

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

April 4, 2019

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: Chairman Craig Krueger

Board members: Diana Atvars, Ralph Martin, Stephanie Monk, Kevin Sutton and Schaffer White

EXCUSED ABESENCES: Henry Liu

STAFF PRESENT: David Lee and Amy Tarce, Redmond Planning

MEETING MINUTES: Carolyn Garza, LLC

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 Mr. Krueger at 7:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 21, 2019 MEETING MINUTES. MOTION SECONDED BY MS. MONK. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Mr. White had not been present and abstained.)

APPROVAL

LAND-2018-01168, Macy's Building

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: Exterior alteration to add windows with new materials to match existing colors

Location: 7400 – 166th Avenue Northeast

Prior Review Date: 2/07/19

Staff Contact: Amy Tarce, 425-556-2938 or atarce@redmond.gov

Ms. Tarce stated that three suggested options from both the applicant and the Design Review Board had been reviewed since the last presentation. The original option for extending brick to the second story has been kept. The project is a remodel of the existing Macy's building in Redmond Town Center. Two additional windows will be on the second floor for a potential office space.

In this iteration for approval, other options will be presented that are acceptable to the applicant. Staff is recommending either option A or B. The other options failed to meet some Design Standards. For approval at this meeting, two conditions are recommended; to require that existing horizontal modulation be retained and the upper portion recessed by one foot, and for the Design Review Board to provide direction on window materials.

The applicant would like the Design Review Board to choose one option out of the four to move forward with.

Mr. UK Kang *with* Jensen Fey Architects continued. With the functionality and use of the building now changing, the best way to incorporate the window with architectural solutions has been examined. The applicant was in favor of the original option, incorporating the window but with more effort. Mr. Kang referred to other options, not described in detail for the audio recording but displayed on slides for the Board.

How the building could have been initially designed with an office space on the second floor was where the original option originated. Options A, B and C are reactive to the existing design concept. The second-best option for the applicant would be option B, which does a better job of accommodating windows.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Krueger

- asked about other questions that had been raised by the Board at the last presentation.

Mr. Kang replied that another study was done where brick was brought all the way up to be consistent, and this would also work. The study had not been brought to this meeting.

Ms. Tarce commented that the difference between the preferred original option and option B was the amount of brick; option B involved more brick.

Mr. Sutton:

- asked if there was a reason the proposed design should not be approved.

Ms. Tarce replied that based on the design checklist, the preferred design does not meet the tripartite articulation. Option B is a compromise as the applicant prefers the vertical orientation, but more space is allowed.

- Mr. Sutton asked if in option B, where windows terminate and brick stops, there is a recess back with the cornice emerging from that point.

Mr. Kang replied yes. There would be trim at the top of the brick, and a header ornament above the window.

- Mr. Sutton asked what material would be used at the top of the brick.

Mr. Kang replied that the materials would match existing material, EIFS foam.

- Mr. Sutton asked if the same profile across the top had been considered.

Mr. Kang replied that the window would be weakened architecturally, and the window trim had been deliberately designed differently from the top of the brick trim for rhythm.

- Mr. Sutton stated that while the rhythm is felt in the preferred option, the version being examined had a heavy base and the trim should run all the way through. Mr. Sutton was open to both options but would want the northwest corner to extend up.

Mr. White:

- Asked to see an enlarged view of the primary preferred option.
- Mr. White liked the proportions of the originally proposed design.
- Mr. White stated that the brick growing at the second level in option B felt top-heavy.
- Mr. White stated that the main design responds better to the original building and what was done on the ground floor.
- Mr. White suggested a hybrid of the option B cornice with the main option columns or brick layout.

Mr. Kang replied that original studies showed better termination at the top, where brick ends.

- Mr. White suggested that the main cornice line could drop down for a better termination point, so that what is both above and below the window is of similar proportion.

Mr. Martin:

- Agreed with Mr. White.
- Mr. Martin asked how tall the cornice would be from bottom to top.

Mr. Kang stated believing the height was approximately 30”.

- Mr. Martin asked how tall the building would be.

Mr. John Marx *with* Jensen Fey Architects stated 28’.

- Mr. Martin [inaudible] and these should be proportional.
- Mr. Martin preferred option B with a modified cornice [inaudible] or a modified main option.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated being in favor of a modified main option.
- Ms. Monk liked the vertical columns of brick with more of a top for tripartite articulation.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated being in favor of a modified main option.
- Ms. Atvars asked if the top cap is existing.

Mr. Kang replied yes.

- Ms. Atvars asked if staff needed further direction from the Board.

Ms. Tarce replied that a modified main option was preferred by the Board and will satisfy Design Standards meeting intent. Option B would be top-heavy. A revised condition would suffice.

Mr. Kang stated that EIFS was the material to articulate windows, consistent with the rest of construction. Instead of introducing a new material, staying with the same material is proposed.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated being in favor of a modified main option.

Mr. Lee suggested verbiage for a MOTION.

MOTION BY MR. WHITE TO APPROVE LAND-2018-01168 MACY'S BUILDING, THE MAIN PROPOSED ELEVATION WITH AN OPTION B CORNICE, EIFS MATERIAL SHALL BE USED AROUND SECOND STORY WINDOWS, AND WITH STANDARD CONDITIONS. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

PRE-APPROVAL

LAND-2018-01323, Woodside

Neighborhood: Southeast Redmond

Description: Construction of 170 homes with mixed-use townhomes and condominiums

Location: 7041 – 196th Avenue Northeast

Applicant: Nick Abdelnour *with* Polygon WLH, LLC

Prior Review Date: 1/17/19

Staff Contact: David Lee, 425-556-2462 or dlee@redmond.gov

Mr. Krueger has consulted with the applicant and recused.

Mr. Lee stated that staff would like to see more variation in the building forms and in colors found throughout the neighborhood for character. Article Three Design Review is met. Changes from the last draft are the addition of a picnic and bus shelter in one. Staff would like to see the shelter closer to the bus stop or a separate shelter provided for the bus stop. Materials being

reviewed are more detailed than in the Master Plan. More context regarding the neighborhood can be brought to the Board if needed.

Mr. Richard Rawlings *with* Polygon Northwest Co. stated that the 12-acre site is at the south margin of the Cadman property with very little vegetation. Northeast 70th Street will be extended from 181st Avenue Northeast to the west over to the site. 191st Avenue Northeast will be extended north to meet Northeast 70th Street. There is an existing pedestrian path which will be continued through this project and connected to other trails. Renderings were displayed.

A new roundabout will be installed at Northeast 70th Street and 192nd Avenue Northeast as suggested by Comprehensive Plan Roadwork. Buildings on the south property line will be the six-unit carriage buildings. On the east property line, the buildings are also carriage but have two units underneath on the slope, eight-unit buildings. The remainder of buildings are alley-loaded three-story townhomes. There is a 100' two-story zone along the south portion of the property, where the transition from single family to higher intensity use occurs.

A 20' x 24' shelter would accommodate a number of people, and the shelter could be used as a bus shelter. A suggestion had been to move the shelter closer to 192nd Avenue Northeast, but the applicant preferred not to because of the hours the shelter could be used not on an arterial. An additional metro-type shelter could be added, however, on 192nd Avenue Northeast.

Townhomes front onto a green open space. A connection has been made to Evans Creek. Renderings of the building designs incorporating previous comments were shown. Three color schemes are proposed; a green-brown blend, reddish, and blue-gray. Building separation to existing homes is approximately 40' with 30' of plantable space. The site will be more related to the surrounding neighborhood in height than currently. All driveways are parkable. A future City park and private property to be developed are across the street.

Mr. White asked if the color images being shown were the proposed color palettes. Mr. Rawlings replied that the colors were proposed.

Similar projects completed by the applicant around Puget Sound were shown. Mr. Rawlings hoped for further comments toward a possible approval at the next presentation.

Mr. Krueger asked if there were comments from the audience and there were none.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that there have been great improvements and appreciated that the applicant took Board feedback into consideration.
- Ms. Monk suggested that grass near the shelter be treated with landscaping or low fencing to minimize pedestrian traffic through, but that the location was not of concern.
- Ms. Monk liked the new color schemes.
- Ms. Monk stated that the exterior improvements had made a big difference.
- Ms. Monk stated appreciating the wider sidewalks and green spaces.

Mr. Martin:

- Asked for the shelter rendering to be zoomed in.

Mr. Rawlings described the details of a steel type structure, metal roof, painted with concrete plaza material underneath and fixed tables and chairs. A connection is not currently clear and can be enhanced. At the sidewalk and behind, a pad with benches is proposed as a bus stop landing area.

- Mr. Martin asked to see the roof perspective rendering and stated not understanding the new articulation.
- Mr. Martin stated that the colors were better but suggested not using blues and grays due to Pacific Northwest winters and cloudy days.
- Mr. Martin stated that of the color schemes shown, [inaudible] are better.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked where the bus would be pulling up exactly.

Mr. Rawlings replied that the School District will pick up on 192nd Avenue Northeast and would not enter the project.

- Ms. Atvars asked for a study to add a smaller version of the shelter near the road.
- Ms. Atvars liked the changes to the color schemes and suggested darker trims.

Mr. Rawlings replied that currently, trims were white

- Ms. Atvars hoped for some variety on the trims for pop.

Mr. Rawlings replied that projects have been developed both ways in the region and trim can be whatever Redmond prefers.

- Ms. Atvars suggested being classy and careful with brighter colors.

Mr. Rawlings replied that seeing an existing development example for reference would be helpful.

- Ms. Atvars asked to see the slide of the future City park view and asked if the carriage building façade could be enhanced because of the street frontage location.

Mr. Rawlings agreed and suggested roofline differences.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the carriage house has come a long way.
- Mr. White stated that the carriage buildings and roofs still feel massive and suggested the buildings split in half with a graceful transition.
- Mr. White suggested bringing a rendering of the pedestrian connection from the existing neighborhood for a better sense of the building mass.
- Mr. White asked that physical color samples be brought to the next presentation as the monitor display may not be accurate.
- Mr. White suggested more color contrast, and stated that the colors of the existing neighborhood were relevant 15-20 years ago and shouldn't necessarily be copied.
- Mr. White hoped to see a street shelter for the kids waiting for the bus.

Mr. Sutton:

- Suggested that the colors should remain muted or subtle to retain a relationship with the existing neighborhood. A transition could be made toward the center of the development.
- Mr. Sutton liked that the shelter is back from the street and suggested that it be made larger.
- Mr. Sutton hoped to see a rendering showing more design of the shelter.
- Mr. Sutton stated that the buildings on the side are tied together and, from the correct angle, can be read as one entire block long building with no breaks.
- Mr. Sutton asked for physical samples of paint colors.

Mr. Martin:

- Asked if there are any rooftop mounted equipment

Mr. Rawlings replied that there is no equipment. The roof pitch would be examined.

Mr. Sutton:

- Requested a ground level perspective facing the entire building.

Mr. Rawlings replied that a better perspective would be brought back to the Board.

Mr. White:

- Stated that a ground level perspective may show that the building is not as massive.

Mr. Martin:

- Stated that connector sidewalks could be different than the regular sidewalks in texture and color.

Mr. Krueger returned to the meeting.

BRIEFING

LAND-2018-00010, Esterra Park Block 6B

Neighborhood: Overlake

Description: Administrative Modification Briefing

Staff Contact: David Lee, 425-556-2462 or dlee@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee stated the Design Review Board had approved the project on September 6, 2018. Due to unforeseen circumstances the project had stalled, but is back on track with a new partner with the City, Inland Construction. A change to workforce housing from the split between affordable housing and market rate housing has been made, expanding the affordable category to a larger range.

In order for the project to be viable, three-bedroom units need to be built and this necessitates modifications to the approval. Before a formal presentation to the Design Review Board, feedback is requested in terms of the proposed changes.

Mr. David Sax *with* Clark Barnes continued. The exterior materials have not fundamentally changed and approved modulation has been kept. Buildings were made larger and windows were shifted; in example, a one-bedroom unit and a studio unit were changed to a two or three-bedroom unit. Slide renderings were shown. Courtyards have grown. Minor design changes were pointed out.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. White:

- Stated that the project looks better with more interest.
- Mr. White commented that in the northwest view, the last design was preferred for more definition to the upper corner.
- Mr. White stated that otherwise, the new design looks good.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated agreeing with Mr. White about the northwest upper corner.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated agreeing with Mr. White about the northwest upper corner.
- Ms. Monk appreciated that there will be more affordable housing in Redmond.

Mr. Martin:

- Agreed with previous comments.

Ms. Atvars:

- Agreed with previous comments.

Mr. Krueger:

- Agreed with previous comments.
- Mr. Krueger asked how far back the upper floor is set back from the lower floor in the northwest corner.

Mr. Sax replied 18" past the front face and an additional 2'; 3' to 3 ½' back from the edge.

- Mr. Krueger was curious if there would be income restrictions on behalf of renters.

Mr. John Fisher *with* Inland Group replied that workforce housing refers to an Area Median Income (AMI) restriction at 60% or below. There are no subsidized units or very low-income restrictions. Rent is reduced, much lower than the market rate based on family size. More three-bedroom units were added based on the demographic typically seen.

- Mr. Krueger asked for clarification regarding 60% AMI.

Mr. Fisher replied that calculation was dependent on the size of the household.

- Mr. Krueger stated that workforce housing was a step in the right direction.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTIONED BY MR. WHITE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:34 P.M. SECONDED BY MS. ATVARS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

May 2, 2019
MINUTES APPROVED ON

Carolyn Garza
RECORDING SECRETARY