CITY OF REDMOND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

February 6, 2014

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: Scott Waggoner, Craig Krueger, Kevin Sutton, Mike Nichols

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Joe Palmquist, David Scott Meade

STAFF PRESENT: Steven Fischer, Manager-Development Review; Thara Johnson, Associate Planner

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

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

CALL TO ORDER

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Acting Chair Scott Waggoner at 7 p.m.

PROJECT REVIEW

LAND-2014-00026, Emerald Heights - Campus Entry Renovations

Description: Front entry modifications which include removing hardscape and replacing and reconfiguring paved versus green spaces to enhance entry experience. New stamped concrete crosswalk provided.

Location: 10901 – 176th Circle NE **Applicant:** Julie Lawton *with* Lawton PM **Prior Review Date:** August 22, 2013

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

Ms. Johnson noted that the applicant was here on this project for approval. The campus entry renovations consist of several updates to the guard house that came before the Board on August 22, 2013. The Board provided some comments at that time on the elevations primarily related to removing the trellis structure that was located in front of the guard house. The applicant has changed the elevations in response to those comments. The exterior design of the guard house mimics other projects within Emerald Heights such as the fitness center and the multi-purpose building. Staff found that the design of the project meets the goals and intent of the City's design requirements, and staff is recommending approval with standard conditions.

Jeremy Southerland with Rice Fergus Miller Architects presented on behalf of the applicant. He noted that this project was for the front entry renovations, 99% of which is landscaping work. The applicant is reskinning the guard house. The structure of the guard house will not change, so it has been a challenge to make some design sense out of it and do something with impact that does not change the form of the building. The applicant has removed the trellis element, as requested by the DRB at the last meeting. There are walls on each side of the entry and entry signage. The hope is to open the whole front entry and create an impression that is more reflective of the new work that has been happening inside the campus. The courtyard is now finished and is stunning, in the applicant's opinion. The guard house is quite dated and reflects a style of architecture that the applicant does not want to associate with the project. The guardhouse has been simplified by getting rid of the double-gabled form with the cupola on top. It has been updated with new materials and a fresher look.

The site plan shows some curb re-routing along the front entry. Right now, trucks run over the landscaping. The curb is closer to the guard house so that security personnel do not have to step out in the rain to talk to someone at their car window. That also allows room for a resident to pass by when a

Redmond Design Review Board Minutes February 6, 2014 Page 2

visitor is at the guard house. The curb gives an opportunity to remove the paved turnaround area and create a landscaped pavilion, which could be a nice feature.

The cupola will be removed from the guard house, and the front and back gables will be removed. The existing structure involves simple roof trusses that will be used for the re-roofing. The columns will be kept in the same place, but there will be some aesthetic cladding added to them. False beams will be dropped in to give the project some character. Tile along the base of the windows will be added. The windows are not going to be replaced, but all the vinyl siding and brick will be ripped off. A stone element will be added to the guard house as well. The over-framing will be removed to create a simple gable with a hip roof. All the materials will match the renovations done inside the main campus. The intent is for a copper roof on the guard house. However, this could end up being a composite shingle roof. The hope is to use copper.

Landscaping will involve moving the existing site walls and creating a layered approach by starting on a small scale and then ramping up behind that, allowing the natural, large trees to be seen a little bit. A new sign will go on the center island.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Said the project looked good, especially with the removal of the trellis. Mr. Krueger asked about the bases of the columns, which the applicant said would be a stone element.
- Mr. Krueger said the materials were good, but he asked for material and color samples. The applicant said the materials for the guard house are the same for the multi-purpose buildings and other buildings inside the campus, which the DRB had previously approved.

Mr. Nichols:

- Asked about the roof material and what shingle might be used. The applicant said the shingles would
 be the same as those used in the other buildings inside the campus. He was still hoping for a copper
 roof, but noted that the budget has not been finalized.
- Mr. Nichols said it would be a shame not to do the copper roof, but he understood. He said the project looked great.
- Julie Lawton, the owner's representative, next spoke to the Board and said the owner would really like the copper roof. She said the project is expansive with the landscaping and sign, and the plan is out for bid right now. The owners would like to fit the copper roof in the budget.
- Mr. Krueger asked if a copper-painted metal could be used. The applicant said the roof would be a copper siding material, which is the same as the Trailside building on the campus.

<u>Mr. Sutton:</u>

 Would love to see a copper roof, but would be willing to trade the extra stone on the building for copper.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Said the project responded to the comments made to the DRB at the last meeting on this application.
 Mr. Waggoner appreciated how the application matched up with other recent projects on the Emerald Heights campus and tied the front entry together.
- He appreciated the landscaping and the moving of the curb, which he said would help the circulation
 of vehicles around this site and the visibility of the site as well. He asked about the automatic arm
 gate for the guard house.
- The applicant said the new gates would allow for residents to go ahead if someone else is checking in. It is important for the operations of the facility for staff to understand the patterns, coming and going, for the residents. The gates will help security staff members keep an eye on the residents without needing the residents to check in with the guard house.
- Mr. Waggoner noted that the gates were set back quite a bit and would not be all that visible from the street. The applicant admitted it was hard to find a nice-looking gate arm, but he thought the one he selected was not too bad and disappeared into the design.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the sign on the project. The applicant said the sign had a tile wall base, which is a poured in place concrete wall with slate tile applied to it. On that is a plate on each side

Redmond Design Review Board Minutes February 6, 2014 Page 3

with metal that has a weathered look to it. The letters are brushed aluminum on top of the weathered metal. Ms. Johnson noted that the sign would be part of a separate permit.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. NICHOLS AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE PROJECT LAND-2014-00026, EMERALD HEIGHTS CAMPUS ENTRY RENOVATIONS, WITH THE CONDITION THAT MATERIAL AND COLOR SAMPLES WILL BE PROVIDED TO STAFF FOR REVIEW FOR FINAL APPROVAL. ALSO, THE STANDARD PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES REQUIREMENTS WILL APPLY, AS SPECIFIED BY STAFF IN ITS REVIEW. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY (4-0).

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. NICHOLS AND SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:25 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

March 27, 2014
MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY

Susan Trapp