MEMORANDUM

TO: DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

FROM: GARY LEE, SENIOR PLANNER

SUBJECT: LAND-2013-01305 170th Avenue Townhomes- Pre-App meeting No. 2

LOCATION: 8081 170th Avenue NE

DATE: January 16, 2014

This is the second Pre-Application meeting for this project. The proposal is for 7 townhomes, just one lot east of the recently approved Retreat East project, and a half block east of Redmond Elementary School. The first DRB Pre-application meeting was held November 21, 2013. Excerpts of the minutes for that meeting are attached for reference.





This site is a corner lot, with the property sloping downward from the northeast corner to the northwest corner, along the curving street front. The driveway is proposed to be located along the west (side) property line, with the largest row of townhomes having front yard access to the main street.

At the previous Pre-Application meeting the applicant presented an updated version at the meeting that was slightly different from the packet originally submitted. The Board members present generally liked the updated concept presented, and stated that they liked the version with a continuous roof over each building and with the reversal of the cladding materials. The Board expressed that the design was a little busy with all the different elements that were being shown, and expressed that it could be simplified a bit.

This current version has been simplified a bit to address the comments of the Board, and looks more unified and coherent. The base of the building is now clad with exposed concrete (as opposed to stone), which gives it a modern look to the design. Staff finds this overall design attractive and acceptable for the location.

Staff has a question of the Board with regard the desired finish of the concrete base. The west elevation (page V-8) looks like there are two different types of finishes shown; a rough form finish on the left, and a smooth (maybe painted) finish on the right. Staff recommends that vertical reveals be built into the forms to ensure that vertical lines are visible, as shown. Staff would like to hear the Boards comments on this, and whether the Board feels the design is ready for an application submittal, or if the Board would desire another Pre-Application meeting.

Excerpts of November 21, 2013 DRB meetings

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2013-01305, 170th Place NE Townhomes

Description: Construct 7 new attached townhomes in 2 buildings – one 3 unit building and one 4 unit

building. The property will be subdivided by Unit Lot Subdivision into 7 lots for individual sale. **Location:** $8081 - 170^{th}$ PL NE

Applicant: Dan Umbach with Daniel Umbach Architect LLC Staff Contact: Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or glee@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee said this was the first pre-application for this project. This is two lots over from the Retreat East project which the DRB has recently seen. This site, like the Retreat, has townhomes, but has a different flavor. The site plan is in good shape according to staff. Mr. Lee said he liked the architecture, which he said was different than other projects staff has seen recently.

Architect Dan Umbach presented on behalf of the applicant. The site is located at 82nd and 170th Place NE. The lot is at the top of a hill and has some sloping going down to the southwest. There is an existing house on the site now and a number of trees, some of which will have to be removed. Three of the existing significant trees would be retained, but others would come out. The site plan includes townhomes with a four-unit building in the front and three in the back. There would be a driveway on the west side and between the buildings as well. All of the four units up front would have entries off the street, three off of 82nd and one off of 170th Place. The three units in the back enter off the driveway aisle and would go out via the driveway. A pedestrian walkway could come off of 170th down to the drive aisle, which is down four to five feet from the grade of 170th. Regarding landscaping, the trees on the southeast and southwest corners of the property would be retained. Some of the others in the interior would be removed, but they would be replaced with street trees and other plantings.

A site triangle would come across the front of the building, which involved a long discussion with the City Engineering Department. What has been proposed is a lawn or low ground cover, with larger plantings closer to the building. More plantings have been proposed in the southwest corner. The four units on the front would have open space on the street. The three units on the back would have a small open space adjacent to the southeastern-most unit and common open space at the southeast corner of the property. All the units would have roof decks and balconies, so there would be quite a bit of outdoor space.

The applicant had considered a rustic look to begin with, but that design has changed slightly. The canopies are now steel instead of timber, and the amount of cedar siding has been reduced. The site now has mostly cement panel siding in two colors, some cedar siding, vinyl windows, metal canopies, and metal balcony railings. All the units have ground floor parking. There is a bonus room at the basement level with a small window and corresponding window well. The main living space on the second level has a larger balcony and master bedroom space and bonus room on the top level. The end of the building, facing east, has an entry off of 170th. One of the units in the back has a bonus room, but the other two do not. This design element is still under consideration. The floor plans are typical townhome arrangements.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked Mr. Lee if he had seen some of the new designs presented at this meeting. Mr. Lee said he had not seen these designs previously, but this still appears to be going in the right direction. He said the materials have been reversed, somewhat. The applicant said the idea was to be more urban and less rustic.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the materials of the siding. The applicant said the materials have remained the same, but the amount of the materials has reversed in some areas. Horizontal cement panel siding now plays a secondary role to the cedar siding through much of the site. The cement panel is a neutral, gray color.

- The applicant confirmed some of the green material seen to the left of the site was landscaping.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the color of the cedar siding. The applicant said it would be a natural, stained color, not the bright red that was showing up in the computer rendering.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the lower doors in the center of the site. The applicant said those would be a natural wood color as well. Mr. Krueger said the affirmation of the colors is making him feel better about the project. He said this was a cool concept and had some nice, fresh ideas. He liked the roof decks and asked about the height limit. The applicant confirmed he was well within that limit.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the window treatment between the buildings. The applicant said that part of the design was incomplete, but he would have that detail worked out at the next meeting. The dining spaces on the back of the project would have a substantial amount of glass.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the 10-foot driveway up against the west side of the townhouses which
 makes a turn into a 24-foot drive aisle. The applicant said this design has been working in Seattle.
- The applicant asked Mr. Lee if the driveway could be widened, in light of the setback lines. Mr. Lee said that could be possible, but three feet of landscaping would have to be in place along the property line. Mr. Lee suggested a change in width would be possible in the pullout area, and the applicant said he would be fine with adding more breathing room for drivers there.
- Mr. Krueger liked the idea of taking the walkway up the east end of the drive aisle so that residents of the three-plex would have an enhanced entry from the street. He said the project looked great.

Mr. Sutton:

- Liked the continuous roof from the previous design. The applicant said he has talked with the owner about the breaks in the roof line, and he was not necessarily sold on those breaks. Mr. Sutton liked the continuous roof gesture.
- Mr. Sutton asked about the roof elements and the vertical piece they connect with. He noted that down below, where the cedar siding is, there does not appear to be a difference in plane. Mr. Sutton said that did not work for him, and recommended a change in projection. The applicant admitted he was conflicted about this element, but did not think an overhang would be appropriate.
- Mr. Sutton suggested that the cedar could turn the corner and go up to the roof. He said the continuous roof element might help in this regard. The applicant said he put a fin element in this location because it changes the scale of the project considerably if it was taken out. That would create a massing issue, in his opinion. He said he would look into this idea, however.
- Mr. Sutton said he liked what he saw, but noted that there were a lot of elements going on, and he
 was not following the logic of why certain areas had different materials. The applicant said the project
 is still evolving.
- Mr. Sutton asked if the vinyl windows could be a color other than white. The applicant said that was
 possible.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Agreed with Mr. Sutton that a continuous roof line would work better for the modern design scheme.
 Mr. Palmquist said that would help simplify the design, which appears very busy to him right now.
- Mr. Palmquist said he was fine with either a rustic or more modern design, but said the site location might indicate a more rustic design. He said the modern design would be fine, however. He said a stone element could be used as a break, but not as a main element.
- Mr. Lee confirmed that at the next meeting, the applicant would express the materials and would have a color board for the DRB as well. The applicant said he would have a full landscape plan, too.