

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

February 16, 2012

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: David Scott Meade, Joe Palmquist, Craig Krueger, Scott Waggoner

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Lara Sirois, Jannine McDonald, Mike Nichols

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Fischer, Principle Planner; Gary Lee, Senior Planner; Thara Johnson, Associate Planner

RECORDING SECRETARY: Susan Trapp, Lady of Letters

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 David Scott Meade at 7:18 p.m.

MINUTES

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1ST, 2012 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15TH, 2012 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (3-0), MR. WAGGONER ABSTAINING.

PROJECT REVIEW

L120024, 85th Street Apartments

Description: 148 unit mixed-use apartment buildings

Location: Southwest corner of NE 85th Street & 158th Avenue NE

Applicant: Scott Hall

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

Mr. Lee noted that this project has been to the Board for three prior pre-application meetings. At the last meeting, the DRB declared that this project was ready to come in for an application and approval. The project has made a few minor tweaks since the last meeting, and Mr. Lee says the project has progressed very well. He has two conditions of approval, one regarding the standard consistency of the project with the plans and the other regarding a landscape plan. He would like to verify the planting materials that will be used on the green screen on the site.

Ted Panton with GGLO spoke on behalf of the applicant. He showed the DRB an overview of the site plan. He has addressed the DRB's concerns about weather protection on 158th, which wraps around a bit onto 85th. The DRB had called for a heavier expression of this, especially on the east side walk. There were three recommendations on the northwest corner, including providing more detail on the brick portions of the building, addressing the blank door on the north façade, and addressing the upper portion of the mid-rise building, which had an appurtenance housing a stair with adjacent mechanical elements. Last, there was some focus on the downspouts, which are a major feature on the north side of the project. The DRB had wanted those integrated more into the overall design.

The applicant showed the DRB a weather protection element, a steel capture piece with a tension fabric. It is bolted back to the face of the building to make a strong connection to the concrete material there. The joints of SWISSPEARL in this area will be celebrated as well to give more legs to the design. Moving

around the corner, there is a thicker outboard piece. A panel has been added to the underside of the tension fabric. At the northwest corner, the DRB had been concerned about the monolithic expression of the brick. The applicant likes the honesty of one color and the platonic solids of the brick. However, the applicant did add more detail with a two-inch inset around the windows, which are framed with a single-stack header course. Lastly, a banding element sixteen inches tall creates a belt around the building under the window sills. Around the northwest corner, an "orphan" door was noted in the previous design. The applicant has pulled the green screen element across the face of the brick on that side, stopping it at the door and continuing it on the other side. The door enters into a service room which is only used occasionally.

The DRB had also been concerned about light cutoff and spill-off for vehicle headlights in the parking structure. The applicant showed that the structure was actually fronting up next to the green screen, and he clarified that there was a concrete stem wall that would cut off light. The green screen will eventually cut off even more light, with most likely 100% coverage when it is fully grown. The DRB had concerned about the west elevation and the stair element there. The applicant explained how the stairway connected the floors of the project. The building has now been notched back a bit more to answer the DRB's concern. The applicant has created a new mechanical screen detail that ties in with site features like the boathouse, as well. The applicant added that the stair element in question is usually obscured. Regarding downspout attachments, the applicant took the comments of the DRB to heart and made the color of the downspout darker. It is now more of a feature piece on the project. The downspouts have an overflow function that allows people to see the collection of water, at times.

Mark Sindel, the landscape architect, next presented to the DRB on behalf of the applicant. The first level of the project is a muse with auto access and pedestrian access. The palette of materials includes overhead vines and a mix of pavers in different colors. The west edge builds on the upland riparian character of the Sammamish River Trail, using river birch, dogwoods, and willows. Access to the River Trail will be provided from the project. Some of the flats have concrete green-jointed slabs for terraces, which are connected with pathways. On 85th, the existing street trees will stay. Layered planting will go up against the building. Evergreen clematis and climbing hydrangea will be used, with 80% evergreen and 20% deciduous plants. Evergreen shrubs are at the base of the concrete wall, with a few deciduous shrubs mixed in. On 158th, there are street trees and tree grates.

In the courtyard, there are terraces with concrete, green-jointed slabs and gabion walls with benches. A grove of trees leads from the site to the River Trail. There is a tapestry of colors and plantings, according to the applicant, providing a layering of plants that should look stunning year-round. The main gathering spaces have a mix of decking and pavers, as well as barbecues and furniture. The roof level, or townhome level, has a green roof of sedums across the entire top, using a pre-grown mat. The planting palette will have more layering on the north side of the project. At the bottom of the downspouts, sedges and rushes will be planted. The site will be irrigated as well. The applicant showed an exterior lighting plan. The west side will have low-level step lights. The courtyard will have bollards with a shielded cutoff. The more intimate spaces will have low-level path lighting. Wall sconce lights have been added at the patios. Catenary lighting will go across the muse overhead.

Mr. Pantan noted that much of the project is using premium materials such as SWISSPEARL and brick. He says the color palette is fairly neutral, allowing the colors of the plantings to express themselves. The applicant showed the two levels of parking on the project and the difference in floor plans throughout the site. Mechanical screening has been placed in four spots. There will be some plumbing vents and stacks coming through the roof. The deviation requests include the muse, with its turning radius analysis and the open space calculation that looked more qualitatively at the space provided through the site configuration. Shoreline information has been provided, as well. Residential usable open space issues have been resolved through the external opportunities for the units to gain access to the outside.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Said this project was very exciting. Mr. Krueger said the amount of SWISSPEARL used had concerned him before, but he likes the look of it now.

- He liked the changes to the cantilever detail, which was a concern of Mr. Palmquist's.
- Mr. Krueger said, in regard to the illumination plan, there were some dark areas noted. The applicant said there was some street lighting on the plan, which meant that the lighting did not need to be duplicated in some areas.
- Mr. Krueger noted that some corners could be dark, and that too much light might be blocked through some of the large trees. He wondered how lighting could liven up that edge. The applicant said he was thinking the same thing, and Mr. Krueger's idea could be incorporated through the use of some down lights.
- Mr. Krueger wanted to make sure the pedestrian edge was well lighted, especially on the east side. He said the boat house element would be an awesome corner.
- Overall, he said the landscaping and hardscaping will present an awesome project overall.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the south elevation of the north building, which the applicant noted has not changed.
- Mr. Krueger liked the extension of the green screen on 85th, which answered the DRB's concerns about the service door in that area. He fully supports the project.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Said he supports the project as well. He noted that the applicant had addressed his comments from last time, and he believed the project was headed in the right direction.
- Mr. Krueger asked for a better understanding of the downspout element. The applicant said he was still working on that detail, perhaps involving some surface infiltration or a water-capturing structure below it for irrigation. The majority of it will be a traditional system, but there will be an ability to hear and see the water on the project.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Agreed with the other DRB members on the quality of the project and the raising of the bar this project represents. He liked that such a quality project was so close to City Hall, which will be appreciated by many people.
- Mr. Waggoner said he liked how the downspouts have been tied to the building and appreciated that they would no longer look spindly, as they did before.
- He said the canopies on the east side still seem to have a thin profile edge in elevation. He was hopeful that the shadow of the canopy would create a heavier horizontal line to counter the vertical lines of the façade.
- He asked for an explanation of the canvas element on the canopies. The applicant noted the canopy would be water-resistant and mold-resistant, which would be cost-effective but also elegant and simple. Light would be able to penetrate through the canvas, as well. A similar canvas has been used at the ticket booths at the Space Needle.
- Mr. Waggoner said the canvas would provide a nice effect and the material should hold up well.
- He asked about the ribbed cement board. Mr. Waggoner noted there was a horizontal groove applied and how dirt might accumulate in those grooves. The applicant said the grooves would need to be cleaned and maintained. A coating would be applied to the board to help shed dirt.
- Overall, Mr. Waggoner said this was a great project that will look great when it is done.

Mr. Meade:

- Agreed with Mr. Waggoner that the project will look great. He noted that the Board was ready for an approval.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO APPROVE L120024, 85th STREET APARTMENTS, WITH THE TWO STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS: THE STANDARD PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES AND THE MATTER REGARDING THE LANDSCAPE PLAN BEING PART OF THE BUILDING PERMIT. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE120003, Emerald Heights Multi-Purpose

Description: Proposal to construct an 11,500 square foot multi-purpose building. Space will be able to be divided into three separate spaces for smaller functions: a pantry for plating food, AV room to control lighting, sound and cameras and included in the AV room an interview space for editing equipment.

Location: 10901 – 176th Circle NE

Applicant: Julie Lawton

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

Ms. Johnson said this site is in the Emerald Heights retirement community, which is on the southeast corner of 111th and 172nd Avenue NE in the Education Hill neighborhood. The proposal includes the construction of an 11,500 square foot building, which is to be used as a multi-purpose space for performances and events. Currently, there is a pool building and fitness in this location used by the Emerald Heights residents. The Board reviewed a fitness center on this site in 2011. Staff has reviewed the architectural elevations, and has these comments:

1. Along the long the northeast elevation, staff recommends additional articulation, specifically adjacent to the existing commons building. Staff said windows would be a good use there. The applicant says this may not be feasible due to a need for a firewall between the residential building and the future multi-purpose building. Staff has discussed using some other options of treatment, such as a trellis with landscaping.
2. Along the southwest elevation, staff would also like more articulation, especially where the cement lap siding is located.
3. Along the northwest elevation, staff is recommending the top level be broken up through the use of, potentially, some opaque windows.
4. Looking at the north-facing elevation, staff is recommending that the applicant include more windows so the hallway is not so blank and does not feel like a hotel lobby. The applicant has said that windows were not included here because this would be a future remodel, with the addition of a dining room and courtyard.

Jeremy Southerland of Rice Fergus Miller Architecture spoke on behalf of the applicant. He noted that this is phase two of a three-phase development scheme happening on this campus. Phase one was the fitness center, which is now under construction. Phase two, the multi-purpose building, is sandwiched between the new fitness center and the existing commons building. The overall idea is to have a formal court that would be highly landscaped and defined on three sides by the fitness center, the new multi-purpose building and the dining expansion. The footprint of the buildings on the site has expanded. The applicant showed the DRB the landscaping plan, and reviewed where old buildings would be demolished and new buildings would be built. The landscaping would involve a contemplative garden and some minimal landscaping where the future dining area would expand. The applicant pointed out a large retaining wall on the site.

Pedestrians would have the main access to the multi-purpose building. A corridor ties into the multi-purpose building as well, giving residents better access. From a design standpoint, the applicant said this new phase was an extension of the design vocabulary of the fitness center. The multi-purpose room can be divided into smaller spaces. There is an entry gallery for pre- and post-function events. Those events can spill into the courtyard above. A band of glass has been added along the entry gallery. The applicant is being careful not to build too much, in that some items would have to be ripped out for phase three. The fitness center has helped define the design of the next phase, as well as existing materials on the campus. Those materials include stone facing with metal canopies. A large model railway built by the residents is part of the design, as well. The courtyard will have a nice, urban look to it.

In terms of materials, the applicant pointed out the stone with metal canopy system, storefront windows both low and high which could add more light and presence to the prominent façade, and the darker contrasting panel colors to separate the mass of the auditorium from the lobby of the fitness center. On the southwest elevation, the applicant is playing off various volumes coming tighter. The applicant knows he has to address the blank wall, and he is considering options to do that. There is not much of a view of that back façade so much of the energy of the design team has been placed on the more public views of the building.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Meade:

- Asked about the vinyl on the residential building. The applicant said that was the existing material on the residential building, so he wanted to show that in contrast to the new material.

Mr. Krueger:

- Understood the staff concern with the connections to the existing building in three different spots. He said the design, at present, does not seem to go with the rest of the building. He noted that those connections have some different dimensions, but the utilitarian corridor was a concern for him. He was hoping to find a shadow line or some detail to change that.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the enhanced garden with the long window walls and the vertical pieces of cement siding presented. The applicant said the siding would be indicative of a column, which matches the detailing of the fitness center.

Mr. Meade:

- Mr. Meade asked if the street view looking west showed the end solution for the corridor connection. Mike Miller from Rice Fergus Miller responded that the street view in question shows the extension of the dining room, which projects out into the courtyard.
- The applicant said the corridor connection piece would run past that probably about ten to twelve feet before it gets to the new extension of the dining room. Mr. Meade asked if a shed roof with some overhang might work in this area to match some of the other volumes and provide some shadow line.
- The applicant said that option was under consideration, but he is still figuring out how to connect that to the existing roof.
- Mr. Meade said this application looked consistent with what the DRB looked at before in terms of an extension and enhancement. He said the runway piece needed to be addressed, but other than that, he did not see too many problems.

Mr. Krueger:

- Suggested that the applicant come back with some photos of what the fitness center looks like, under construction, to give the DRB a better idea of what the overall final product would look like.
- Mr. Meade noted that the residents had brought some concerns over phase one on this site. He asked about a green roof. The applicant said, after budget discussions, the green roof is no longer on the table. More upper windows have been added to celebrate the front façade. The applicant was disappointed to see the green roof go away.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Noted that on the first phase of the project, there were concerns over the large mechanical apparatus needed. He asked if that were a concern in phase two. The applicant said there is one rooftop mechanical unit above some restrooms. There is a screen wall around it.
- Mr. Waggoner noted that all the apartment buildings are much higher, and look down on that mechanical apparatus. He noted that the shed roofs added in the first phase could be used here in phase two to add some interest, provide more screening, and mimic the fitness building design.
- The applicant said the first design iteration showed the shed roofs Mr. Waggoner is talking about. Due to the volume of the space, and that the auditorium wants to be the tallest ceiling, there are some long clear spans and the trusses are getting deep. A shed roof would have to be very high over the auditorium, and canting it the other way would not provide a good, dramatic effect.
- The applicant said there was no clear solution with a shed roof scenario.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Said that looking at the two pieces, the roof form has not been resolved. He would like the applicant to work on resolving that issue. He noted that the two buildings almost want to be different, and that the residents were not happy with shed roofs in the first phase.
- Mr. Palmquist said gables might be an answer or even a lean-to design in the front façade. He said connecting two flat roofs introduces another language to a site that already has multiple languages.

- Mr. Waggoner noted the big spans of windows on the fitness center have a good design, and he would like to see that window design on the new building, as well, to tie the complex together.
- Mr. Meade added that a similar window language could be added on the hallway piece. He also suggested shedding the gallery space in the direction the pool goes. He said a node at the top of the main auditorium, with a changing shed piece such as a loft, could provide some different dimension without dominating the roof.
- Mr. Meade said without a green roof, some changes on the roof for residents to look down on would be a good idea. He liked the notion of mimicking the window organization.
- The applicant said the concern about the sheds was that the residents did not like the height of the roofs relative to their views and relative to what they are used to. He asked, were the green roof to come back, if that would answer the DRB's concerns about the views of the roof.
- Mr. Meade said perhaps, but he noted that the shed roofs would better answer the massing integration issue rather than the concern about the overview.
- Mr. Waggoner added about the shed roofs on the fitness center. The applicant said it would be a membrane roof.
- Mr. Palmquist said the concerns of the DRB are more about massing rather than the overhead view of the roof. He would like the applicant to experiment with some different roof shapes.
- Mr. Meade said, regarding the gallery piece, the overhanging piece on the pool is very nice. He suggested perhaps another overhang could help tie the design together.
- Mr. Palmquist said, if new roof forms were not possible, a stronger piece at the top of the parapet would be nice and perhaps create a new, more acceptable design. That could also help out with the long connectors that staff is concerned about and not complicate the future building phases.
- Mr. Krueger said he liked the perspectives the applicant has provided and would like to see the same perspectives of the back side when the applicant comes back. The applicant said he was trying to present the building as an urban backdrop to the future landscape court planned for the site.
- The applicant was trying to relate the design more to the lounge of the fitness center, but he said he would continue to work with the treatment of the space.
- Ms. Thompson said the northwest and southwest elevations, with the massing of blank siding, were still not addressed. Mr. Meade said the applicant had some landscape concepts that could answer those concerns.
- The applicant said with the rear-facing façade, the auditorium wants to be dark because performances will be held there. Therefore, he did not think that windows would be a good idea. He was considering other ways to mitigate that blank area.
- The applicant said the landscaping could be beefed up with the idea of providing more screening and softening the blank wall area. He said there was a lot of screening in place already for that wall.
- Mr. Meade said landscaping would be an excellent idea in this area. The other DRB members agreed. The DRB thanked the applicant team for their time.

DESIGN AWARDS PROGRAM **Continued Discussion**

Mr. Krueger noted that he would be leaving the meeting at this point. He filled out a form indicating his choices for the design awards. Mr. Fischer has provided new photos and aerials of the projects in question. Several Microsoft buildings were to be considered. The MAPS building was first on the list. Mr. Krueger did not think this building was deserving of an award; however, Mr. Meade was happy with how the project turned out, overall. Mr. Fischer noted that the bulk of the detail of the building was at the front, and it was a clever redevelopment of a concrete box. The rest of the building beyond the front, however, is still a concrete tilt-up box. Staff stated that this project should earn no higher than an Honor award. Mr. Palmquist said it felt like a Las Vegas building, but said that the dome was a nice touch. He was more supportive of other domed buildings the DRB has considered. Mr. Meade said he was not supportive of giving an award to this building.

Mr. Waggoner asked about getting caught up on the large list of buildings before the Board, as he was not at the last meeting discussing the awards program. Mr. Fischer explained the process to Mr. Waggoner, and said the main idea was to give awards to worthy projects, no matter how many awards that entailed. Mr. Palmquist said talking about the MAPS building later might be a good idea, with more DRB members present. Mr. Waggoner said the building had some decoration that was in line with the

tradition of the group who designed it, but he overall, he was not supportive of giving it an award. Mr. Meade suggested passing on the MAPS building and moving to the next one.

The White Swan building was passed over for an award. Building 33 for Microsoft was a complicated one for staff to photograph. It has been around for a while and a portion has been added on. Mr. Fischer noted that the addition was put on rather seamlessly. The DRB decided to pass on this building. The covered walkway project was passed over as well. The old Safeco campus, now Microsoft Building 88, was next considered, with the focus being the addition to the garage. The DRB decided to pass on Building 88.

Microsoft's entire west campus was next for consideration. There are four new buildings as well as a commons building. The Eddie Bauer building was made over as part of the process. Mr. Meade said this was an impressive project in the way it was executed so quietly. He said the buildings are much more lush up close than they are from a distance. He said the cut of the stone takes your breath away when you are eight feet or closer to it. Mr. Waggoner noted that each building had its own stone, and each therefore had its own identity. Mr. Meade agreed, saying each building had its own flavor. As a campus, he said the project was amazing. Mr. Fischer and Mr. Palmquist noted that each building had its own type of landscaping. Mr. Meade said the Xbox pitch in the middle was incredible. Mr. Palmquist thought this was a great project, but lamented that the only time most people see it is driving by on Highway 520. He said the stone on the project shows fine detail up close.

Mr. Meade said the stone does not look like true stone from a distance. He said this project should be Outstanding or Superior. Mr. Palmquist said the employees' shopping mall was very well done. He asked for a Superior designation, and Mr. Meade agreed. Mr. Krueger recommended the same, and said in his notes that this is a great example of an office building, a large floor plate broken into sections with modulation and a mix of materials. Mr. Waggoner said he was biased in that he worked on part of the project, but said this campus turned out great. He said, with this campus, Microsoft raised the bar on business park aesthetics. He hoped those aesthetics would rub off on other projects. He noted that the detail is high around almost every building on the campus with quality materials and first-class site work, all the way down to the landscaping. Mr. Meade said putting together this project in the timeline that was followed with such execution was a shock. He said it seemed to take no time at all. The DRB decided to go with Superior.

Microsoft Building 99 was next, at 148th and 36th. The stair tower was enclosed in glass, using Microsoft colors. Mr. Krueger recommended an Outstanding designation based on the mix of materials, window patterns, and a good street presence of the office buildings. Mr. Palmquist said an Honor designation might be more fitting, in light of the previous project. Mr. Waggoner said the project does have a good street edge all along 36th. He said the project is typical for the understated Microsoft approach to many of its projects. Mr. Fischer said the garage and building should be considered as a whole. Mr. Meade said this was a very successful project. He said it was a very good project, and noted that if Building 99 were not considered before, he might consider it more award-worthy. Mr. Waggoner said this was a 250,000 square foot project, which was disguised well in the design. Mr. Meade said this was a good parking garage, too. Mr. Waggoner liked the garage better than the office building for its whimsy and variety. Mr. Meade would like to have an example of a parking garage that would be award-worthy; this garage could stand alone, in his mind. Mr. Waggoner noted that the building and the garage are tied together with materials. Mr. Meade said the two should be tied together and should be given an Outstanding award. Mr. Palmquist and Mr. Waggoner agreed.

The chiller for Microsoft Building 100 was considered next. It is recessed into the earth with rows of trees around it. Mr. Fischer noted that it was tough to photograph, in that it was virtually buried. Mr. Meade said this was not award-worthy, in that it was an infrastructure piece added onto a building. Mr. Fischer said the building was hidden well. Mr. Meade said he would like to celebrate designs that were not hidden. Mr. Waggoner noted that this project did the minimum the DRB asked of it. Mr. Meade said some utility buildings, like the well houses the DRB has considered, can be design worthy and iconic for the community. The DRB passed on giving an award to the chiller.

Building 37 for Microsoft, including its parking garage, was next for the DRB. Mr. Meade said the distant view of this building did not do it justice. He said if he had designed this building, he would have it tattooed on his arm. He said it was a beautiful building. The floor plan concept, with interlocking glass connections, is elegant, in his view. He said this would be an Honor or Outstanding award. He said the colored glass or films used on the minor windows create some interesting hues. Mr. Meade said the garage is not extraordinary. He noted that the modulation of the window pattern was impressive. Mr. Palmquist was leaning toward an Honor, in that the garage was not as good a design. Mr. Fischer said the building and the garage could be considered separately. Mr. Meade suggested striking the garage and recognizing the building with an Outstanding award. He said the garage was very predictable. Mr. Waggoner agreed to go along with that.

The DRB next looked at Building 36, which was another challenge to shoot with a still camera. Mr. Fischer noted the building overlooked a ravine and wetland area. Mr. Waggoner said he did not get a good idea as to where entries to the building were. Mr. Meade said the materials were exquisite, but the DRB decided to pass on Building 36. Building 120 was next on the list, on 40th near the 520 overpass. It was an existing building that went through a remodel. Mr. Waggoner said it was a cool, modern building, but nothing special in terms of what Microsoft added. Mr. Meade said this was a building Microsoft wanted to overlook when it came up for approval. The DRB decided to give it no award.

Next up was Nintendo, a unique square structure which had dictates from Japan governing its design. The design is square and needed help from staff and the DRB in breaking up its massing while still following those dictates from Japan. The building has Redmond's largest green roof. Mr. Meade said the concept from the architects was to have a floating penthouse on top of the building. He said the raised podium courtyard between the garage and the main building was incredible. He noted that there was a river planned to flow past the building, but that did not happen. The penthouse was originally supposed to represent the buttons of a Wii controller. The design inside, with ladder elements and ramps, was supposed to represent the Donkey Kong game, which Mr. Meade said was incredible. He said the stone used on the project was amazing, and it modulates the building well. He said this was a big budget project and was glad to see Nintendo invest in the Redmond community.

Mr. Meade said the project was Superior. Mr. Waggoner said the building has a federal courthouse stature with its inverted large scale on top and smaller scale below. He said the uniformity of the building is really crisp and well modulated. He noted that all the window openings on the upper floors have a lot of variation and scale, with different depths to the frame elements. He said for a large building, he found nice repetition and breakdown to it. Mr. Meade noted that the use of glass on the project was well done, and noted that the architects had a lot of fun with what appears to be a regimented project. Mr. Fischer said he has suggested to people that they should look at the way the first floor has been lit with different, playful colors, and staff would support a Superior award. The whole campus works well together, he noted, with an eye toward a larger campus in the future. Mr. Waggoner, Mr. Meade, and Mr. Palmquist supported a Superior Award.

The narthex added onto St. Jude's Church was next for the DRB to consider. Mr. Palmquist likes this. Mr. Waggoner said the building has a great feel to it. Mr. Meade said it was awesome, in that it picks up an Asian flavor in its design. Mr. Palmquist said it was a tough building in terms of executing the addition that was put on. Mr. Meade said the building was very iconic, and the doors were amazing. Mr. Waggoner noted that there was a Northwest timber feel along with the Asian influence, and a nice symmetry was well executed throughout the project. Mr. Palmquist said the exposed concrete was nice. Mr. Krueger said he could not get a good sense of the project through the photo, but he recalled the space being attractive. He was not sure about an award, and said it was worth a possible Honor designation. Mr. Meade said it was Superior, and believed it was very cool. The DRB agreed on a Superior designation, and said Mr. Krueger had been outvoted on this one.

The Presbyterian Church on 166th was next on the list. The DRB said this building did a good job of preserving great amounts of trees. Mr. Meade said the project was really nice, in terms of the scale of the building. He said the church picked up on the language of neighboring buildings, such as Redmond Junior High and other buildings on Education Hill. He liked the naturally-stained wood and the base as well, which he said came out very nicely. Mr. Palmquist said, knowing the lack of budget this project

started with, it turned out really, really nicely. Mr. Meade said this project had a lot of sophisticated moves that were done well, and you would not guess there was a constrained budget behind it. Mr. Waggoner said it was a good example of decent design without a generous budget. Modest materials were used, but really nice alignment helped the banding and accents. Mr. Meade said it was worth an Outstanding award. He said the campus is very different and really sings, in that it is amongst mature evergreens. Mr. Krueger said the project had a good mix of materials, with struts and the height of the stone at the base that add interest to the design. Mr. Krueger suggested an Honor award. Mr. Meade said it was better than that. The DRB said it was Outstanding. Mr. Waggoner agreed that the project was Outstanding, and the other DRB members agreed.

Redmond High School was next on the list. Mr. Meade said the building was incredible, from the masonry detail to the glass to the cafeteria. He said that the DRB has pointed to this project as an example for other applicants, in terms of detailing. The masonry modulations and the lighted block were amazing little pieces. Mr. Palmquist said the white stucco material used was probably the wrong one to use, but that was his only critique. He said the rest of the building was incredible. He noted that he went to this school in his youth; this building is a hundred times better. The DRB said it was worth a Superior award. Mr. Meade said the new wings on it make it even better.

The 91st Street Condos were next; the DRB decided to not include it on the awards list. It was a Craftsman design that did not impress the Board. Reservoir Park Pump Station came up next for the DRB. Mr. Meade said it was nice and had durable materials. He and Mr. Palmquist said this was simply not as good as some of the other pump stations the DRB has looked at. The DRB decided to pass on giving this an award.

Next up was the Washington Cathedral recreation center building. Mr. Meade said this was a big-time project. He said it was really nice. Mr. Fischer said it was nice inside and out, with a pool, basketball court, restaurants, and offices, among other attributes. Mr. Meade said the brick, concrete, and glass were done very well. Mr. Waggoner said the project had more of a gadget effect than he would expect, with curb corners and sloped soffits and angled walls. He noted that there were a lot of different parts and pieces with a lot of quality involved. He thought the project was not cohesive enough for a top awards mark, but was award-worthy. Mr. Meade agreed. He said Honor or Outstanding could work. Mr. Meade did not like the entry with the cross. He said the project should get an Honor, in that it was executed well, but there were some cohesion issues. Mr. Fischer said he would put all the awards together at the end of this process and see if some projects need to be shifted to another award category. The DRB agreed to an Honor designation for this project. Mr. Krueger had recommended Outstanding or Honor, saying that there was strong, dramatic architecture, with a blend of materials, patterns and colors.

Next up was the PCC 11435, made up of the grocery store and the retail strip. It is a LEED building, possibly Silver, one of the few groceries in that category. Mr. Meade said it was a great grocery store with some great detail along the Avondale side. He wanted to eliminate the strip center as part of the award, in that it is very predictable. He said the columns with art pieces were a nice touch. He said it was a well laid out store. Mr. Waggoner said it fit in well with a residential neighborhood feel and scale. It is in a neighborhood commercial zone, along an arterial. Multi-family units are to the south and west. Mr. Palmquist wanted to include the retail strip, which he thought was well done. He said the site work was very well done, with a raised walkway from PCC to the storefronts. He said the roof forms and materials were very nice. Mr. Meade agreed they were well executed. Mr. Palmquist said this project is not terrible for what it could have been. Mr. Waggoner said this was an example of what the DRB wants in terms of a strip retail center. Mr. Meade and Mr. Palmquist said all together, this project was worth an Outstanding designation. Mr. Waggoner agreed. Mr. Krueger recommended Outstanding on this project, saying it was a great addition to the neighborhood with a good street presence on Avondale and good colors, as well as a good mix of materials and pattern.

Avondale Park was next, which includes some transitional housing run by Hopelink. It is a large complex off of Avondale. Administration and counseling services are on this site as well. Mr. Waggoner said the mission and purpose of the complex is noteworthy, but he did not think the buildings were worth an award. Purely design-wise, he said this project does not stand out to him. Mr. Meade said he would consider an Honor award, but he recommended holding the project so everyone could chime in. If the

DRB wanted to do a feel-good award designation, this might be worthy. Mr. Krueger noted that this project could be an Honor award, or possibly excluded. He said he liked the affordable housing when it was first built, but now the elevations look cluttered with lots of cantilevers. Mr. Meade agreed that the roof lines were a bit crazy. Mr. Waggoner said the windows had a funky look.

Sequoia Estates was next on the list. Mr. Meade said the building was immense, and noted that several trees had to be retained. He said this project is better than it could have been. Mr. Waggoner liked the stone walls and other stone elements on the elevations. He liked how the stone wrapped around the project. He said this might be more award-worthy than the Avondale Park project, in that multiple windows were not used. Mr. Palmquist said there was too much going on with this project. Mr. Krueger recommended excluding this project. Mr. Palmquist said the beige color on the project killed it. Mr. Meade recommended excluding it, as well. Mr. Waggoner recommended holding this project for other DRB members to see, and Mr. Fischer will take more pictures of it.

Billy Townhomes, as the DRB has called it, is actually named the Element. It was the former location of Billy McHale's. Mr. Krueger has recommended an Outstanding award. He said it was a fun, contemporary architecture. He liked the colors and streetscape along 85th, as well as the building orientation and roof forms. Mr. Meade said this was a good example of reveals using hardy plank. He said the design was pretty good. Mr. Waggoner said the project has a good drive-by character. Mr. Palmquist said it was totally different. Mr. Meade noted this site had been snake-bitten for years, and he was impressed that it was a Craftsman walk-up. Mr. Meade noted some people in the community did not like the design. Mr. Meade said, at the time, that the public did not know what they were talking about. He said the body color was a little tame, but the accent colors and vertical metal are very cool. He said the project has a good, edgy feel. Mr. Palmquist said the roof helps the body color, too. Mr. Meade said the roof forms are really dramatic and exciting in what could have been a very mundane project. He said this makes an amazing complex, and he said it was awesome.

Mr. Waggoner liked the random breakup of the windows and spandrel areas were Mondrian-esque. He liked the color applications in those areas, which provide a vigor that is not often seen on apartment complexes. This project was built several years ago, and Mr. Meade said it was about time that someone built something like this. He remembers people complaining the building would block views for the neighborhood. He said the project created a new entry piece, or front door into Redmond on Redmond Way. He recommended Outstanding or Superior. Mr. Palmquist and Mr. Waggoner said Outstanding, and Mr. Meade agreed.

Playnetworks was the next building considered. Mr. Krueger has recommended Honor award or exclusion, due to the fun entry, the mix of materials, patterns, brick, and landscaping. This is a new building, and Mr. Meade said he loves these buildings. He said this was a classy, elegant building with a crisp, tailored look. He said the landscape is done really well. He said more glazing could be added, but he liked the project overall, especially how it looks from the street. He thought Honor was a good award, and the rest of the DRB agreed.

Willows Creek was the next project considered. Mr. Krueger has recommended an Honor award due to the enhanced entry, a good mix of materials, window patterns, and interest in the elevations. Mr. Meade said the building was handsome and simple. He said it was award-worthy. The DRB agreed to give it an Honor award. Mr. Meade liked the jewel box over the front door, and said the project glows at dusk. The entry and vertical circulation are well defined, with intuitive design.

Next up, the DRB considered the Grass Lawn Park Shelter. Mr. Meade said the shelter building and storage or utility building are extraordinary. The designers re-skinned the restroom building with six-inch block veneer, which was then bumped out to create a covered entry. There are also new handicapped stalls and new mechanical elements. Mr. Meade said the design was very successful compared to what it was before. It looks like a new idea, even though the same footprint and wacky roofline were followed. The other building that was once a house was torn down, but a residential scale building was placed there. Mr. Meade said it was awesome, and every piece of it is amazing, including how it was coursed out with the window mullions. He liked the shed roof, roll-up doors, integrated bathrooms, and the park space created in front of it. Mr. Meade said this project took Grass Lawn Park from being great to outstanding,

because it needed more built environment to go with the park facilities. The utility building, which could have been a background piece, has been done really well. Mr. Meade said the main building was Superior.

Mr. Fischer suggested putting a hold on this until more photos came in. He is waiting to get photos of the PSE building for the next discussion of awards. The DRB noted that PSE probably should not get an award. Mr. Fischer said he will be shooting new photos and clustering the designs into groups to help the DRB resolve those projects put on hold and those with two possible award designations. He was hopeful for a final review, soon.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION MADE BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:05 P.M. MOTION PASSES (3-0).

April 5, 2012

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY