

**CITY OF REDMOND
INNOVATIVE HOUSING REVIEW PANEL
April 30, 2007**

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting.

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT: Judd Black, David Scott Meade, Korby Parnell, Sally Promer-Nichols

STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Churchill, Assistant Planner; Sarah Stiteler, Senior Planner

The Innovative Housing Review Panel is appointed by the Mayor to evaluate proposals submitted under Redmond's Innovative Housing Program, as described in the Redmond Community Development Guide 20C.30.62.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Sarah Stiteler, as no Chairperson had yet been elected, at 7:04pm. Review Panel member Tanika Kumar was excused.

ELECTION OF CHAIR & VICE CHAIR

David Scott Meade accepted a nomination to serve as Chairperson. Korby Parnell accepted a nomination to serve as Vice Chairperson. The nominations were approved unanimously by the Panel.

SYCAMORE PARK

Description: 12-lot residential development on 1.6 acres with 6 single-family detached, 6 single-family attached, and 4 optional accessory dwelling unit (ADU) spaces. Home sizes would range from 1,200 to 2,580 square feet. The ADUs would be approximately 400 square feet.

Location: 16814 NE 122nd Street

Applicant: Leo Suver, Steve Burnstead Construction Company

Project Team Present: Leo Suver; Peggy Wyatt, Hackworth Group; Mark Gibbons, Core Design

Staff Contact(s): Sarah Stiteler / 425-556-2469 or Jeff Churchill / 425-556-2492

Applicant Presentation

Leo Suver presented the Sycamore Park proposal to the Innovative Housing Review Panel. He described that the proposal had been in the works since October 2005 when he first met with City staff. He said that the proposed site is 1.5 acres¹ in North Redmond and that the proposal would result in doubling² of density on the site. Mr. Suver described the site as sloping gently from south to north and containing a significant maple and some significant firs that the applicant intends to retain as an amenity. The proposed access for Sycamore Park is an 18-foot-wide concrete *woonerf*, with two alleys for driveways. The site would also include a perimeter trail system with the potential to connect to neighboring properties. Mr. Suver noted that the proposal includes four ADUs, and that one of the homes (not two as stated in the applicant's submittal package and repeated in the staff report) would be offered as affordable to those earning 80% of King County median household income. He also stated that the homes would achieve 4-star ratings in the BuiltGreen system, which means they would use recycled and sustainable materials as well as energy efficient appliances. All homes would include at least three bedrooms, two bathrooms, and a front porch. The ADUs would include a bathroom and kitchenette.

Peggy Wyatt of Hackworth Group, an architectural and planning firm, described the architectural attributes of the proposal. She noted that as a flat and largely pastoral site, the property was well-suited to higher densities. One of the design goals was to make the large maple a focal point of the development. Fronting homes 1, 2, and 3 onto NE 122nd, she said, would provide a "face on the street," rather than having backs of homes on the street. She said that all garages are deemphasized in the plan, and that the apparent mass of the buildings would be reduced by separating garages from the homes (for homes 1, 6, 7, and 12). Variety is further increased by providing seven distinct floor plans. Vehicles are

¹ The site is 1.6 acres

² The proposal would almost double the allowed density: 7.5 units/acre vs. 4 units/acre

deemphasized by placing parking and garages for eight of the twelve units on the side alleys rather than the central *woonerf*. She also said that pulling homes 4 and 5 toward the east edge of the property opened-up the central area as a common open space. She noted that providing parking was a challenge, and that while 28 spaces were required by code, the proposal included 47.

Mark Gibbons of Core Design, an engineering firm, described how the *woonerf* would work on the site. He said that *woonerf* means “street for living” and that speeds (10mph) and volumes are typically low. He cited several examples from Issaquah Highlands, where the applicant has worked with Core Design and others in implementing the *woonerf* concept. The *woonerf* at Sycamore Park would be paved with porous concrete to increase infiltration and provide some level of stormwater treatment. He noted that microbes live in the “void” spaces of the concrete and consume nitrogen compounds that vehicles emit. The concrete is maintained by power washing it every six months, and has a lifespan of about 40 years – comparable to traditional asphalt. He said that the *woonerf* concept, while originating in the Netherlands, has been implemented in Dallas, Cleveland, Japan, and Israel.

Public Comment

Tim and Ann Shilling, who own the property directly to the east of the proposed project, voiced a number of concerns. First, they said that the proposed density is inappropriate given the level of development on nearby properties. The proposed level of density would be more appropriate closer to the city center. That density would impact their access to NE 122nd St. since, they said, Sycamore Park’s road would be overloaded with cars and those cars would spill onto NE 122nd, blocking the Shilling’s view out of their driveway, which is very near the property line with the Burnstead property. They noted that six homes would be common for a property of this size, and that twelve homes, plus four ADUs, doesn’t match the feel of the neighborhood. They said that no parking exists on NE 122nd St. now (for overflow), and that the proposed *woonerf* would be unsafe for children given vehicle traffic. They noted that NE 122nd St. is very narrow now, but that drivers still drive upwards of 35mph. They wanted to know whether parking would be allowed on NE 122nd St., and in general what frontage improvements would look like on NE 122nd St. They recommended that “no parking” signs are needed near their driveway so that their sight lines are not blocked by cars.

Staff Report

Jeff Churchill, Assistant Planner, briefly summarized the staff report by explaining how staff felt the proposed project met the goals of the Innovative Housing Ordinance. He noted that the project includes three home styles: single-family detached, single-family attached, and ADUs. He noted that the size of the homes is significantly smaller than the average permitted in Redmond in 2006 (1,400 – 2,240 vs. ~3,000)³, while one is to be made affordable to a person or family earning 80% of King County household median income, which in 2006 for a family of four was \$62,300. He also noted that the proposal includes a home with a main floor master suite. He noted that the proposal includes architectural elements that meet or exceed neighborhood design standards, including providing a variety of building footprints, front porches, articulated massing, cascaded roofs, and recessed garages. He noted where the applicant is seeking departures from existing site requirements and that the proposal would help the City evaluate the use of multiplexes, pervious pavement, reduced road width, and increased density in Redmond in the future.

Mr. Churchill identified three issues and questions for the applicant: 1) staff recommended removing or somehow redesignating the parking spaces meant for the ADUs since they appeared to be in the front yard setback – a prohibited location; 2) staff wondered to what extent the applicant intended to make one of the units ADA compliant; and 3) staff wondered whether the applicant could include curvilinear elements to the *woonerf* or otherwise enhance its potential effectiveness. He concluded that staff recommends that the Review Panel authorize the project to proceed for land-use entitlements.

Questions & Comments from Review Panel

Mr. Black

- Wanted applicant to confirm that Public Works was comfortable with a private road

³ In an email to staff, the applicant corrected these figures. Home sizes are to range from 1,200 to 2,580 square feet.

- Applicant answered that he had previously shown the road plan to Dave Almond
- Wanted to confirm that Fire was comfortable with an 18'-wide road
 - Applicant confirmed
- Wanted to confirm that utilities would be private
 - Applicant confirmed
- Wished to see a better delineation of private and public spaces, especially for homes 4 and 5, since they open onto the common green
- Wondered how the applicant planned to handle stormwater issues
 - Applicant's team is in contact with Jeff Dendy, who has requested additional information on their stormwater plan; a vault is proposed
- Asked whether the applicant had considered constructing a SEA⁴ street

Ms. Promer-Nichols

- Wanted to confirm that Fire was comfortable with pervious pavement
 - Applicant confirmed
- Asked how, with a subdivision, the community would handle issues like fences and other issues related to ownership property rights
 - Applicant said that the new development would have a homeowners association (HOA) that would govern home colors, fences, and other similar issues; issues like these have been resolved in similar communities at Talus in Issaquah
- Commented that variety in homes was good, even for neighbors, since they would not have to look at a series of home back ends
- Concurred that traffic was a valid concern and that Panel should urge its careful consideration at the technical review level
- Appreciated tree retention
- Commented that *woonerf* would allow children to play on the street – a good thing

Mr. Meade

- Suggested that the applicant look into interlocking concrete pavers for the *woonerf*; these would provide textural clues to drivers of the nature of the road
- Commented that coloration of road surface would be a good addition
- Suggested PercoCrete as a possible road surface and noted that it acts in some ways like a stormwater detention system
- Suggested adding a 2nd walkway in front of homes 4 and 5 to better delineate private and public space
- Asked how homes would be addressed
 - Applicant responded that several options exist, including address labels on the main access road

Mr. Parnell

- Asked what is so outstanding about this project that it could land on the cover of the Wall Street Journal (as another Hackworth project did)
 - Applicant responded that diversity of home types in one development would be new to Redmond
- Asked what other site development options were considered
 - Applicant responded that he and his team considered an all-duplex development, but staff asked them to reconsider
- Recommended grasscrete at the ends of alleys, and wherever else Fire Department would be satisfied with it, so as to “green” the landscape
- Was concerned about the 70% impervious surface area coverage⁵
- Suggested a community amenity on the common green or elsewhere, such as a pavilion; he noted his own development includes community BBQs

⁴ SEA stands for Street Edge Alternative. SEA streets have bioswales on their edges for treating stormwater

⁵ Staff clarified that 70% referred to lot-by-lot impervious surface area coverage, and not site-wide coverage, consistent with how impervious surface area coverage is calculated in Redmond, but not clear in the staff report.

- Asked whether thought was given to sunlight vis-à-vis landscaping
 - Applicant responded in the affirmative; grass is shown in areas that will receive most sun light
- Noted that the porch for home 5 seems to jut into the public space

Discussion

After airing comments and questions, Panel members offered suggestions and recommendations as part of further discussion of the project.

Mr. Meade suggested that the entry trees might need to be pulled back so as to improve visibility for neighbors. Mr. Black suggested that the front half of the development could be moved forward so as to open-up the community open space a bit more in the middle of the project. He also commented that the edge of the property respects the neighbors, and that he was satisfied overall, provided that the applicant could resolve technical issues.

Mr. Parnell expressed disappointment that the applicant would not offer a second home at 80% of median income, and implored the applicant to look at other alternatives for making a second home affordable. Mr. Black and others asked the applicant to estimate home sales prices for the units. The applicant estimated that five traditional single-family homes would fetch \$800,000-\$900,000, while the proposed homes would be anticipated to sell in the range of \$500,000 (more or less) depending on size.

Mr. Meade asked whether the Panel would have an opportunity to review this project again. Staff responded that the Review Panel would not have another formal review opportunity, and that design would be safeguarded by administrative design review and the written report expressing the opinion of the Review Panel. The Panel agreed that the architectural finishing of all of the homes was an important feature of the project, enhancing the quality of life for residents, neighbors, and passers-by. Architectural features in the submittal package include articulated massing, recessed garages, trim, dormers, porches, cascaded roofs, and roof awnings.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. PROMER-NICHOLS TO AUTHORIZE THE PROJECT TO PROCEED FOR LAND USE PERMITS, WITH THE REVIEW PANEL IDENTIFYING THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS OF THE PROJECT AS VERY IMPORTANT TO ITS SUCCESS:

- **RETAINING THE PERVIOUS *WOONERF***
- **RETAINING FOUR-STAR BUILTGREEN CERTIFICATION**
- **RETAINING THOSE SIGNIFICANT TREES IDENTIFIED IN THE SUBMITTED SITE PLAN**
- **RETAINING THE UNIT TYPE MIX DESCRIBED IN THE APPLICANT'S SUBMITTAL**
- **RETAINING AND PERHAPS ENHANCING THE COMMUNITY OPEN SPACE**
- **RETAINING BUILDING ARTICULATION AND OVERALL BUIDING DESIGN AS DEPICTED IN THE SUBMITTAL PACKAGE**
- **DELINEATION OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE OPEN SPACE WHERE HOMES FRONT THE COMMON GREEN; THIS COULD BE ACCOMPLISHED BY ADDING A SECOND WALKWAY OR A LOW HEDGE IN FRONT OF HOMES 4 AND 5**

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED 4-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35pm.