

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

March 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 (arrived late), Mike Nichols, Scott Waggoner

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Arielle Crowder

STAFF PRESENT: Steven Fischer, Principal Planner; Thara Johnson, Associate Planner; Carl McArthy, Code Enforcement Officer

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 7:00 p.m.

SIGN PROGRAM

LAND 2013-00358, Elan Sign Program

Description: Sign program for Elan (aka Center Pointe)

Location: 16345 Cleveland Street

Applicant: Victor Gonzalez *with* Greystone Development

Staff Contact: Carl McArthy, 425-556-2412 or cmcarthy@redmond.gov

Mr. McArthy noted that the sign code requires a sign program be created when multiple tenants or multiple buildings are involved. The program that is established becomes the sign program for subsequent tenants as a way to provide consistency. Staff has reviewed this proposal with the project's sign consultant, and staff did not see any issues with this program. Staff believes the proposal is appropriate for the current architecture and meets the signage needs for the site. Based on Redmond Zoning Code Section 21.44.010(G)(11), staff is recommending the DRB approve the Elan sign program as presented.

Victor Gonzalez with Greystone Development and Doug Raver from Outdoor Dimensions presented for the applicant. Mr. Gonzalez said the big yellow building on Cleveland is the project in question, at the corner of Gilman. The roof is going on now, and the hope is to have the building completed by the end of this year. The building houses 134 apartment units and covers 100% of the site. It is surrounded on three sides by public streets, with a trail on the fourth side. This is a mixed-use building with up to four retail spaces on the ground level. A restaurant will go in on one of the corners. In developing the sign program, starting several months ago, the applicant worked with an architect, an interior designer, the Outdoor Dimensions group, and the retail broker to create a coherent and flexible proposal that would meet all the needs of the project and stay within what Mr. Gonzalez says is a complicated Redmond Sign Code.

The applicant said the signs had to meet the Code and had to be functional, such that people knew where the entrances and exits were for different parts of the building. The signs would also have to be flexible, in that the retail space in the future could be divided up different ways. Plus, being on three streets, the aim was to get as much visibility for the signs as possible from each angle. Lastly, the applicant wanted the signs to look good and complement the design of the building. The retail on the ground floor is important, but is not the most important part of the project. The applicant showed the DRB some slides of the site plan, detailing the difference between the retail and the community identity of the site. On the rear of the building, there are no lit signs above the trail area. The retail spaces can be broken up a number of ways.

The corner site at Gilman will be the restaurant space. The other corner could be a financial institution, and the applicant is seeking a bike-oriented retailer in the space near the trail.

Per the Sign Code, the blade signs appear to be the most appropriate between the awnings. Those may or may not be used by the retailers. The blade signs would be internally lit. There are two corners with awnings, and in the middle, there is an entry awning. Channel lettering, internally lit with LED lights, would be on the radius of the awnings at the two sides and in the front. Two projecting project ID signs at the first level say "Elan," which is the brand name for these apartments. The applicant next showed what he called the community ID signs. There are two parking entrances for residents that are private. There is one commercial entrance that is public, so there has to be a differentiation between those entrances. The parking signs project out at the garage entrances to accomplish that goal. On the Cleveland elevation, the applicant showed the proportion of the signs in relation to the rest of the building. The applicant believes they are not overwhelming and tastefully done.

Doug Raver from Outdoor Dimensions, who will be manufacturing and installing the signs, spoke to the DRB next on behalf of the applicant. His business has been in operation 40 years, and he has been with the company for 25 years. His business has a lot of experience with apartments, retail centers and hospitals all over the western states of the U.S. The applicant took the Sign Code in mind when designing this sign program. All the signs are LED and low-voltage, which works well from an economic standpoint and with regard to insurance, as well. Mr. Gonzalez concluded by saying that he agreed with staff that the program met the Code, and he asked for the Board's approval.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Apologized for arriving late to the meeting. He asked about A-boards and if those were part of the sign program. The applicant said those signs were taken out in the final version of the program.
- Mr. McArthur said the Code allows sandwich boards for residential and retail use. That element does not need to be included in the sign program, but the Sign Code allows for that.
- The applicant said retailers love A-board signs, and some might indeed be on the site. Mr. Krueger asked if they would be tastefully done, and the applicant agreed. Mr. McArthur noted that A-board signs would be limited to a three foot by two foot size. One sign may be used per shop.

Mr. Nichols:

- Asked about the signs for the retail, and how they would be located on a sign band. He asked if those would be individual letters or a box with letters on it. The applicant noted that there would be no boxes at all, as those are not allowed in the City's sign criteria.
- The same point applies to the awning, the applicant said. Mr. Nichols said the project looks good.
- Mr. Meade agreed that the project looked fine, and asked for a motion.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE LAND 2013-00358, THE ELAN SIGN PROGRAM. MOTION APPROVED (6-0).

PROJECT REVIEW

LAND 2013-00238, Emerald Heights

Description: 43 residential unit apartment building with parking

Location: 10901 - 176th Circle NE

Applicant: Julie Lawton *with* Lawton PMG

Staff Contact: Thara Johnson, 425-556-2470 or tmjohnson@redmond.gov

Ms. Johnson noted that this proposal includes a new independent living unit building located at the southern edge of the Emerald Heights campus, which is located in the Education Hill neighborhood. It is about 100,000 square feet and is going to have 43 apartments on three stories over one floor 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. The exterior design of the independent living unit building, also called the Trailside Building, is to include materials and detailing strategies that were used on the fitness center and multipurpose building on this campus, both of which the DRB approved in

2011 and 2012. Materials and design were chosen to complement the existing vocabulary of the campus without direct imitation. The DRB last reviewed this application at its June 21, 2012 meeting as a pre-application request and then reviewed it again at the November 1, 2012 meeting. At the November meeting, the DRB members requested that additional details should be provided relating to emphasizing a vertical break at the main entry to create more separation between the masses. The DRB also asked for a more deliberate design of the rooftop penthouses.

The applicant has made changes to the elevations based on the DRB's recommendations. The applicant has also formally submitted the site plan entitlement application and completed the preparation process. Staff is recommending approval with standard conditions. Additionally, something not included in the DRB packet on this project, a design standards checklist, was offered to the Board members by Ms. Johnson. Mr. Meade confirmed that the applicant was seeking approval at this meeting. Mr. Krueger confirmed with Ms. Johnson that there were no outstanding issues on this application that would have scored a one or two in the staff analysis. She said she did not believe the applicant scored a one very much. Mr. Fischer said the checklist has been modified to say compliant or not compliant. He clarified that the number rating process is no longer used.

Architect Jeremy Southerland with Rice Fergus Miller presented on behalf of the applicant. He noted that this is the third time the DRB has seen this building. He reminded the Board that the independent living building is on the south end of the campus, separated from the main building by the circle drive that goes around the campus. Considering the existing aesthetic of the surrounding building, the applicant was trying hard to tie into some of the coloration and texture of the existing building without mimicking the style that has been there for a while. The building was, from its early concept, broken into pieces to follow the curvature of the road and to present a more urban aesthetic from a massing standpoint. The applicant says the landscaping is intended to create clusters of smaller, more ornamental trees to hopefully provide a little bit of visual interest in the middle of the three primary masses for the building.

There are three floors of apartment units over one floor of underground parking, and both ends of the building are stepped back for outdoor terraces to the upper floor apartments. The views from surrounding properties has been a concern on the campus, and the applicant has made sure that from the third floor of building directly across the circle drive, the sight lines have been taken into account. The applicant wanted to make sure that the roof of the new building was not visible from across the street. The applicant is relying on two different patterns or vocabularies of cement panel siding. Primarily, the lower and middle parts of the building have lap siding. A more modern panelized siding with an aluminum reveal system is on the upper portion of the building. The step backs have some eyebrow pieces that are more a sunshade to provide a visual cap to the building. The DRB had commented at an earlier meeting that the top of the building needed a treatment of some sort, and the applicant believes lighter colored panelized system answers that concern.

The main entry has changed the most since the last time the DRB saw it. The applicant has brought a larger, glassier storefront piece out in the lobby, and the main entry lobby is split on two levels. One level is at the street. A half a level up is the level one floor slab. This has allowed a nice stairway to happen in what the applicant is calling the feature wall, which is intended to be tiled with a slate-type of tile. The intent is to provide a warm feature, but have it in a more modern aesthetic with a long, linear stone tile. The pedestrian plaza has been provided at the front of the building along with a new glass and steel canopy, which has been kept intentionally as a simple design. The idea is to create a sense of place and enclosure with some benches underneath the cover. Some other benches will be out in the sun to provide a variety of gathering opportunities.

Eyebrows will remain on the ends of the building, allowing the mass of the center part of the building to be a little different from the others. The applicant would like to emphasize three distinct masses that are all visually tied together. The second knuckle of the building has been intentionally downplayed with some storefront windows to provide a lot of light into the lobby spaces. A small canopy structure has been placed in this part of the design over the door. The majority of the visual break will happen through the contrast of the lap siding versus the panelized system. The west end of the building, where the terraces are, the eyebrows cap the top of the building. The back side of the building, where it connects to the loop trail, there will be walk-outs from the units so that residents have direct access to the trail.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Waggoner:

- Said his overall impression is that this project has come a long way and has made some great improvements. Mr. Waggoner liked that the building had more articulation at each knuckle, and that each of the major massing segments have more turns to them, compared to the original scheme.
- Mr. Waggoner asked if the eyebrow elements would be open trellises.
- The applicant responded that the eyebrows would be an open slat, using an aluminum bar system. He added that some of the siding on the mechanical penthouses is shown as a faux copper finish. The eyebrow elements would have a similar finish to add some warmth.
- Mr. Waggoner said some shadow effect from the eyebrows could be interesting, as well.
- He asked about the decks and what their undersides would look like. The applicant said those elements would not be closed in. They would be painted. From a weatherization standpoint, the applicant said it would be simpler to leave the deck soffits open. That would be consistent with how the decks are treated throughout the campus.
- Mr. Waggoner confirmed that that the soffits would have wood that would be exposed and painted. Overall, he said the project looked good.

Mr. Nichols:

- Said the project looked great and that the applicant listened to the DRB's previous comments.
- Mr. Palmquist agreed, and said the project looked good.

Mr. Sutton:

- Agreed that the project looks good. He said the copper color is prominent in some of the renderings, and said it would have been good to have a better look at that color earlier.
- But overall, Mr. Sutton liked the project a lot better than the last time he saw it.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the effort that went into the effort of the sight lines, and asked the applicant why he went through that so quickly. The applicant said he could revisit that issue, and said the overall intent was to show that sight lines were considered in a very complete manner.
- The applicant continued that there is an active group of residents on the campus who are very concerned about how this building looks from many angles, and the applicant has done a thorough job at looking at that issue. The residents living in the building across have been reassured that they would not see the roof surface.
- Mr. Krueger asked if the residents were happy with this project. The applicant said he believed that was the case. Some resident forums were held about two weeks before this meeting, and everyone was excited about the project.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the windows that would be used. The applicant said they would be double-hung fiberglass. At the knuckles, an aluminum and glass thermal storefront window would be used.
- Mr. Krueger confirmed that the fiberglass windows could have a black color. Mr. Meade noted that fiberglass could be painted or powder coated.
- The applicant said the fiberglass on the site would be a dark brown, and is a standard window color from the manufacturer. The windows are white on the inside. Mr. Krueger asked if fiberglass were more expensive than the vinyl. Mr. Meade said fiberglass was a step up from vinyl.
- The applicant agreed, and said fiberglass would perform similarly from a thermal standpoint. Many windows were considered, and the fiberglass was chosen.
- Mr. Krueger said the project looks good, and he liked what the applicant has done with the focus on the entry and also how the applicant listened to the comments from the DRB. Mr. Meade called for a motion.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE LAND 2013-00238, EMERALD HEIGHTS, WITH THE STANDARD STAFF INCONSISTENCIES RECOMMENDATIONS. MOTION APPROVED (6-0).

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. Fischer noted that following the last DRB meeting, the Board conducted its election of officers. He presented the results and noted that there was no change in officers for this year. Mr. Meade and Mr. Palmquist will continue as officers of the Design Review Board for 2013. Mr. Fischer congratulated Mr. Meade and Mr. Palmquist.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. NICHOLS AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:39 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (6-0).

April 18, 2013
MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY