. The center units thus now have tandem stalls in their footprint. The center units will have an extension of their garages that will be absorbed below some patios. Open space is provided on NE 82nd Street and to the south as well.

The applicant had previously considered using different floor plate elevations for each unit, but that is no longer the case. That design was problematic for vertical circulation between the floors for the easternmost units. Now, both the north and south buildings step up once by six inches at the main floor. A higher elevation for the main living space has been provided, as suggested by the DRB at the last meeting. Each unit would have its own bay, probably clad in cedar shingle. The rest of the building would

be clad in a hardy cement board lap siding with about a six-inch exposure. On the ends, particularly facing 169th, there was a question from the DRB about access, and what appeared to be a very awkward situation. The applicant showed the DRB a design where each unit would have its own steeply-sloped dormer, with 10/12 pitches. The main roof is 8/12. The fascias are now oversized and secondary trim has been added to give the fascia more character, providing an updated Craftsman look.

On the ends, the entries have been integrated into the units with some of the vocabulary already onsite. Shed dormers have been placed on one side. On the southern unit, there is a gable dormer with a shed at the base and a little porch element. A shared garden will be provided on the west side of the building. The colors were noted by the DRB at the last meeting to be playful and assertive. The base of the building would be a vanilla color, with white trim around the windows. Small areas of color would provide individuality for each unit. The colors are related, but different for each unit. The hope is that the two buildings are separate, but still relate to each other. At the master bedroom level, each unit would have a small deck. A large deck would be below that at the living level. A steel mesh with a 3 x 3 grid would be repeated where steps go into the property.

There is quite a bit of grade drop on 82nd, and the applicant is trying to use that in the buildings so that the interior spaces can access the exterior. The northern building will use the northern front yard for private, open space. Each unit will have its own patio going right out to grade at either the first floor or second floor. The intent is that those spaces will get activated and used. A series of rockeries will be used to step the grade down from one unit to the next. The materials board was not provided, which the applicant admitted was an awkward situation.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Said that this project was up for final approval, but he did not think the drawings were ready for submittal for building permits to the City. Mr. Krueger said he thought the project would be awesome, but he was concerned about the steel mesh grids and other materials that the DRB has not been able to see.
- Mr. Krueger said, in the past, more technical drawings have been supplied when a project is up for approval. He liked the changes proposed and the elevation on 169th, especially. He liked the colors and said this was a great project. He was uncomfortable approving this project without more specificity and the material board.
- The applicant showed that there was a photo of the material board. He said this was not a vague project in any way, and he could turn in drawings the day after this meeting. He did not think it was appropriate to bring the CD's and put those in front of the DRB.
- The applicant said the skin of the building is two materials: cement board lap siding with a four-inch or six-inch exposure and a cedar shingle at the bays and at a few projecting areas around the entries. One unit is tied back to itself.
- Mr. Krueger confirmed that there would be a mix between the four-inch and six-inch siding. The applicant said there were some large areas of exterior wall on this project, and he was attempting to break it up with different siding sizes. That treatment is carried around all the buildings.
- The applicant said he did not want to use twelve different materials, but rather two of them would be used in creative ways to tie everything together and give it some variety. The same would apply to the paint scheme. The trim is repeated throughout the building, and is not just a 2 x 12. A 2 x 4 would be provided at the top and knee brackets would be used as well to define the gable roofs.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked the applicant to walk the DRB through the elevations and identify materials. The applicant said the roofs would be asphalt shingles in a light gray color. Both buildings would have the same roof. All the trim would be white, and there are knee brackets at all the projecting gables.
- The applicant continued that there would be some cedar shingles with a heavy stain in some locations. There will be six-inch exposure lap siding as the primary skin of the building. On the end bays, due to the large expanse of wall, four-inch and six-inch lap siding would be used.

- A beige finish would be used on the lap siding, which would turn the corner and terminate on an inside corner. There would be no situation on the building where materials would change on the inside and outside corners.
- Mr. Meade confirmed that all the knee brackets would be transparent stain on wood. The window and door trim would be a consistent element of a white, painted wood. That would carry though on the edge of the decks as well to provide some consistency.
- The applicant said the end units facing west would have wood columns with a white base and white trim around the hip roofs at the top. The hip roofs on these units would wrap around the corner to tie the building down a bit.
- Mr. Meade confirmed that the soffit material would be painted rough-sawn plywood. The windows would be white vinyl. The garage doors would be white painted wood. The applicant thought it would be too chaotic to have different colors on every garage door in the central spine of the development. Every garage has a Craftsman-style glass pane at the top, as well as the entry doors.
- Mr. Meade said the concern over the individuality of the units has been addressed, so the garage doors could be a calming factor. He asked about the railing mesh and if it had a wood cap. The applicant said it was a wood cap that would be painted black. The mesh itself is galvanized, not painted.
- Mr. Krueger asked about how the garage on one of the end units and how it stuck out into the setback. The applicant said the garage was below grade and the physical appearance is that the garage is part of the patio. It projects out six feet from the unit. There will be a joint where there is an edge to the concrete garage transitioning into a slab on grade. The whole area will be usable as outdoor space and will be separated from other units by rockeries.
- Mr. Krueger confirmed that the garage could be accessed off the main level and that a window would not be seen from that level. Previously, the applicant said, the center units had a room at the end of the garage, but that room has been eliminated to allow for a tandem garage. Thus, the center units do not have living space at the lowest level.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked if the stairs were still an element on the outside of the garage, or if the grade simply came up to the patio level. The applicant said there were still stairs going up to three units. There are four units facing north, and the western unit is accessed off of 169th, so there is no stair access from the north. The other three all have stairs, and each has about three risers, up or down, to get into the units.
- The applicant said he worked hard to make sure the grade change was minimal, but it could not be eliminated entirely because the stairs have to get back to the sidewalk slope running up 82nd. The western two units go up. The farthest east unit goes down a little bit.
- The stair would be alongside the patio and built into the side of the patio. It would be a concrete stair with mesh railing and a wood cap, just like the deck elements.
- Mr. Sutton said the concept sounded good, but it would be helpful to see it. The applicant said he did not have an elevation of the access stairs.

Mr. Nichols:

- Said the Craftsman style makes this project attractive. Mr. Nichols liked the materials proposed, which all seem to be of good quality. He said this would be a nice looking project. He was disappointed that the DRB was not able to see more formalized plans for the project.
- All in all, Mr. Nichols said this project would be fine, and he noted that the applicant addressed most of the issues that were raised by the DRB previously.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Agreed with Mr. Nichols that the applicant had addressed most of the comments that had occurred to him. Mr. Waggoner liked the project and appreciated the end elevations of the two buildings and how the two buildings look different.
- He liked the variety of colors on a per-unit basis, and thought that the whole project would have a lot of character for a multi-unit project. He felt good about the descriptions given by the applicant and felt confident that the detailing and the final elements would come out well.

Mr. Meade:

- Said that, based on the comments of his fellow DRB members, and based on their knowledge of the applicant's previous work, he had a level of comfort for moving forward with an approval at this meeting.
- Mr. Meade asked for a motion that would provide some leeway for staff.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS TO APPROVE LAND-2013-01488, RETREAT EAST, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF IN REGARDS TO INCONSISTENCIES AND ALSO ADDRESSING THE PROTRUSION OF THE BUILDING. THE APPLICANT WILL ALSO RECOGNIZE THAT STAFF WILL REVIEW THE CD'S, AND IF THERE ARE ANY CONCERNS, THOSE WOULD BE BROUGHT BACK TO THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FOR FURTHER REVIEW. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2013-01332, 160th Avenue Senior Housing

Description: 74 units of affordable senior housing with a mix of studio, 1 & 2 bedroom units

Location: 8550 160th Ave NE

Applicant: Dan Landes *with* Shelter Resources, Inc.

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

Mr. Lee said that the City issued an RFP for this project. Craig Krueger and Mr. Lee reviewed that RFP, and this is the first meeting in the prep process. The project presented is a bit different than what had been discussed before. The design has a driveway ramp in the front of the building on its east side. The building is pretty much the same in shape and form, but the driveway location is different. The City's Technical Review team has not completely evaluated the driveway situation.

Dan Landes with Shelter Resources presented to the DRB on behalf of the applicant. Shelter Resources, along with Providence Health and Services, were selected to be the developer of this site on 160th, which is owned by the City of Redmond. Mr. Landes was excited to start a partnership with the City, and said this was a great site for senior housing due to its proximity to the senior center, library, shopping, and recreation. The applicant is proposing a five-story building over one floor of underground parking. There will be 75 units of studios, one-bedroom, and two-bedroom apartments all for seniors. There will be 8,000 square feet of commercial space on the ground floor. Providence will create a program for all-inclusive care for the elderly in that space through a separate permit. The apartment units will be affordable for seniors with low incomes. Mr. Landes introduced Don Doman and Valerie Thiel from SAGE Architectural Alliance for more details on the design.

Ms. Thiel next presented to the DRB on behalf of the applicant. She agreed with Mr. Landes that this was a great site for senior housing. It is located on 160th and to the south is 80th. To the north is 90th. The project is in the Downtown zone. The site is just two blocks from Redmond's senior center. Amenities like a grocery store, medical services, and a bank are nearby. This is a long, narrow site with the longest side along the street. There is a lot of open space around the site. Immediately across from the building is an open parking lot, and there is another parking lot to the north across the street. To the east is a daycare and gym. The public building that is closest is the library, which is diagonally across the street. This area is largely made up of one-story buildings, but some are as high as 20 feet tall. The property immediately to the north of the site is vacant, and is now a parking lot with gravel surface. To the south is a pedestrian path, which is an important element for the site as it leads to the senior center. The applicant says the library will be an important contextual element. The applicant is proposing to express the community common space with brick elements. The massing is very similar to the massing of the library. The idea is to pick up the brick of the library and reflect it in the design of the common spaces.

Mr. Doman next spoke on behalf of the applicant. He showed the DRB the site plan for the project. He noted that the pre-application process helped with the design of the site. Because of the long length of the building, a north and south fire lane are required. The south fire lane overlaps the pedestrian walkway, which presents some design issues. The plan is for the paving of the path to run through the fire lane, which appears to be okay with the fire marshal, according to the applicant. Another guideline for the project is that the primary common areas, especially the ones on the first floor, should be on the

southwest corner facing out to the pedestrian walkway and street. A lobby and informal area is on the southwest corner leading out to the primary outdoor space and a more program-related space. The Redmond Senior Center plans to use part of this outdoor space as well. There is a manager's unit and some administration space in the southwest as well.

On the north end, the fire lane will be used as a ramp down to the garage and for an access spot for two handicapped vans, which are too tall to get into the garage. The ramp is on the street side, primarily to make sure that the building could be pushed as far away from the sidewalk as possible. Other issues included saving some trees. There is a 32-inch fir on the site which will be saved, and the project has been adjusted in several points to allow for street trees. A drop-off site for emergency services has been provided, which was a concern raised in the pre-application process.

The applicant showed a sketch of the basic volumes of the site design. The plan is to have a brick element on the west side that wraps around the south side of the building. That element will be strongly expressed through the building. Given the function of the first floor, the applicant thought it should have a base, which would be achieved through a material change. A stucco material or other light material has been proposed. The upper floor levels would be expressed through some modulation lines on the building. Some parts of the building have been stepped out and stepped in to create this modulation. The two-story residential common area will link to the elevator and the elevator lobby.

Another major design concept is breaking down the scale of the building to a comfortable pedestrian level. The brick matched between the residential commons and the library across the street would help in that regard. The building steps back from the south and the west, from the street side. It steps back on the north as well. The existing trees help divide and modulate the façade. The landmark tree marks the main plaza, and a clump of Douglas firs conceal the north wing of the building, which is pushed back from the street.

The applicant next showed the DRB some 3-D renderings of the building and how the design attempts to reduce the scale and bulk of the project. Proposed colors will be presented at a future meeting. The top floor has been differentiated from the rest of the building. With the middle block, the base has been extended up two stories. The elevator lobby is set back on the top three floors and has a view of the outside. There is a roof terrace as well. On the north, the first floor would have a tenant with storefront windows. The ramp would be screened in this area with a five to six-foot solid wall that would have a green screen of some kind in front. Some work could be done on the inside of this wall, in that there will be some windows looking out onto it. The applicant said the tenant would be Providence Senior Services, an internalized office on the project. This would be a daytime operation. The first floor would be fairly open, but would need a screen despite the cars and vans parked in front of it. Louvers for cross-ventilation have been provided in this area. On the south side of the building, the applicant showed the walkway area and the brick expression of the senior residence common areas. The hope is to make this area as open as possible. There would be low sitting walls or raised planters in this area to help define the space. The corners of the building have been cut away on the south side, in a sense, and the fifth floor steps back a bit.

The applicant said creating spaces for social connection would be very important for this project as a matter of health for the senior residents. Next to the feature plaza will be a coffee area and fireside lounge. The main entry under a large extended canopy is also adjacent to the plaza. As a person goes through the main entry, the experience is a two-story space overlooked by some exercise equipment and some TV rooms above. The large entry room would be used primarily by residents, but it would be shared with the community center about a third of the time. Seniors would see programs going on this space and would be encouraged to engage with them. An outdoor terrace above would be accessible from a room dedicated to the residents. The large landmark tree provides shade for the south and west exposure. A secondary entrance is located by the pedestrian path that leads to the community center.

The applicant said Juliet balconies would be used. The client has requested that a regular balcony should not be provided. The idea is to encourage socialization, not isolation, on the interior and exterior. The applicant said balconies were not that popular with seniors, and were used more often for storage, which could create a management problem. The trees seen around the site are on the neighboring sites, but

they serve to shield the view of the site. The applicant said there would be some experimentation with colors. Mr. Meade asked about the window panel, and if spandrel were being used. The applicant said on the south, west, and north, there were Juliet balconies. On the living room side, the applicant wanted a window that emulated a Juliet balcony. The window would have a spandrel panel that would have the same color trim as the rest of the project. Mr. Meade asked if egress was needed from some of the windows. The applicant said that was indeed the case. The bedroom windows on the east side would be the same as the windows on the west side. The applicant said an eyebrow has been added to the top of the bays. The hope is to break up the flat roof profile in some way. This is the biggest building in the area, and that should help break up the design.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Meade:

- Suggested the wall element presented by the applicant could be more of an edge than a wall hidden behind landscaping. Mr. Meade was not sure that was the right treatment next to a busy sidewalk. He suggested a more vertical element with penetrations, perhaps.
- Mr. Meade said the building could have more of an urban edge to fit in with the urban shopping available in this area. The applicant said that could be possible, and said there could be some articulation in the wall.
- Mr. Meade said if the wall were close to the sidewalk, it should be taller so that it would not be an unattractive nuisance. The applicant said there would be 10-12 feet from the sidewalk.

Mr. Krueger:

- Said the wall could be transparent fence or railing system that would allow for a view of the facilities behind the wall. Mr. Krueger said the Providence building in the Rainier Valley has a nice street presence, and he suggested this project could do the same, to keep the street interaction lively.
- The applicant said the wall was a bit of a knee-jerk reaction, and he said it could go higher.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Asked about the paving surrounding the site and how it comes right up to the building. Mr. Waggoner said some landscape space could be created along the face to pull the driveway outward to the street, creating a green buffer a few feet deep along the front of the building. Mr. Waggoner said that could provide multiple layers of landscaping between the street and building.
- Mr. Lee clarified that the area Mr. Waggoner was talking about was around the spot where the driveway is. Mr. Waggoner said that landscaping could buffer the more solid end of the podium in this area. The applicant said the plants used would have to be compact. Mr. Waggoner said a compact vertical plant, or vine, would be a good suggestion.
- Mr. Waggoner said the east side of the building could have its sidewalk pulled out and could also have some landscape screening. Where windows are looking out, there would be some privacy and a more layered landscaping look.
- Mr. Krueger asked what the walkway was for on the east side of the building. The applicant said the fire department wanted it, and added that it would be for walking dogs, too. The walkway is near the fire apparatus parking. Mr. Krueger suggested more landscaping could be in this area.
- Mr. Lee said some stepping stones could be in this area, but not too many shrubs and big trees should be added, which would hinder the fire department. He did not think there needed to be a full-length sidewalk to the building.
- Mr. Meade noted that the manager's residence unit provides a landscape opportunity for the building. If the sidewalk moves out, there could be a better view outside the residence unit. The applicant said he appreciated the comments of the DRB on the sidewalk.
- Mr. Waggoner said if there would be any type of retail use on the site, the exposure to the street would not be right. He said the internalized office space would seem more suited to the design as presented.
- Mr. Waggoner asked about the two-story brick element nearest to the street, which does not really indicate a two-story room behind it. He asked if the attention to the outside would provide a view of the interior with a lot of activity or with just a view of empty rooms.

- The applicant said the major multi-purpose room would be in the first floor big block space, which would provide views of events and seniors exercising. The entry does have a small two-story space behind it.
- Mr. Meade asked about the access to the commercial leased space. The applicant clarified that the access point would be off the sidewalk. Mr. Meade suggested wrapping patio around the community space to the north to create one more opportunity for outdoor activity. More hardscape, Mr. Meade said, could help expand the patio to the west.
- Mr. Meade continued that more landscaping here would be unused background, but a patio could become a more active space. The applicant said that could be an option.

Mr. Nichols:

- Asked if one elevator would be enough for all the seniors on the site. Mr. Nichols asked also about the large landmark tree, and said that protecting it during construction would be a challenge.
- The applicant said the large tree would not need a large protective zone, but added that the project team would be careful with it.
- Mr. Nichols asked about the elevator area and what the vertical material would be used. The applicant said it would be different than the surrounding materials.
- Mr. Meade said the east elevation is less detailed than the other sides, and he wondered if there was a way to develop this design further. He asked for more detail on this side.
- Mr. Waggoner said the unit plans were not done and the windows presented are placeholders. He said the southwest and northwest corners are inset. Right now, these are solid walls facing each other, but these would be primary views from the street. These could be areas for glazing to create some more character from the street view for these critical corners.
- Mr. Meade said he would like to see more symmetry to the form rather than taking part of the top story off of the left tower of the building. He said a full tower, like the one next to it, could help simplify unit plans, maximize the space, and provide more symmetry.
- Mr. Meade echoed Mr. Waggoner and said that, on the west or south elevations, there might be opportunities for glazing. That could improve views out of the building and would help the building embrace the corner a bit more.
- Mr. Krueger added that there is outdoor space above the first floor, above the podium building. He suggested putting in some windows rather than having unused, dead space.
- Mr. Meade asked if the entry into the two-story space could use a little more announcement from the west. He said the access pointed appeared a little concealed.
- The applicant said the entry could be extended to be a stronger element. Mr. Lee said the Transportation Department wanted to discourage pedestrian cross-traffic near the City driveway that is across from this site's driveway, mainly because seniors may need extra time to get across the street. The hope is to encourage the use of the crosswalk on the south end of the project site.
- Mr. Lee said the Transportation Department wanted all pedestrian activity moved to the south end, and thus, moving the entry north might not be the best suggestion.
- The applicant disagreed with this assessment, and said that residents of this site would be going to the senior center and other locations via the pedestrian pathway, which would be the shortest way to get there. Going north, seniors would be going to the grocery store.
- The applicant asked for suggestions on addressing the pedestrian issues. Mr. Lee said he would meet with the Transportation Department soon, and would get back to the applicant.
- Mr. Meade asked about the large Douglas fir in the southwest corner of the site. The applicant said it was a landmark tree. The project arborist said it would be helpful this fall to trim the roots on one side to get the tree used to where it has to be in relation to the new building's east side.
- The applicant said that Douglas fir tree root masses do not spread far. Mr. Meade was concerned about all the design work going into this project and the possibility of the tree falling over. The applicant said that the tree was important to the design. He said some focus time would be spent on this tree to make sure it will survive the construction process.
- Mr. Meade said he had saved Douglas fir trees before, only to see them topped and damaged by a strong windstorm. He said a large, quick-growing tree could potentially replace it. The applicant said that would be a worthy analysis. Mr. Meade suggested an ultrasound test should be done on the tree rather than core samples to determine the true health of the tree.

- The applicant asked for any color suggestions. Mr. Meade said it appeared to be early to talk about color, and he would like a clearer picture on materials and massing. He noted that there appeared to be a tripartite organization happening, which he believed made sense.
- Mr. Meade said the Bella Bottega Mall might be a good point of reference for lush colors. He said the project should not shy away from more vibrant colors, which could help create a modern facility for aging people.

Mr. Krueger:

- Said bolder colors on the previous project reviewed by the Board were a good example as well.
- Mr. Krueger suggested the bay windows on the west elevation could be combined so they did not look so repetitive. He said the west elevation was crucial, and he wanted to make sure the applicant took a look at it.
- Mr. Meade said the library this project is trying to emulate is a beautiful building, but the library, in his opinion, missed the mark when it comes to color. The geometry of the library is striking, and the brick is great, but the colors are very pedestrian.
- Mr. Waggoner said the architectural character of the project would need to be refined before a discussion of color could happen. He said he did not hear the applicant explain a character of architectural expression, and he suggested the applicant should work on that.
- Mr. Krueger said some sample photos could help guide the project and help the DRB understand the architectural style is looking for.
- Mr. Meade said the commercial space could have a nice canopy element across the top of its windows, even though it is an internalized office space. He said that would help celebrate what is going on in that space a bit more.
- The applicant said he would explore that idea and others in terms of adding some texture and sun screening to the project.
- Mr. Sutton said he was concerned about the position of the ramp and how difficult it might be for a larger car to make the turns required to get onto the ramp. He said flipping the ramp to the backside would help pull the building forward and create some street presence, which other DRB members spoke to earlier.
- The applicant said that might happen, depending on the advice of the Technical Committee. Mr. Lee hoped the applicant could come back in a month's time. The DRB and the applicant thanked each other for their time.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WAGGONER AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:45 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).

November 7, 2013
MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY