

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

March 1, 2012

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: David Scott Meade, Joe Palmquist, Craig Krueger, Mike Nichols

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Lara Sirois, Jannine McDonald, Scott Waggoner

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Fischer, Senior Planner

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 David Scott Meade at 7:02 p.m.

DESIGN AWARDS PROGRAM

Continued Discussion

Mr. Fischer noted that the DRB had been through the list of possible award recipients a couple of times. The Board members have discussed which projects might be worthy of awards, which should be excluded, and which ones should be put on hold. Some have been between award categories, and at this meeting, Mr. Fischer would like to tie up some loose ends. He has grouped all the projects in the categories of Superior, Outstanding, and Honor, and has also given the Board a list of the projects on hold and those that have been excluded. Mr. Waggoner has sent in some written comments on this process, as he was unable to come to the meeting this evening.

The first project up was City Hall. The DRB has noted this project was Superior in past meetings. Mr. Waggoner wrote that he was willing to move that down to an Outstanding classification. Mr. Meade was still firmly behind the selection of Superior, as were the rest of the Board members. Mr. Fischer said it would be Superior.

With the Starbucks project, the Board had thought it was worth Superior or Outstanding. Mr. Waggoner supported a Superior designation. Mr. Meade said, however, that the Board has been romantic about the quality of this building. He said it did deserve an Honor designation, however. He said, in light of the other projects, and in the name of balance, he did not see it as Outstanding. Mr. Nichols said he was still between Superior and Outstanding. In reflection, he was leaning toward Outstanding, but would not go down to Honor. He likes the use of materials and the interior, as well. He said, in comparison to other Starbucks, it is a step up. He would support an Outstanding award, with which Mr. Krueger agreed. Mr. Palmquist decided on Outstanding as well, and so the project was designated as Outstanding by the DRB.

The River Park A, B, and E office buildings project was next. In the past, the Board was split between Superior and Outstanding designations for this project. Mr. Waggoner wrote in to say the River Park buildings, as a group, should be Outstanding. Mr. Nichols liked the outdoor space, landscaping, and water element. He was leaning towards Outstanding, but could call it Superior, as well. Mr. Krueger weighed in for the Superior nomination due to the project's exposure to the river and its strong presence there. The east side is a weak elevation, but that is in recognition that in the future, there will be a building there. He likes the boardwalk as well as the detailing and finishes on the interior courtyard between the office buildings and hotel. He said it was a strong, important group of buildings.

Mr. Meade said the group of buildings is a timeless but modern office structure. He noted that the main residential building has always been the cherry on the sundae. He wanted this project to be in the Superior category primarily for the residential building, but noted the designers did a nice job with the campus. He said voting on this project as a campus was most logical. He said the applicant involved multiple architects to create something that was not from one person. Four architects did the buildings and one more architect oversaw the whole project. He said he loved anyone who would hire that many architects, anyway. He said the buildings were very cool, and the project showed a good sensitivity to the edge of the park at the behest of the Board, out of concern for the trees there. He likes the project and would like to see it more activated, but he thought it was a nice cornerstone.

Mr. Palmquist would support a Superior award for this campus as a whole. He said the applicant with this project was really the first of many to create such a large-scale residential building in Redmond. He said no one has done as well as these architects did. He said, as a campus, it was deserving of a Superior award. Mr. Meade said the care on the site work, from below the podium up, showed layer after layer of design. All the design elements were not successful, but the goals were high and most of those goals were achieved. He hoped that the connection between the building, park and trail would grow in the future. Mr. Nichols said the architects made the buildings look different within one big project. Mr. Meade said that was a key point to this campus. Mr. Fischer noted that this project came a long way; it did not look like it does presently when it was first shown to the Board. The DRB agreed to a Superior designation for the River Park campus.

Well #3 was next, and was noted as a Superior award in previous meetings. Mr. Waggoner supported that, in his letter. Mr. Krueger was supportive of that award. Mr. Nichols said, as a public structure, this well was nicely done. He wanted to give it some love for being a good utility structure. Mr. Meade said, although this was a public utility building, the applicant took the time and care within a limited budget to take some design license. Now, this building is an example for the DRB as an infrastructure building that was done right. He said this building could have been a humble box, but the designers had fun with it. The project is still utilitarian, but was done very, very well. The DRB agreed on the Superior award for Well #3.

Next up was Lake Washington Technical College. The Board has discussed this for a Superior award, which Mr. Waggoner agreed with. The Board members all agreed with the Superior designation.

Microsoft's West Campus was next, and the Board has called this a Superior project in the past. Mr. Waggoner supports that award designation. Mr. Nichols noted that the stone on the project has a great texture, up close. He supported the Superior award, as did Mr. Krueger. Mr. Krueger said this project, viewed from Highway 520, has some interesting forms and modulation. He said the palette was muted, but with the materials, it was a good project. Mr. Nichols said it was not boring, and liked the different materials. The Board agreed on the Superior award for West Campus.

Next up was Nintendo; the Board has discussed a Superior award for this project in the past. Mr. Waggoner supported that. All the other Board members agreed to call it Superior. Mr. Krueger said it was a very cool building, and said the materials create subtle interest throughout the project. Mr. Meade said the architects did an impressive job with the stone banded mass, which gives the project a look like it is standing on top of glass. He said that concept was cool, and he appreciated how the designers tied the outdoor space with the building. The river planned to run through the project never came to fruition, but Mr. Meade noted that the garage with this project was extraordinary. Mr. Meade said the Board marveled at the rooftop suite on this project. He noted that the project has elements of the game Donkey Kong inside the building. The stone used in the project is a top material. The modulation of the exterior has created a building with a very pure expression.

Mr. Fischer said the lobby of this building was one of the coolest in Redmond. The Board wanted to tour this building, which Mr. Nichols might facilitate. Mr. Fischer noted this building had the largest green roof in Redmond. Mr. Meade recalled the architects on the project worked tirelessly on the pursuit of an extraordinary design. Mr. Krueger noted the recessed windows are very cool and also provide texture to the building. Mr. Meade noted that the aesthetic of the building is very historic, through its pattern of glazing. He hoped that buildings in the historic district of Redmond could echo the expression of materials

and function that the Nintendo has, as a way to provide a respite from more historical gingerbread-type buildings. Mr. Fischer agreed. The Board agreed to call the Nintendo project Superior.

The Board next considered St. Jude's Catholic Church Narthex, which had previously been discussed as a Superior award. Mr. Waggoner supported that, as well as Mr. Nichols. Mr. Krueger noted that he had recently visited the building. He had questions about this project in previous meetings. He said the pitch of the roof is very strange to him; it is covered with solar panels. He said the project is awesome. The Board agreed to call this project Superior.

Redmond High School was next. The Board had called this project Superior at its last meeting, which Mr. Waggoner supported. The rest of the Board supported the Superior award for Redmond High School.

Moving on to some projects the Board had considered as Outstanding awards, Mr. Fischer next brought up Cleveland Street West. Mr. Waggoner supported an Outstanding award, as did Mr. Nichols. He said there were some elements on the exterior that could have been done better; he said it was still very nice but not Superior. Mr. Krueger and Mr. Meade supported the Outstanding award for this project. Mr. Meade noted that the project did a great job replacing the Tony Roma's restaurant that used to be there. It provides more density for Downtown Redmond and, indirectly, better nightlife. He said it was incumbent on the Board to encourage living opportunities like Cleveland Street West to support Redmond's industry partners. He said this building was timeless and embraces the idea of the historic district. He noted this project had its challenges, but the overall execution was very well done. He hoped in the future that much more foot traffic would be in this area. The Board agreed on an Outstanding award for Cleveland Street West.

The Redmond Center remodel was next, with a focus on the principal portion of the building as well as the stand-alone, one-story retail stores on the street. In the past, the Board has recommended an Outstanding designation for this project. Mr. Waggoner has agreed with the Outstanding designation. Mr. Meade said this was really two projects; the Trader Joe's on this site has been integrated into the existing mall and started to blend into what the Board wanted. The designer went away from stucco and desert colors and created something more sustainable, durable, and lush, as the Board requested. The Board also pushed to have the Trader Joe's entry at the corner, which has helped activate that area. The outboard building is now a richer building due to the superior palette of materials used. Mr. Meade said the designers were very successful with this project, especially with creating a very usable street frontage. He appreciates this project, especially at night. He supported the Outstanding award. He said it was a great first step; the whole area around it might be refaced in the future. Mr. Nichols also supported the Outstanding award for the Redmond Center remodel, as did the rest of the Board.

Bella Bottega Medical was next on the list. Mr. Palmquist supported an Outstanding award; he said it could have been Superior if the brick on the project had turned out better. Mr. Meade noted that this project went through several iterations. It was originally a story shorter. He said replacing the building that was originally there has provided an anchor on this street corner. Mr. Meade agreed that if the brick had been better, it could have been Superior. He did not blame the architects, but noted that in large scale, the brick loses its crisp design texture. The Board agreed on an Outstanding award for Bella Bottega Medical.

Park Place Apartments, formerly the VFW site, was next for consideration. Mr. Krueger supported the Outstanding award for these apartments. He said they have a great presence on the street. He has admired this project for a while for its use of materials and its impact on the streetscape. The modulation and detail is very nice. Mr. Nichols said the only thing he did not like was the chain link fire lane separation, but noted that that was a City-required element. The Board agreed on an Outstanding award for Park Place Apartments.

The Whole Foods building and the adjoining one-story retail strip building came up next. Mr. Krueger said it should receive an Outstanding award. He said it had nice detailing. He noted the building on the bottom of the project was very complicated and more cluttered than he would like, but he said the center pulled off a good design, overall. Mr. Meade noted that if this project was before the Board today, he would push for the parapets to go deeper to conceal that they were just parapets. He would have liked to have seen

mass and read those parapets as individual structures. He said the project could have been more convincing. The Board supported an Outstanding award for the Whole Foods project.

Microsoft Building 99 was next on the list. Mr. Palmquist said it was Outstanding, and the Board agreed. Mr. Krueger said the building is very cool, with interesting materials that provide some drama. Mr. Meade said the materials are extremely lush, and the parking garage is a home run. He noted that the banding areas, surrounded by glass, give it a look almost like a glass box. The Board agreed that Microsoft Building 99 should get an Outstanding award.

Microsoft Building 37 was next for consideration. Mr. Meade said this building borrows somewhat from Building 99. He noted that the garage with this building is nowhere near the quality of Building 99's. He noted that Building 37 is off the beaten path, yet is still Outstanding. Mr. Krueger asked about the tone and color of the building. Mr. Fischer said the color is a creamy, sandy gold. Mr. Meade noted that the material used is all a gorgeous stone. The Board agreed to an Outstanding award for Microsoft Building 37.

The Redmond Presbyterian Church was next for consideration. Mr. Krueger asked about the shingles on the roof. Mr. Meade noted they were all metal. Mr. Meade said the building shows itself very well in snow. He noted that the project has a lot of quality in its design and is grand in scale, especially from a pedestrian's view. However, it is still intimate enough to be a chapel, and is well situated in a wooded area. Mr. Krueger loved the use of materials, from the strong base of the project to the lighter wood of the lap siding to the struts. Mr. Meade said the project is clean and well done for the budget constraints involved. Mr. Palmquist noted that a lot of volunteer work went into this project. Mr. Meade said every fenestration was thought of carefully and executed well. The Board supported an Outstanding award for the Redmond Presbyterian Church.

Mr. Fischer next presented the PCC project to the Board, which the members had considered Outstanding in the past. He noted that this project should be considered as an overall retail center, with a retail strip involved as well as the main store. The columns and art elements are important elements to the project. It is also the first LEED Gold grocery, according to a press release on the project. Mr. Palmquist said the retail strip needs to be included in the project, in that the layout of the site works well. It has a nice outdoor area on its southeast corner that has a lot of good sun exposure. He noted the artwork and columns provide a good entry to the storefronts, and he said the designers did a good job with a small site. Mr. Fischer noted that this was a small, skinny site constrained by wetlands on its back side.

Mr. Meade said he is a proponent of small retail opportunities, which allows for small businesses to get a foot into the community. Mr. Meade agreed with Mr. Palmquist that the campus of PCC has been sewn together to provide a pedestrian-friendly area. He said the outdoor area is great. He likes the big masonry pieces all over this project, which create a monument motif that ties the whole site together. He noted that the masonry provides a traffic calming effect, as well, which encourages even more pedestrian activity. He was supportive of an Outstanding award for this project. He would have liked a bigger PCC store, but he noted that this was supposed to be a smaller neighborhood store. Mr. Krueger supported the Outstanding award for this project. The only problem he had with the project was its north end, which has been vacant several times in the past. Mr. Nichols liked the materials and layout. The Board supported an Outstanding award for the PCC and the adjoining retail strip.

Billy Townhomes, as it is known, was up next for the Board. The members agreed it was Outstanding. Mr. Krueger said he toured this area recently, and was impressed with the design. Mr. Fischer said the retaining wall on this project was screened very nicely. The Board agreed that Billy Townhomes would receive an Outstanding Award.

The Board next considered a group of projects that were seen as possible Honor award candidates in the past. The first up was the Redmond TOD Building. The parking garage was not discussed as part of this project, originally. Mr. Fischer and the Board said the garage actually turned out very well. Mr. Meade likes this project. He said it was done on a limited budget. The mayor of Redmond, at the time this project was submitted for design review, initially did not like this project, but the Board did. Mr. Meade said his

main critique of the project was the canopy on the retail, which he says should have been dropped to split the glazing on the building and change the scale of the pedestrian way. To him, the project looks very leggy around the glazing. Mr. Nichols said that might create a less urban look. Mr. Meade said, to him, the pedestrian space appears too wide open. But that was his only criticism of the project. He said the designers were very successful based on what they had to work with. Mr. Nichols would support an Honor award for the project.

Mr. Krueger asked to designate the Redmond TOD project as Outstanding. He said the exterior is very well done, from roof forms to the subtle balconies. Mr. Palmquist said he was initially a big critic of this project, but noted that upon seeing the front elevation of the project across from the skate park, he would agree with Mr. Krueger that this project was Outstanding. Compared to Red 160, he noted this project works better in terms of the color palette and the layers of massing. He said that the red color really pops. He wants to encourage people to use bolder colors in this way. Another tan color, instead of red, would have caused this project to fall apart. He said this project still looks inviting, though he understood Mr. Meade's concerns about the height of the canopies. Mr. Meade said he has always liked this project. He noted that the building ties in with Redmond's association with bicycles well, which was a nice, clever touch. He supported the Outstanding award for the project.

Mr. Fischer asked if the parking garage should be included in the Redmond TOD project. Mr. Meade said the parking garage is handsome, with an expert job of dressing up the garage and concealing its interior function. The applicant came in several times to the DRB before it was done right. Mr. Fischer asked if more photos needed to be shot of this project. Mr. Krueger said the garage could be tied in to the shelter, as well. Mr. Waggoner had stated that the project should earn an Honor award. Mr. Krueger, Mr. Meade, and Mr. Palmquist are leaning toward Outstanding. Mr. Nichols supported an Outstanding award for this project. The DRB agreed the Redmond TOD building should earn an Outstanding award.

The City of Redmond Treatment Center was next up for the DRB. Mr. Nichols said the project went above and beyond for a public building, and he would support an Honor award for it. Mr. Krueger also supported that award designation. Mr. Palmquist said it went a little bit above and beyond, but did not come near Well #3. Mr. Meade said this project kept a residential feel to a public works building, but it still is a public works building. He said it appears bulletproof and should look like this forever. He loves how the architect apparently worked by hand to complete this project. The Board agreed on an Honor award for the City of Redmond Treatment Center.

The Marriott Hotel was next. The DRB discussed the idea of excluding this building from the list of awards. Mr. Meade said this project had many missed opportunities. He said the location and materials used were phenomenal, but he was not sure it was worthy of an award. Mr. Fischer noted that the building took many of its design standards from Redmond Town Center. The fountain in the front of the hotel was a request of the mayor of Redmond. Mr. Palmquist said the project was not executed well. Mr. Meade noted that the columns are clunky and bulky. He said the main corner of the project could have been special, but was not. He added that the balconies looked phony to him. Mr. Krueger said he would exclude the project due to the DRB's lack of enthusiasm about it and the missed opportunities of the project. The DRB decided to exclude the Marriott Hotel.

Next up for the Board was the Redmond East Corporate Center. Mr. Krueger liked this project, and said it was deserving of an Honor award. He likes how the materials were broken up in the modulation of the building. He noted there was a fun design with the mullions on the windows and the entry jutting out on the canopy. Mr. Palmquist said he saw the project recently and was also impressed. Mr. Meade said the windows tell the story of the building. He said the entry piece shows this project could have been a complete fumble, but instead, turned out very cool. Mr. Palmquist noted that the reflection of the trees on the project looked cool, as well. The Board decided to give Redmond East Corporate Center an Honor award.

City of Redmond Well #5 was next for the DRB. Mr. Nichols said there were some design cues from Well #3 in the Well #5 building, with its windows and masonry. Mr. Meade said the pictures of the project do not show it well. Mr. Krueger said the moss on the building needs to be pressure-washed off. The building is somewhat hidden off the road. Mr. Palmquist did not like the way the shed roof was not complete on

this project, and missed the theme of simplicity that has made other municipal projects in the City sing. Mr. Meade said he enjoys this building in person, but it almost appears to be lacking a top in looking at the pictures. Mr. Meade said he would be okay with excluding it, but might go for an Honor award. Mr. Nichols would support excluding it, as would Mr. Palmquist and Mr. Krueger. The DRB decided to exclude City of Redmond Well #5.

The Washington Cathedral Rec Center was next for the Board's consideration. Mr. Krueger said the project was dramatic and looks cool in its location on the hillside. He said an Honor award would be deserved for this project. Mr. Nichols would go for an Honor award, or possibly excluding it. He said it did not do much for him, personally. Mr. Palmquist said the materials were nice, but the massing was not well done. Mr. Meade said he loved some images of these building, but he does not like the entry in particular. Mr. Meade said he would exclude this project, and the rest of the Board agreed to exclude the Washington Cathedral Rec Center.

Next for the DRB was the Playnetwork building. Mr. Meade loves these buildings. He said they were tasty and cool. He loved the brick and the clean sophisticated design of the project. He liked the entry split detail especially. He drives by this building often, and always looks at it. He said there was something very lush about the project, yet with a simple design that was driven by choice, not budget constraints. He liked the brick detail around the windows and canopies, and there was a real demonstration that the applicants knew the materials they were using. Mr. Krueger liked the fun design of this building and said it was very cohesive. He said it would deserve an Honor award. The rest of the DRB agreed that Playnetwork should receive an Honor award.

The Willows Creek Building was next for the Board. Mr. Meade said this was a well-executed little building with asymmetry around the entry which provides an interesting relief. He would support an Honor award for this project. He said the design is very transparent and the scale works well, such that the entry area is well-designed. The cantilevered box design in the project is unexpected and delightful. He said he would love to own this building. Mr. Krueger agreed, and said the mullion designs are very fun. He likes the windows and entry feature. Mr. Meade said the materials used were very interesting. The Board supported the Honor award for the Willows Creek Building.

Mr. Fischer next moved to some projects that the DRB had previously put on hold. The Redmond Transit Center Shelter was first up. Mr. Krueger said he could use more photos of this project to help make a determination on its award status. Mr. Fischer noted this site had several squares of colored concrete and asphalt, which is difficult to depict in a photo. Mr. Nichols said this project would deserve an Honor award at minimum. For what it is, it looks nice. Mr. Meade noted that the DRB had been looking at several infrastructure pieces, and some of those have echoed community standards or introduced some interesting design style. He said this project includes some well-executed pieces, as a collection. He said the designers went above the call of duty for this kind of function. He would like to honor that effort toward creating variety while also creating structures with integrity that look like they will last forever. He said the project could have tragically bleak. Mr. Krueger said more could have been done, but he agreed the project looked nice. Mr. Meade said he wanted to reward the client, as well, who let the architectural team go a little bit further. He wanted to encourage applicants and architects to do more projects like this. He noted that the bank building in Redmond that has been rebuilt as a power station would be another good example of innovative design ideas. Mr. Meade would support an Honor award for this project; Mr. Palmquist agreed. Throwing the garage into the project may be an option, Mr. Fischer noted. He will look into that possibility and get back to the Board on that issue.

The Redmond Medical Office Building was next. Mr. Meade wanted to exclude this project. He said the lighting was poor, and said the designers did not take the Board's advice on that issue. He noted that the designers were given many options to make changes. He said the back of the building was poorly executed as well. Mr. Nichols noted that the canopy lighting was far too bright. Mr. Palmquist and Mr. Krueger wanted to exclude it. Mr. Palmquist said many simple things could have been done to make this project better. After a really great start, with some circular stair towers on both ends of the building, the designers did not make those towers into nice-looking bookends for the project. Mr. Meade noted that the red piece on the project was poorly executed. The Board asked the applicant to play with the glazing

pattern, but that was not executed well either. Due to missed opportunities, the Board decided to exclude the Redmond Medical Office Building.

Next for the Board was the Fairwinds Retirement Community project, to which Mr. Waggoner wanted to give an Honor award. Mr. Meade said the project was very cool, with a lot happening for a retirement community building. He said it was a bit fussy. Mr. Nichols said it deserved some recognition and Mr. Krueger liked it as well. Mr. Nichols says there is a residential feel to the architecture which would be worthy of an Honor award. Mr. Meade said this project does not try too hard, but hits the target for the market of people moving into a facility such as this. Mr. Krueger noted that the project had good consistency with its hipped roofs, and was done tastefully overall. Mr. Fischer said it was a solid-looking project. The Board decided to give Fairwinds Retirement Community an Honor award.

The MAPS project was next. Mr. Waggoner had moved to exclude it from award status. Mr. Meade noted that he thought this building was well done, at first. He knows that Mr. Krueger does not like it. Mr. Fischer said that the front side of this building was well done, but the other three sides look like a concrete box. The dome on the building is an applied element of foam product. Mr. Palmquist said he still likes the project, in that it went above and beyond what it could have been. He noted that it was an exotic, rare design, and that may be the attraction for him. Mr. Meade said he liked the cool design, but does not like the foam arches over the windows. Mr. Meade said his honeymoon with this project was over. Mr. Nichols and Mr. Palmquist agreed to exclude it, as well. The DRB decided to exclude the MAPS project.

Next up for the DRB was Avondale Park. Mr. Waggoner is recommending an Honor award for this project. Mr. Fischer has provided more photos to the DRB to assist in the award process. Mr. Palmquist and Mr. Nichols moved to exclude this project. Mr. Palmquist likes the mission of this place, but he does not like the overabundance of Craftsman design elements. He is not sure about the extra roofs placed on the project. Mr. Meade said the project looked like a train station. The Board decided to exclude the Avondale Park project.

Moving on, the DRB looked at the Sequoia Estates project. Mr. Meade said the project did well to deal with some landmark trees. He moved to exclude it. Mr. Krueger agreed, and said the project only looks good passing by at 45 miles per hour. He said he did not get the design, which appeared too complicated to him. Mr. Meade said the drawings for this project were awesome, and far better than the building itself. Mr. Palmquist said he was always against this project. The DRB decided to exclude the Sequoia Estates project.

Next for the DRB was the Grass Lawn Park Shelters, which includes several buildings, including a storage shed and restroom building. The building in the middle is a maintenance building tucked into a hill, with tennis courts behind it. Mr. Fischer said the picnic shelter, the public building across the bottom of the site, was done outstandingly well. The maintenance building on the right is a background building, done nicely, but in the background. The top restroom facilities and maintenance buildings are upgrades to an existing building that involved some creative thought, in Mr. Fischer's opinion. Mr. Meade asked if the main building could be considered separately and recognized as Superior. Mr. Nichols agreed that the landscaping was outstanding. Mr. Meade said the maintenance building is a gem, as well, but it is just a utility building. The bathroom building, he says, was a difficult remodel due to budget constraints. It came out better than Mr. Meade thought, however. He said he loves the park and the project, but sees the bathroom as pulling the entire project down. Mr. Palmquist said he would support separating the main building. Mr. Meade said he would consider giving the bathroom more credit if it did not have such a loud exhaust fan system.

Mr. Fischer confirmed that the DRB wanted to give the picnic shelter building a Superior award. Regarding the other buildings, Mr. Krueger said they should not be lumped together. The buildings have been considered together because they were all presented at the same time by the Parks Department. Mr. Fischer said all three pieces of the project do not have to be recognized; he agreed the picnic shelter was deserving of a Superior award. Mr. Palmquist asked about excluding the bathroom and considering the maintenance building and picnic shelter as Superior. Mr. Krueger would support that, but he wanted to make sure the Parks Department knew the Board's position that the bathrooms turned out better than anyone anticipated. Mr. Nichols suggested giving the bathrooms an Honor award. Mr. Meade confirmed

that the lower building was Superior, and lumped the maintenance building with it. Mr. Meade wanted to exclude the bathroom, in that it should have been torn down in the first place. Mr. Krueger wanted to know how much it cost to remodel the bathroom as opposed to rebuilding it.

Regarding the maintenance building, Mr. Palmquist said it had an elegant, simple form, especially with the exposed rafters in the roof. Mr. Meade said the building is still a background building, but it frames the view of the park. The applicant did well to match materials of the maintenance building in harmony with the main building while still allowing the focus to stay on the main building. The cap to the building does what it is supposed to do, but in a crisp, clean and austere way. Mr. Krueger liked how the roof elements of the maintenance building echoed the main building in a subtle way. Mr. Meade said the project was handsome and tidy. The DRB decided to give a Superior award to the picnic shelter and maintenance building for the Grass Lawn Park Shelters project. The bathroom was excluded from award status.

Mr. Fischer showed the DRB a list of projects to be excluded. Mr. Nichols asked for a re-consideration of the Microsoft Building 88 West Garage project. He liked the use of the structural glazing and the poured form concrete and stainless steel. He said, for a garage, the designers took it to the next step. He would support an Honor award for this project, in that it was a nice-looking structure. Mr. Fischer noted that the overall Safeco campus, of which this building is a part, was given a Superior award previously. One of the features noted in that discussion was this garage. This building has come back to the Board at this time due to some additions to the garage. Those additions included another level for the garage. Mr. Nichols did not realize that this garage had been considered for an award in the past. Mr. Meade said he was a junior member of the Board when this project first came through, and remembered that this parking garage was regarded then as an outstanding design. There were concerns over views and lighting, but the garage was executed well. Mr. Meade said the previous garage design was more elegant, in terms of scaling. However, the designers did do what they said with their new project, in accomplishing the goal of getting extra parking and doing it seamlessly. Mr. Nichols said he would be okay with excluding this project. Mr. Krueger said the extra level was well done, but not necessarily award-worthy. Mr. Fischer thanked the Board for their work on the awards effort. He said he would try to pull all of these notes together soon, with a goal of having an awards presentation in June.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION MADE BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:06 P.M. MOTION PASSES (4-0).

April 5, 2012

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY