

CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AND LANDMARK COMMISSION
December 1st, 2011

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD AND COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: David Scott Meade (Chairperson-DRB), Joe Palmquist, Craig Krueger, Scott Waggoner, Lara Sirois, Thomas Hitzroth (Chairperson-LHC), Miguel Llanos

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Mike Nichols, Jannine McDonald

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Fischer, Principal Planner; Kim Dietz, Senior Planner

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

The Landmark Commission is appointed by City Council to designate, provide additional incentives to, provide review of changes to, and provide expertise on archaeological and historic matters pertaining to properties qualifying for either a national, state or local register status.

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

LANDMARK COMMISSION

The meeting of the Landmark Commission was called to order by the Chairperson of the Commission, Thomas K. Hitzroth, at 7:00 p.m.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (LEVEL II)

Project: Perrigo House

Description: Certificate of Appropriateness

Applicant: Seth Hale

Staff Contact: Kim Dietz, 425-556-2415, kdietz@redmond.gov

Kim Dietz presented the certificate and noted the history of the site. It is a landmark because of its association with the Perrigo family, one of the founding families of Redmond. She compared photos from 1936 and 2010, noting that this property was designated because of the A2 criteria, the association with the family mentioned. There are no features of significance because the location did not maintain the nature in which it was originally used, which was a farm and orchard with a view of the Bear Creek area. The setting has been compromised; currently, it is an office for the Eagle Rim Apartments. It is surrounded by those apartments and no longer has a view east. It is not eligible for regional landmark status. It is, however, a community landmark.

Mr. Hitzroth described the community landmark designation vs. a regional landmark. The distinction between the two is integrity. The Perrigo House did not qualify as a regional landmark because its spatial integrity in two areas was compromised. There were significant alterations to the exterior of the building. The other change, as shown in the photo, is in its relation to the surrounding area, which is no longer farmland. The following project for review, the Odd Fellows Hall, is intact, in comparison. The Hall is as it has always been. Its footprint is the same and the window configuration is the same, so it has the integrity that allows it to be considered as a regional landmark. As a regional landmark, it would then be held at the same level as a King County landmark or state landmark, and would be eligible for the same benefits.

Ms. Dietz noted that Mr. William Perrigo settled this area in 1871. On this particular site, he first constructed a log cabin. From that structure, he provided a trading post and store. He was known to deliver goods throughout the vicinity. That cabin burned in 1909, and the house in consideration at this meeting was built sometime between 1909 and 1920. Several documents refer to that period of time; one

makes a note of the date 1914. It is one of the older remaining structures in Redmond and the only remaining structure related to Mr. Perrigo. The current use is an office, and it is two stories. The fenestration on the structure has been replaced, for the most part, but some windows are original. The applicant would like to change a majority, if not all the windows. The product proposed to be used is a Colby, which is described as supportive to historic structures in that the original framing can stay in place and the impact on the structure is limited. There is an all-wood or combination material proposed.

Staff is recommending supporting this certificate of appropriateness because it will help enhance energy efficiency. There are a limited number of original windows remaining in place, so new windows will help in that regard. The product proposed will limit impact to the structure, and there will be an opportunity to go with all-wood, possibly. Overall, this project could help maintain the structure over time.

Architect Seth Hale presented on behalf of the applicant. He noted that the upper floor has all of its existing double-hung windows, which are all original except for a small one. On the lower floor, there are some original windows as well. The front windows are not original; there are casements on the sides with a fixed window in the center. On the side of the home is an apparent addition to the house, which has all aluminum windows. An all-wood Kolby replacement window was presented, as well as one that is aluminum-clad. The applicant would prefer the aluminum-clad without the interior mullions and clear glazing. There are long-term maintenance issues with the wood windows. A sash kit is included with the Kolby product that fits in the existing frame. No trim or window frame would come off. One revision under consideration is in regard to the casements, which would involve putting in a new frame. For those windows, the applicant wants to use a double-hung window that would no longer have horizontal mullions. All the windows are proposed to be replaced.

COMMENTS FROM LANDMARK COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Mr. Hitzroth:

- Asked about the *special relationships* and *spatial relationships* referred to in the application, and asked about the terminology of repair vs. replacement.
- Mr. Hitzroth noted that repair is a Type I COA, which staff can handle. Replacement is Type II. Mr. Hitzroth wanted to make sure he was clear on what the applicant meant.
- Ms. Dietz said that because of a change in the material and construction, she wanted the Commission to review this project as a Type II. With a replacement of a broken window or replacement due to failure, that would be a repair.
- Mr. Hitzroth said it did not appear that there was any replacement of historic windows. Mr. Dietz says there was one historic window on each floor. The majority of the windows are non-historic.
- Mr. Hitzroth noted that this was a community landmark, and noted that there was little chance this building would ever be upgraded to a regional landmark. Therefore, he does not see a problem with the changes proposed by the applicant.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked why the windows were replaced originally, and what they were replaced with. Ms. Dietz said the windows were replaced over time and in differing forms, and were not done in kind.
- The applicant noted that the upper floor windows are all wood. On the lower floor, there is a combination of wood fixed windows and aluminum fixed windows.
- Mr. Meade asked why the applicant did not try to match the window in look and appearance in the kitchen.

Mr. Krueger:

- Said that there was a medley of mullions, and asked how the replacement products might pull the overall design of the building together.
- The applicant spoke to Mr. Meade's concern first. He said he could put in a similar window to the one he wants to replace, but more exterior construction would be required, including possibly replacing the frame. The idea was to avoid any demolition of the exterior.
- To bring the building back to its original construction, the majority of the windows would most likely require clear glazing. The applicant would be more than happy to remove the horizontal mullions.

Mr. Llanos:

- Asked if there was a preference between wood or aluminum windows.

Mr. Hitzroth:

- Noted that the changes proposed here were similar to those permitted at the Brown Building, which was another approval by this Commission.
- He noted in that case, more durable materials were approved, but those materials were not allowed to change the configuration of the transoms or other items. He noted that aluminum might be more durable and still keep with the character of the building.
- Mr. Palmquist would like to make sure there was no further demolition to the building, especially if the window configuration were not original.
- Mr. Hitzroth confirmed with the applicant that the windows would be configured as they were before, except in the case of the double casement, where individual casements have been proposed for energy efficiency. That would also match up with the other proposed windows for the site.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the need for additional exterior work with that individual casement proposal.
- The applicant noted that replacement of the frame would be required for individual or double casement windows because it is a wider window, making the sash kit used elsewhere not possible. Either method would involve the same amount of construction.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. MEADE TO APPROVE THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, TYPE II, FOR THE PERRIGO HOUSE FOR THE CHANGED IN THE WINDOW MATERIAL AND CONFIGURATION. MOTION APPROVED (8-0), COA 11-002 APPROVED.

STATUS UPDATE/CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (LEVEL II)

Project: Odd Fellows Hall

Description: Status Report

Applicant: Tim Short

Staff Contact: Kim Dietz, 425-556-2415, kdietz@redmond.gov

Ms. Dietz noted this was not a Certificate of Appropriateness situation yet, merely a consultation. But depending on the Commission's actions, it could turn into a certificate application. The Odd Fellows have been around since at least 1918 in Redmond. The structure in question had several antiques, and its characteristic three rings representing friendship, love and trust have moved over time. For a time, this building was known as Odd Fellows Grill, and the rings were moved again. Now there is a new tenant, Redmond's Bar and Grill. Staff has spoken with the new tenants and issued a Level I Certificate of Appropriateness to allow them to remove the rings but included a requirement for the applicant to return for discussing the ring's future placement with the Commission. For the interim, there is a sign on the brackets that once held the rings. In addition to the structure designated as a landmark, covering the entirety of the property, there is also a preservation easement. A grant was issued to this structure by the City and the Commission for roof repair. In one attachment, there was a provision for the placement of the three rings. The property was designated a landmark using the A1 criteria, in that it played a significant role in the culture and evolution of Redmond in its earlier days. This was a gathering place that the community used that provided entertainment as well. Several Odd Fellows Halls exist today. Bothell and Monroe have similar halls; in Fall City, the three-ring motif is painted on the structure.

Redmond's Odd Fellows Hall was built in 1903 during Redmond's period of Downtown development. The Odd Fellows took over the structure in 1923, once the group was established. This is a wood-frame building, which was prominent during the time. The grant mentioned earlier for roof repair was for \$19,390. The easement notes that the primary façade shall be maintained in accordance with the easement in perpetuity or until such time the City and property owner mutually agreed on any changes. This is a unique storefront that calls out to customers on the sidewalk to come into the interior meeting place. If the rings need to be repaired or replaced, that will be monitored by this Commission. If these rings, considered signs, have to be replaced, the Commission will discuss that as well with the tenant.

Tim Short spoke on behalf of the applicant, and displayed the actual rings in question to the Commission, noting they were in a state of disrepair. The applicant is concerned about the cracking and peeling on the

rings and where the responsibility in maintaining them lies. He asked if there was a City fund for repair or if that was the owner's responsibility. He also asked where the City would want the rings. In early photos, the rings are seen in a higher location, but they were brought down after that. Mr. Hitzroth said the rings should be put in an area where they could be easily removed. He was concerned about the condition of the rings. The applicant has put up new signage to let people know the business is there. He noted that in the past, this building has been a theater as well, with a different window structure in the front. The applicant wanted to know what the Commission's take was on the windows as well, which are single-paned and may need replacing in the future. Mr. Hitzroth added in 1908 this building was known as a public hall; in 1926 it was a place for movies but also had a stage with scenery. The applicant says there is one remaining wall from where the stage and wings were. The interior is not a feature of significance, historically. Part of the projectionist's platform is still there. The applicant has not considered how the rings should be preserved, as he was unsure who was responsible for preserving the rings and if there were any funds from the City for preservation. Ms. Dietz noted that there is a grant program supporting restoration.

Mr. Hitzroth noted that the rings were part of the defining character of the building, and it would be nice to get those repaired. Mr. Llanos asked if the applicant wanted the rings flush against the building. The applicant said yes, in that he did not want to obscure his existing signage. He would like to put the rings where they were when the historic easement was granted. Mr. Hitzroth noted that there is no standard way the Odd Fellows would display those rings. Mr. Llanos asked about getting a bid to repair the rings. The owner would submit that bid, and if the grant were sought after, the Commission would see that information again. Ms. Dietz said that getting three bids would be best, and noted that the applicant would have time to obtain those bids. She can help the applicant find some contractors to do that type of work. Mr. Hitzroth asked if the rings could be restored to the original colors; they were not originally all gold. The date 1903 was painted above the rings originally, but that was not part of the original structure. Mr. Hitzroth asked if the Commission was of consensus that the applicant can put the rings where they were originally, though there is some question as to the rings' exact location. The first photo of the building is 1937, which can make that determination difficult. Given how Odd Fellows operate, there was no particular standard for ring placement, and the 1937 location would work.

Ms. Dietz said the intent is to restore the rings to the location from which they were removed then there would be no reason to bring this project to the Commission. If another location was used, the Commission would need to be involved. That is the reason for this meeting tonight. Mr. Krueger noted that he had no problem bringing the rings back up the gable, as it is noted on the preservation easement diagram. Mr. Llanos agreed, and said the rings could be protected from the elements up above. Mr. Hitzroth confirmed that the applicant could restore the rings back to where they were originally in 1937, with an assist from the City in finding a restoration contractor. Mr. Hitzroth thanked the applicant for coming.

Mr. Hitzroth added that a crib ford has been brought to his attention in the Bear Creek area. It is a structure of four beams laid perpendicular to the flow of the river. It is 150-200 feet from the overpass on Union Hill Road. It is a historical feature. The King County Landmarks Commission has been made aware of this by Mr. Hitzroth, and their archeologists will look into this. It is a singularly unique feature to this area, and Redmond somehow found a way to preserve it, through accident or design. It is on William Perrigo's land, and its age is not known. Mr. Hitzroth is asking preservation experts in King County how best to preserve what is left, in that it is a unique structure. He will continue working on this.

Mr. Hitzroth has located the first city jail, on 164th. Half of the building is on the sidewalk, and half is on the street. The jail was where the exit lane for a drive-through is, currently. He would like to see some interpretive signage here and other places in the future. Mr. Hitzroth will talk with the City Council on December 6th about the historic preservation part of the Comprehensive Plan. A letter has been crafted by Ms. Dietz for property owners who have landmark possibilities. After the first of the year, an old boot shop on Leary will be invited to consider the landmark designation process. There are some issues surrounding the parcel, which Mr. Hitzroth will look into. He noted that this was the last meeting of the year for the Commission. He said the preservation highlight of 2011 was the picnic shelter at Anderson Park, which has reached King County's notice as a good example of historic preservation. Mr. Hitzroth says the City of Redmond is the most aware of any city in the area in preserving its heritage. There are sixteen community and regional landmarks in the City. Vashon Island is the only region with more. He

appreciates the commitment of the Commission in their work, and thanked the Commission members and staff members for their efforts.

ADJOURNMENT OF LANDMARK COMMISSION MEETING

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. LLANOS AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO ADJOURN THE LANDMARKS & HERITAGE COMMISSION MEETING AT 7:52 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (8-0).

Mr. Krueger offered his thanks to Mr. Hitzroth for his work with the Anderson Park project. Mr. Meade noted that the wood preservationists who worked on that project might help with the Odd Fellows Hall wood preservation.

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Meade called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 7:53 p.m.

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.

PROJECT REVIEW

L110482, Verizon Wireless @ Bear Creek

Description: Front Façade Remodel for new tenant

Location: 17258 Redmond Way

Applicant: Franklin Ng with Freiheit & Ho Architects

Staff Contact: Steve Fischer, 425-556-2432 or sfischer@redmond.gov

Mr. Palmquist recused himself from the discussion, as he works for the applicant. Mr. Fischer said this was a tenant improvement, a facelift to an existing retail space adjacent to Panera Bread. There is some work being done on the front face of the building involving the covered canopy and also the creation of a false front or parapet. Staff is recommending approval with the colors and materials presented with the standard presentation materials inconsistencies. One item in the staff report is a request from the applicant to clarify if there will be some effort to tie the front into the mansard roof.

The applicant noted that the front would indeed be tied back to the roof, right into the mansard. A color scheme and design would be employed that would be similar to what some of the neighboring businesses are using. The frontage would be stepped down, as appropriate next to a much larger space. The entry of the space has been opened up to make it more approachable. There will be two new columns with the black coping and trim used elsewhere on the site.

COMMENTS FROM LANDMARK COMMISSION & DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the tie-back of the frontage and if there would be side walls running up to the roof.
- The applicant confirmed there would be. Mr. Krueger believed that would look nice.

Ms. Sirois:

- Asked if there would be a flat roof with a parapet behind the tower element, which the applicant confirmed.
- Ms. Sirois said the project is continuing the direction the Board is happy to see in the Bear Creek development.
- The applicant said the main colors and body will match the tower element. The middle color will be where the signage is. The darkest color will be at the cornice element, with the column caps also black. The new brick in the columns will match the brick used in the Ross building.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Asked about the coping color. The applicant noted that green was the existing color of the coping, and it would be painted over with black. The idea is to have similar coping and paint schemes as the shopping center grows, according to the applicant.
- The applicant added that a new, uniform paint scheme for all of Bear Creek will be worked out over the next year with the shopping center's owners. The Board would most likely review that color scheme, as well. Mr. Meade said he was ready for approval.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. SIROIS AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE PROJECT L110482, THE VERIZON WIRELESS BUILDING AT BEAR CREEK WITH ALL THE STANDARD CONDITIONS. MOTION APPROVED (4-0) WITH ONE ABSTENTION.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE100038, 85th & 158th Apartments

Description: Construct a new building with 4,000 sq. ft. of retail space, 120 parking spaces and 150 multi-family units

Location: 158th Ave NE & NE 85th Street

Applicant: Scott Hall *with* Pine Forest Properties, Inc.

Architect: Ted Panton *with* GGLO

Prior Review Date: 02/03/2011 & 07/07/2011

Staff Contact: Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or glee@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee noted that this was the third pre-application meeting for this project, and what he hoped was the last before an approval. As previously discussed, there are some administrative modifications regarding parking and courtyard dimensions. The Board has been amenable to those deviations. There is a third concern over a private usable open space for the balcony, which has not yet been discussed. Staff is amenable to granting that deviation, as well, but Mr. Lee is looking for input from the Board. Different sizes, shapes, and conditions for the balconies would be considered. He is asking for more details from the applicant on the different balcony types under consideration. Generally, Mr. Lee says the project is moving in the right direction. It looks great so far, with some minor concerns. On the north elevation along 85th Street, there are issues with engaging pedestrians on that street front. The brick building and parking garage could pose an issue, and Mr. Lee wants input from the board on that point. Regarding the brick portion of the building near the river, Mr. Lee wants some comments about the design, and if more details are needed to help make it more interesting. The third issue is possible light spillage out of the garage. There is a lot of green screen in this area that could allow a lot of light coming out. A fourth concern is that there might be too much gray material on the building, but adding another color could make it too busy.

Ted Panton spoke on behalf of the applicant. He said the project has evolved through the preparation process. He reviewed the site orientation of the project and how special it was, being near City Hall. The applicant noted that the Board had questions beforehand about the roofline along 85th, and a high-quality soffit has been added. He believes there is a simple elegance in the execution of this detail. The Board had also commented on the openings of the building and their placement, which the applicant has responded to. There was also a desire to break up the scale along 158th, which the applicant has answered, as well. The windows, downspouts, and reveals have been updated. The Board also discussed the retail frontage, and a possible double-high building in that area. The leasing center may fill that role. The corner frontage has some double-high potential as well. The applicant has added new details on the overhang and soffits in that area. The entire retail frontage has been modified to deal with flood plain concerns.

Mark Sindell, landscape architect, next spoke on behalf of the applicant. On 85th, the existing sweetgum trees will remain, with some lawn as well. A curb well has been introduced. There will be perched entries at the corners with ramps and steps. Regarding the green screen, the plantings will be layered with clematis, evergreen shrubs, and vine maple. Evergreen and deciduous ground cover would be used as well. Along 158th, there will be street trees in tree grates. Per the standard, there will be wider sidewalks. There will be a muse providing drive access into the garages to create a more pedestrian scale. Accent paving has been added at the entries with a heavily-planted trellis and low wall. The idea is to maximize connection to the river with riparian planting on the river side of the project. The main courtyard has a

primary pathway coming down from the amenity spaces going to the river space. The amenity spaces are meant to be for indoor and outdoor use. Terracing has been added to the units, as well as a grand stairway. On the roof plain, a green roof has been proposed on the townhomes with 4 inches of green material planted. Evergreen clematis, sedges, and spring-flowering shrubs have been added to the green screen area. The street trees on 158th will be an ash, after consultation with the City. On the west edge, there will be a continued multi-seasonal, layered approach with dogwoods, fescues, and an evergreen background. Wisteria is the vine along the muse. In the courtyard, there are more ornamental trees closer to the actual units, leading down to more riparian plantings closer to the river trail.

Mr. Panton continued with the vertical design of the development, showing the DRB the eye-level perspective of the project. The double-high buildings will be a very noticeable part of the building, with warm counterpoints provided around the entry. Along 158th, the awning has a nice horizontal containment for the sidewalk, in the applicant's opinion. Masonry has been added in some succinct spots to create some warm balance with the other materials. On 85th, the amount of masonry increases. On the river trail side of the project, the lower step-down portion of the units connects with a great stairway through the middle of the design. There is a boat house-type structure on this side that might be constructed of wood, or at the very least, materials with a warm wood tone. On the muse side of the project, there will be vehicle access for the unit residents. The boat house wood elements would be echoed here to continue an urban cabin type of appeal. Dynamic trellises would line the muse as well, with catenary lighting and vine plantings. This would help create a hierarchy of entry, leading in from the specially-marked pavement on the muse. The muse would be a low-speed auto area that would be comfortable for pedestrians, according to the applicant.

Regarding materials, the applicant showed the palette used on the project with the masonry, wood and some premium cladding products, such as SWISSPEARL. The windows will be anodized aluminum at the bottom with vinyl windows used in the residential units. On the elevations, the applicant showed rendered versions of the project to help the DRB get a better feel for the design. The green screen appears to be a good opportunity for different options, in that it could involve many different plantings. The downspouts create an expression in that area as well. Anchoring this to the west is the lower part of the mid-rise building. The applicant wants to keep light spilling under control, as well. On the east elevation, the double-high storefronts work in concert with the end brackets. Some bike storage has been provided on this elevation, as well. On the south elevation, the boat house has a buff brick along its base. The green roof will create a nice backdrop to the design. With the river frontage, one would see some brick details and some of the lower units with their terraces.

Regarding the ADF discussion about the muse and drive aisle, the applicant is providing 20 feet clear for a fire lane, which is the outright requirement. Also, the applicant is flaring out to have a compliant drive aisle between the unit entries. The cars would be able to turn in and out of the entries and maneuver with no difficulties. The applicant says this is a win-win, where cars can go in and out and some unit residents can park and walk to a unit. The courtyard width requirements are 55 feet, free of building elements. The applicant said the project is more disposed to a funnel-like shape for that courtyard, which would be narrower than the requirement. However, that design provides a net gain of 1,000 square feet for open space. There is also a requirement for each unit to have its own outdoor space: 5 feet in width, 5 feet in depth, and 50 square feet minimum. The applicant says many of the decks presented have much more than 50 square feet, but some are below that 5 foot requirement. Screens have been erected between many of the decks, giving privacy between neighbors. The applicant feels that he is presenting a complete package for the decks, and the design flows with the geometry of the site. There is an exception for a 12 square foot option for some of the decks. Mr. Lee has been working with the applicant to design this Juliet balcony option. The east and north facades have no balconies. The applicant says those sides lend themselves better to an urban street wall design. The applicant is hoping the DRB will understand the rationale for the non-standard size of some of the decks.

COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Likes the evolution of the project, especially the south and west elevations and their massing.
- He wanted to make sure that City Council members and the Mayor appreciate what they are seeing of this project as they drive to City Hall, which is just across the street. To that end, Mr. Krueger has been asking for lighter colors, but he is unsure about the white color of the SWISSPEARL product.
- He says the east and north sides, which use that product, should be looked at. He likes the corner detail, but he is concerned about east and north elevations.
- Mr. Krueger asked how the applicant's building relates to City Hall. The applicant says the two buildings share a contemporary design. He says his project has a similar dynamism as City Hall, but at a different scale. The deep roof overhangs are a commonality between the two buildings.
- The applicant says City Hall is focused on its parking area; his project focuses on the public realm on the street. But he says the two share a common language of elegance and significance in their modern design.
- Mr. Krueger says the glass and other elements on the east elevation could make it lively, which the applicant agreed with. The applicant said the design is simple; the use will define the onlooker's experience.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the north elevation and a door placed in a very plain and lonely way there. The applicant says the green wall in that area should make it look less stark, but said it was a good point to remember.
- Mr. Krueger is looking for other Board comments on the SWISSPEARL used on the east and north.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Says overall, the project is looking really good. He commended the applicant on the corner detail especially, which is really strong.
- Regarding the City comments, Mr. Palmquist says most of the Board has agreed the parking works well with the muse concept. Regarding courtyard width, Mr. Palmquist says the funnel concept makes sense.
- He does not have a problem with the balcony dimensions. He would rather see different types of balconies rather than a verbatim expression of the design standards.
- On the north elevation, Mr. Palmquist asked about the door Mr. Krueger referred to. The applicant said that would be a sprinkler service room entrance. Due to that use, Mr. Palmquist would not want to draw attention to it and would not recommend a canopy over it.
- Also on the north elevation, Mr. Palmquist looked at the transition to the brick element, and asked if the green wall could be extended across the masonry to tie the design together. The applicant said that could be possible.
- Mr. Palmquist asked about header courses and sills on the brick, which could look good on top of the openings to give them a little more character. The applicant said, by way of breaking up massing, that every third or fourth course of brick could potentially be smaller.
- Mr. Palmquist asked if the brick colors would change in that model. The applicant said no; it would be a simple, subtle difference. Mr. Palmquist said that could be successful, but he would like the applicant to find a way to tie that coursing in to the top and bottom of the windows.
- Mr. Palmquist asked about the cladding materials on the west end, and if some of the design language and material used on the north and east side of the project could be used on the west and south. Beyond that, he is supportive of the project and would welcome approval at the next meeting.

Ms. Sirois:

- Likes the project and its fresh and lively massing.
- Ms. Sirois is back and forth on the white color presented, but says the palette of materials may balance it out. She is hoping when the trees in the area grow up, it will balance that color out.
- The applicant noted that on the north side, the sweetgum trees are already there to break up that color.
- Ms. Sirois agreed with Mr. Palmquist that the corner piece was an interesting approach.
- She does not have a problem with the balconies departing from the standard for the sake of variety.

- She agreed with Mr. Palmquist's idea to extend the green screen. She suggested painting out the door on the north elevation to match the storefront frame, or create a full light door with opaque spandrel glass. Her idea was to make it look more like the other doors.
- Otherwise, she says the project is looking great.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Echoed the comments that this project looks very cool. Mr. Waggoner likes the crispness of the white color, and does not have a problem with it.
- He noted the brick building on the northwest corner helps break down the massing considerably by providing elements with separate character. He said he did not feel like the pieces should more like each other; he likes the different character of the different corners.
- Mr. Waggoner says some horizontal banding at the second floor level might be a good idea, or perhaps some transparency in the thin canopy material to offset the heavy eave line of the overhanging roofs.
- Mr. Waggoner asked if the deck at the boat house element has been reduced in size since the last presentation. The applicant said this deck area is a base for the rest of the project, and he did back off on its size a little.
- Mr. Waggoner suggested some sort of cantilevered deck could create a better dock analogy, even off of the bike storage area. The applicant noted that such a deck might create too much shadow and darkness in this portion of the project.
- Mr. Waggoner likes the lush look and variety of the landscaping plan.
- He asked about the oversized downspouts on the north side. He asked if they were the only downspouts on the whole project and he asked if they were large enough for storm water containment. The applicant said that water would be gathered in a cistern beneath those spouts.
- Mr. Waggoner suggested a fin from the roof to the ground that would hide those downspouts.
- Generally, Mr. Waggoner says the materials and colors look good.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked about the detail of the joints where the SWISSPEARL comes together. The applicant says the material would come together in a seal, to provide weather protection.
- Mr. Meade asked if the fasteners for the SWISSPEARL would match the material. The applicant is still working that out, but is leaning in that direction.
- Mr. Meade says that the amount of SWISSPEARL used could be a concern, but he is reassured by Mr. Waggoner's support of the idea.
- Mr. Meade suggested a simple row lock or header course to break up the massing of the brick material. He asked if the mortar would be color-matched. The applicant said the goal for the mortar would be a sturdy, low-maintenance material.
- Mr. Meade suggested gray mortar might work, which would lighten up the dark brick. A buff-toned mortar could work as well, such as Davis 5447, which looks like historic lime mortar. That could bring some lightness to the dark brick as well. Mr. Meade said that choice could make a huge difference.
- Mr. Meade was struggling with the south elevation, and liked Mr. Palmquist's idea to echo some of the materials used elsewhere on the project on that elevation.
- Mr. Meade appreciated Mr. Waggoner's idea of a heavier canopy element. The applicant said the storefronts were supposed to express themselves as their own module, in a sense.
- Mr. Meade brought up the concern of the staff about how the green screen filtering out light from the garage vehicular lights. The applicant said that the screens could be augmented to block out that light. Mr. Meade said some sort of belt and suspenders concept, attacking the light from both sides, would make sense.
- Mr. Lee noted that this was still a pre-application meeting, and asked if this could come back for approval. Mr. Meade queried the DRB and determined that the project was ready for approval.
- Mr. Meade said that when the project comes back, focusing only on the changes presented would be helpful as regards time management.
- Regarding the fasteners for SWISSPEARL, Ms. Sirois recommended color matching to keep the crispness of the project. Mr. Meade noted that the SWISSPEARL product is very fragile and tender in the construction phase, in his experience.
- Mr. Meade noted that consulting the CollinsWoerman design group could be helpful in dealing with the cladding materials presented. He thanked the applicant for his time.

DESIGN AWARDS PROGRAM

Mr. Fischer continued the discussion on this topic from the last meeting; some DRB members were not at that meeting and needed to catch up. In talking with staff, Mr. Fischer has determined that the desire is to have this remain as the Design Review Board's award system, not something people applied for. Mr. Fischer has provided a set of projects going up through 2007. He will soon have a set of projects leading up to 2011. Mr. Fischer said that staff recommendations are not the final arbiter on this decision by the Board. He asked if the DRB had any questions about this program and if they had some suggestions for him to focus on. Mr. Fischer would like the DRB members to help him focus his time on what they want to see in terms of photos he should take or research he should do.

He asked if there were any projects on the 2004-2007 list of projects that the DRB really wanted to see. Mr. Meade asked if there would be a celebration of these awards at some point, and Mr. Fischer said that would happen. He noted that the process would be a selection by the DRB, an announcement for the owner of the building and design professional involved, and a written notification. A program would be put together for a design awards event, which would include the narrative of the DRB's discussion about the projects in a video. The event would involve a reception in the City Hall lobby with Mayor, City Council, and DRB involvement, likely including some comments from Mr. Meade. The award categories would be superior, outstanding, and honorary. Every project would get some sort of plaque. The Budget Director has approved Mr. Fischer's requests for this awards concept. Mr. Krueger would appreciate a consolidated list of projects to help in the decision-making process.

Mr. Meade asked if the awards could have a bicycle motif to represent Redmond. He said if the City makes this event special, the property owners would find it special. He suggested delivering the awards to the property owners in person as a way to do that. Mr. Fischer says these awards have been successful in the past, and will be well-received by designers as well as local media outlets. Mr. Meade noted that he would like a full list before making any recommendations. Ms. Sirois asked to receive the list as soon as possible. Mr. Fischer said he would send out that list early in the week following this meeting. He said the awards should be presented in the spring, no later than May. Mr. Krueger suggested taking an abundance of photos to help the process. Mr. Meade asked if the parking garage on the Microsoft campus would be award-worthy; Mr. Fischer said that project has been mothballed. He said there should not be any limits on how many projects or how few projects should be honored. Mr. Fischer noted that the awards would most likely be handed out every other year, which Mr. Meade agreed with. Mr. Meade wanted to make sure that municipal projects were recognized as well, including wellheads and park buildings. Mr. Fischer agreed, and noted that there was a picnic shelter in the Grass Lawn area that might be worth recognition. He said that smaller projects, or municipal projects, should not be overlooked.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:46 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).

February 16, 2012
MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY