

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
September 6, 2018

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, Co-Chairman Kevin Sutton, Board Members: Stephani Monk, Shaffer White, and Diana Atvars

**EXCUSED ABSENCES:** Henry Liu, Ralph Martin

**STAFF PRESENT:** Steven Fischer, Gary Lee, David Lee, Cameron Zapata and Benjamin Sticka

**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 Mr. Krueger at 7:07 p.m.

**MINUTES**

**MOVED BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 2, 2018 MEETING, SECONDED BY MS. MONK. MOTION PASSED (5-0).**

**APPROVAL**

**LAND-2018-00617 & LAND-2018-00586, Emerald Heights**

**Neighborhood:** Education Hill

**Description:** Proposed 54-unit assisted living and 42-unit independent living buildings within the existing Emerald Heights campus

**Location:** 10901 – 176<sup>th</sup> Circle NE

**Applicant:** Julie Lawton with Lawton PMG

**Prior Review Date:** 08/02/18 & 08/16/18

**Staff Contact:** Benjamin Sticka, 425-556-2470 or bsticka@redmond.gov

Mr. Sticka stated this is a request for approval of modifications to the approved site plan and building elevations for both the Assisted Living and Independent Living buildings to be constructed on the Emerald Heights campus. On August 17, 2018, staff emailed the

Design Review Board with all emails that were submitted by residents of Abbey Road. Also, these comments and letters were posted on the City's website for review. The applicant has since increased the number of existing trees from twenty-one to twenty-two. The new trees have increased from 79 evergreen to 129 evergreen trees and reduced the number of deciduous trees from twenty-nine to fourteen based on discussion from the last board meeting. The total tree count has increased from 114 to 159 trees. Additional modifications include some material changes that are more residential in feel and look, some significant modulation on bay windows, and façade step backs at different locations. The other change is significant landscaping which exceeds the minimum planting size and heights. Mr. Sticka walked through some other design elements such as the increased step back, the trail removal that allows for additional trees, the unit count decrease, and colors and materials that were displayed on the material board. Staff believes the applicant has submitted a code complainant project and outlined the applicant's revisions based upon feedback since the project was originally submitted to the board. Staff would appreciate the board's feedback and asks for recommendation for approval. If the board feels ready for approval, Mr. Sticka asks the board to please include their perceptions on the project, focusing on compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Kelly, with Fergus Rice Miller, started with the CUP cover sheet for the Assisted Living building and showed aerial slides how the campus looks at this point, pointing out the existing sidewalk and the loop trail. As part of the response to feedback from the last meeting, part of the loop trail will be removed which was located to the east of the new Assisted Living building. The connection back to that trail will be through the south courtyard which will still provide the connectivity to that activity and would also provide a connection to the putting green and lawn bowling area. Context photos of the greater Education Hill area were shown depicting other streetscapes adjacent to the building. The original design of this project from 2,016 slides were shown and compared with the current design. No real changes have been made to the actual buildings since the last board meeting two weeks ago. An updated view of the north corner of the project was shown with the improvements. A more dense buffer of trees has been added to complete the screening of the building.

Mr. Lyon is the landscape architect for the project and stated the request of removing the trail allowed a second layer of trees consisting of Cedar, Douglas Fir, and Serbian Spruce to be planted. Those trees are planted eight feet on center with an install height of twelve to eighteen feet. In removing the trail, not only were more trees allowed, but a more native plant palette was added to give more of a forested look. A number of deciduous trees were removed from the east side and more evergreen trees were added. More street trees are also included in this project.

Mr. Kelly showed a slide with the added trees and the sidewalk. The existing ivy fence will also help to screen the new building. At the last meeting it was requested that an average of the setbacks be provided which is twenty-one feet. There is a pinch point of about 15.4 feet at the furthest north corner. There will be no exterior light fixtures on the east side of the Assisted Living building to avoid light spillage. The physical material

board was the same as last time with the exception of the orange color, which was toned down a bit. More elevation slides were shown of the entire project showing where the trail would be reconnected. More renderings of the buildings were shown with the screening trees faded out to show the building.

Mr. Kelly then put the Independent Living building slides up commenting that there were no real changes to this building other than the updated CUP cover sheet. He showed more slides of this building and the context within the internal Emerald Heights campus. The loop trail is still part of this project as it works its way south of the project. The planting palette is very similar to the one used on the Assisted Living building project. This is will be a forty-two unit building with subgrade parking. Some different perspectives of this building were also shown. The material board for this project was shown with similar colors to the other building, but with the addition of the Corten material for the feature wall.

Mr. Sticka asked Mr. Kelly to put up the site plan slide. Mr. Sticka informed the board that he has received many emails from the residents of Emerald Heights expressing concerns about the removal of the loop trail and asked the applicant to speak to this element.

Mr. Kelly feels this is a significant concession for the Emerald Heights community as it allows the residents to circulate around the community. Connections were able to be made; however, they are not ideal, but residents can still use this walking trail. The thought was breaking the trail at this point was the best possible solution to the screening issue.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE**

Mr. Krueger asked each audience member to please sign in and state their name for the record and limit their comments to no more than four (4) minutes.

Ms. Engque, an Abbey Road resident, thanked all the volunteers for all the time they have put into this. She feels she is participating in a democratic process in speaking out against this proposed building and thanked the City of Redmond for allowing this process. She feels zoning is to protect people within the zones on what expectations they can have. She stated that the code says neighborhood planning has the following benefits: neighborhood specific policies can help residents retain or strengthen a sense of place that is a combination of character and setting land uses and environment that makes a neighborhood unique and sustainable for the long-term. She stated that because the project has CUPs does not mean buildings can go up wherever it is wanted. These buildings are huge and not like homes at all. This fight is not about trees, this is about buildings that will be in the neighborhood forever. Evergreen trees are conical, their width is at the bottom, not at the top, therefore they will not hide the buildings.

Mr. Gilbert, a resident of Emerald Heights, has lived there for nine years. In his career as a planner, he wishes he would have had more clients like Emerald Heights. The management has been very diligent in accessing a wide variety of alternatives for siting buildings on the campus. Emerald Heights has been very good about replying to suggestions, the recommendations of the City, and the interest of the neighborhood. Losing the trail is a very large concession as that trail appears on the logo of Emerald Heights. He asks that this project be approved so it can be started at last.

Ms. McEwen, a resident of Emerald Heights, loves the trail. She feels Emerald Heights has gone way above what is required to get this approved. Losing the trail is a big disappointment and would like it to see this project approved without the loss of the trail.

Ms. DeBuths, who lives in the skilled nursing building in Emerald Heights, feels that this building is needed urgently. She asks that the project be approved and get it moving. She has friends that ask her, when is the new building coming? She hopes that after tonight, she can tell them that it is all set and moving forward.

Mr. Soderbom, an Abbey Road resident, has his houses three down from the entrance to Emerald Heights. He feels this will change the whole feeling of the neighborhood.

Mr. Barnett, Abbey Road Home Owners Association president, stated that the residents of Abbey Road are not against the Emerald Heights buildings, but firmly against them building in the greenbelt buffers that have separated the communities for many years. This is not compatible with our neighborhood. These will be large, institutional buildings with hundreds of windows looking down at all the other homes. What is at issue here is an institutional building co-existing with a residential neighborhood. He further stated that Emerald Heights made written statements in their 2010 rezoning application which stated that they would not impact existing greenbelts and buffers around the campus. The residents, banking on that statement, readily agreed to the re-zone. The City has received over one hundred letters from Education Hill residents stating this is not reasonable or compatible with the neighborhood, nor does it align with the City's comprehensive plan.

Mr. Carlos, a resident of Emerald Heights, appreciates the opportunity to speak in support of the buildings as proposed. Concept of design oftentimes does not work in reality. In his understanding, and according to what he has heard, siting is not within the purview of the Design Review Board, but only the design and codes. There is no definition of greenbelt. The only concern here is whether or not this design meets what is necessary. He urges the board to approve this project.

Mr. Harrison, an Abbey Road homeowner, had their home built there because they knew what the surrounding neighborhood would look like. He has been on the Planning Committee and was a member of the City Council. During his time on the council, the Redmond Town Center Development was approved. There was much controversy about this development as well, but the Council assured the citizens that the large green spaces would remain along the rivers. Both Abbey Road and Emerald Heights

developments were required to maintain green spaces to maintain compatibility with their surroundings. He urges the board to deny this project and demand that Emerald Heights maintain the entire greenbelt. He feels the trees planted as proposed will fail as they will be planted too close together.

Ms. Suzuki, 177 Ct NE, says her street is the street that will be most visually impacted by the proposed building. She has learned a lot from this disagreement with the placement of these buildings. She appreciates the exhaustive detail the City requires of an applicant for approval of permits. She feels strongly that this project will destroy the character of the neighborhood and that it has not complied with zoning codes and design criteria. She hopes that the board has reviewed all the comments and concerns and was able to drive through the neighborhood. She showed pictures of the homes in the area and said that 176<sup>th</sup> is the defining road for Emerald Heights and Abbey Road. It is a narrow road and is a unique to the City. She showed other pictures of buildings in the area that had green space around them to be compatible with the neighborhoods. The Design Review Board must follow the City's design standards check list. She then read some of the standards. She ran over her allotted time; however, continued on with her disagreement with the proposed project.

Mr. Stilin, an Abbey Road resident, felt no proof was given of alternate building placements on the campus. No engineering statements or other documents were provided to substantiate the claims that there was no other site on which to build these buildings. Emerald Heights is running out of pervious surface to build on. He feels that there are alternatives to this placement of these buildings by demolishing the cottages in the back of the property in order to place these larger buildings. If that had been done, these buildings would probably be already constructed. With this proposal, 28% of the trees on this site will be removed. He stated the City has committed errors in permitting previous building in the past.

Ms. Stilin, a member of the Abbey Road Preservation Committee, feels the board is tasked with a major responsibility to make a recommendation on two buildings in the context of a Conditional Use Permit. The broader issue of compatibility with the immediate vicinity must take precedence over creative architectural design and asks for denial of this project. The City requires retirement developments to get a special development permit to build in R-4, R-5, or R-6 zones and to be embraced by the surrounding community. She feels the residents are being forced to accept the adverse impacts these buildings will have on their community. She feels that Emerald Heights is using the cheapest and fastest way to solve a problem of their own making. Other solutions do exist, the management may not like them, but there are other solutions. She again asks that this project be denied..

Mr. Brody, an Emerald Heights resident, said he has listened to both sides and if he were to come up Abbey Road, these building would not be seen because Abbey Road tilts down and away from Emerald Heights. He ask for approval of this project, it is not hurting anyone's view, in his opinion.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

### **Ms. Monk:**

- Has spent time driving and walking around the neighborhood and cannot see why the character would change with these buildings being built where proposed.
- Feels the building style has been done well and likes the changes in materials to make it fit in better with the neighborhood.
- Stated she has read all the comments from both sides.
- Feels traffic will be impacted slightly.
- Appreciates the concession from Emerald Heights of installing more evergreen trees.
- Thinks that taking out that trail was a big concession to the Abbey Road residents.
- Agrees that the Design Review Board has no say on where the building is placed.

### **Mr. White:**

- Asked about the boundaries of Abbey Road. Mr. Barnett stated they are 104<sup>th</sup> past the entrance of Emerald Heights.
- Appreciates the comments from all.
- Thinks that this project will be affecting people.
- Feels the proposed project is in keeping with Redmond Design Code.
- Thinks the design is compatible.
- Stated that the siting is not in the purview of the board.

### **Ms. Atvars:**

- Feels that if the suggestion of removing the trail is not enough of improvement for the neighborhood, then the trail should not be removed.

### **Mr. Sutton:**

- Feels removal of the trail is a small concession to make.
- Thinks that if Emerald Heights residence are concerned, they should speak to the management.
- Feels it is a nice job with this design.

Mr. Lee confirmed that siting of the building is not in the purview of the Design Review Board.

### **Mr. Krueger:**

- Asked Mr. Sticka if both buildings meet codes. Mr. Sticka said that both buildings do meet all codes.
- What we have before tonight is a code compliant site plan for both the independent and the assisted care buildings. Retirement housing is an allowed use within all residential neighborhoods in the City.

- There are certain requirements that some of the higher density might have but that the code lays out setbacks, side setbacks, rear setbacks, street setbacks all of those. When I looked at the code today, I didn't see anything that required buffers per se. It did require that those setbacks that are setup next to the street as part of the code, that they be planted to screen the development from the adjacent uses. It doesn't talk about the buffer, but it does talk about for certain higher density buildings that they are to be used not like as a rear yard of a house in Abbey Road, but to be used for landscaping to screen the building. So, in my mind in looking at this, as we have looked at it for over the last year and a half, both buildings, is that we have worked with them on the architecture to make it more compatible from the height standpoint and of course as regulated by the code, from the modulation, from the materials, from the colors, and the different aspects that go into the building as far as creating the form.
- I think what they have done here over time, to drop one floor from the north end of the building and that corresponds with the small setback. That is where the 15 feet 4 inches is, where they have dropped it down to two stories. That's the place where the utility corridor is; where there is limitation on what they can do to from a landscaping standpoint. The rest of the building has been shifted further towards the west away from the street. I think losing the trail was a great suggestion. I'm glad they incorporated this, because it really does give the opportunity to add a lot more landscaping and create the screening that will mitigate the visual look of the building. When I look at the slides both from the drone and then from the street I am impressed and when I look at the street section on the Abbey Road side, we have a planter strip with some street trees, a sidewalk and then a six-foot wood fence. In some cases, you have some landscaping in the backyards that are higher than the fence and overhang the fence. They have got a detached sidewalk. Then they have the right away line and they have an ivy fence that looks like a solid green screen that's below the lower branches of the street trees. So, as you drive along that street you can see the street trees up above and you are going to see this green ivy screen that is going to stay. Then it is going to be supplemented by the large number of trees that have been placed in that set back area and changed from that deciduous to evergreen.
- My inclination is that I would support a motion to approve this again recognizing that this is a recommendation to the Hearing Examiner as part of the Conditional Use Permit.

**MOTION TO APPROVE LAND-2018-00617 & LAND-2018-00586, EMERALD HEIGHTS AS A RECOMMENDATION TO THE HEARING EXAMINER WITH THE COMPATIBILITY BASED ON NUMBER OF FEATURES THAT WERE MENTIONED IN THIS MEETING BY MR. SUTTON, SECONDED BY MS. MONK, MOTION PASSED (4-1 WITH MR. WHITE VOTING NAY)**

**MR. KRUEGER CALLED FOR A RECESS AT 8:38 P.M. MEETING WAS RECOVENED AT 8:42 P.M.**

## **APPROVAL**

### **LAND-2018-00559, Overlake Retail Building**

**Neighborhood:** Overlake

**Description:** The proposed development will include a tenant improvement of the existing Sears Auto Center

**Location:** Northeast corner of 148th Ave NE and NE 20th Street

**Applicant:** David Morse with Regency Centers

**Prior Review Date:** 06/21/18 & 08/16/18

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

Mr. Lee said this is not up for approval tonight as there is a whole new design and design team.

Mr. Bretsch, with Regency Centers, is filling in for Mr. Morse and introduced the new architecture team: Hewitt.

Mr. Shema, with Hewitt Architects, stated that the previous versions that the board has seen were done by another team. This is a whole new design. One of the comments made before was concerning the patio. This new design will keep that large concrete canopy as it is part of the building. The canopy will be enhanced with steel, skylights and lighting making it an outdoor covered eating space for the restaurant tenant at that end of the building. The previous schemes had removed all of the concrete canopies around the building, in this new design, those canopies will be left in place as they are part of the character of the building. The canopies do not need to be re-created all the way around. There will still be steel canopies as well which will provide complete weather protection. The large concrete canopy will have landscaping around it and be a featured element. The landscape will be enhanced throughout. The building is not consistent north to south in structure. The north part of the building has concrete columns with infill and the south part has masonry bearing walls. This will allow creation of several different planes of building façade north to south which would be responsive to what the structural systems are. This responds to the comment to get rid of the flatness and have some variety.

There will be large openings cut into the west side façade for retail store fronts. There will be flexibility for tenants to use overhead doors thus giving a nod to the former automotive use of the building. This will be a tenant specific solution, but the flexibility will be there. This scheme calls for leaving the brick on the upper part of the building exposed and possibly painted instead of cladding it. There will still be a cornice at the top as previously shown. The thinking is to have several different kinds of paneling material around the store fronts on the first floor. The larger tenant at the south end of the building will have a taller expression in that corner without cutting windows in the second floor. There is a parapet cap under consideration at this point.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

### **Mr. White:**

- Would like to see the heavy concrete lightened up. Mr. Shema said the thinking is to suspend some sort of armature above the sitting area that would hold lighting, space heaters, and some skylights for natural lighting.
- Would like to have the parking regulation lifted if possible to allow for more functional use of the building.
- Thinks there might be opportunities for color lighting on the top of the building to make it livelier at night.
- Feels the nod towards the building's history is great.

### **Ms. Atvars:**

- Is really impressed with the new design.
- Looking forward to seeing what comes back.
- Is intrigued by the corner design.

### **Mr. Sutton:**

- Likes keeping the structure, even though it is a big mass.
- Feels the last design just stripped all the character out of the building.
- Thinks there is an opportunity to create something unique.

### **Ms. Monk:**

- Agrees with Ms. Atvars' statement of being intrigued with the metal and brick.
- Thinks this will make a great gateway entrance.
- Asked about the white band and what it is made of. Mr. Shema stated that is a painted concrete beam. That is a masonry bearing wall and, once openings are cut, it will be difficult to save the brick below the band.
- Feels the cover would needed to be lightened up as Mr. White stated before.
- Likes the new concepts, especially the double height corner showcase.

### **Mr. Krueger:**

- Agrees with all the board members comments.
- Especially likes the gateway idea.
- Is looking forward to seeing it next time.

## **APPROVAL**

### **LAND-2018-00010, Esterra Park, Block 6B**

**Neighborhood:** Overlake

**Description:** 2 buildings with 260 units; Building A includes 130 affordable housing units; Building B includes a YMCA day care and 130 market rate units

**Location:** TBD, parcel number 6448900030

**Applicant:** Scott Clark with Clark | Barnes

**Prior Review Date:** 07/19/18

**Staff Contact:** Cameron Zapata, 425-556-2480 or cazapata@redmond.gov

Ms. Zapata stated this is the third time this project has been before the board. It includes affordable housing, the YMCA, and market rate units. The applicant is asking for the same administrative design flexibilities, the roof line modulation, blank walls, façade modulation, and exceeding the six-story height limit within fifty feet of a right-of-way on 152<sup>nd</sup>. These administrative design flexibilities require the Design Review Board's recommendation to the Technical Committee if the design flexibility criteria are met. Staff recommends approval if the Design Review Board recommends approval for the administrative design flexibilities.

Mr. Saks, with Clark Barnes, stated that there were a few items the board asked the design team to look at for this proposed approval meeting. Most of them related to colors. He showed slides from the two previous meetings concerning color choices and the new versions. The colors were muted at the first meeting, those have been brightened up on both buildings. The brick stands on its own with a deeper yellow color. The accent color has been brought in from the decks. The YMCA entrance has been stepped up and down and now has a white store front instead of the dark gray. This gave it a more distinctive entrance from all of the other entrances to the buildings. Also, a nice, rich, wooden door has been added to the YMCA entrance.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

#### **Mr. Sutton:**

- Feels this project has made great progress.
- Thinks the colors are okay.

#### **Ms. Atvars:**

- Likes the colors.
- Thinks the project looks great.

#### **Mr. White:**

- Likes changes to the YMCA entry.
- Has reservations on the yellow. Likes the yellow on building A, but not as much on building B.
- Likes that the colors are brighter now.
- Thinks glazing on the corner could be white.

#### **Ms. Monk:**

- Likes the thinner band. Maybe staff could see if a color change could help.
- Likes the YMCA entrance area.
- Asked about bike storage. Mr. Saks said there is more storage in the building.

#### **Mr. Krueger:**

- Likes the yellow color, maybe come back to staff with a little different color.

Mr. Saks says they like the yellow because it pops. They also looked at white, but did not like the way it blended in. They will work with staff on this issue

**MOTIONED BY MR. WHITE TO APPROVE LAND-2018-00010, ESTERRA PARK, BLOCK 6B WITH THE STANDARD CONDITIONS AND THAT THE ARCHITECT STUDY THE COLOR FOR BUILDING B AT THE SE CORNER AND WORK WITH STAFF TO MAKE A FINAL RECOMMENDATION, SECONDED BY MS. ATVARIS. MOTION PASSED (5-0).**

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**LAND-2018-00566, Esterra Park, Block 2A/2B**

**Neighborhood:** Overlake

**Description:** 8-story multi-family building with 600 apartments

**Location:** 15300 NE Turing Street

**Applicant:** Larry Flack with Runberg Architecture Group

**Prior Review Date:** 07/19/18

**Staff Contact:** Cameron Zapata, 425-556-2480 or cazapata@redmond.gov

Ms. Zapata stated that this is a 600 residential apartment complex which fronts Esterra Park. At the previous meeting, staff had concerns with the roof line modulation. The applicant has modified the corners to accentuate the roof line. The applicant has also addressed lack of residential feel. Staff is pleased with the progress of the project and is eager to hear feedback from the board.

Mr. Flack, with Runberg Architecture Group, gave a brief overview of the project analysis and went through the project vision and goals.

Mr. Lee, with Runberg Architecture Group, said that Block 2 is in the Esterra Park neighborhood. Some site photos were shown that depicted the steep grade change on this site. All of the projects in Esterra Park are proposed to be multi-family with the exception of block three which is a future office development. The highlights of this area are its proximity to the future light rail station and close to Microsoft campus. There is a great opportunity with the Park across the street which allows solar exposure to the south as well as views.

Mr. Flack said there were three different options for this building, but the preferred option was opening the courtyards to the park. There was some discussion for providing a more residential feel to the building, mechanical screening, and how to differentiate public versus private at the ground level.

The design goals and visions were to use the park to act as a backdrop to this project. Pictures were shown of the area around the river and the cues taken from those areas in stacking the buildings. This was the inspiration for the folded plane on the park and establishing the connection to the park. The site will take advantage of the solar orientation. The hill climb creates a parallel path inside the building that is referred to as the spine of the building. The folded facades form the strata step up the hillside. The

building appearance makes it look like it is rising out of the ground and connected to the park. The materials that will be applied to the buildings are the frame elements, which will be Corten steel around the edges of the frame. As the frame elements get to the ground plane and they are housing common areas, there will be more glazing. In the strata sections of the building a metal panel will be used that has varying widths of reveals in a random pattern. That material will be run throughout the three layers of the building with a subtle change moving from one area to another.

There will be recessed balconies with glass railings and stained fiber cement as an accent. There will be other balconies with perforated metal with black framed windows. Board formed concrete will be at the base of the building.

Ms. Lundquist, with Rumbaugh and Associates, stated that the hill climb is the frontage of this project. There are two drives on the east and the west and set up more as streetscapes where the pedestrian activities occur. The sidewalks are about ten feet wide in those areas with some narrowing at the service areas. The Technical Committee is asking to extend those ten-foot sidewalks and that is currently in process. There is a forty-three foot grade change on this site with the steepest grade change occurring on the west side. The hill climb presents an opportunity to create the central plaza location and get some shallower, level lawn spaces. The hill climb is a visual gateway to the park which draws people in. Landscaping will be done on both sides of the hill climb to provide connectivity and varies in width from twelve to sixteen feet. The central plaza is the hub of this space. There is a mews space that runs from the central plaza to the north and has unit entries in the north half. The mews is also functioning as a fire lane and hammerhead.

The landscape character changes with the topography. On the west side it is more organic with clusters of trees, then on the east side, where it levels out, it becomes more of a streetscape. The private courtyards on the east and the west have a view of the park.

Mr. Flack showed an aerial perspective of the project showing all of the building including all the courtyards and lobbies. The same slide also showed the roof modulation with the Corten steel frame at the top level.

Mr. Lee showed the overhead weather protection provided for the residents. To discern the private from the public areas, there will be operable screens that would be open during the day and closed at night time for privacy and security. An illustration showed the internal spine and how that relates to the hill climb. At the central plaza and mews there is common amenity space to activate the area. There will be constant interaction with the park. There is a proposed fitness area, lounge, and a co-work space. The night view shows how that transparency spills out to the park and provides a level of safety and activity.

Mr. Flack showed the beginning of the upper hill climb. The co-work space could be used by residents or public. The "spine" is a covered walkway as it moves through the project. Several more slides were shown of the area.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

### **Ms. Atvars:**

- Asked if the parallel pathway is on the ground level only. Mr. Flack said that is correct.
- Suggests ensuring accessibility to the amenities.
- Feels the applicant has done a good job of choosing materials.
- Likes material palette.
- Would like to see more of a residential feel.
- Thinks more balconies would add to a residential feel.

Ms. Lundquist stated that there is a path that parallels the hill climb that is accessible and then there are other paths from each of the main plaza levels to the park that are also easily accessible.

Mr. Flack said that each of the vertical cores line up with the “spine” and it is very easy to get down to the ground level.

### **Mr. Sutton:**

- Thinks this is a pretty cool project.
- Asked if in the landscape of the recessed courtyards, is there a strong need to cut those off at a certain time? Ms. Lundquist replied that the screening is needed to separate those areas because there will be resident specific amenities.
- Asked if the Corten steel elements are a true frame as they seem fairly random, is that the intent? Mr. Flack responded that the randomness is intentional.
- Thinks the project should stay the way it is instead of more residential.
- Would like to see the ground floor rendering next time.

### **Mr. White:**

- Likes the metal panels with the variety of patterns.
- Asked about the materials for the balconies. Mr. Flack stated the recessed balconies are a stained fiber cement paneling, which reads as a warm color.
- Would like to see a sample of that stained panel at the next meeting.
- Asked about the ground floor materials, the rendering reads as glass. Mr. Flack said that within the framed elements, it is one set of materials, but in the unframed areas, it is another set of materials. Those could be metal panel and there could be white painted Hardie. This is still in development.
- Would prefer not to see Hardie on the ground floor. Mr. Flack said the preference is to use the same material and will be bring samples with reveals at the next meeting.
- Likes the circulation.
- Thinks the screens can be an operational headache and would like to see pictures of the gates opened and closed.

- Likes the boxes, but there should be more thought on how the Corten steel terminates.
- Suggests thinking about the corner boxes to pop up and give the penthouses the appearance of being one and a half stories. Mr. Flack said they will spend some time exploring that; however, it is felt that would water down the design.
- Thinks that overall it is a great project.

Ms. Monk:

- Likes the Corten steel frames.
- Appreciates the random element of the project.
- Feels the hill climb integration is a pretty cool element.
- Feels the security screens with the translucent roof seem dark.
- Suggests exploring ways to make the walkway more weather protected.
- Suggests considering changing the color of the supports at ground level.
- Likes the mews area.
- Asked if there will be a water feature. Ms. Lundquist stated there is no water feature planned.
- Would like the applicant to consider mixing up the colors in the middle section of the building.

Mr. Krueger:

- Feels the project is too complex.
- Loves the modulation and the layout.
- Would like to have the design reflect as if each building was built over time instead of all at once.
- Is not fond of the frame element.
- Likes the idea of going vertical with some of the elements.
- Feels the north elevation is calmer.
- Agrees with the comment from Mr. White about something different on the ground floor.
- Likes the landscape plans.
- Feels the design of first rendering shown in the first review meeting was softer.

Mr. Gary Lee announced that he is taking a new position at the City and will no longer be staffing the Design Review Board.

