

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

April 7th, 2011

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: Craig Krueger, Joe Palmquist, Scott Waggoner, Jannine McDonald

EXCUSED ABSENCE: David Scott Meade, Lara Sirois, Mike Nichols

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Fischer, Principal Planner; Gary Lee, Senior Planner;
Judd Black, Planning Manager

RECORDING SECRETARY: Susan Trapp, 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 Vice Chair Joe Palmquist at 7:00 p.m.

MINUTES

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 17TH, 2011 MEETING. MOTION PASSES (4-0) WITH THREE ABSTENTIONS.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MS. MCDONALD TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 3RD, 2011 MEETING. MOTION PASSES (3-0) WITH FOUR ABSTENTIONS.

PROJECT REVIEW

Ulta Beauty

Description: Change exterior colors

Location: 17170 Redmond Way, Bear Creek Village

Applicant: Franklin Ng *with* Freiheit & Ho Architects

Staff Contact: Steve Fischer, 425-556-2432 or sfischer@redmond.gov

Mr. Palmquist noted that the firm he works for is the applicant, and normally, he would recuse himself. However, because the DRB would not have a quorum without him, he asked the Board members if they would object to having him participate and vote. Hearing no objections, the DRB turned over the presentation to Mr. Fischer.

Mr. Fischer noted that Ulta Beauty is a future tenant in the Bear Creek Village shopping center. Most recently, the DRB reviewed a project in the Village from Agave Cucina. In October of 2010, the Board approved a Ross façade remodel, which is part of the colored renderings the DRB is looking at this evening. In October of last year, the area to the left of the Ross building was left blank, but the Board decided to continue the color and design elements of the Ross building. Now, Ulta Beauty has decided to occupy that space and change the exterior colors. Agave Cucina is the next tenant over to the left of Ulta Beauty, for purpose of reference. Ulta Beauty would like to change the color of the coping over the raised parapet from black to brown. Secondly, the color of columns would change from off-white to pure white. Orange awnings would go across the storefront. Mr. Fischer noted that the Village is a shopping center in transition and there are no uniform design standards as yet. Staff would like to knit these storefronts together as best as possible, with some sense of unity. On that basis, staff would deny the color changes.

Architect Franklin Ng spoke on behalf of the applicant. He noted that it was difficult to get tenants into Bear Creek Village, especially in this economy. Ulta asked for these design changes to go along with its corporate identity. What has been presented to the Board this evening is a compromise between Ulta and the Village in terms of color and design. He believes the white and off-white are not all that different from each other, and says the color palette overall has a warm tone, especially with the orange awnings. The applicant admitted that the solid white color might add more brightness to the project, but overall, he did not think that color would stand out. He reminded the Board that the Village is a shopping center in transition, and is a retail center in competition for tenants with many others in the region. During the search for the true design identity of Bear Creek Village, he would like to allow for some of the corporate standards requested by the Ulta applicant and larger tenants like Safeway and Rite Aid. The applicant says the ownership of the Village wants a retail center that allows tenants to bring their own identity to their storefronts.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Says the off-white he is looking at appears very brown. He added that because work continues on the Ross store, it would be difficult to match up this new project's colors.
- Mr. Krueger says he is concerned about the lightness of the colors in Bear Creek Village. He is concerned at the Ulta design would simply continue that trend toward whiter colors.
- He added that the staff report noted that bright colors were discouraged. He appreciates using those colors in an overall makeover, but he says this project appears to disrupt the transition of Bear Creek by adding another design element.
- He says he appreciates variety, but he would like to see some continuity and character.

Mr. Fischer:

- Clarified that the Code says the City prefers softer, muted colors as opposed to bright colors. New design standards put in place last year, however, allow for more variety of color.
- Mr. Fischer says staff's recommendation is connected to the materials originally presented. However, he noted that it was the DRB's prerogative to approve or reject this application. Color can be a divisive issue, and he asked the Board to take a close look at how the colors of this project would work with other projects at the Village.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked Mr. Fischer about trying to maintain unity across the stores in Bear Village, and how stores would be allowed to retain their own identity.
- Mr. Fischer noted that Redmond Town Center, for example, has a Master Plan that requires the use of brick. Presently, some tenants in Redmond Town Center are looking for some leeway in that requirement.
- With the Ulta project, Mr. Fischer says staff is trying to create a design that would fit with a puzzle that includes the Ross project and Agave Cucina. Staff does not want to prevent individuality in storefronts; do they all fit in with the overall shopping area is the question.

Ms. McDonald:

- Says she understands why a place like Ulta would want to change its storefront and create a new identity to create some separation with the Ross store next door, which is very large.
- However, she says that the black coping is a good tie around the whole building, and even more of it could be used for a creation of identity for Ulta.
- She added that the awnings could be allowed, but perhaps in a black color, not orange. That could help create a unique identity for Ulta while keeping it in line with the surrounding buildings.
- She noted that the door of the Ulta project has shifted to the side, which appears different than the initial elevations. She realized that was not a part of this review. The applicant says the door has been moved to allow customers in and out more easily.
- The applicant added that Ulta's identity is about standing out in the beauty products industry, and that is why the additional colors have been requested.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Does not have a problem with the orange awning, and noted it might not be a permanent part of the building. If it were on the upper elevation, it might blend in better.
- Mr. Waggoner would like the applicant to keep the coping color in black. He suggested creating a look of a free-standing archway using the black coping and the white color proposed by the applicant.
- Mr. Waggoner does not believe most of the changes would make this project stand out too much from the rest of the shopping center. He would have liked to have seen some other options with these colors presented by the applicant.
- The applicant says the ownership of the shopping center sees this project as a chance to create some energy and a lasting presence for the retail area. He added that Ulta has not completely signed on yet to occupy this space.
- Mr. Waggoner said he could buy into the proposed scheme, but he also noted that the door location jumped out at him, as it did for Ms. McDonald. He would like to leave the doors centered, but allow for the proposed colors.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked about Agave Cucina's door, and if it were offset as well. The applicant noted that it was slightly offset.
- Mr. Krueger noted that Agave has a dark, muted design, and its door stands out. He asked if the Ulta project would have a similar look. The applicant says elements of the project would stand out during different hours of the day at different sunlight levels.
- Mr. Krueger did not feel like he could approve this project this evening. The applicant noted that he was open to suggestions on changes.
- The applicant introduced other members of the shopping center ownership, who noted that they were very committed to creating a consistent look for the center, but one that was attractive to tenants.
- The applicant added that it was unclear how committed the Ulta ownership was to occupying this space, but he would check with them to see if design suggestions would change their commitment.
- Mr. Fischer reiterated the City's position, and asked the DRB to consider these questions:
 1. Do the proposed colors clash with the surrounding shopping center?
 2. Is the white color and brown coping proposed for the parapet appropriate? He noted that Mr. Waggoner's idea to have the parapet as all white might be an option.
 3. Are the awnings appropriate? The City would say the awnings are not a problem, but the colors are the issue.
 4. Is the door in an appropriate location? It appears the DRB is in agreement that the door should be in the center, but there may not be that big of an impact on customers. It does look odd, however. But the question for the DRB is whether to make moving the door a condition of approval.

Ms. McDonald:

- Noted that she noticed the door location as something that looked odd; she would not make moving it a condition of approval. She would like to see a sense of identity established with the black coping.
- She says that the white color against the cream color is a small step, and it seems difficult to her to add the bright white with the cream color already in place.
- Mr. Krueger says he does not have a problem with the colors presented, necessarily. He just wants to make sure the shopping center progresses in a comprehensive way, not piecemeal.
- Mr. Krueger says changing the coping as Mr. Waggoner suggested, removing the brown element, would be acceptable.
- Mr. Palmquist asked if that suggestion would work for the applicant. The applicant said he could make that work, and simply add white coping. Mr. Krueger noted that would be a better look and would not overpower the Ross store.
- Mr. Waggoner suggested the white archway look again, but wanted to allow for two different schemes that would allow the applicant options to blend into the shopping center in different ways.
- Ms. McDonald asked if the applicant could come back with other options; Mr. Fischer noted that the applicant was looking for an approval tonight to go back to the possible tenant with, but added that asking for another meeting was the DRB's choice.

- Ms. McDonald wanted to see some different options, in that the Board members have expressed some issues coming to an agreement. Mr. Fischer noted that the shopping center has several transitions within it, which again creates a decision point for the DRB.

MOTION BY MR. KRUEGER, AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER, TO APPROVE THE COLORS OF THE ULTA BEAUTY PROJECT AS PRESENTED IN THE ELEVATION THAT INDICATES THE LOWER PORTION OF THE BUILDING. HOWEVER, THE COPING COLOR WILL BE REVISED TO BE THE SAME AS THE BODY OF THE WHITE STOREFRONT. THE MOTION WILL INCORPORATE THE TWO STANDARDS NOTED IN THE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT. MOTION PASSES (3-1).

PROJECT REVIEW

L110091, Redmond High School - Expansion

Description: New 2-story classroom addition and auxiliary gym addition. Project also includes 2,917 SF of renovation within existing building and rough-in for 8 portable classrooms, including restroom portable.

Location: 17271 NE 104th Street

Applicant: Ralph Rohwer *with* Lake Washington School District

Staff Contact: Dennis Lisk, 425-556-2407 or dwlisk@redmond.gov

Mr. Fischer presented on behalf of Mr. Lisk. He noted this application was in the prep process, and the applicant was hoping for an approval this evening. This project has been before the DRB a number of times; the Board has discussed the location of the buildings, including the portables, and the gym and its entrances. Staff is recommending that the DRB recommends this project on to the Hearing Examiner, as this is a conditional use permit project. Staff has added conditions, especially around portables. The applicant does not know what type of portable will be put in, so staff is asking that the portables follow some general conditions:

1. The portables will be designed with building forms and roof lines that are consistent with the other buildings on campus.
2. The portables will incorporate high-quality design with regard to choice of building materials and finishes.
3. Adequate and effective landscape screening will be provided around the portables.
4. A rich color palette will be utilized to fit well with the other buildings on campus.
5. The portables will be reviewed by staff prior to building permit approval.

Architect Marc Gleason presented on behalf of the applicant. There are three primary locations on the site: the addition on the south side, which will now include two new classrooms; a new auxiliary gym, which has some artwork and lighting issues to discuss; and the portable buildings, which have some issues surrounding their orientation. Some trees will have to be removed due to the position of the gym. However, some trees have been moved, including a so-called tree of learning, a sequoia, which will go elsewhere on the site. A raised planter bed in an L-shape will hold some of the trees on the east and south sides of the building. In the portables, there are grassy areas on the north side and landscaping to the south. The idea is to soften the look of the portables, but not provide too much cover that it would create a student security problem. Shrubs about 3' tall are proposed in that area. Many trees that are in poor health will be removed and new tree lines will be established to improve the architectural design. No buffers will be affected by the landscape design. Around the buildings, there are mainly foundation plantings to help the building blend into the site. Some new lawn would be laid down, as well. On the north side, a rain garden has been proposed with low concrete seat walls, and a tree of learning will be placed in a courtyard area. The applicant is considering some interpretive signs, about 20" x 30", for the rain garden in response to DRB comments at the last meeting.

Two classrooms have been added on the south side as a way to add room for students, which is a continuing district concern. The idea would be to add those classrooms on the south side and thus reduce the amount of portables needed. The footprint of the portables has been reduced. The DRB had some concerns at the last meeting about visibility and security around the portables, which the applicant is attempting to answer with some new design ideas. The applicant says the addition of the classrooms is a subtle difference; the modulation already discussed in the design has been retained. The second floor is virtually identical to the ground floor in terms of fenestration and doors. Other elevations that the DRB has

seen before have remained essentially the same. A generator enclosure has been included for the Board's review. The enclosure may have some accent bricks on it similar to the overall design. Some stainless steel mustangs, to go with the school's mascot, have been considered as well. There is a designated area for signage and school-related artwork of that nature.

Energy efficient light fixtures have been added to the interior and exterior design. Some doors have been added to the area around the theater for ventilation, on the advice of faculty. Those would be hollow metal doors and painted to match the main building color. Colors and materials were presented to the Board as well, including ebony and red accent colors. Some high-performance glass has been included to increase energy efficiency. Some prominent stainless steel has been used to add some contrast. The portable colors will have a red brick color that should fit in with the existing campus.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Mentioned the shift in the south base and noted the change does make the design more symmetrical.
- Mr. Krueger says the applicant has answered the DRB's concerns about the portables and low landscaping elements. He says the project looks great.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Asked about the black paint color and where it would go. The applicant says that would go on the steel for the covered walkway area outside the theater.
- Mr. Waggoner says the applicant has done a good job incorporating the DRB's comments, especially with rotating the portables and dealing with the car drop-off area.
- Mr. Waggoner likes the landscape plans, especially the idea to replace the tree lines on the site. He says the building elevations do not look like they have changed much. The addition of the classrooms appears to mimic what the DRB has seen before.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Agrees that the design looks good. Mr. Palmquist asked about the portables, and when they would go in. The applicant says that will be a separate bidding process, but the portables would be installed at the same time as the main building is constructed.
- The applicant says the district will determine the need for three, five, or six portable units. The applicant will probably hold off on the portables for a year while the student population is still moving.
- Mr. Palmquist is concerned about the portables, and the shed roofs on them, which he believes could look like a backyard garden shed. He would like to see gabled roofs on the portables.
- Mr. Palmquist asked Mr. Fischer if the Board could approve the use of portables, and the use of landscaping, and then allow for staff to approve the design of the portables based on DRB comments, or bring them back to the DRB.
- Mr. Fischer says the conditions of approval are crafted such that a motion would be needed to truly guide the process. Modifying Mr. Lisk's recommendations is not a problem. Or, the DRB could approve the project with a condition to bring the portables back for review. However, the applicant is anxious to get this process rolling without additional meeting review time.
- Mr. Palmquist would be comfortable with staff recommendations 2, 3, and 4. He does not want to make the shed roof design, which is noted in recommendation 1, a deal breaker.
- Mr. Waggoner agreed that factory-made portables, which will most likely be used, might not allow much design leeway with a reasonable price. He agreed on recommendations 2, 3, and 4. Mr. Krueger and Ms. McDonald agreed with that concept.
- Mr. Krueger was not completely against recommendation 1 regarding the roof detail. The applicant has not pushed back on the idea of having a roof line on the portables that would be consistent with the overall building. If a problem arises, the applicant could come back to the DRB.
- Mr. Palmquist noted that the metal and glass used in the design drawings for the portables would most likely not be replicated in reality. The applicant suggested he could work with city staff to find a suitable roof; he does not know what types of portable building designs are available.
- Mr. Waggoner says he would like to allow the applicant some flexibility regarding roofs.
- Mr. Palmquist suggested the DRB could combine recommendations 1 and 4 such that the building forms and colors match, or blend in with what is on the site. The way recommendation 1 reads to him, he could foresee shed and flat roofs all over the site.

- The way the recommendation is written, in Mr. Palmquist's opinion, would require the applicant to use a flat roof if a proper shed roof cannot be found, which would give the look of a school surrounded by job trailers.
- He also considered the idea of adding some sort of slope to the roof rather than specifically a *shed roof*.

MOTION BY MR. KRUEGER, AND SECONDED BY MS. MCDONALD, TO RECOMMEND L110091, THE REDMOND HIGH SCHOOL EXPANSION, TO THE HEARING EXAMINER WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS, WITH AN EXCEPTION ON RECOMMENDATION 1, THAT THE PORTABLES HAVE A SLOPING ROOF LINE. MOTION PASSES (4-0).

MOTION BY MR. WAGGONER, AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER, TO CLOSE THE MEETING AT 8:38 P.M. MOTION PASSES (4-0).

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. Fischer noted that City Council would like to have a joint meeting with the DRB soon. These meetings happen on an annual basis. May 24th or June 14th would be some proposed dates, and Mr. Fischer asked if the Board members could get back to him about their ability to have a meeting on those dates.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE100016, Overlake Design District Master Plan

Description: Redevelopment of Group Health Overlake Hospital property

Location: 2464 152nd Ave NE

Applicant: Mike Hubbard *with* Capstone Partners

Prior Review Date: 08/05/10, 10/21/10 & 11/18/10, 03/03/11

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

Judd Black filled in for Mr. Lisk, and asked the DRB to review tonight's presentation to make sure it is consistent with the Board's comments from past meetings. Concerns from staff include the following:

1. The three options for the park have not been completely studied by the Parks Department. The applicant is hoping to get more time on that part of the project.
2. The amount of retail has gone from 40,000 SF to 25,000 SF. Staff says that smaller amount is not adequate to serve the 1.5 million SF of commercial and 1.5 million SF of housing on site.
3. Sustainable development could be strengthened, and staff would like the DRB's input on this issue. The applicant is hoping for approval on at least some parts of this project soon.
4. The 28th Street connection that goes between 152nd and 156th may need to carry more traffic. If it does, that may impact the design, which could also affect the urban design character of the site.

Staff is asking DRB to help the applicant make this into an approvable project for the next visit, if possible. Mr. Black says staff, overall, is happy with the project, but wants to make sure the DRB's input is included. Overall, this project has a lot of what staff is looking for, but the staff is looking for the DRB's help in fine tuning. Mr. Palmquist clarified that what the Board would be approving is the overall framework of the project; the individual projects within it would come back to the DRB for approval.

Steve Schlenker presented on behalf of the applicant in place of Mr. Hubbard, who is on vacation. He wants to make the master plan simple for anyone to pick up and understand the vision at work. The DRB has not seen the implementation phases and timeline, and the applicant has provided those elements this evening. The applicant has a new mapped area of what people can walk to from the site. An open space network and courtyard spaces have been noted, as well as neighborhood gateways. The applicant laid out the mobility goals and concepts for the project, and showed how vehicles move around and through the site. There are possible underground connections through parking garages. Bicycle mobility has been improved across the site. The applicant has some new urban pathway configuration options; the path will be designed and built by the Parks Department, as well as the urban park. In terms of buildings, the applicant has included some new drawings that give a better idea of the character of the residential units. Spacing is such that views would be preserved in the high-rise portion of the project. Those high-rises do

not shade more than 20% of the park during the spring, summer, and early fall months. The applicant noted that there were no restrictions to add more high-rises all around the site; that might not be feasible right now in this economy, but it would be possible in the future.

Regarding the reduced amount of retail, the applicant says that since this is an early action project in the overall scheme of the Overlake neighborhood, large amounts of retail spaces would not be supported by the surrounding area. The landowner wants to commit to 25,000 SF of retail on 152nd and then encourage but not require more retail on the site. The idea is to make sure there are no empty storefronts. The applicant is considering green buildings and green infrastructure. Those criteria will be added in the final master plan. Recycling and reuse are a concern, and the applicant has laid out those details as well as where trees would be taken out on the site.

The applicant explained the implementation phases next, and noted that the plan will involve early phases with the commercial sector on 156th and residential buildings on 152nd. The underlying goals are to deliver equitable amounts of infrastructure for the development. Initially, it was thought that the development would happen on both sides of the project and the spine road, as the applicant calls it, would not go through. However, after talking with City staff, the applicant has decided that as the 156th NE commercial development goes in, more infrastructure might be added in that area. Land sales would determine if a permit would be issued. Residential development might require less infrastructure development, and the spine road could potentially be preserved. On the technical side, there are provisions to allow residential or commercial units to shift from block to block, as well as landscaping, to allow for some flexibility.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the meeting process with City staff. The applicant explained there was a prep group helping guide the project along with planners like Mr. Lisk.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the hill climb park and who would design and build it. The applicant says the developer will deliver that part of the project in a rough, seeded form. The Parks Department would complete that part of the design, obtaining public involvement as well.
- Mr. Krueger was glad to see that future vetting would happen, as the DRB had many divergent views on what the hill climb should look like.
- He asked about the potential areas that could start residential, and how those might be easily converted to retail. The applicant says he is still working out those details, but he is foreseeing a good demand for those spaces as tenants start to move in.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the distance between the buildings, and how that was determined. The applicant showed how the design of the units would determine the distance between them.
- Mr. Krueger asked how big the blocks were. The applicant said the distances would be between 240' and 300' across, which would allow for vehicle traffic.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Discussed the Master Plan process with the applicant and Mr. Black.
- Mr. Waggoner says the general approach to the project is looking good, with a lot of thought put into it. However, he noted that language including words like *will* and *shall*, would help a developer.
- Mr. Black says this is more a conceptual, overall design statement. Some specifics regarding square footage have been added. He says this is a road map for developers, not a list of Code regulations.
- The applicant added that this is a master plan with the underlying code already in place. This plan has more information on the uses of the infrastructure, and is not a full-blown master plan. It is more of a visionary plan, because it does not include the City Code in it.
- Mr. Black asked if adding an appendix to understand that concept, as well as references to the Code, would be possible. The applicant said he would work on that.
- Mr. Waggoner asked for a stronger introduction to the piece that would offer an explanation of how the vision that is expressed in this document is overlaid on a part of the Overlake District, which is governed by the City of Redmond Code. The applicant agreed to that request. Mr. Waggoner says the project looks better every time he sees it, and he believes this is a solid guiding document.

Ms. McDonald:

- Likes the progress of this project, including the shadow studies.
- Says overall, the project is very well done.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Noted a general consensus among the DRB that the bones and the vision of this project were good. But Mr. Palmquist wants to know how this site will evolve, and how assumptions about light rail and developer investment will play out.
- Specifically, he asked how a market for the residential units would change. He noted a nearby site in Bellevue has never been developed for housing, and he is concerned that the same thing could happen in Redmond.
- Mr. Palmquist asked if the plan could change and be flexible to allow for slow market activity on the residential and retail front. He asked if empty sites would be allowed, and if Microsoft would take over multiple areas within the site.
- Mr. Black says this is an issue the City and the applicant have discussed quite a bit. The principles of site design, with half housing and half commercial, could change many years down the line, but the City is committed to that split between retail and living spaces.
- Mr. Black proposed the idea that if commercial is built, residential development should have to be built as well. He is confident residential units will work on the site, due to the housing needs in Redmond. Housing downtown right now is full.
- Mr. Black says the future is still uncertain about the future of residential development, and is a continued concern for the City and the applicant.
- Mr. Palmquist asked if a lot of Microsoft people decided to move into this area, could the situation be reversed, and more housing would be needed.
- The applicant noted that twice as much housing as retail would be allowed on the site under current City Code. That would mean that the high-rise housing piece would go in, if that demand happened. The applicant would very much like that possibility.
- Mr. Palmquist would like to see three scenarios presented to indicate what may happen with this project ten years in the future, with less or more commercial and residential units. He would also like to consider that Microsoft, nearby, has a lot of retail storefront.
- Mr. Palmquist would like to allow the units to be either retail or residential, and have that noted on the plan to allow for a shift over time. Mr. Black said the Code drives the ratio of commercial and residential development, but he said many scenarios were possible, including denser development.
- The applicant says the balance of the project now indicates a scenario where a more mid-rise product could provide that balance from the residential side. The high-rise development may be developed in the future, but the timing of that is unknown.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked when the Master Plan process would be done so that this project could go to market. Mr. Black says the plan first needs to be approved by the DRB. Then, the City Council will have to adopt a development plan. He would like to see that done in the next few months and he is not approaching the time element casually.
- Mr. Black says some issues, including technical issues, will need to be worked out. But once staff and the applicant bring this to the Council, he is hopeful that only one or two meetings would be necessary to move forward.
- The applicant says approval from the DRB is the first step to help move this project to the next stage.
- Mr. Black asked if the DRB's questions could be reviewed by staff, or if the DRB would need to see this again. Mr. Palmquist says he would not have a problem approving this at the next meeting.
- Mr. Palmquist added that the members of the DRB have not had a problem with the design or the vision of this project for the last several meetings. Now, most of the questions are beyond the scope of what the Master Plan covers.
- Mr. Black noted that suggestions about an introduction and user's guide were made by the DRB at this evening's meeting. Mr. Waggoner says only a few items have to be clarified, and there may not need to be more pre-application meetings.
- The applicant says approval from the DRB means the Council should feel a lot more comfortable about moving forward with the project.

- Mr. Krueger asked to make sure that the missing members of the DRB at tonight's meeting were heard. Mr. Black says he will invite those comments. The applicant says the DRB will be allowed to comment on the plan in the future, as well.
- An official approval from the DRB is not needed for this application, according to staff. But the applicant thanked the DRB for their general support and promised to be back.

PROJECT REVIEW

PRE110006, Redmond Square Apartments

Description: Three 5-story apartment buildings with 2 levels of parking; total 202,100 SF

Location: 7941 170th Ave NE

Applicant: Oscar DelMoro *with* Cosmos Development Company

Architect: Robin Murphy *with* Stricker Cato Murphy Architects

Prior Review Date: March 3, 2011

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

Mr. Lee informed the Board that this was the second pre-application meeting on this project. There are four basic issues with this project:

1. The projections of the building appear to be going over the setback line in the southeast.
2. Staff is not ready to give administrative design flexibility on this project, but would like the DRB's input on that point.
3. The applicant is counting a triangular space in the alley as open space, which Mr. Lee would like the DRB to consider.
4. The berm is an issue.

Oscar DelMoro presented to the DRB on behalf of the applicant. He recapped what happened at the last meeting on this project. It is in the East Hill District, which has a group of lots and a lot across the alley. The block geometry is good for residential, but too narrow for an underground parking garage. The project can be centrally located between two alleys. Instead of an alley could be dedicated to trucks; it could be used as a *muse* that provides circulation from the main roadways. That muse will help guide the project, and an alley vacation has been sought after on Lot 19. The application presents the possibility of having or not having a muse; soon, the applicant is meeting with the Planning Department to discuss this issue. This is a five-story building with an elevated parking garage. A berm will go up against the garage. The first floor of the garage will be buried, and stoops will be added for visual appeal and pedestrian access. Burying the garage in this manner will allow it to get out of the water table, put housing on the alley level, and allow better access to the building. The applicant says he has overcome the major issues presented by the DRB, and has an overview of the project as well as materials and colors to discuss.

Architect Robin Murphy next presented to the DRB on behalf of the applicant. He is asking for input on the base, the massing of the building, and the architectural skin. With the skin, the applicant is suggesting four stories of brick, in some cases five at the base. The top floor would include, possibly, some metal siding. Parapets on the fourth story are a basic dividing line. Some color options include gray; others would include muted tones on the three buildings presented. The cornice is 30" high with some articulation and girth to give a proper top to the brick. At the base of the podium, there is a beltline going around the building that separates the base from the brick. The 18' tall windows will span two stories with a metal panel modulating in the middle. The window is very simple in design; some will have some depth within the wall in order to add some variance. The brick skin will sit on a rain screen, and should be 7" thick.

The courtyard will be open space to meet the criteria that staff has set forth regarding light and openness. On north and south, more open space areas may be available. The intent is to dramatize that the building is wrapped in a thick masonry skin. The bridge in the alley could be a key to this project; if it is not allowed, only 142 units could be built and not all the planned amenities could be built. Lot 19 might end up having fewer units as well, bringing the total number down to 126.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Likes what he is seeing, and is pleased at the traditional, solid brick detail. He thinks the project overall looks great.
- Mr. Krueger is still concerned about the massing and the height, and he is not sure about the band at the bottom of the building. He is also concerned about pedestrian connections.

Ms. McDonald:

- Asked about the different colors suggested. The applicant says he could bring those samples next time. He is suggesting muted tones, possibly gray like the brick or possibly earth tones.
- Ms. McDonald says she would simply like to see the colors. She likes what she is seeing so far. She needs to see more to determine how the whole project looks together.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Agrees that brick would look handsome, and of high quality. He would tend, at the ground level, to continue with that, or possibly CMU to continue the masonry character. He would like to see quality material near the ground floor, where pedestrians are.
- Mr. Waggoner says the belt lines help break up the massing. A different accent color at the top of the buildings might help in that effort to break the massing as well.
- Mr. Waggoner says the general articulation should be simple and thus, could be more affordable.
- The applicant says originally, the lobby was pulled into the front yard setback. He noted that the lobby is now pushed back.
- However, there would be a brick wall that would go out to the property line. It would be penetrated with windows and doors and lead to an open courtyard area.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked if brick would really be used all the way around the building, five stories up. He says that would be a big cost, which the applicant has said is an issue.
- Mr. Palmquist says brick could be used to accent the corners of the building up top, and full brick could be used for two floors. That could introduce a vertical modulation that is not in the project, which would be important for this very residential neighborhood.
- Mr. Palmquist is having a tough time understanding the street level, and noted that this was the main concern area raised by staff. He would like to see enlarged, detailed plans from the exterior wall out to the property line.
- Mr. Palmquist says the architecture looks great, but the approval of the project will depend on that interaction with the ground floor. He would entertain some creative solutions. He likes the use of the alley, which looks very European.
- Mr. Palmquist would like some planting in that alley area to help define the pedestrian areas, at the very least. He says the project has a lot of potential, and the applicant is going in the right direction.
- Mr. Palmquist says the general colors, modulation, and structure look good.

Mr. Lee:

- Asked how the alley piece of the project would work. The applicant says a bridge has been added in one version of the plan, which the DRB should note.
- There is parking on the right side, a stair that can access the courtyard, and additional trees. Plus, the access drive for the parking garage comes out at the same grade as the alley. Units under the bridge would have elevated steps and stoops.
- Mr. Lee confirmed that these units that one would enter from the alley are basically flats. The applicant says the intention is to vacate the alley, which would allow an easement for vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian access. That easement meets all City Code requirements.
- The alley would basically be 16' wide of pavement with 7' driveways on either side. There is no 10' setback because there is no right of way. An option that includes the setback has been included.
- The applicant says he would like to do the muse scheme if possible.

Ms. McDonald:

- Noted that some sites in Seattle are using an alley format. She would like to see some plants in this area that would provide the European street look.
- In her mind, that would be a positive, and would attract pedestrians.
- Mr. Krueger added that he liked how light came into the project, but he wants to make sure that the project intersected well with the public streets surrounding it.
- The applicant says carrying the building material down to the ground floor plane could muddle up the project. He would like some brick at that level, but not all brick.
- The applicant says modulating the landscaping along the street could be a big help to help the ground level view. A 5' planting strip has been added near the sidewalk in front, and stairs have been added as well. Terraces and sitting areas are included.
- Large stones, or other dramatic elements like water features, may be placed in the front. Split-face CMU may be a good material for that ground level facing, but most likely not brick. The sidewalk may modulate, as well, and artsy gates may be added.
- The applicant is considering some water features or vines on the wall, with interaction between the ground level units and the pedestrian passers-by.
- On the north end of the project, near 80th, the scale has been broken down to add more green to the site. This side also has a perched sitting area, but this is not as actively connected to the street.
- On Building 19, the idea is to use stoops again and have a building-street relationship. Modulated landscapes would be used here as well.
- Between Building 19 and the area to the east, the applicant has echoed some of the architecture that is used in the muse. This area is in flux due to current discussions with the City.
- The upper level podium has some different, eccentric geometry. A large gathering area, appropriate for a party, dinner, or wedding, is available here. This has a connection to the alley as well. Upper level common spaces are perched above this.
- The applicant reiterated that the base of the building will be strongly differentiated by landscaping.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Noted that what the applicant is presenting is far beyond what was originally presented in the packet the Board members were looking at this evening. He liked the amenities presented in that they create a more active streetscape.
- Mr. Waggoner says a green buffer has been created all around the building, which he appreciates. He also says differentiated paving that indicates plaza areas would be critical in the alley areas. The applicant says the plantings also help in that differentiation.
- Mr. Lee asked if the triangular space indicated in the alley was still needed for common space requirements. The applicant says that is not clear yet.
- Mr. Lee asked how the DRB felt about that issue. Mr. Palmquist says he would consider it, but only if there was a pedestrian front on the other building to count it as an entry. If there are steps up to people's apartment within that triangle, as shown in the drawings, Mr. Palmquist would consider it.
- Mr. Lee says the triangle area needs more details.
- The applicant says he would like to consider this building as five stories with a basement, not a six-story building. He would also like to add some residential spaces to the basement, otherwise known as the units facing the alley.
- The applicant is trying to take advantage of the exceptional design flexibilities the city offers.
- The applicant says because a lot of money has been spent in the muse area, he is hoping that triangular area Mr. Lee is concerned about can indeed be designated as open space.
- The applicant says the podium defines the basement, and there is no question about that, after a discussion with Mr. Lee and City staff. The issue now is to satisfy the DRB that the grade articulation can work with private open space and access point.

Mr. Lee:

- Mr. Lee says the challenge will be eroding the berm to create a better connection to the street. The berm's size has to go through an average grade calculation and still look good to get that basement designation for the alley units.
- The two-level loft on top of the building has been designated as a floor plus a mezzanine, not two stories.
- The applicant says he does not consider the berm as a berm, but more like articulated landscaping.

- Upon a question from Mr. Krueger, Mr. Lee noted that there is not a maximum height under consideration, but rather, the number of floors.
- Ms. McDonald asked about the series of roofs shown as usable open space. She asked how those would be landscaped or developed. The applicant says private open space will be away from those roofs, facing the street. The roof courts are on the side of the units, and thus separated.
- Mr. Lee asked about the thick masonry wall placed outside of the unit on the street level, in which one would walk through it to an open courtyard. That wall, made of brick or CMU, would be 16'-18' tall.
- The applicant noted that the lobby of the building needs to project out, but Code does not allow that beyond the setback. The wall presented here meets Code and still provides that inviting entrance point, in a similar way to the walls on the outside of Safeco Field in Seattle.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Mr. Palmquist says the design sounds interesting, but more details are needed.
- The applicant asked about the base of the building, and what feedback the DRB had on that issue.
- Ms. McDonald says the project is going in the right direction in making a connection to the street. She liked the addition of the stoops and the pattern of outside spaces and private spaces.
- Mr. Palmquist says the design is a little too busy. He is concerned about how people would use the semi-private areas on the lower level, and believes tenants might not use those spaces.
- Mr. Palmquist suggested reducing the level of the stairs so that the tenant would consider that entire outside space as their own. He would like to see two sizes of outdoor spaces depending on the size of the units, not two outdoor spaces per unit.
- The applicant noted that Mr. Palmquist's idea would create a bigger front wall. That is why the inner step area has been created. The applicant says this type of setting does get used by tenants in other projects on the Eastside.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Brought up the point that if these outdoor spaces were too small, they would serve only as storage for a bike, for example.
- Ms. McDonald asked if families would be in these units, and if some outdoor play areas for kids would be considered. The applicant says the upper outdoor area would serve as that spot for the kids and their families.
- Mr. Lee asked again about the projection on the southeast part of the building. The applicant says that part of the project has been pulled back, as it is not necessary for the design. So, there is no front yard setback intrusion on that side of the building.
- The applicant says he is working to simplify the project, which he thinks will add elegance to the design while also cutting costs. He is pushing to get this project on the ground in 2011, and he is shooting for a final approval from the DRB in June of this year.

Mr. Krueger:

- Likes that the southeast corner has been pulled back, but he would like to see something more special in that area, as most people will see that corner as they arrive at the building.
- Mr. Waggoner suggested something like a rotunda to soften the corner up against the street.
- Mr. Krueger says Canal Station in Ballard might be a good inspiration for the applicant.
- The applicant thanked the DRB members for their time and promised to be back soon.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION MADE BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MS. MCDONALD TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 11:00 P.M. MOTION PASSES (4-0).

May 5, 2011

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY