

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

**FROM:** Thara Johnson, Associate Planner

**SUBJECT:** Emerald Heights Independent Living Building; PRE120029

**DATE:** March 7, 2013

**REQUEST:** CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF SITE PLAN, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, LANDSCAPE PLAN, MATERIALS AND COLOR

### PROJECT BACKGROUND

#### I. LOCATION & SURROUNDINGS

The project is located in the Education Hill neighborhood, within the Emerald Heights Retirement community, at the southeast corner of NE 111<sup>th</sup> Street and 172<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE. The Emerald Heights Retirement community comprises of 38.00 acres and was approved in November 1988 as a Planned Unit Development. The community consists of 33 buildings on 38 acres. The approved Planned Unit Development is comprised of 308 residential suites, 30 personal care suites and a 60-bed skilled nursing facility. Over the years, there have been several enhancements to the facility since the original approval.

The proposal aims to construct a new residential building along the south edge of the campus. The project includes constructing 43 units of independent apartments on three levels over one level of under-ground parking.

#### Surrounding Uses, Character and Comprehensive Plan Vision

Surrounding land uses consist of single family residential to the north, single family residential to the east and west (Abbey Road subdivisions), and Redmond High School located south.

The proposed project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan Vision for the Education Hill Neighborhood. The Comprehensive Plan land use designation for this area is Single Family Urban and is located in the Education Hill neighborhood. Neighborhood planning for this area accounts for the Emerald Heights facility as an existing facility and provides for compatible uses surrounding the community.

## **II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The proposal includes construction of a new independent living unit building that is approximately 100,345 square feet and will be located along the south edge of the campus, and will be detached from the main building, and consist of 43 apartments over one-story of underground parking. The building will feature open floor plans, radiant floor heating, a contemporary aesthetic, and a direct connection to the campus loop trail.

### Design Summary

The proposed Independent Living building is located along the southern edge of the Emerald Heights campus and is bordered by forested area to the south.

The exterior design of the Independent Living Units building is to include the materials and detailing strategies used on the new Fitness Center and the Multi-Purpose Building. These materials and design were chosen to complement the existing vocabulary of the campus without direct imitation. The design utilizes glass bays and cantilevered balconies to provide modulation along the façade horizontally. To create an urban streetscape, the building is broken into three primary masses rotated slightly to follow the curvature of the street. The connections between the three masses are treated as “knuckles” which constitute two Foyer areas between the three sections/wings of the residential floors, that are intended to break down the scale of the building on the exterior, while working to resolve the geometries of the rotated masses. The use of storefront windows at the “knuckles” will bring natural light into the corridors and provide shared lounge space for the residents of the building on the interior.

The City of Redmond Planning Staff has prepared this memo as part of a packet of materials for design review.

## **III. SURROUNDINGS, ZONING, AND STANDARDS**

### Surrounding Uses, Character and Context

Surrounding land uses consist of single family residential to the north, single family residential to the east and west (Abbey Road subdivisions), and Redmond High School located south.

### Comprehensive Plan Vision

The proposed project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan Vision for the Education Hill Neighborhood. The Comprehensive Plan land use designation for this area is Single family urban and is located in the Central Education Hill subarea. Neighborhood

planning for this subarea accounts for the Emerald Heights facility as an existing facility and provides for compatible uses surrounding the community. Below is the applicable Comprehensive Plan policy.

FW-13: Create opportunities for the market to provide a diversity of housing types, sizes, densities and prices in Redmond to serve all economic segments and household types, including those with special needs related to age, health, or disability.

N-EH-14: Encourage a mix of housing types, styles and a range of choices while maintaining the overall single-family character of established neighborhoods in Education Hill.

## **DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS CHECKLIST**

### **Zoning Designation**

#### **1. Site Requirements**

The site plan must comply with the following applicable site requirements:

Zoning: R-4

Minimum Building Setback on all Sides: Front - 15 feet, Side Street - 15 feet, Side/ Interior – 5 feet/ 10 feet, Rear – 10 feet

Maximum Lot Coverage of Structures: 35%

Maximum Impervious Surface Coverage: 60%

Maximum Building Height: 35 feet

Minimum Open Space: 20%

#### **2. Neighborhood Requirements (RZC 21.08.180)**

The proposed project is within the Education Hill neighborhood. No neighborhood-specific regulations apply to this proposal.

#### **3. Parking Requirements (RZC 21.08.060)**

a. Parking shall not be below the minimum requirement of 1.25 spaces per unit.

#### **4. Landscaping (RZC 21.32)**

a. The proposed Multi-Purpose Building is an improvement which is located within the Emerald Heights Retirement facility and is proposed where the current pool building is located. The applicants have submitted a landscape plan which complies with the City's landscaping requirements.

#### **IV. DESIGN REVIEW BACKGROUND ISSUES**

The Design Review Board reviewed this project at its June 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012 meeting as a Pre-Application request and at the November 1, 2012 meeting. At the November 1, 2012 meeting, the Board requested changes be made to the proposed design and additional details be provided at the next meeting. The Board recommended emphasizing a vertical break at the main entry to create more separation between the masses, as well as being very deliberate with the design of all rooftop penthouses. Individual comments from Board members are included below from the minutes of the November 1<sup>st</sup>, 2012 meeting:

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:**

##### Mr. Nichols:

- Asked about the window detailing Ms. Johnson had mentioned, and if she was looking for more vertical and horizontal mullions. Ms. Johnson agreed that that was indeed what she was looking for to enhance the windows.
- The applicant noted that the windows are fiberglass in the residential units. At the knuckle areas, the windows are a dark brown anodized aluminum, which matches the fiberglass window color.
- Mr. Nichols asked about the railings on the decks. The applicant said those railings would be aluminum or fiberglass, also dark, to match the window mullions.
- Mr. Nichols asked about the color of the feature wall. The applicant said the color and material does not show well on a computer screen. There are slight variations on a monochromatic palette, which should accentuate the pattern.
- Mr. Nichols said it was difficult to determine what the feature wall looked like in terms of tone, feel, and color.
- Mr. Krueger asked if the proposed change to the feature wall was due to a limitation on the color of the material. The applicant said there was some limitation in terms of color. The applicant has looked at several different tiles, and the tile presented was the best option considered so far.
- Mr. Nichols said a pop of color in the feature wall, especially at the main entry, would be desirable and would look nice. He said the colors presented in the sketches provided by the applicant do not have that kind of pop. He would like to see a different color for the tile that is out of the range of the body colors elsewhere on the project.
- Mr. Nichols confirmed the hardy panel would be a smooth panel, using an aluminum reveal system. The applicant proposed leaving the reveals as anodized aluminum, not painted, to give the wall more of a modern feel at the reveals.
- Mr. Nichols asked about the base of the building under the storefronts, and if that material would be concrete. The applicant said some cast in place concrete would be used, but he was not certain that material would come down that far on the building. Mr. Nichols confirmed that many of the site walls would be masonry.
- Mr. Nichols asked about the hammerhead required for the fire lane, and if the applicant might consider a grass paved product that would not stick out like asphalt. The applicant asked the fire department about that grass paved product, and the fire department does not like that material because it is slippery. Gravel would be acceptable for the fire department.
- The applicant is leaning toward using a stamped concrete that would look like stone and hopefully fade into the forest floor in this area over time.

##### Mr. Krueger:

- Asked again about the entry material and the blond brick and stone that have been used in other parts of the campus. Mr. Krueger suggested tying in some way to those materials with this new building. The applicant said the brick was considered as a feature material, but the project ended up looking like a chimney.

- The applicant said the brick contrasted too much with the modern look of this building, and did not provide enough of a vertical pattern to break up massing. Stone options have been looked at as well, but cleaner, polished stone was considered.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the wood supports at the entry and why this detail was not repeated anywhere else on the building. The applicant said the geometry of the lobbies in the building comes out parallel to the middle section of the building.
- The applicant has been trying to integrate the lobbies into the building, and thus the roof has been allowed to come out to the same level as the lower lobby. That creates a deep overhang which would require some sort of bracket, and the applicant looked to celebrate that with the wood supports. He admitted that the concept of tying in the wood supports to the building has not been resolved.
- Mr. Krueger said that even without the brackets proposed, that could be an interesting corner of the building. He asked about the dark trim at the corners to the right of the entry wall. Mr. Krueger said that trim seems to date the building and stands out to him.
- The applicant agreed with that assessment, and said the trim is probably a holdover from an older sketch that needs to be updated.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the features over the windows. The applicant said the idea was to provide a visual break at the upper level, or an eyebrow piece of some sort. This element is a bit unresolved. The hope is to create something that is not a detailing nightmare. A sunshade system will most likely be used over these windows. The applicant does not want a giant cornice on top of the building.
- Mr. Krueger said he recognized the concern over shading these windows.
- He asked about the west perspective and the step from the street to the site provided in the landscaping. The applicant said this was simply a perception due to the nature of the sketch. The hillside will actually be a smooth, planted hillside of low ground cover, not grass. Mr. Krueger actually liked the terraced look.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the parking provided. The applicant said there was more parking than allowed by Code. Residents say there is not nearly enough parking on site. There are fifty stalls in the parking garage and another fourteen in front of the building.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the dead-end parking areas that do not have space for turning around. The applicant said the spots in question were for assigned parking areas.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked about the trim at the right of the entry wall. He said defining the corners in this area with two colors actually looked good to him. He said if the applicant did get rid of the trim, hardy panel with mitered corners would be a good choice to keep with the modern look of the building.
- Mr. Palmquist asked about the windows, and noted that are some modern-looking windows and then some windows with mullions down the center proposed. He asked why all the windows could not have a modern look.
- The applicant said that the design has recently changed from casement windows to double-hung windows, which was not reflected in the model shown to the DRB at this meeting.
- With that in mind, Mr. Palmquist said the double-hung windows would look good all the way around the residential units. The applicant said that would be the case.
- Regarding the entry, Mr. Palmquist said the tile color needed to pop out from the hardy plank color. He said if this design needed to be much bolder if it was the only place this type of tile was used on the building. He suggested defining the knuckles of the building using the tile, possibly. He appreciated defining the entry, but wanted something much more substantial.
- Mr. Palmquist said the feature wall should be taller than the mechanical screen, if possible. The applicant noted that the mechanical screen was 20 feet behind the feature wall, and would not be visible from the ground. The screen could be visible from across the street.
- Mr. Palmquist would like the feature wall to break up the massing of the mechanical screen, or perhaps raise the screen to make it into its own wall. He suggested making the feature wall more of a trapezoidal shape to make it bolder.
- Mr. Palmquist said it was difficult to gauge the view of the roof from a distance. He wanted to see an elevation of that roof from the perspective of a resident seeing it from across the

campus. He noted that some residents feel very strongly about their views of this new building.

- Mr. Palmquist said the feature wall material could go around another side of the elevator inside the building, perhaps creating an L-shaped wall to create more of a magnificent entry piece. Overall, Mr. Palmquist said this project has progressed well and is heading in the right direction. He said the rest of the building was great, but he asked the applicant to improve the entry design.
- If the design could not be bolder at the entry, adding the feature wall material at the knuckles could work. However, Mr. Palmquist would really like that bolder entry piece. He said this was one of the most successful designs the Board has seen with a long, skinny entry area.
- Mr. Nichols said he would like to see how the applicant would be treating the top of the walls. If coping was used, the Board would like to see that material at the next meeting. He said this was a nice-looking project.
- The applicant said he was still looking for some matching colors for the hardy panel presented, but he could bring in some metal coping pieces for the Board to see.
- Mr. Palmquist asked for comments from the public in attendance.

Ms. Crowder- member of the public

- Arielle Crowder asked about the units in the back of the building, and if they were covered with tree shadows.
- The applicant noted that some trees would be lost in the building of this project, but trees would be replanted. In the short term, the units would get lots of daylight, but that amount of light would be reduced as the trees grow. The applicant said this was a heavily forested area.
- The applicant said more details on the landscaping could be provided at the next meeting. Mr. Palmquist said he would like to see those details. Mr. Nichols said he would like to see what specific materials and trees would be used. The Board and applicant thanked each other for their time.

## V. STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicant has made some changes to the elevations based on the Board's comments. The applicant has provided a description of the changes included as part of this request –

*Main entry of building:* The applicant indicates that a strategy of layered walls in the east west direction at the roof penthouses has been applied. The most prominent of these walls is located at the elevators in the main lobby. The wall is clad with a feature material, carrying it all the way from the elevator overrun to the entry lobby. As the feature material hits the ground plain, it turns into a horizontal surface originating as a floor inside the lobby and becoming a hardscape surface in the entry plaza. An interior stair has been oriented so that the building occupants circulate along-side and above the feature material. A primary goal with the feature wall is to bring a material that reads with some warmth to an otherwise modern and clean vocabulary. At the November 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, the Board encouraged the applicant to look at alternate materials for the feature wall. The previously shown tile has been substituted for a slate-look tile with a variety of colors ranging from dark gray to vibrant rust. To further accentuate the warm rust tones in the tile, a copper finish will be used on metal siding on the roof penthouses between the parallel walls.

The City of Redmond Planning Staff prepared a design checklist (see Attachment) which is derived from the Redmond Zoning Code design standards. Staff analysis is provided under the “Comments” column.

The staff recommendations below are based on the scores in the design checklist. A score of 3 in the first column means that the specific design standard shall be met by the project design, 2 means that the standard is of some importance, and 1 means the design requirement is optional or not practical for the proposed project. The second column of numbers reflects Staff’s numerical representation of whether or not the project met the design requirement. Wherever a design guideline has a score of 3, Staff determined that the project has satisfactorily met or exceeded the requirements of the guidelines. A score of 2 means the project meets the design standard for some parts of the project but will require additional action to address areas of deficiency. The texts in bold indicate areas of deficiency in design that must be further addressed by the applicant. A score of 1 means the project has not met the design requirement. The Staff Recommendations below reflect specific items to rectify design deficiencies to meet the design standards with a score of 1 or 2.

Staff finds the design of the proposed project meets the goals and intents for the neighborhood and complies with the City’s site development requirements and design standards. The building materials, colors, and architectural detailing for the project reflect the residential character of the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed landscaping will provide adequate buffering over time for the adjacent residential uses, while also improving the overall appearance of the property.

## **VI. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

The City of Redmond Planning staff recommends approval of the Building Elevation, Colors, Materials, Landscape Plan, and Lighting Plan for the Emerald Heights Fitness Center with the following conditions:

1. Presentation Materials Inconsistencies
  - a. Where inconsistencies between the floor plans and elevations are found after the Design Review Board has approved the building addition, the elevations approved by the Design Review Board at this meeting will prevail.
  - b. If, after this Design Review Board approval, there are any inconsistencies found in the information provided for the elevations, floor plans, landscape plans, lighting plans, materials and color between the presentation boards and the 11” x 17” submitted drawings, the Design Review Board and the Redmond Planning Staff will review and determine which design version will be followed for the proposed project.

Attachment A – Design Checklist

Cc: Julie Lawton, Lawton PMG, 7520 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE, Seattle, WA 98115