

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

February 7, 2013

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, Kevin Sutton, Craig Krueger, Mike Nichols

**EXCUSED ABSENCE:** Arielle Crowder, Scott Waggoner

**STAFF PRESENT:** Steven Fischer, Principal Planner; Dennis Lisk, Associate Planner

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Susan Trapp *with* Lady of Letters, Inc.

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Chair David Scott Meade at 7:53 p.m.

**MINUTES**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. NICHOLS AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 3, 2013 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 17, 2013 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (4-0) WITH ONE ABSTENTION.**

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**LAND-2013-00178, 18300 NE Union Hill Road Garage**

**Description:** Construction of a new multi-story parking garage to service an existing office park containing multiple buildings. Project is adjacent to Bear Creek.

**Location:** 18300 NE Union Hill Road

**Applicant:** Shawn Mahoney *with* OAC Services

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

Mr. Lisk noted this was the first pre-application meeting for this project, which is located at the Millennium Office Park off of Union Hill Road. It is a ten-acre piece of land that has six buildings, and is just south of Bear and Evans Creeks. It is within the Shoreline Management Zone for those creeks, so there are buffers that apply to the site. At least a portion of the garage would be within the outer buffer. That has an impact on the building height, to some degree, for a portion of the garage building. The garage is planned to have more than 300 new parking spaces for the site. All the building tenants on the property would use the garage. Mr. Lisk would like to address the design of the garage and its articulation and modulation. There are some requirements for screening of the garage. Where the top floor of the garage is visible, there are Code requirements for either landscaping or architectural screening. In other portions of the Code dealing with landscaping and shorelines, there are further requirements for screening along the edge of the garage or on the garage itself. Lighting and noise are two other aspects staff will be looking at carefully due to the proximity of this project to the shoreline. A portion of the site is also within a Critical Wildlife Area, which regulated by the Critical Areas Ordinance. A detailed review will need to be completed to make sure the light shed by the garage and the noise of the cars does not unduly the habitat area adjacent to the garage.

Shawn Mahoney presented on behalf of the applicant. He introduced Brent Rogers with NBBJ, the architect on the project, and Mark Brumbaugh with Brumbaugh Associates, the landscape architect. Mr. Mahoney said his client was negotiating with the building owner for additional space on the site. The project hopes to add three hundred more parking spaces on the site within the existing parking area.

Mr. Rogers said this project is in a pre-schematic status. He would like some feedback from the DRB on the organization of the garage and the planning strategy for the site in terms of massing and lighting. He showed the DRB some slides of the current site and some design sketches. The applicant has looked all around the site in terms of infrastructure and opportunities to park with the lowest impact. The site plan shows the existing parking, the strategy for the new parking garage footprint, and some initial plans about pedestrian safety and circulation. The applicant said the pedestrian circulation involves getting pedestrians from the garage to the buildings in the quickest, safest way possible. The parking areas would be re-striped and repaved to ensure clear circulation paths, especially going to the two buildings flanking the garage and the existing sidewalk structure south of the site. The applicant noted that this was a built site. The parking has been sited as close to the center of the project as possible in an area that would be big enough, which really only left two locations on the campus, the one presented and one other to the west. The site to the west has a major underground stormwater vault that would be very difficult to deal with. To the east, there are some utility issues and the distance from the parking to the buildings would appear to be prohibitive.

There are two setback lines, including a 150-foot setback line and another line that delineates a 35-foot height limit. Anything north of the height line would have a 35-foot maximum height limit. Anything to the south would have a roughly 60-foot height limit. The massing of the garage has been manipulated to fall within those guidelines, and no deviations from that have been requested. There are ten-foot landscape buffers to the north and south. A generator has been relocated on the north side, surrounded by a landscape buffer. The parking strategy calls for the use of the existing surface parking circulation, which would allow for people to get in and out of the parking area as quickly as possible. Fire lanes and buffers have been maintained. The building would slope down to the north to stay under the height limit and rise up on the south side. The office buildings on the site are two and three stories tall.

The applicant presented some initial lighting strategies. One concept would place lights at the perimeter of the garage, focusing the light on the center of the garage to avoid any light spill to the surrounding landscape. The study shows that the light spill is under a foot-candle once outside of the garage, as measured at the ground level. The applicant reiterated that this was a work in progress.

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

##### Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about some alternatives for the garage in terms of its size. The applicant said there are three strategies. One alternative took the shape of the garage presented and pushed it further north, away from the office buildings. Another lowered the garage and moved it further north. Both options are out of the realm of possibility in terms of zoning, shoreline, and setback requirements.
- The applicant said, with the help of the staff, he has developed the most realistic footprint. He said he was not trying to overreach on the parking count, so the footprint worked well for the site.
- Mr. Krueger asked about some anticipated additional square footage for the buildings on the site. The applicant confirmed that additional square footage would be put within the existing buildings and that new buildings would not be built. Mr. Krueger asked why more parking was needed at this point.
- The applicant said the previous development based the number of parking stalls on office space square footage. Recent developments in design efficiency have helped offices realize additional square footage on their sites, which in this case will create a need for more parking.
- Mr. Krueger said he has an issue with obvious ramps on parking garages. He knows that placing the ramp on the north of the project, toward the wetland, recognizes that concern. Even with screening, he believes the ramp could be seen on Avondale Road, which he believes is tacky.

##### Mr. Nichols:

- Was aware that the parking on this site was not ideal. He thought the applicant was making the best of a tough situation.

- Mr. Nichols said, in light of Mr. Krueger's comments, that the applicant should pay close attention to the screening to the north. The view of the garage from Avondale and homes to the north of the project was a concern for him. He wanted to make sure the vehicle headlights shining out past the parking structure would be taken into account, as well.
- Mr. Nichols asked if additional storm water detention would be put in on this site. The applicant said that would be located underneath existing parking. Mr. Nichols said he looked forward to seeing the next evolution of the design, and said the project was off to a good start.
- Mr. Krueger asked why more water detention was needed. The applicant said changes in the Code have necessitated the installation of a new detention vault.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Noted that staff had some concerns over articulation of the sides of the project. He asked the applicant if the project met the Code requirements for articulation, in that it appears to be a plain box structure.
- Mr. Meade noted that the buildings surrounding the proposed garage are basically metal and glass bands and it appears the parking garage is an appropriate response to the buildings.
- Mr. Palmquist wanted to see if the articulation requirement could be waived, in that he did not want to add things to the building. Mr. Lisk said it was not clear how the applicant was dealing with articulation, and the City was waiting for more design information.
- Mr. Sutton said he had nothing to add.

Mr. Meade:

- Said the project was off to a good start in that it meets the client's needs and matches buildings on the site.
- At the next meeting, Mr. Meade would like the applicant to demonstrate how headlights and other light spill issues would be dealt with. Mr. Meade said the next meeting should involve an approval.
- Mr. Krueger asked if the Microsoft Connector came to this site. The applicant said the existing shuttle service to this site would not be changed.
- Mr. Meade thanked the applicant for his time.

**PROJECT REVIEW**

**Redmond Center Repaint**

**Description:** Change of exterior color

**Location:** 8125 160<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast

**Applicant:** Amy Webber *with* Nelson Legacy Group

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

Mr. Fischer noted that this project was located behind Trader Joe's. This item came in just as the agenda was getting distributed, and staff did not want to hold the applicant up. Thus, it has been added to the agenda at the last minute. The owner is proposing to paint the building a darker brown with a lighter taupe accent on the trim. Staff found the proposed color scheme acceptable, though it is much darker than any of the other buildings in the center. Mr. Fischer noted that the building is somewhat separated from the rest of the Redmond Center properties. Staff noted that this project would set a background for the bike shop that is planned for to the site.

Amy Webber presented on behalf of the applicant, and showed the DRB the colors the tenant proposed. The idea is to make the building look more modern. The tenant has a ten-year lease and wants to change the look of the building from its old frontage, which was a liquor store.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked where the colors would be used. The applicant confirmed the colors would be used on all four sides of the exterior. The hope is a darker color would help the sign of the store pop, visually.
- Mr. Krueger confirmed that the walls of the building and the fascia would be darker brown, with a trim of a lighter color.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked if there were any discussion about the colors. Mr. Nichols said he thought the colors were pretty dark. Mr. Meade said the project across the street from this site had a dark color. Mr. Nichols said he was fine with these colors.
- Mr. Meade said the single-story retail stores around this site match up well with the color scheme the applicant has presented.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the sign on the site. Mr. Fischer noted that staff would review the sign administratively and the sign would not be part of the purview of the DRB at this meeting.
- Mr. Meade added that the beauty of paint is that it can be painted over.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the type of sign that would go on this fascia, and if it would be a white sign on the dark background, which he would have issues with.
- Mr. Fischer asked if this building would be part of the Sign Code for the shopping center. The applicant said it was separate. This parcel is not owned by Redmond Center. Thus, there is no sign program for this project as of yet.
- Mr. Fischer said the type of sign would be dictated by the square footage of the site. Mr. Meade asked for any further discussion.

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO APPROVE THE REQUESTED COLOR CHANGES FOR THE REDMOND CENTER 8125 160<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE NORTHEAST REPAINT. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).**

Mr. Fischer noted that this was the first electronic agenda he has sent to the members of the DRB. He will add to the agenda in the future that Wi-Fi is available at the City of Redmond. Thus, a laptop or other device could be used to log in and follow along. He asked the DRB members if the electronic agenda worked for them. Mr. Meade said it was slick, and he wished he had brought his tablet. Mr. Nichols said having a tablet is the way to go. Being able to get to the documents on the website worked fine for him and the agenda was clear and easy to navigate. Mr. Fischer said he would try to have a screen with the agenda visible at the meeting and run the television at the same time to make sure everyone is looking at the same page at the same time. Mr. Palmquist noted that some colors tend to wash out in the visual presentations using the screen and projector. Mr. Meade asked for a printed agenda to help lead the meeting. Mr. Palmquist said a printed page with staff recommendations would be helpful to him. Mr. Meade asked for the rubber footing of the microphone he was using should be fixed, which Mr. Fischer confirmed was microphone number one.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. NICHOLS AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:30 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).**

**March 21, 2013**  
**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

---

**RECORDING SECRETARY**