

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

April 18, 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 ABESNCES: Henry Liu

STAFF PRESENT: 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

Mr. Krueger stated that on page 4 of the March 7, 2019 Meeting Minutes, the name of the developer should be Robert Pantley and not Robert Payton.

MOTION BY MS. ATVARS TO APPROVE THE MARCH 7, 2019 MEETING MINUTES AS AMENDED. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. MARTIN. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY (Mr. Liu, Ms. Monk and Mr. Schaffer were not in attendance and abstained).

MOTION BY MS. ATVARS TO APPROVE THE MARCH 21, 2019 MEETING MINUTES. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. MARTIN. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL

LAND-2015-01974, Archer Hotel

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: Seven-story building on single lot - five stories for hotel and multi-functional use and two stories for a 170-car parking garage

Location: 7210 – 164th Avenue Northeast

Prior Review Date: 08/06/15, 01/21/16 and 05/05/16

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

Ms. Tarce stated that construction of the project is almost complete, having been approved by the Design Review Board on May 5, 2016. This is being reviewed post approval. During an inspection, eleven items were discovered in the exterior elevations that did not reflect what was in the approved and Design Review Board materials. After the presentation, the applicant will go through each item providing explanations for changes and how they will mitigate for these changes. Some but not all of the items will be presented but the Board was given the full list.

In approved plans, the entire garage deck is covered by the trellis element. Today, there is a 24' wide section not covered by the trellis which is the drive aisle for double loaded parking. Structural changes to the building would be necessary if the applicant were to extend the trellis. Staff examined the intent of the trellis, and the visual impact of seeing cars at that level was determined to be the issue. In trying to find an acceptable alternative to staff meeting the intent, as a condition of approval a recommendation is that the applicant provides permanent, decorative paving to mitigate the visual impact. The opinion of the Design Review Board as well as alternatives was desired.

The next issue is the replacement of the EIFS on the south elevation with masonry and extending masonry on the ground floor for both the southeast and southwest corners. Staff is not opposed to the treatment of masonry as this is a higher quality material, but in so doing, blanking wall is created for both corners. Staff recommends a condition of approval requires that the blank walls be mitigated. The code allows acceptable mitigation, including landscaped with windows and doors or a trellis element. Because of the progress on the project, staff believes that the most reasonable condition is the trellis element.

One new item, not in the staff memo, is glazing in approved plans on the third level of the garage. On the second level, spandrel and mullions mimic upper floors. The applicant would like to reflect the same treatment on the third level as the second level, inconsistent with what had been approved as part of the building permit and what had been presented to the Design Review Board at the time of approval. Staff does not have a specific recommendation and asks the Design Review Board to make the

determination. Corner treatment on the third level of the garage is a new issue that came up after the staff memo was prepared. This corner treatment will be item 12.

Ms. Tarce stated that being submitted tonight would be an additional condition of approval, item number 7C. The City of Redmond Planning staff recommends approval of the building elevation and materials with the following conditions:

1. At the southeast corner tower, add spandrel glass window and match the southwest corner treatment.
2. At the south elevation, add approved windows or use window boxes (for windows, such as those used at the former Macy's entrance facing the plaza).
3. At the south elevation add the approved brackets that connect stone baluster with the trellis or a similar alternative.
4. At the ground level of the south elevation, mitigate blank walls per Redmond zoning code 21.60.040.b.6.
5. Install caps to all masonry walls for the profile as depicted in the Design Review Board elevation drawings approved on May 5, 2016.
6. Provide visual impact mitigation of the entire garage deck with an acceptable alternative, in example decorative art as paving in the drive aisle if the trellis is not a viable option.
7. Presentation material inconsistencies.
8. Inconsistencies between floor plans and elevations found after the Design Review Board had approved the project; elevations approved at this meeting shall be deemed to the correct information approved.
9. If further inconsistencies are found following the Design Review Board approval at this meeting, The Board and staff will review and determine which design version will be followed.

For 7c, the Design Review Board approval for building elevation, landscaping and architectural details at this meeting are limited to twelve items that have been presented by staff and discussed in the staff memo and at tonight's meeting. The site copy approved for the project, associated building permits, BLDG-2016-00811, BPLN-2016-05448 and approved civil plans CIVPLAN-2016-00801 shall be the basis for planning staff inspection to determine the issuance of the building certificate of occupancy.

Mr. Bob Mannon, Vice President of Development *with* Lodgeworks Partners L.P; Mr. Howie Beauchamp, Project Architect *with* LK Architecture; and Mr. Roger Brown, Design Architect *with* LK Architecture were introduced.

Mr. Mannon stated that the project was tremendous for the City and community and looked forward to the opening. The building is complicated and some conflicts remain. The hotel is hoped to open in late May 2019.

Mr. Beauchamp continued that the Board members had been given a layout sheet with original design conceptual elevations. The elevations presented four years ago have not been completely fulfilled in the execution of the final building. Elements of contention with planning were as follows.

First, although balconies were hoped to be emphasized, larger balconies could not be sprinklered per the Fire Department. The balcony size has been reduced by one foot as a result. Renderings were displayed.

Mr. Beauchamp asked the Board if questions should be addressed at each issue or at the end of the presentation, and Mr. Krueger replied one at a time.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Krueger

- Stated that the issue was addressed through a Fire code standpoint, reducing size by only a foot, and was not a major issue.

Mr. Martin:

- Asked about a discrepancy seen in the size of the balcony between the rendering displayed and the staff recommendation markup.

Mr. Mannon replied the size was the same.

- Mr. Martin stated that the tower piece extends further and what is seen is not sky but a building beyond to the right.

Mr. Mannon replied that the entire area had not been clouded.

- Mr. Martin stated not seeing railing in front of the second half of glazing and asked if the issue was the rendering.

Mr. Mannon replied seeing the issue of Mr. Martin. Ms. Tarce replied that several balconies had been shortened and that unless each section would be approved separately, staff recommendation is either approval of the entire drawing or not. Staff opinion is that shortening of the balconies does not have a significant impact on overall character regardless of which side.

- Mr. Martin asked to see a camera photo of the balconies.

Mr. Mannon asked for clarification from Mr. Sutton that in the original rendering, an element not identified for the audio recording was different.

- Mr. Martin asked for the reason that the element referred to had been brought back.

Mr. Mannon replied that when the element being described became narrower, the element became less usable and length did not play into the usability of the space.

- Mr. Martin stated being satisfied.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked if the applicant had not wanted to sprinker the balconies or if they could not be sprinklered.

Mr. Mannon replied that sprinker systems were complicated to accommodate with exposed pipe either inside or outside. There is also floor to ceiling glass. The decision had been made to shrink the balcony one foot as no coverage is required at less than four feet.

- Ms. Atvars stated that the rendering appeared cleaner in the original design but if prior detail had not been known, the building would still work.

Ms. Monk:

- Agreed that the original conceptual renderings looked better but working with Fire code was understood and was okay.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that to rectify the situation, the solution would be drastic at this point in time.

Mr. Sutton:

- Believed the fix is impractical and standard practice is to bring back to staff when changes are desired to the exterior.

Mr. Beauchamp continued to the second item. Original design drawings showed cable rail horizontal balcony. The cable rail could be used as a ladder and the owners made a safety decision for families with children in the hotel. Cable rail has been replaced with glass panels.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated being very good with this change.

The next item is the south façade where the elevators are against the tower form. An oversight was discovered that center panels were not shown as spandrel.

Mr. White:

- Stated that if the issue had come back to the Design Review Board, shadow boxes would have been preferred over spandrel glass.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that the spandrel breaks the symmetry, not the best choice but not the worst.

Mr. Martin:

- Asked how close the shaft is to the spandrel glass.

Mr. Beauchamp pointed the shaft out in a rendering.

- Mr. Martin stated that a different treatment around the shaft would have been better.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that it would be hard to see the entire façade at any given time from the surrounding road and in the pedestrian experience, but it can be seen from State Route 520.

Mr. White:

- Stated that at night the difference would be stark but did not know of a fix.

Mr. Krueger stated that ideas may come later but asked the applicant to continue.

Mr. Beauchamp continued to the location of spandrel glass in the garage floor levels. Spandrels are used to hide car headlights or for fall protection on each of the floors. The goal was to make the garage feel like the building. During the construction process,

mullions and spandrel were chosen to leave the garage as open as possible and to extend the elevation.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that in the approved plans the brick extends above the cornice. The original was preferred.
- Mr. Sutton asked if there was a reason for the condition or adjustment.

Mr. Brown replied not being aware of the reason for the change.

- Mr. Sutton asked if there is glazing or if this was open. Mr. White added that what Mr. Sutton was asking was that in-between spandrel read like glazing.

Mr. Brown described a rendering in regard to where spandrel had been added but not in detail for the audio recording.

Mr. White:

- Asked if they are spandrel or open and no vision glass applied.

Mr. Brown said “yes” and described more renderings but not in detail for the audio recording.

- Mr. White asked if it could be said that everything on the floor is either open or spandrel glass with no vision glass.

Mr. Brown replied yes.

- Mr. White asked about a possible shadow line.

Mr. Brown replied yes, but a subtle difference and not as much as is shown in the rendering.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked if the shadow line was another change that occurred during construction.

Mr. Brown replied no; the change was probably an inconsistency from schematic to reality. The wall is framed and materials are veneered, tiled and EIFS.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that functionally this is an improvement helping with headlight glare.
- Ms. Monk stated that there appeared to be a lot of push back visually from the Board on the change and wondered if there is a relatively easy fix.

Mr. White:

- Stated that spandrel glass serves the purpose.
- Mr. White stated that the lack of glazing felt unfinished; the original approval was for a mix of open and glazing and one or the other would be preferred, rather than a mix.
- Mr. White stated that other discrepancies have been discovered between what was shown in elevations and what has been executed.

Mr. _____ :

- Asked if there is a garage exhaust system, or if the garage must be ventilated naturally.

Mr. Brown replied the garage must be open as presented originally to the Board for natural ventilation. There is no mechanical ventilation.

- Mr. White asked to see the original elevation and stated the elevation did not align with an open ventilation concept as some are open and some are closed.

Mr. Brown showed a rendering and explained that everything below headlight height is open on the second and third floors.

Mr. Tarce described an image of the garage that had been confusing to staff regarding glazing. When we looked at the second and third level of garage, it shows glazing on the third level of the garage so staff was made to believe this was the intent.

- Mr. _____ stated that the corners do not work.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that in all renderings, the middle tower with the trellis roof bumped out and was not portrayed correctly for the Board previously.

Mr. Brown asked if what was meant was that the renderings did not reflect the built condition.

- Ms. Atvars stated that the question regarding the middle tower was a different issue and could be addressed after the garage issue.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked to see the rendering of what the west elevation looks like today.

Mr. Brown replied not having the west elevation rendering.

- Mr. Krueger asked to see the graphic of the lower left corner, what is being proposed to the Board at this meeting.

Mr. Martin:

- Stated that the east and west sides were the same in previous comments and asked for clarification that both sides are the same.
- Mr. Martin stated that 3-D renderings show a popping out but this does not occur in the photo; the only pop-out is the thickness of the veneer.

Mr. Brown replied that being so close to the property line, design had to change in order to make the ramp work on the inside for access to the garage. Mr. Beauchamp replied not being sure in inches how much further toward the property line the garage could be extended out.

Ms. Tarce distributed a site plan to the Board members showing property lines in relation to the building footprint.

Mr. Mannon stated that easements had been obtained from Redmond Town Center (RTC) for balconies as they project over the property line.

Mr. Krueger asked if there was something that could be done as far as using a different material to add shadow line in some fashion.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the material should have been all brick being all on the same plane, no stone.
- Mr. White did not have a fix for this issue aside from removing siding and re-installing and suggested moving to the next issue.

Mr. Beauchamp asked if the garage being open was okay, and Mr. White replied the garage would need to function.

Mr. Beauchamp suggested that stone could be capped to give a break and dimensionality depending on the property line.

Ms. Tarce stated that easements can be researched further. A public right-of-way does not allow for extensions but a private street will allow extensions. Mr. White replied that a fix would be disruptive and suggested tabling and moving to the next issue.

Mr. Beauchamp continued. In order to hide headlights and provide fall protection along the entire slope of the garage, the opening for the garage became smaller in order to accomplish.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that there are more significant issues in the south elevation facing the street.
- Mr. Krueger suggested moving to the next issue.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the garage was okay, preferred the original design but there was obviously a practical reason for the change.

Mr. Beauchamp stated that the next item was somewhat related. The specific location was not identified for the audio recording but comments were that the southwest corner is shown to be different than the southeast corner. There is a floating floor. A slab location cuts through the location of glass. An attempt was being made to hide sloping behind a flat wall, to hide the sloping floor.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked for clarification that the slab penetrates into the space where the window well would have been.

Mr. Beauchamp replied that the area is deep enough that continuing glass on the same plane was prohibitive. Spandrel had been designed but, in reality, the slab was cutting into the window interrupting the frame behind it and removing the integrity of glazing. The solution at the time was to continue the EIFS to the left.

- Mr. Sutton asked if the slab could have been cut back to accommodate the glazing.

Mr. Beauchamp replied that prior to the pouring of post tension concrete slab, this would have been an option. Solution at that time was just to continue the EIFS. We didn't think it would be good to add a narrow slip of glass and a sliver of EIFS as it won't relate to anything on the façade. In initial design the slab should have been cut back and glazing could have preceded.

Ms. Tarce asked that staff had included a condition for approval for spandrel, so are saying spandrel could not be used in the location?

Mr. Beauchamp stated that the same condition carried around to the east side. There is a five-foot grade change between the sloping garage floors that prohibits each end from being the same.

- Mr. Sutton stated being okay with the composition of the two corners, but the issue was still that the corners don't match.

Mr. White:

- Agreed with Mr. Sutton that the issue is the lack of symmetry across the façade.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked if that would wrap around the southwest corner as well.

Mr. Beauchamp replied yes, matching the condition with the southwest. There is glazing present now supported by the glazing below.

- Mr. Krueger stated that at the southwest corner, glass could be corrected with framing and EIFS.

Mr. Beauchamp replied that the window wall would need to be pulled for the floor.

Mr. Beauchamp stated there is no glazing in the interior of the southwest corner because of generators.

Mr. White:

- Would like the corners to be treated the same.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked if this is doable.

Mr. Beauchamp stated that this would not be free.

Mr. Brown stated that the glass is from Poland, a unique window system that the contractor had presented. Windows will be added but storefront will be mimicked. Similar frame profiles can be achieved but obtaining more glass from Poland probably would not occur.

Mr. White:

- Asked if the bend between the top and bottom portions are part of the window system as well, and asked if the aluminum were a window wall or curtain wall system.

Mr. Brown replied that the design is a storefront type system and not a curtain wall system.

- Mr. White stated that what the Board proposed was to swap out the bottom portion for EIFS on the southwest corner in order to match the southeast corner.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked if, aside from cost, the suggestion of Mr. White could be achieved.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated being fine with the south elevation appearing differently than the north elevation.

Mr. Brown stated that the trellis had been the most difficult part of the project for the contractor. A sub-contractor had been hired but left the project during the process. Another sub-contractor able to produce the original design was not found. A simpler trellis was designed architecturally from steel that would have a look of the original design. A rendering was shown.

Mr. White:

- Stated that a straight element was okay but did not feel robust enough in the space.

Mr. Brown replied that the straight element was chosen, being easier to construct and matching the lean-to on the highest points of each roof.

- Mr. White stated that this was more proportional and may need to be a more substantial piece of steel.

Mr. Sutton:

- Agreed with Mr. White.

Mr. _____ replied that the trellis is a much lighter weight than originally designed and proportions could be altered to be heavier.

Mr. _____ stated that 4 x 4 angles could be enlarged to 6 x 6 with a wider channel for more stature.

- Mr. Sutton stated that the channel should be deeper and not wider and depth would look better.
- Mr. Sutton would leave to staff to decide construction and proportion.

Ms. Tarce asked for clarification and Mr. _____ replied that there were angles and not channels.

- Mr. Sutton stated that rectangular Hollow Structural Sections (HSS) rather than an angle would be better for depth on the outside.

Mr. _____ asked if a larger solid tube would be adequate and Mr. Sutton replied deeper.

Ms. Monk:

- Asked if a condition for approval for brackets was being discussed.

Ms. Tarce replied that staff recommendation was to improve the original design, an arch with deeper dimension or an alternative. An alternative had been proposed but if quality did not match the original design, staff hoped for additional conditions from the Design Review Board.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked for clarification that the heavy horizontal brackets are not present today.

Mr. _____ replied correct.

- Mr. Krueger stated having taken a photograph this week of the building.
- Mr. Krueger asked if there would be value in providing a prototype for staff.

Mr. _____ replied that a rendered mock-up could be made but a physical prototype was not necessary.

Ms. Tarce asked if the Design Review Board hoped to see the rendered mock-up after staff. Mr. Sutton stated being okay with staff making the decisions and providing technical details.

Mr. Brown continued with the garage. Originally, the idea was to cover the drive and parking stalls. Because of the way the project stopped with the sub-contractor, the option was no longer available because of the structure for spanning. A decorative painted pattern on the driveway now will be seen from room windows looking down. Parking stalls on both sides now will be covered. Post tension concrete slabs with a traffic topping and a simple pattern down the center section of the garage was suggested.

Ms. Tarce added that durability of paint was an issue for staff. An alternative material used for pedestrian crossings that appears as brick has been presented to the applicant.

Ms. Monk:

- Asked for clarification of the location of the trellis.

Mr. Brown replied that there would be trellis on both sides. Only the drive aisle is exposed and if not acceptable, a graphic would be placed in the drive aisle only.

- Ms. Monk stated that in regard to durability the pattern would look great for only a short period of time and the trellis was more important.

Mr. Sutton:

- Agreed that getting the trellis correct facing the street is more important. From a design review standpoint, people in rooms seeing parking did not make a difference.
- Mr. White suggested that the funds be used toward an element the rest of the public would see.

Mr. White:

- Agreed with Mr. Sutton that nothing done would be better than an element that will look shoddy in a year.

Mr. Krueger:

- Agreed with Mr. Sutton and Mr. White.

Mr. White:

- Commented that the column on the post is very skinny

Mr. _____ replied that the column was an anchor solution.

Mr. Krueger:

- Agreed with Mr. White regarding the column.

Mr. Beauchamp asked if the treatment should be only on the south elevation and not the other verticals. Mr. White replied that the treatment would be accepted there and the visual from the street is of concern, not from inside the garage.

Mr. Brown continued to window locations. Two additional windows were originally shown on the south elevation and were approved by the Building department, but the windows were not built. If necessary, adding the windows back is doable.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the windows were necessary.

Mr. Martin:

- Asked what is behind the windows that would be added back in.

Mr. Brown replied garage and parking stalls. A rendering was shown. The top half of windows would need to be spandrel due to a ceiling at the elevation. Mr. Beauchamp replied with another solution.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked if there were an alternative other than a window, in example a shadow box, like at the Macy's building.

- Mr. Krueger stated that the southwest and southeast corners had been compromised with the changes. It can help with the blank wall. It doesn't have to be a vision glass.

Mr. Beauchamp asked if Mr. Krueger hoped for a pocket in the wall.

- Mr. Krueger replied that something that would continue the pattern was needed.

Ms. Tarce commented that the windows in questions should appear as the windows above and suggested the applicant view the Macy's building at Redmond Town Center for the ground floor shadow boxes. Staff recommends that the Design Review Board requires the applicant to provide the same quality of windows used at Macy's. A design with mullions but not glass will not have the same quality effect. The windows contribute strongly to the overall quality of the south elevation because without the windows the garage line is very clear. In the original review of the project, the Board was very concerned about mitigating the two-level garage, a very public face of the building. Putting the windows back has a strong contribution to the quality of the building.

Mr. White:

- Was concerned that spacing would not be able to be maintained.

Mr. Beauchamp replied that the base of wall construction is 1½" of EIFS, weather barrier, 5/8" sheathing and stud back up, no way to pocket a faux window in. A hole would be made, re-waterproofed, and an attempt made to replicate the windows above. The same size window and same spacing would be used. Details were described for the Board but locations were not identified for the audio recording.

- Mr. White hoped that effort would be spent on the ground two floors with more detail.
- Mr. White stated that the composition was okay but everything below needs more attention.

Mr. Sutton:

- Agreed with Mr. White and was okay with the windows not being returned.

Ms. Atvars:

- Believed that the windows should be added if possible.

Mr. Martin:

- If new windows are to be added, it must match the windows above. Believed a new element should not be introduced and is fine both ways.

Mr. White:

- Asked if there is an exhaust and stated that keeping the punctuation going down the building was important.
- Mr. White stated that if windows are to be added then the exhaust vent should be added also for consistency.

Ms. Monk:

- Agreed with Ms. Atvars that the windows should be added and stated that actual windows may brighten the garage.

Mr. Beauchamp continued. A 4" cap between tile and EIFS was not installed by the contractor, who used 1" in some locations and 4" in other locations creating an inconsistency. The applicant intends to have the contractor re-install the caps per the original plan, painting the cap flashings to match cast stone caps on top of the pile esters.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the solution sounded reasonable.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated seeing nods from the other Board members.
- Mr. Krueger asked for clarification regarding the stone.

Mr. Brown replied that the stone was a man-made product using concrete for the look but a finer quality than natural stone with fissures. The stone protects the cap of the wall.

- Mr. Krueger asked if the stone could be place on the east and west sides of the building

Mr. Brown replied that the stone must hold onto something such as a steel lintel.

Mr. Brown continued. Originally, the EIFS color came to the ground. During the construction process, stone was incorporated. A vent location splits the ethos and stone

and the option for stone all the way across was chosen. The stone is a nicer material than EIFS. On the east and west sides of the south elevation the stone can be seen extended in the rendering.

Mr. White:

- Asked if a trellis or additional signage could add relief and character.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that when driving west on Bear Creek Parkway, the southeast corner of the building stood out as unattractive. At that time, Mr. Krueger questioned whether the Board had approved the design. The corner is prominent to traffic and ideas to mitigate the blank wall are necessary. Mature trees could be one to approach.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that an ornamental tree would be a better solution than attaching something that will grow up the wall. They would prefer landscaping that breaks the wall but separate from the wall.

Mr. White:

- Asked how large the planting strip is.

Ms. Tarce replied not having an actual measurement, but the strip is half of the width of the parkway landscaping. A concern was regarding trees is that roots can damage a building foundation. Shrubs would not accomplish mitigation of the blank wall because the masonry wall is very tall.

Ms. Monk:

- Asked if a piece of art that can be taller has been considered.

Mr. Martin:

- Asked if a green screen wall could be attached onto the masonry, with vines eventually crawling up part of the wall.
- Mr. Martin asked for clarification regarding the panel.

Mr. Beauchamp replied that the panel is silver anodized corrugated steel.

- Mr. Martin stated that there are many materials being used at the corner, and while this design might be alright in the back of the building, the main corner appears as a hodgepodge.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that the previous comment regarding using art might make the corner even busier.

Mr. White:

- Asked if a horizontal trellis to add another layer and divide the blank wall could be used.
- Mr. White asked about a window or garage door on the side.

Mr. _____ replied that the area in question is an exercise room, pool, and meeting room, and the door is a stair exit.

- Mr. White asked if options could be brought back to the Board such as greenery up the building, proposed landscaping or a horizontal trellis element.
- Mr. White stated that extra stone took one element away that helped to break up the corner.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked about a signage allotment area on the project.
- Stated that having signage on the side and not facing the highway was odd. Would accept signage on south elevation with tall plantings.

Ms. Monk:

- Asked if more attractive or decorative vent covers could be considered.

Mr. White:

- Stated that several options have been suggested and the Board needs to see a proposal before a determination.
- Mr. White stated that the suggestions were additive so there should be less of a time crunch.

Board heard 4 or 5 different options. This should come back to the Board.

Mr. Mannon replied having an opening to come back to the Board in the latter part of May, 2019.

- Mr. White asked if an agreement could be reached so that occupancy is not held up with work completed later.

Ms. Tarce replied that the code does not give the authority to bond for anything architectural that is not completed. If only green screen or plants are asked for, we can deem as landscaping and bonding can occur and the schedule can be accommodated with a temporary certificate of occupancy (TCO). Some additives may be substantial, however, and a TCO is active for only 90 days. This should be a consideration for what is conditioned.

Mr. Martin:

- Asked if a TCO for longer than 90 days could be issued.

Ms. Tarce replied only in very special circumstances. If the Board feels very strongly about a certain mitigation requiring additional time, management would be made aware.

Mr. White:

- Asked if the work would need to be completed or only an agreement made within the 90 days.

Ms. Tarce replied that the work must be completed.

Mr. White:

- Asked if a Motion with a condition to come back and request a longer TCO should be made to expedite.

Ms. Tarce replied that staff would recommend that the project be presented to the Board as part of a formal review. The project can be brought back quickly as the item is small. The Board decision is part of the record and what is discussed outside of a meeting would not be included in project approval.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that staff should come back for a Motion, with consideration that a TCO should be issued so that May 2019 occupancy can occur.

Ms. Tarce replied understanding that the Board concurs with staff recommendations for the issues 1,2,4 and 5:

- Approve shortening of balconies
- Approve balcony glass panels
- Approve spandrel glass replacing clear glass and open non-glazing at parking garage level 2 and 3
- Approve smaller garage opening on south facade

The issue tabled was regarding replacing windows with spandrel because of the elevator lobby.

Ms. Tarce stated that possible revised conditions had been mentioned by the Board regarding the southeast corner tower, moving the window at garage level and replacing with EIFS. The Board condition would be to match the southwest corner with the southeast corner.

Ms. Tarce stated that regarding the south elevation and windows eliminated at garage level, the staff condition of approval is to add approved windows or window boxes that match below.

Ms. Tarce stated the next issue was removing the decorative brackets of the trellis. Staff agreed that a deeper dimension should be achieved and the issue would be brought back to the Board.

Ms. Tarce stated that the next issue was the profile of cap flashing. The applicant will restore.

Ms. Tarce stated that the Board was not concerned about the drive aisle or a need for mitigation. Mr. White replied that the only issue was that the vertical posts along the south elevation should be more substantial. Ms. Tarce replied that this issue would be a part of the condition for the bracket and would be brought back to the Board.

Ms. Tarce stated that an approval could be given at this meeting with items to be brought back to the Board.

Mr. White:

- Asked about adding a cap piece to the top of stone at the east and west elevations for depth.

- Mr. White suggested a product without structural requirements. There's a product that's foam that can be attached and does not require structural changes.
- Mr. White asked for clarification regarding the EIFS and stone.

Mr. _____ replied by describing a rendering. A 4" flashing cap would give a horizontal band.

- Mr. White asked if the stone could turn the corner.

Mr. _____ replied possibly.

- Mr. White suggested covering with flashing as the element appears glued on.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that the element was a major shortcoming of the built product versus what the Board had been shown in renderings and elevations. Everything is in a flat plain and not as previously presented to the Board.

Mr. White:

- Asked why the columns recess back going up two floors.

Mr. _____ replied that the wall had to be built out due to an issue with the slab or piece of steel. The property line could also be a factor.

- Mr. White asked if the Architects understood that the renderings that were presented to the Board in the original proposal are not as built.
- Mr. White did not want the building re-built but different options to address depth are needed.

Mr. Krueger:

- Liked the idea if the option can work.

Ms. Tarce asked if the issue was at both the east and west elevation and Mr. _____ replied yes. Ms. Tarce stated that the conditions of approval were being revised to be read when the Board votes.

Ms. Monk:

- Requested more current photos of the exterior due to the amount of questions.

Mr. Sutton:

- Requested specifically a photo of the north and south elevations.

Mr. White:

- Requested photos that show every corner and the entire elevation of all four facades.

Ms. Tarce stated to the architects that the three items to be brought back will not have conditions of approval and not included in an approval at this meeting.

A discussion between several unidentified individuals occurred simultaneously.

Mr. Krueger looked forward to hearing thoughts regarding how to address interface issues.

Mr. _____ spoke to the Board but was not near a microphone for the audio recording.

Mr. White:

- Commented on an element not explained for the audio recording.

Mr. _____ replied but did not indicate the location or element being addressed.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked if grills could be painted to match the ethos to be not as obvious.

Mr. _____ replied that the grills are painted to match the ethos.

Mr. White:

- Stated that most people experiencing the building would not understand the other three elevations, so punctuation would be wanted along the south.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that there were a lot of shortcomings.

Mr. White:

- Asked that the grill be kept.

Mr. _____ asked for clarification regarding the elevator glass spandrels.

- Mr. White stated disappointment but did not see a feasible solution.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that symmetry will not always be present in a hotel with lights in windows on and off, curtains open and closed and is okay for now with the elevator glass spandrels unless there is another treatment idea in the limited space.

Mr. White:

- Stated that there is not a good solution for the elevator glass spandrels but hopefully there will be solutions in the other identified areas to compensate.

Mr. _____ asked if the consensus was that the elevator could be left as is and the Board replied yes.

MOTION BY MS. MONK TO APPROVE LAND-2015-01974 ARCHER HOTEL WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- **ITEM 1) THAT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER TOWER MATCH THE SOUTHWEST CORNER ETHOS TREATMENT TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER.**
- **ITEM 2) THAT THE SOUTH ELEVATION APPROVED REAL WINDOWS AND VENTS CONTINUE THE FINISTRATION TREATMENT OF THE HOTEL ROOMS ABOVE.**
- **ITEM 5) INSTALL CAPS TO ALL MASONRY WALLS WITH THE PROFILE AS DEPICTED IN DRB ELEVATION DRAWINGS APPROVED ON MAY 5, 2015.**
- **ITEM 7A) WHERE THERE ARE PRESENTATION MATERIAL INCONSISTENCIES AND WHEN INCONSISTENCIES ARE FOUND AFTER THE DRB HAS APPROVED THIS PROJECT, THE ELEVATIONS APPROVED AT THIS DRB MEETING SHALL BE DEEMED THE CORRECT INFORMATION APPROVED.**

- **ITEM 7B) IF AFTER THE DRB APPROVAL THERE ARE ANY INCONSISTENCIES FOUND IN THE INFORMATION PROVIDED FOR THE ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, MATERIALS AND COLOR BETWEEN THE PRESENTATION BOARDS AND 8 ½ X 11” SUBMITTED DRAWINGS, THE DRB AND THE REDMOND PLANNING STAFF WILL REVIEW AND DETERMINE WHICH DESIGN VERSION WILL BE FOLLOWED.**
- **ITEM 7C) THE DRB APPROVAL OF BUILDING ELEVATIONS, LANDSCAPING AND EXTERIOR ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS AT THIS MEETING ARE LIMITED TO THE 12 ITEMS THAT HAVE BEEN PRESENTED BY STAFF AND DISCUSSED IN THE STAFF MEMO. THE SITE COPY APPROVED FOR THE PROJECT’S ASSOCIATED BUILDING PERMITS, BLDG-2016-00811 AND BPLN-2016-05448, AND APPROVED CIVIL PLANS CIVPLAN-2016-00801, SHALL BE THE BASIS FOR PLANNING STAFF INSPECTION TO DETERMINE THE ISSUANCE OF THE BUILDING CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY.**

Mr. White asked if the Motion should be amended to note the three items to be brought back to the Board.

MS. MONK AMENDED THE MOTION ITEM 7C TO STATE NINE ITEMS INSTEAD OF 12, WITH THREE ITEMS RETURNING FOR REVIEW; THE BLANK WALL, TRELIS BRACKETS AND SPANDREL GLASS REPLACED WITH CLEAR GLASS IN PARKING TWO AND THREE, AND ADDITIONALLY PROVIDING MORE PHOTOS TO THE BOARD FOR REVIEW.

Ms. Tarce stated that staff presentation included 12 items but during the meeting, the Board noted one additional item. The condition should say 10 with three items coming back.

MS. MONK AMENDED THE MOTION ITEM 7C THAT LANDSCAPING EXTERIOR ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS PRESENTED AT THIS MEETING ARE LIMITED TO 10 ITEMS AND THE THREE ITEMS MENTIONED PREVIOUSLY ARE STILL EXPECTED TO RETURN TO THE BOARD.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WHITE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Simultaneous discussions occurred away from microphones.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTIONED BY MR. SUTTON TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:25 P.M. SECONDED BY MR. WHITE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**June 20, 2019
MINUTES APPROVED ON**

**Carolyn Garza
RECORDING SECRETARY**