

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

April 17, 2014

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, Kevin Sutton, Scott Waggoner, Joe Palmquist, Mike Nichols

**EXCUSED ABSENCE:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Steven Fischer, Manager; Gary Lee, Senior Planner; Dennis Lisk, Associate Planner; Heather Maiefski, Associate 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 7:34 p.m.

**MEETING MINUTES**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 6, 2014 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (4-0) WITH TWO ABSTENTIONS.**

**PROJECT REVIEW**

**LAND-2013-01227, Avalon Redmond Overlake Village Block 4**

**Description:** One 6-story mixed-use building, with ground-floor retail, five levels of residential and underground parking

**Location:** 2700 – 152<sup>nd</sup> Ave NE

**Architect:** David Kelley *with* Ankrom Moisan Architects

**Applicant:** Avalon Bay Communities

**Prior Review Date:** 08/22/13, 11/22/13, 01/16/14 & 01/23/14

**Staff Contact:** Dennis Lisk, 425-556-2471 or [dwlisk@redmond.gov](mailto:dwlisk@redmond.gov)

**PROJECT REVIEW**

**LAND-2013-01228, Avalon Redmond Overlake Village Block 7**

**Description:** One 6-story mixed-use building, with ground-floor retail, five levels of residential and underground parking

**Location:** 2700 – 152<sup>nd</sup> Ave NE

**Architect:** David Kelley *with* Ankrom Moisan Architects

**Applicant:** Avalon Bay Communities

**Prior Review Date:** 08/22/13, 11/22/13, 01/16/14 & 01/23/14

**Staff Contact:** Dennis Lisk, 425-556-2471 or [dwlisk@redmond.gov](mailto:dwlisk@redmond.gov)

Mr. Lisk asked the Board to consider these two projects together, as they are so closely related. However, separate motions would be needed for their approval. The DRB agreed to that course of action. Both of the buildings front on 152<sup>nd</sup> as well as the new “spine road” or interior road of the project. Both of the buildings also have ground floor retail along 152<sup>nd</sup>. Building 4 will have about 221 units. Building 7 will have about 260 units. The DRB has seen each of these buildings at least three or four times prior to this meeting. One of the main topics of concern has been the building materials standard in the Code. The applicant has asked for administrative design flexibility for relief from that section of the Code. The DRB

established at its last meeting on this topic that the applicant had indeed delivered the superior, distinctive design required to get relief from the Code. Staff is ready to recommend approval for both projects.

Jenny Chapman spoke on behalf of the applicant to review what had been approved over the last few meetings. With Block 4, the DRB helped develop the massing facing the park and the cladding concepts for Building 4. The applicant has paid special attention to the streetscape, especially along 152<sup>nd</sup> and the spine road. The applicant tried to create buildings that were unified yet distinct in their identities. Materials were introduced in the third meeting with the DRB, and the Board helped develop these materials at grade to help enhance the pedestrian experience.

Block 7 had a similar process of development. The massing concept was approved in the first meeting with the DRB, again developing a massing and cladding plan. Landscape and sidewalk/pedestrian considerations were taken into account. A pavilion element along the spine road outside Building 7 will help break down the massing and activate the pedestrian experience. In the third meeting with the DRB, the applicant introduced materials and detailed elevations.

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

##### Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the sign presented on the site and if the applicant has gone through the Sign Code process to obtain the distinctive signage requested. The applicant said the signage package will go through later in the process.
- The applicant said that there would be an element that could hold a sign on the building whether that sign was actually approved or not. It would be an architectural element for the building.
- Mr. Krueger asked about an elevator that apparently has moved at the pavilion elevation. The applicant said that element was approved at the fourth meeting on the project.

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE LAND-2013-01227, AVALON REDMOND OVERLAKE VILLAGE BLOCK 4, WITH THE STANDARD DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES LANGUAGE. MOTION APPROVED (6-0).**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE LAND-2013-01228, AVALON REDMOND OVERLAKE VILLAGE BLOCK 7, WITH THE STANDARD DESIGN REVIEW BOARD PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES LANGUAGE. MOTION APPROVED (6-0).**

#### **PROJECT REVIEW**

##### **LAND-2014-00490, Sound Transit East Link Master Planned Development**

**Description:** Master Planned Development for expansion of Sound Transit East Link Light Rail System in Redmond. Includes new rail lines, station areas and parking garage.

**Location:** Various locations in the Overlake Neighborhood

**Applicant:** Sound Transit

**Staff Contact:** Dennis Lisk, 425-556-2471 or [dwlisk@redmond.gov](mailto:dwlisk@redmond.gov)

Mr. Lisk said that this was a Master Plan Development for a portion of the East Link System within the City of Redmond. Sound Transit was before the DRB with this plan in November of 2013. At that time, the project was at about 30% design level, with sketches and drawings presented. The applicant is pursuing a design/build procurement method for the portion of the line within the City. That has now been further developed, and with that will come some unique aspects to this project. One benefit of design build is to be able to have some parts of a project get a head start over others. That helps achieve some efficiencies and cost savings. The hang-up is that a site plan entitlement or approval is needed. Sound Transit would like to have an approval in hand when a design builder is selected. The only method the City has to give Sound Transit a higher level approval of the basic plan and the locations of the transit facilities is a Master Planned Development permit. This is similar to Sound Transit's plan to the Group Health site in some ways, but it is different in that this proposal involves a discrete set of activities over a predictable time frame. The Group Health project is a bit more unpredictable in terms of its timeline.

Mr. Lisk said this application fits a Master Planned level of design. A document has been produced that meets all the City's requirements for a Master Plan. Staff is recommending approval of this project as a Master Plan. This will end up going to the City Council for ultimate approval, but the Technical Committee and the DRB also have to give their recommendations.

Leonard McGee from Sound Transit presented on behalf of the applicant. The applicant is seeking approval for the phased development of this project and for the conceptual development plan for the East Link Line in Redmond. This approval will allow Sound Transit to pursue its design/build project. The applicant reviewed the history of this project. In 2012, the prep site plan review began and information on the station areas and design principles was presented. Operational and maintenance characteristics require that the design is standardized using a balanced approach. In November of 2013, Sound Transit told the DRB that design/build would be the project delivery method for the last two miles of the East Link Project. The first mile of the design/build will begin in Bellevue and the last mile will be in Redmond. Future meetings with the DRB in 2015 will include shaping the design/build process and looking at design and development opportunities as well as site plan entitlement.

The applicant noted that the East Link project is a permitted use in the City of Redmond and consistent with the City's Overlake Neighborhood Plan and vision. In fact, in the OV1 and OV2 Zones in the Overlake Village, a Master Plan is required for projects on three or more acres. Since Sound Transit is not developing anything more than light rail stations, the applicant is exempt from the full requirements of the Master Plan Development, in that no residential or commercial units will be built. A light rail station and support facilities are the only structures that will be built.

The applicant pointed out that the design/build process is different from design/bid/build. In the design/build process, the designer and construction contractor are one. That creates some efficiency in the project and a reduction of risk. More of the risk is given to the contractor as opposed to Sound Transit. There are also opportunities for innovations with design/build that may allow the contractor to build a bigger and better project faster and cheaper, thus saving money and time.

The project will involve clearing and grading the site, followed by the building of below-grade infrastructure. That will be followed by the building of station elements above, including tracks and systems required for light rail. The applicant said a design builder could begin with clearing and grading right now, in that a permit has been approved for that work. While that work is occurring, plans for the next phase of development could be approved to keep the project moving efficiently. The applicant showed the DRB the Overlake Village infiltration vault, which would be subject to site plan entitlement. The design builder may need some flexibility to move ahead in the site plan entitlement areas that are part of the early work on this site. The Overlake Village infiltration vault, for example, will be at the Overlake Village station and located under the future public plaza street. The infiltration vault, a City project, will be part of the regional improvements for storm water in the Overlake Area. This project has been combined with Sound Transit's project, in that the light rail station will also have storm water detention needs. This is the substructure, below grade work that a design builder may want to move ahead with while the above ground designs are developed.

The applicant is working on some frontage improvements on 152<sup>nd</sup> that also may end up proceeding ahead of other parts of the project. Structural walls and retaining walls will be built outside the site plan entitlement area. The light rail tracks, as they approach NE 40<sup>th</sup>, start to descend into a retaining cut at about a 1% grade, setting up to go underneath NE 40<sup>th</sup> in the future when the project moves into SE Redmond and Downtown Redmond. There are walls in that retaining cut that the design builder may move forward on outside the site plan entitlement, which could include bridge shaft work. The applicant is looking for opportunities for flexibility for the design builder. The applicant is also working on station-based structures and garage foundations. The platforms for the light rail station will be 380 feet long, and the widths of the platforms vary from 14 to 24 feet based on ridership. Substructure and drainage would be built into the walls that support the platform. The Master Planned Development process is a way for Sound Transit to phase the development of its project and show the DRB where the project is going.

The applicant showed the DRB the Conceptual Development Plan for the project, which is a side platform station with double entrances. Ticket vending machines, the station plaza, and station art would be included. A plaza street, infiltration vault, pedestrian/bike bridge, and pickup/drop off areas have been identified. The general location is fairly fixed. If it changes, the applicant would come back to the DRB for approval. The applicant plans to release a draft Request for Proposals in the summer of 2014 and a final RFP in the third quarter of 2014. Proposals would be received by the end of 2014, and a Notice to Proceed would be issued in the third quarter of 2015. The first construction package could come within 90 days of the issuance of the Notice to Proceed. The DRB will review the winning proposal to give the design builder and Sound Transit some additional guidance moving forward.

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

##### Mr. Krueger:

- Said the project appears to be fairly straightforward, from its structural walls to the parking garages and other elements. He noted that this would not be a situation where a forested site would be cleared out and sitting for a period of time.
- Mr. Krueger noted that the Overlake Transit Center is up and running right now, and this project would basically be an expansion of that Center. He said this Master Plan was a good idea to get this project rolling while the designs are finalized.

##### Mr. Nichols:

- Supported the design/build delivery method, and said it would help get this project be efficient and flexible. Mr. Nichols said one of the things that the DRB would be most concerned about would be the materials that would be used for the project.
- Mr. Nichols wanted to make sure the materials stayed consistent with what the DRB saw in the prior meetings. Beyond that, he said the overall plan was well-developed and he supported recommending this project for approval to the City Council.

##### Mr. Meade:

- Said this was an excellent program. Mr. Meade said this would be the best way to work through the design process. He asked for a recommendation for approval.

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. NICHOLS AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO RECOMMEND LAND-2014-00490, SOUND TRANSIT EAST LINK MASTER PLANNED DEVELOPMENT, FOR APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL.**

Mr. Krueger asked if the Technical Committee had reviewed this project. Mr. Lisk said that the Technical Committee had indeed reviewed it and recommended approval to the City Council.

**MOTION APPROVED (6-0).**

#### **PRE-APPLICATION**

##### **LAND-2014-00072, Nelson Mini Storage**

**Description:** Demolish 2 existing buildings and a portion of a 3<sup>rd</sup>. Construct a 82,000 square foot mini storage building on four floors. Existing curb cuts and landscaping remain and most of existing parking remains.

**Location:** 18026 Redmond Fall City Road

**Applicant:** Ned Nelson *with* Ned Nelson, Architect

**Prior Review Date:** 02/20/14

**Staff Contact:** Heather Maiefski, 425-556-2437 or [hmaiefski@redmond.gov](mailto:hmaiefski@redmond.gov)

Dennis Lisk, 425-556-2471 or [dwlisk@redmond.gov](mailto:dwlisk@redmond.gov)

Mr. Lisk said this was the second pre-application meeting for this project. The site is about 2.5 acres and is located in SE Redmond. The site currently has several buildings on it. About two and a half buildings would be demolished in this proposal and would be replaced with a new 82,000 square foot, four-story mini storage building. It would be located in the back corner of the site and would incorporate an existing retaining wall in that area. Most of the existing parking on the site would remain unchanged as a result of

this proposal. The site complies with the landscape requirements under the Code for the MP Zone. At the last meeting, the DRB discussed the building modulation requirement, which the applicant is just shy of achieving. The DRB suggested that the applicant should increase the width of the stairway feature on the south side of the building, and the applicant has responded to that suggestion in the design presented at this meeting. Staff is also looking for a more detailed planting plan for the green roof that has been proposed for this project. Staff had asked for a different color for the trim of the building as well. Mr. Lisk said this project could be approved at the next meeting as long as the applicant is able to deliver on the previously discussed elements.

Ned Nelson spoke to the DRB on behalf of the applicant. He noted that the buildings that would be torn down have been there about 25-30 years and have outlived their usefulness. The new four-story mini storage building would use a 15-foot tall retaining wall on the site. The wall protects a large stand of hemlock and fir trees. The storage building would be 200 feet off the street and would be behind the other buildings on the site. The Pennzoil building on the site would be retained, but the back half of it would be removed. The buildings on the east and north sides of the property would be removed to build the mini storage. The buildings left would be the Sherwin-Williams building on the north side, the Firestone auto repair building in the middle and Pennzoil on the south. The existing landscaping would be maintained in almost its full entirety. The access points to the site would remain the same, and the applicant has talked to other entities in the City to review the technical issues on the site.

The building materials include textured concrete blocks. A colored, textured metal sandwich panel would be used as well. The DRB had asked for more detail on the windows used for the project at the last meeting, and the applicant has provided that. There will be display windows where one could see mini storage units behind the glass. The applicant is using a green roof to get enough design points to achieve a fourth floor on the building. The green roof would be about 4,000 square feet. With regard to modulation, the applicant is just short of the requirement. The DRB had suggested making the stairway a little wider at the last meeting, and the applicant has done that. The new stairway has allowed the applicant to build a service closet up on the roof for maintenance materials for the green roof, which is a big investment. The modulation percentage is now around 44 to 45% of the front width of the building.

The green roof will be a key part of the site plan entitlement, in that it comprises almost all of the landscaping on the site. The green roof is a product from Anacortes. It is a cassette system that sits on the roof, and it is irrigated. Sedums grow in it. The green roof will not be seen by most people due to the location of the building on the site. The value of the green roof is the zoning credit it affords to the applicant. The applicant said the green roof would also offer some improvements to water quality on the site. The applicant is putting a darker colored detail on the fascia, as per Mr. Lisk's suggestion. A dark charcoal green has been proposed, which would blend with the lighter green and tan colors of concrete used for the building.

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

##### Mr. Waggoner:

- Asked about the stair tower in the southwest corner of the site. Mr. Waggoner said that the DRB had suggested at the last meeting to pull out the stairs and shift them out from the plane of the building on both sides so that the tower could create some modulation on the south side of the building.
- The applicant said there are some technical issues around the stairs, including an access easement that goes back to about 20 feet behind the building, to the rear of the stair tower. Thus, the applicant has had to move the stair tower about five feet north to get out of the access easement, which might answer Mr. Waggoner's concern.
- Mr. Waggoner confirmed that the stair tower would jog out on its north and west sides, and would be wider as well, to create some modulation. Mr. Waggoner suggested making the cladding on the project continuous from top to bottom. The applicant said this building would be behind the Pennzoil building on the site, and would not be very visible.

Mr. Meade:

- Said the applicant could explore Mr. Waggoner's suggestion at the next meeting. Mr. Meade said the cladding material could be the concrete block or the siding presented.
- Mr. Meade said he understood the building would not be very visible, but once people did come to the building, it could be a nice design surprise for the applicant to explore. The applicant said the concrete block could easily extend to the ground.
- Mr. Waggoner asked about the south elevation of the stair tower, which shows an overhang of the upper cladding extending beyond the face of the block. He asked the applicant to look into matching that design element on the top and bottom of the building.
- The applicant said the easement issue has come along late in the process, but it appears to have pushed him into a solution he believes is positive.
- Mr. Krueger confirmed with the applicant that he understood Mr. Waggoner's suggestion. The applicant said the concrete block element could go to the ground using the same footprint as the tower above it. The applicant did not want the metal element going to the ground because he thought that material would get beat up.
- Mr. Waggoner agreed with that and said bringing the concrete block element up on the tower rather than bringing the metal element down would be optimal. The applicant said there is a technical issue that would prevent having a canopy over the sprinkler access room. About the south third of it would be removed.
- The applicant confirmed that several design elements on the stair tower would go all the way to the ground. Mr. Krueger asked about the horizontal lines presented on the block element and how those lines would be created. The applicant said that there would be two colors of block used to make that modulation.
- Mr. Meade asked if there would be some modulation over the openings to the site, and the applicant said he was not planning on that. Mr. Meade confirmed with the DRB that this project could come back for approval at the next meeting.
- Mr. Lisk said he still wanted a planting plan for the green roof. The applicant said his landscape architect is on vacation, and he would have that plan soon. He confirmed that the DRB needed to see green roof details. He said he would revamp the elevation surrounding the stair tower based on the suggestions made at tonight's meeting.

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**LAND-2014-00302, 16545 NE 80<sup>th</sup> Mixed-Use**

**Description:** Proposing a 6-story structure with ground level retail; to include 98 residential units 3 parcels; existing 2 structures to be demolished.

**Location:** 16545 NE 80<sup>th</sup> Street

**Applicant:** Amber French with H+dIT Collaborative

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

Mr. Lee said this was the first pre-application meeting for this project, which is on the corner of NE 80<sup>th</sup> and 166<sup>th</sup> Street. The plans presented generally meet setback requirements and other restrictions. The technical review of the project still needs to be completed to make sure the building meets fire department regulations. Mr. Lee noted that there is a retail parking requirement for this project, and he would like to have that parking closer to the street access and not buried in the garage.

Michael Hoffman, the architect for the project, presented on behalf of the applicant. He said he was excited about this project, which is in a part of Redmond that really has not yet been developed. The applicant said this area is starting to become more urban, and would like to create something that fits in with the character of the neighborhood and helps with the transition to more urban aesthetic. He would like to create a project that works now and in the future. A landscape plan will be employed at the main corner of the site. It is not currently a highly-trafficked pedestrian area, but it is near a community center, church, and YMCA that is growing. In the next ten years, this neighborhood will likely get a lot denser. The applicant said with the busy nature of 156<sup>th</sup>, the residential units have been pulled off that street. He

noted that 80<sup>th</sup> Street does not have as much high-paced traffic. There is some limited parking on 80<sup>th</sup>, but not much parking on 156<sup>th</sup>. There is a high water table in this location, which pushes the design in certain directions. The applicant is trying to keep the street entry to the garage and driveway off of 80<sup>th</sup> as far from the corner as possible.

A public entry lobby and amenity space has been proposed to create a buffer from the street and an activated corner element. An accounting office, or something similar, could be placed on the site near the corner at street level. The applicant has been wrestling with the idea of providing commercial versus residential spaces on 156<sup>th</sup> due to the speed and noise of that street, and he is open to suggestions from the DRB. A corner courtyard element has been proposed with some separation between it and the sidewalk. There could be some retail stores around it that could activate it, but some private exterior space could also be nearby for residential units, such as a dog walk or a patio. There is an easement that runs five feet into the neighboring property which keeps the applicant from moving the driveway any further than the spot where it is currently proposed. The applicant said he had some work to do to make sure the proper signage and curb cuts were placed on the site. He pointed out where areas for trash would be concealed behind gates and not out on the street at all times. About 87 units have been proposed for the site. He said getting the parking to work will be a challenge, especially with the groundwater concerns on the site. Thus, a parking ramp has been proposed that will go about four feet into the groundwater.

The applicant showed the DRB some of the other projects he has been working on. He noted that the project in question at this meeting is in the very early stages of design. He would like to use brick and other quality materials at the base level of the project, especially on the residential side. The materials would transition to the middle of the building and create some modulation. The applicant said some plantings could be added to the main façade of the building to make it more inviting.

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

##### Mr. Meade:

- Asked the applicant about the front porch element of the project. Mr. Meade said it appears to be taken up with circulation space. He suggested dedicating more area back to open space by eliminating some of the stairway elements, possibly.
- Mark Brumbaugh, the landscape architect, spoke on behalf of the applicant and admitted there was some redundancy there. The applicant would like to have more exterior space in the area where Mr. Meade is focusing.

##### Mr. Waggoner:

- Spoke to the parking and unit count issues the applicant is dealing with. Mr. Waggoner said that adding height to certain elements of the building could help break up the massing.
- He added that some of the applicant's other projects include some protruding elements that carry all the way from the top to the bottom of a building. He would like the applicant to consider that concept with this project to add some articulation and break up the scale of the building. The applicant said he would consider that going forward.
- Mr. Waggoner said the applicant has also had strong roof elements in his other projects, as well as "eyebrow" elements that could add some shadow and modulation to the façades of this project. The applicant said that was the plan, especially on the main corner of the site.

##### Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the schematics of the project, and wondered if the open space proposed could be put in a place that would have some southern exposure and perhaps serve the residents of the site better. He appreciated the idea of having this open space in a visible part of the project, but he wondered if the open space could be placed elsewhere, perhaps recessed into the project somewhat.
- The applicant said he was concerned about other buildings that might be built in this area, which could tower over the open space in the spot Mr. Krueger is suggesting.
- Mr. Krueger asked if some elevated open space could be considered. The applicant said that was not in consideration at this point, but it could be a possibility.

- Mr. Krueger asked how this project scored the proper amount of zoning points to allow for another floor to be built. The applicant said the addition of low-income housing, as well as green building factors, will help add more height to the site.
- Mr. Lee said the added height was not entirely a bonus system, in that the applicant can purchase transfer development rights. He noted that low-income housing credits and green building incentives would help with the addition of height, however.

Mr. Nichols:

- Encouraged the applicant to pay special attention to the quality of the materials. Mr. Nichols asked the applicant to make sure this was a project that had character and was differentiated from the other apartment buildings in Redmond.
- The applicant said the project would have a modern character, but might use some traditional materials. He would like to focus on good design on the upper and lower floors of the project.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Said changing some of the uses of the site at the ground floor would be a good idea. Mr. Palmquist liked Mr. Meade's suggestion to reduce some of the circulation near the main corner. He thought retail stores could be added to the second floor, possibly.
- The applicant said there could be an indoor/outdoor covered area element in the project.
- Mr. Palmquist suggested another option for the patio space, and said the public/private line could be blurred a little more than the applicant is considering. A small bench or fountain could be added in this area. The applicant said he was considering a few options in that area, and the grade change there might lend itself to a seating wall, possibly.
- Mr. Palmquist said the retail elements were a concern for him on 156<sup>th</sup>, and said not having any residential walk-ups in this part of the project struck him as odd. One Anderson Park development near this project has several walk-up units. The applicant said the busy nature of that street did not lend itself well to the walk-up residential unit idea.
- Mr. Palmquist suggested orienting the corner element more to the north and south to get more sunlight coming into that part of the project. He said putting the residential units on 80<sup>th</sup> would make sense to him.
- He said the massing looks okay, but the project could almost be split into two buildings to help the overall massing concept. He said the project was off to a good start.

Mr. Sutton:

- Said he appreciated the applicant's long-term approach to the site and the concern over putting residential units on 156<sup>th</sup>, but he did not think it would not be a completely foreign concept to have residential units on a busy street.
- Mr. Sutton said consolidating the entry elements, as suggested by Mr. Meade, would be a good idea. Some of those elements could be shifted to the west. Mr. Sutton said the lobby area appears to be a bit bigger than it needs to be in the current design.
- Mr. Sutton said he liked the corner element. He said a number of different tenants could fit around this area, including, possibly, a larger restaurant.
- He would like to see how the applicant would resolve the podium element of the site and work on other massing issues. Mr. Sutton wanted to make sure the applicant took a close look at the balcony elements. The applicant said he was working on having units that look different, and he would like to use a number of balcony designs to accomplish that.

Mr. Meade:

- Said the irregular shape of the site would give the applicant opportunities for creativity. Mr. Meade spoke to Mr. Palmquist's suggestion to step down the north elevation to respect the massing of the church across the street. Having a tower on the north elevation might come across as a little unfriendly.
- Mr. Waggoner agreed with some of the comments about the retail units and said they might not be successful in the areas where they have been proposed. He urged the applicant to consider live/work units or other options along 156<sup>th</sup>.



- The applicant said he would consider that suggestion and how that would impact the main corner of the site. He would like to provide somewhere for people to go, especially people walking across the street from the church.
- Mr. Meade said the applicant should be flexible at the southeast corner, and said the right kind of retail store could work, even on a busy urban street.

### **PRE-APPLICATION**

#### **LAND-2014-00477, Redmond District Court**

**Description:** Addition of a 450 square foot vestibule to front entrance. Vestibule is to contain security screening operations of the building.

**Location:** 8601 – 160<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE

**Applicant:** Erica Loynd with DLR Group

**Staff Contact:** Steve Fischer, 425-556-2432 or [sfischer@redmond.gov](mailto:sfischer@redmond.gov)

Mr. Fischer noted that this project was before the board one or two years ago, when the DRB was looking at the canopy in front of the District Courthouse. The applicant is proposing a 450 square foot addition at the front entry. The existing security screening equipment is just inside the front door and does not provide adequate safety and security. The vestibule proposed would move that equipment outside the proper lobby space as a way to improve safety and security. The applicant is proposing to use a metal panel for the vestibule, and Mr. Fischer would like to see how that would work with the existing material on the site in terms of color and modulation. He showed the DRB the different elevations and the floor plan proposed for the project. Staff noted that there are some signage and design issues for the site for the DRB to consider. Signage is derived at 15% of the façade.

Erica Loynd presented on behalf of the applicant. This project is very small, and she would like to know how to improve the process for a job this small in the future. The existing entry to the courthouse is a double door, but there is a lineup created there. Thus, the vestibule doors remain open, which neglects the purpose of the vestibule to protect people from the weather. The biggest issue for the applicant is having all security screening in this area. If there was a security problem, it could not be controlled in the same way that it could if the vestibule were outside the main building. Keeping any contraband outside, such as a bomb, would be preferable. The applicant said the hope is to create an easy access to the front of the building, which is not the case currently.

The plan is to tie into the existing building as much as possible. The vestibule would be a passive space and would not tie into the mechanical elements of the building. Space heaters and some fresh air intake units would be used to meet the minimum standards. The applicant is using metal rather than the existing stucco system. She said it was difficult to match the existing stucco, and potentially, the whole building would have to be repainted to make the colors match. Stucco is not as durable material as metal, and the applicant wants to use durable materials in light of some of the angry people leaving the courthouse. The metal panel proposed is insulated to meet modern energy codes. It would have a stucco-embossed white finish, so it will have a texture to it. The seam joints between the panels would be visible, and the applicant wants those seams to line up with the window system as much as possible. The interior wall will be an insulated wood-framed structure to meet energy codes. The signage is meant to be an art piece that sets off the building that could work with the nice park nearby. The King County logo would be used, with some set-off metal lettering, perhaps with a steel or orange color.

Mr. Fischer noted that signage was very important for this site, in that a lot of people are confused to where the courthouse is on the City campus. He would like to see, in the future, where the signage would be placed and what size the letters would be.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

Mr. Nichols:

- Asked about the roof and what it would look like. The applicant said it would be a flat roof with a nominal slope. It would work together with the existing roof. The existing parapet that sits over the front entry would be removed. It would be a white membrane roof with a full insulation layer.
- Mr. Nichols asked about the metal panel, which the applicant said was a 24-gauge painted steel that is very durable.

Mr. Meade:

- Confirmed with the applicant which parapet would be removed on the site. The height of the vestibule would match the existing building.
- Mr. Meade said his biggest concern was the texture of the panel and if it could be something smooth. The applicant said it could indeed be something smooth, but the stucco feel was suggested to pull that element through the site. The main point is to create a more durable structure.
- Mr. Meade said doing something different, other than the stucco texture, would be a good idea. He said a smooth texture would be good for long-term maintenance, as well. He liked the idea of using a COR-TEN type of material. The applicant said that the COR-TEN product can have a bright orange color, which she thought could be a problem.
- Mr. Meade said isolating this vestibule from the building could create some long-term maintenance issues. He noted that there are different finishes to consider with COR-TEN that can change its color and appearance.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Noted that the insulation of the metal panel could do a good job of adding texture to the building. Mr. Waggoner said the applicant might consider a deeper than normal window frame system to create some modulation.
- Mr. Waggoner said the canopies over the door could be pulled out further to tie the vestibule better into the existing building. He would like the applicant to play with some plane changes in a way that would be simple and cost-effective.
- He would like the applicant to provide better renderings of the site to make them more descriptive. He said this project was off to a decent start.

Mr. Sutton:

- Confirmed with the applicant that the parapet on the addition would be at the same elevation as the parapet of the existing building.
- Mr. Sutton suggested that the parapet elevation could be taller to help break up the massing.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked about the north elevation and the window placement there. The applicant said the windows are in place for security officers to see out properly. On the south elevation, some of the windows would be operable to allow for natural ventilation. The windows would match up with panel breaks.
- Mr. Meade echoed Mr. Waggoner's idea to recess the windows, where possible. He said he would like to give the applicant a design award for this project. He said this vestibule could be a gem of design, and he urged the applicant to push the design a little bit and get creative.
- Mr. Fischer asked about the metal panel and what color it would be. Mr. Meade suggested that another color could be chosen to match up with another part of campus. He would like the vestibule to stand alone and take a step away from the current color of the building.
- Mr. Meade said this vestibule could be its own isolated gem and it would be a great start to beautifying the entire City campus.

Mr. Krueger:

- Suggested the existing canopy could be painted whatever color the applicant decides to use for the metal panel.
- The applicant said she was looking forward to not using a stucco material. She asked what the procedure was to go forward with approval. A land use permit has not been filed as of yet. A pre-application has been filed. Mr. Fischer said he would talk with the applicant outside of this meeting. This design would have to be brought back to the DRB for approval.
- The applicant said she would look forward to coming back. Mr. Meade said the COR-TEN material could set off from the building, somewhat, to provide some shadows or other modulation. That could provide a better opportunity for long-term maintenance, as well.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:45 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (6-0).**

**June 5, 2014**  
**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

  
**RECORDING SECRETARY**