

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

April 5, 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, Lara Sirois

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Jannine McDonald, Mike Nichols

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Fischer, Principal Planner; Gary Lee, Senior Planner; Thara Johnson, Associate Planner; Dennis Lisk, Associate Planner

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

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

CALL TO ORDER

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by David Scott Meade at 7:00 p.m.

MINUTES

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 16TH, 2012 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (4-0) WITH ONE ABSTENTION.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1ST, 2012 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (3-0) WITH TWO ABSTENTIONS.

PROJECT REVIEW

L120074, Vision 5

Description: Arts/Live Work Community; 5-story mid-rise; 1 building with 8 units; 97 SROS; 25,480 square feet

Location: 8550 163rd Avenue (NE 85th Street at 163rd Avenue)

Applicant: Robert Pantley

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

Mr. Lee noted that this project has come before the Board two times in the past as a pre-application. Tonight, it was up for approval. Staff had no conditions of approval for this project. However, there are two new sheets in the packet that the applicant presented to the Board. Architect Jay Janette spoke on behalf of the applicant, and reminded the Board members that they have spoken in support of the Arts/Live Work Community project. The DRB supported the firm, urban response that met the street in a very urban way. The DRB also supported the overall design approach, save a few items of clarification about design execution. The applicant said the project has not changed, other than creating upper balconies with a better expression of the handrails. The applicant also provided more photographs to display the pedestrian scale of the project and the level of reveal in the concrete element in the upper stories. The applicant said that one-foot setback in the concrete provides some of the façade modulation the project is trying to achieve. The storefront itself has a layering effect of shade, shadow and relief on the façade. The garage door will be built on a tube steel frame with an exterior treatment of cedar that is also expressed on the front façade. The hope is to use a reclaimed cedar product for this element. The canopies will have translucent glass.

The applicant showed a vertical cut-through of the project to show the expression of the reveals and the recessions of the storefront. The applicant showed how the horizontal expression of that façade was repeated in several areas. The spandrel is the center of the concrete frame, again providing shade, shadow, and relief. The concrete base of the project, in the applicant's opinion, is substantial yet still has a relation to the concrete panels above it. Those panels would be treated with a reveal flashing. The relief is up to seven inches from the windows to the panels. The wood in the center portion relates to the windows and the finish detail as the DRB had requested at the last meeting. The applicant said overall, this is a very special project. He was hoping to execute it as a long-term asset to the Redmond community. The architect is anxious to get this project started in June.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Ms. McDonald:

- Mr. Fischer noted that Ms. McDonald had written in comments on each of the projects at this evening's meeting. She noted three points on this project as follows:
- Ms. McDonald asked about the location of mechanical equipment on the site. If rooftop equipment is proposed, there will be a need for screening.
- She also noted that the west elevation could benefit from the addition of green panels at the S3 designations, which are shown as white.
- Her third point was that balcony rails should not have too much whimsy; a modern, straightforward approach would better keep with the overall expression of the details of the project.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Said the applicant has addressed the concerns of the Board. He said this project is a unique and different kind of project that Redmond should welcome, and one that will attract a unique segment of society to the City.
- Mr. Waggoner said that the applicant has done a commendable job in creating an attractive building that will benefit the neighborhood. Overall, he supported the project and had no other upgrades to suggest.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Said he supported this project.
- Mr. Palmquist said, in regard to Ms. McDonald's point regarding the green panels, that the applicant has created a multi-layer system, and white fits best in the areas she pointed out. He was not concerned about the use of the white panels, which he says fit into the overall design.
- He said the applicant has addressed the concerns of the DRB, so he supported the project.

Mr. Krueger:

- Said that at the last meeting, there were some concerns about the west elevation.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the white panels used at S3. The applicant said the color there was to be determined, but it would be a white color. Mr. Krueger said white was fine with him.
- Mr. Krueger asked about some additional landscaping. The applicant noted that there were green screens and benches on the west façade for the private use of the residents. There is more landscaping in some of the larger corner elements to break up the façade.
- The applicant said the rigor and organization help represent what is going on in the balance of the building, but there is some visual relief with the benches and green screen.
- Mr. Krueger said he supported the project and especially likes the street elevation, which he believes will be timeless and impressive.

Ms. Sirois:

- Said the details on the project have progressed in a very thoughtful way.
- Ms. Sirois agreed with Ms. McDonald's point regarding the balcony railings, in that they should be clean and simple.
- Ms. Sirois says the white colored panels were fine, in her opinion.
- She said the project looks terrific and she is looking forward to seeing it built.

Mr. Meade:

- Said he also supports this project, and would appreciate a motion for approval.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MS. SIROIS TO APPROVE L120074, VISION 5, WITH THE STANDARD STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON PRESENTATION MATERIALS AND INCONSISTENCIES. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE120012, The Retreat

Description: Construction of 14 new townhomes on 21,450 square foot lot

Location: 8384 & 8400 167th Ave NE

Applicant: Natural and Built Environment, LLC

Contact: Robin Murphy

Staff Contact: Dennis Lisk, 425-556-2471 or dwlisk@redmond.gov

Mr. Lisk said this was the first pre-application meeting for this project. This site is located off NE 167th Avenue, just south of the end of 85th Street in the East Hill area of Downtown. The entire site is just under a half-acre in size. The surrounding land uses include single-family residences, some mixed residential and commercial uses to the west and Redmond Elementary School to the south. The applicant is proposing four townhome buildings that would hold a total of fourteen single-family units. Each unit would have two floors over a garage, with the units running front to back. Each unit would have their own private open space areas. There would be communal open space areas, including a patio area on the south edge of the site along with a gardening area. The garages would be accessed off of NE 167th Avenue by a central access way and split off with an alley. Staff would like to hear the Board's thoughts on building and site design in the early stages of this project. Staff's main comment was regarding the decks on the two buildings that face onto 167th Avenue. The elevations show the decks without any roof coverings, which feels to staff like a backyard element along a street front. The applicant has since revised the decks by providing a roof cover, which staff appreciates.

Architect Robin Murphy presented on behalf of the applicant. He noted that the project is trying to build on what Natural and Built Environment has done with a similar project about two to three blocks away. The difference with The Retreat is a sloped site that comes up to a six or eight-foot bench. The site also slopes up to the northeast corner of the lot. The slope helps with the entries to the units, but also presents some challenges in that the buildings have to be pushed up significantly. The applicant has tried to embrace that by creating two entries to the street units with an entrance on the street side and also on the sides of the building. The applicant pointed out the roofs over the decks help break up the facades while also providing weather protection and giving more of a front-porch feel to this side of the site.

There are two color schemes for the project, one that includes a series of browns and beiges. The second color scheme is more colorful. The buildings themselves include a front façade with some character that hopefully shows it as part of the fabric of Redmond but also a part of the future. The materials will be durable residential materials with residential details. Each unit will have private and semi-private open space. The entry sequence going to the first unit on the street has a distance of about 25 feet to the back of the curb, which should allow for a portal of sorts, perhaps a trellis with vines on it. The entry will allow for a direct entry to the center unit or the ability to go to either side of it on a series of steps to the private zones of the other units. The applicant said that the northeast corner of the lot has a steeper than 2:1 slope that was artificially created by a previous owner. This corner is covered with second-growth alders. The applicant is working on an alternate site plan that would respect that slope, pushing the buildings away from the slope. He asked for the DRB's input on that sloped area.

Mr. Robert Pantley added his comments at this point. He said this would be a LEED Platinum community. He said he was hoping to get the strength of a street feel with the project, but still create livability. He noted that the people would be living on the second and third floor due to the lower-level garage. That is why the entry elements are presented in the way they are, to create a gentle flow into the building. He asked the DRB for guidance on colors. The applicant likes bold colors and would like to confirm that

concept with the Board. The applicant noted the slope is not an issue, in that it is a man-made slope. He asked if the DRB would support moving the buildings on the site to get around that slope, or if that slope were not that big a concern.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Ms. McDonald:

- Mr. Fischer noted that Ms. McDonald wrote that the roof forms respond to the neighborhood context, but the overall impression of the project is that she has seen this before.
- She would like to see a more modern project with shed roof forms or different window patterns, something with greater interest.

Mr. Meade:

- Confirmed that staff has already worked out details over the slope in the northeast corner. Mr. Lisk said he was looking for input from the DRB on that point and others.
- Mr. Meade said that if the slope was environmentally critical, or even if it were not, pushing the site back to the corner would free up space in the interior and get the two buildings further apart from each other, which he thought would be beneficial.
- He was not so worried about the northwest building being closer to the street, in that the project is the last building on the street. He said pulling the back building away from the southeast building would be more important.
- That separation of buildings, Mr. Meade continued, might free up some traffic space in the inside, such that cars could turn more easily.

Mr. Krueger:

- Agreed with Mr. Meade that pushing the project back would open up more common open space between the buildings.
- Mr. Krueger said the buildings should line up to the street and said the variety between the elevations is rich enough that the buildings do not need to jog with each other.
- He said the space between the garages would be impacted by moving the building. Mr. Meade added that some planting space might be laid into that area.
- Mr. Krueger asked if more landscaping might be added to soften the buildings on the exterior, which the applicant agreed with.

Mr. Meade:

- Said there was an opportunity for more variety on the site, especially on the two back buildings. He would like to see some individual detailing, perhaps not with shed roofs but by borrowing a specific detail to create more individual units.
- Mr. Meade likes the more vibrant color palette, but was not supportive of the green shade included.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Appreciated the staff comments about the roofs over the decks.
- Mr. Waggoner does not have a problem with the staggered building line along the street. He said pushing the building back from the northeast corner would be a good idea to create more separation between the buildings.
- He would also support more individual identity for each building, such that residents would be able to pick out the home they were coming home to.
- He would like to make sure the applicant is careful with the color selection. He said the applicant did not have to choose a modern roof selection.
- Mr. Meade added that with so much white trim on the buildings, that element becomes dominant. He said something other than white trim would be preferable, perhaps to match with a darker tone window product.
- Mr. Pantley confirmed that the DRB would like to avoid the white trim on the outside corner trims. Mr. Meade agreed with that thought, and said the outside corners could be the body color, with a higher-end look.
- Mr. Meade said the garage doors will be a critical piece for the residence. He suggested adding some glaze to these doors, or some other sense of variety that could provide some identity.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Said what the applicant has done with the decks over the roofs is a good start. Mr. Palmquist said those roofs need to look a little more substantial.
- Regarding the colors, Mr. Palmquist said he would support the bolder color scheme, but with the caution that a building on Cleveland Street has used these colors in the wrong way.
- About the site planning, Mr. Palmquist supported pushing the project back from the northeast slope to encourage livability.
- The applicant asked how to make the porch areas on the west side more substantial. Mr. Palmquist suggested using a flat soffit with returns on the side with the same siding and trim details on the rest of the building. He added that a mixture of designs, perhaps some gables, might be a good idea.
- Mr. Meade suggested the applicant look into a different idea, such as a trellis element, but with the concept that the structure is more substantial in the way it is supported.
- Mr. Krueger asked what the railing would be for that deck. The applicant responded that he has painted them in the past or used iron. He was open to suggestion on this element.
- Mr. Krueger suggested not using wood on the railing and suggested something more transparent. Mr. Meade said that element depends on the price point and buyers for the project.
- The applicant said he originally looked into a strong modern look on this project, but that was rejected by many of the salespeople and staff in his company. He believes the buyers for this project would be looking for more of an urban design.
- Mr. Meade said some stained cedar might be a good element to add, perhaps in combination with wrought iron on the railing detail.

Ms. Sirois:

- Said the less bold color scheme is not strong enough, but noted that the bold scheme might be too bold. She recommended paring down the number of colors, and agreed with getting rid of the green color that Mr. Meade suggested. She said there might be too much going on with the different colors.
- Regarding the massing, Ms. Sirois prefers the back row of buildings. She said that it was okay to express that these were townhomes, and would like to see more of a row house feel.
- She agreed that pushing the northeast unit away from the slope would be a good idea.
- She said that the styling could be cleaned up a little bit. The design appears fussy to her in the present form.
- Mr. Krueger asked to see more details on the landscaping, materials and the overall project design at the next meeting.

Mr. Meade:

- Reinforced the point Ms. Sirois made about creating a solid row house look rather than a large house look. He recommended a few sites around Redmond for the applicant to see as examples.
- Mr. Meade said that there would be no reason not to make the statement that these were town homes. The applicant said the Comprehensive Plan says the buildings should have a single-family look.
- Mr. Lisk clarified that the project does not go against the Comprehensive Plan in that there are many different forms and shapes of the building that give it a single-family sensibility.
- Mr. Lisk added that the East Hill area is meant to be a transition area coming down from a massively single-family home area into Downtown. He said the row house concept would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
- Ms. Sirois noted that the homes would have a natural gap and a scale that would reflect a single-family home type of feel.
- Mr. Meade asked about the base siding. The applicant said that would be lap siding with six to four inch exposure.
- The applicant said the DRB had helped him tremendously in terms of direction. Mr. Meade added that the DRB was all for bold design and taking some risks. The DRB and the applicant thanked each other for their time and attention.

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: game rooms, birthday celebrations and serving pantry for plating of food. The space will also be used for a number of activities and large events.

Location: 10901 – 176th Circle NE

Prior Review Date: 02/16/12

Applicant: Julie Lawton

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

Ms. Johnson noted that this project came to the Board at the February 16th, 2012 meeting for a pre-application meeting. It is in the Emerald Heights Retirement Community, and includes construction of a new building that is about 10,500 square feet. It will be adjacent to the fitness center that the Board approved in 2011. The new building will be a multi-purpose space for performance and other activities for the residents. The building will be located where an existing pool building is sited. At the February meeting, the DRB had several comments regarding the design of this building. The applicant has responded to those comments with revised elevations and an accompanying memo. Staff is concerned about the placement of the generator in its current location next to some residential buildings. Staff is worried about the noise emanating from the generator during testing and operations and the effect of that noise on the residents.

Jeremy Southerland with Rice Fergus Miller Architects presented on behalf of the applicant. He said the building presented is phase two of a three-phase campus expansion program, primarily in the heart of the Emerald Heights campus. The fitness center was the first phase, the multi-purpose building will be the second, and a small dining expansion will be the third phase. The applicant is hoping to complete an internal courtyard at the same time the second phase is in progress, which ties into the dining area. The facades of the multi-purpose building are tied directly to the other two phases. The landscaping, in particular, will tie in with the new courtyard.

The multi-purpose building connects to the main building and fitness center. The massing strategy for the building has not changed drastically. It has been further clarified, however, with regard to the DRB's concern over the length of the connector corridors back to the main building and the blank walls in those corridors and on the back of the project. The generator enclosure Ms. Johnson mentioned will have screening around it, which may include some lap siding around it to match the other buildings. There is a model train court built into the site, which has been built by residents of the community. The applicant showed the DRB a number of photos around the site to show the scale of the project and the echoes of different elements throughout the design.

The applicant addressed the blank wall condition at the southwest façade. Putting windows in this space would not be an option, as this wall is the back side of a performance stage. Therefore, the landscaping strategy has been updated to deal with the blank wall. All the site lighting in this area will be down low, with bollard lighting. The southwest wall will not be seen by any residents, but it will be lit up to create silhouettes of the trees. The second concern addressed by the applicant was the idea that the architectural treatment was somewhat utilitarian and brutal on the connection piece between the multipurpose building and the main building. To deal with this concern, the applicant introduced a new smooth panel siding with horizontal reveals and vertical trim boards with a repetitive sequence. An overhang on the deck has been created on the top to make a shadow line and provide horizontal definition. The vinyl windows have been changed to a storefront design to match other window design on the project. The door and window configuration is repeated on the other side of the corridor to provide some transparency and a view into the model railroad courtyard from the central court.

The third concern from the DRB was the appearance of blank walls flanking the entry gallery. The applicant said that those blank walls made a powerful statement of showing the mass of the auditorium piece itself and highlighting the new vocabulary established on the site. The applicant proposed to mitigate those walls with landscape screening. The applicant commented on Ms. Johnson's concern about the generator. He said that in the event of a power outage, the multi-purpose room has been designated as the place the residents would go. Therefore, if there was an outage, the residents would

likely be inside the auditorium and benefiting from it, not in their residence being bothered by the sound. The tests of the generator are scheduled regularly, once per month. There is a generator just across the courtyard already, which is also scheduled once per month in advance with the residents. There have been no complaints. Therefore, the applicant does not believe the noise issue will be a huge disruption from what the residents are accustomed to.

Mr. Meade asked about the decibel specifications on the generator. The applicant said it was specified, and sound was taken into consideration in the design. The generator has acoustic housing around it, but he was not sure what that decibel level was. The existing generator on site does not have acoustic housing, and when the power is out, it runs the kitchen and health center portion of the building.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Ms. McDonald:

- Mr. Fischer noted that Ms. McDonald wrote in that she would prefer to see a flat roof than the almost-flat shed roof proposed. She said the roof angle looks awkward.
- She further wrote that overall, the project is okay. The blank walls are not ideal, in her opinion, but acceptable given the context.

Ms. Sirois:

- Said that the explanation of the new generator was fine, in her opinion, and she did not have an issue with that. She believed that noise would not be a problem.
- Asked the applicant for the overall view between the fitness building and the multi-purpose building to see those buildings next to each other. She was having a hard time seeing how they relate to each other.
- Ms. Sirois agreed with Ms. McDonald's points about the blank walls. She said they were not ideal, but given the circumstances, they were okay.
- Ms. Sirois does like the color and material palette, which is subdued but with nice contrast.
- She said the main space may have a small lift in the roof, and asked if a parapet could come up even more. The applicant clarified that all of the roofs are flat, but the connector pieces are slightly pitched for drainage.

Mr. Krueger:

- Said the project looks great, and said that the construction is coming along well. He liked the changes presented to the connector corridors.
- Mr. Krueger liked the changes made to the back side of the building, and said the extra landscaping would be acceptable.
- He said the location of the generator makes sense where it is, but he would like to see the area around the generator enhanced in the future. He asked if stone, in a low wall, might be placed around the generator to give it a better look.
- The applicant said he was hoping that the generator enclosure falls back into the backdrop and becomes part of the building. The focus of the upgraded materials was on the pedestrian court on the front side of the project to allow events to spill out from the multi-purpose room.
- The applicant added that the back side of the building would be a quieter, contemplative, less public area.
- Mr. Krueger liked the new windows added to the connecting corridors, and asked if the existing connector going to the pool building would be updated to match that design. The applicant said that connector would be demolished and would indeed match that design when it is rebuilt.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Agreed with most of the comments so far, and appreciated the window system that now matches the two buildings together and ties the whole complex together.
- Mr. Waggoner said the new articulation in the connector corridors helps break down the long, linear feel those corridors once had.
- He was concerned about the small connectors between the stone used on the project, and suggested a stronger line to provide some sort of banding around the site. He would like to see a little more of that detail to understand what is intended for the future of the project.

- Mr. Waggoner said it would be helpful to have some better indications of how the elements of the project tie together. Overall, however, he said the DRB knew where the project was going and he appreciated the updates.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Suggested, on the connector piece, that the applicant use the same darker brown color on the vertical elements. Bringing that color across might help it blend in. The applicant said he had considered that, but wondered if the verticals became too busy with that type of coloring.
- Mr. Palmquist said the idea should be to tie the corridors into the overall project, and reiterated that the dark brown color should come out in some way to help with that effort.
- He asked about the edge treatment on the cement panels. The applicant said there was a two-inch batten on the dark panels that makes the grid on top of the joints. The lighter panel will have a prefabricated flashing piece that holds the panels about an inch apart which provides a reveal.
- Mr. Palmquist said a black grid between the panels might be a good idea, but noted that might be a challenge with the batten element. He suggested the applicant look at the darker grid idea, especially around the back side of the project with the blank walls.

Mr. Meade:

- Noted that on the northeast elevation, there was a note on the stone that spoke about cement lap siding. The applicant said he would correct that.
- Mr. Meade said the applicant should present staff with a decibel rating on the generator to ease concerns about that issue. He suggested shrouding the generator in evergreen material rather than deciduous trees to provide another buffer layer to the sound.
- Beyond that, Mr. Meade said this project is coming along and becoming more cohesive.
- Ms. Johnson noted that the applicant has just submitted a formal application, and will come back to the DRB for approval. The DRB and the applicant thanked each other for their time.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE120002, Valley Furniture

Description: Construction of a 5 – 6 story mixed-use development with approximately 270 units

Location: 8200 – 164th Avenue NE

Applicant: Lizabeth Soldano

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

Mr. Lee noted that this was the first pre-application meeting for this project. The site is the Valley Furniture site, which is just south of a 7-11 store and across the street from a brick-clad office building on 164th Avenue NE. The zone on this site is bisected by two height limits. The fronting on 164th allows for six stories; the fronting on 165th allows for five stories. The model reflects those limits. Staff is excited to see this urban density building, but there are a couple of concerns. One is that this building looks like many other buildings in Redmond with this scale, and staff would like some suggestions from the DRB on that issue. Staff suggested reducing the number of balconies to remove that constant rhythm of balconies. That might create the need for the in-lieu fee for lack of balconies, but would create a different look. Staff also noted that the ground floor residential on 165th is raised above the sidewalk grade, and Mr. Lee wanted to make sure there was a connection for the residential uses that front on the streets of 83rd and 165th to provide a stoop feel rather than a barrier protecting the private spaces on the units. Staff is concerned that the street corner of the intersection of 164th and 83rd orients to the street, perhaps having the main entry to the building facing out on that corner.

Amanda Keating of Weber Thompson Architects presented on behalf of the applicant. The applicant noted that this site will be a mixed-use structure, with five stories on one half of the site and six stories on the other side due to the Downtown height overlay. The site is on the Town Square zone, right on the eastern edge of it and directly adjacent to East Hill. There are two pedestrian street classifications on this site in that 164th is a Type 1; NE 83rd and 165th are Type 3 pedestrian streets. Modulation standards would apply to this project as well, ensuring no blank facades. The people living and working in this building will have access to all the amenities of Downtown Redmond and the quieter zones of the residential neighborhoods and the neighborhood school. The buildings surrounding this site include a mix

of mid-rise new construction and some townhomes as well as existing low-rise construction. The applicant said the site was very well situated for transportation access and pedestrian access to retail, groceries, entertainment, schools, and parks.

Jeff Bates with Weber Thompson Architects next presented on behalf of the applicant. He noted that the massing ideas for the project include a street edge with elevation about four feet above the sidewalk level. Looking at the big picture, the design aesthetic is very modern with a simply expressed building using articulation in the right places, especially at the corners. He noted that the landscaping in the setbacks will help provide privacy for the residents. At 83rd and 164th, the applicant is planning for a well-developed entry. Different colors and modules will help articulate the façade. The balconies on the site fulfill the 50% balcony requirement and provide minor articulation as well. The applicant pointed out that the massing on the site echoes some of the other buildings in the area. There are two vehicular entries, one off 164th and one off of 165th. The applicant said the plan of the building includes a major entry piece, a courtyard, a landscaped area on 165th, and elevated stoop conditions on the street side units. The lobby of the building will help animate the design with a story-and-a-half ceiling height. The main entries to the street side residential units will be from an interior corridor rather than from the street itself.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Ms. McDonald:

- Mr. Fischer noted that Ms. McDonald's written comments on the project included two points. The first was that the design is boxy and more texture or modulation would be needed, or perhaps some better forms in the mass to give the project more identity.
- Her second point was that the proposed landscaping needs to be better defined. She said the design cues on page 10 and 11 of the presentation were confusing with a mixture of possible intent.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the sixth story on 164th and if that extra floor was through a TDR. Mr. Lee said that height is allowed in that district, but that TDR's will be needed for this project on other issues.
- Mr. Krueger said he liked the shape of this project and the treatments of the corners, especially.
- He did not have a problem with the balconies in this project. He would prefer a transparent handrail vs. one that might stand out too much.
- Mr. Krueger liked the orientation of the project, including the raised entries along 83rd and 165th.
- He asked about how the building would interface with other buildings on either side of the project, in that there was a four-story building on one side and a six-story building on the other.
- The applicant responded that there would be several window openings wrapped around the ends of the building. There is a 15-foot setback from the property line that will provide some space as well.
- Mr. Krueger wondered if there was a way to scale down the massing of the interfaces between the two residential zones contained in the project. However, he liked the orientation of the internal courtyard.
- The applicant responded that the fenestrations in that interface area should provide some activity, with people moving in the windows and on the decks.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Liked the project in general and its modern feel especially. He liked the massing on the main corner of the project, and recommended most of the focus for the applicant should be on the main floor and its canopy, as it wraps around.
- He encouraged the applicant to play up the break between the strong base and open feeling found on the lower floor in the retail area. He wanted the designers to emphasize the entry on the level where it would be most used.
- He suggested using a different color in the area opposite of the main entry, but said bringing a tower element down the ground in that area would probably not be a good idea.
- Mr. Palmquist said the project was on the right track. He said the decks were done well, but noted much of the look of this project would change as elevations and renderings are developed.
- He was generally in support of the massing on the project.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Agreed with the other comments made by the Board and said the design cues provided a crisp, cool look to the project. He liked the super grids, recessed grids, articulated screens, and bold colors of the project.
- He said this project has lots of great content when it comes to providing a modern feel. The applicant thanked Mr. Waggoner for his support of the design cue images.
- Mr. Waggoner said the site plan and layout were good. He said the courtyard-style building would be a good element, too. He liked where the building entry for pedestrians was placed, separately from the automobile entrance. He said this design is off to a great start.

Ms. Sirois:

- Agreed with the preceding comments of the Board. She liked the images and design cues provided, which she said could help lay down a good design vocabulary.
- She suggested using more horizontal and vertical fins to link the balconies across units to alleviate staff's concern that this building would look too much like others in the City.
- Ms. Sirois said this design is off to a good start.
- Mr. Waggoner added that he liked the concept of using a staggered grid of windows, and suggested that might be used in the design to make it unique.

Mr. Meade:

- Talked about the design cues on the project and the fins that other DRB members have talked about. He believes this is the type of design the applicant is going toward, and he likes that direction.
- Mr. Meade said, however, that the main corner of the project has a great opportunity to have an active retail level. He said the building across the street from this project looks lifeless, due to the lack of a vibrant retail level on the lower floor. He wants people to want to walk here.
- Mr. Meade liked the idea of drawing people into the pedestrian space using the cue of certain void areas between the retail storefronts.
- He encouraged the applicant to continue to work on the corner piece, and find a way to make it special while still integrating it into the design of the building.
- He liked the landscape area in front of the building and asked for more details on that area. Mark Weisman of Weisman Design Group spoke on behalf of the applicant at this point.
- Mr. Weisman noted that the room on the street might be so big that it would not make sense to have formal stoops on the project. He wanted to provide a connection between the street and the residential units, but not formal stoops. He asked for some feedback from the DRB on that point. The applicant saw these areas as more like decks, not stoops.
- Mr. Meade said he liked the idea of layering landscaping into the site rather than providing stoops. He hoped the applicant could come back with a design element that wowed the DRB with a green but transparent feel to this area.
- The applicant said not a lot of steps would be involved in this area, and reiterated that the primary connection to the street for the street side units is from inside the building, not through the decks.
- The applicant noted that this is not a Type 2 street, therefore, those deck entries are not provided.
- Mr. Meade asked about some special paving notes he saw written into the project. The applicant said he would look for that opportunity for different paving or concrete stamping.

Mr. Krueger:

- Mr. Krueger asked about the material palette for the project. The applicant said it was too early to nail down exact materials, but he thought a cast-in-place concrete wall would be best at the lower level. The upper floors would have some sort of panel system. The corners would have accent colors to fit with the panel system.
- Mr. Lee asked about the retail space being double height, but being very shallow in terms of depth (about the length of a parking place). He asked if this would be desirable for renters.
- The applicant responded that the retail space would be bigger than what Mr. Lee might think, at a depth of about 25 feet. That retail area would be about 15 feet tall, which is not exactly double height.
- The applicant added that deeper spaces are not always desirable for retailers, either.

Mr. Meade:

- Said that depth of 25 feet sounded good to him, and compared the space to a Jamba Juice, for example. He said if there was enough room for interior circulation and access to the materials needed, the depth of 25 feet should not be a problem. He is a fan of small retail spaces.
- Mr. Meade said some sensitivity about the awning placement would be critical for the design.
- The applicant and the DRB thanked each other for their time.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE120013, FedEx Ground Distribution Facility

Description: Single-story package distribution center; 212,000 square feet

Location: 188th Ave NE & NE 73rd Street

Applicant: Jill Marcotte

Staff Contact: Dennis Lisk, 425-556-2471 or dwlisk@redmond.gov

Mr. Lisk noted that this was the first pre-application meeting on this project. Mr. Palmquist recused himself from the discussion of this pre-application, as he works for the architect who is speaking on behalf of the applicant. The site is a 23-acre parcel of land that was approved, through a development agreement a few years ago, as the Taylor Union Hill property. Costco was approved on a site just north of here a few years ago. There will be an extension of 188th Avenue from the south going up to the north, as well as a future east-west street, NE 73rd, that will run along the north boundary of this site. Previously, this site was a sand and gravel mining pit operation and a very industrial area. As it was part of another development agreement in 2008, the development of the area is vested to the regulations in place as of that time. New regulations added to the Zoning Code in the last year do not apply to this site. This will be a one-story rectangular building that will be about 212,000 square feet. It will be about 740 feet long, or the length of nearly two and a half football fields. This will be a distribution facility for FedEx Ground and will have several trucks and vans going in and out of this site, which drives some of the design.

Staff has raised a few issues about this site, including the sheer size and scale for the building and what opportunities there might be for modulation or changes in color or rooflines, with a full understanding of the constraints of the design. Staff would like to explore ways to break up some of the massing of the building. Landscape screening is another issue. The preliminary concept presented has an area on the west side of the property without a buffer. Costco, for example, dealt with that issue in a certain way, which could be a guiding point for this applicant. Another issue for staff is getting people from the employee parking lot to the main building, which is some distance away. The only method shown in the plans is a sidewalk. Staff would also like to see what opportunities exist for sustainability techniques. No specific requirements are in place under the Zoning Code for 2008, so that effort would have to come from the applicant.

Developer Jill Marcotte spoke on behalf of the applicant. She noted that this was a unique facility designed around FedEx's operations. Drivers for pickup and delivery vans are coming in and out of the facility with time-sensitive packages for ground operations and, at times, home delivery in the surrounding area. There is a specific conveyor system that the building is designed around. That system will take about five months to design. The applicant said this would be a prototype facility that would be secured and gated. All employees and contractors will come in through one entrance area. All the traffic is set to come in and out of the main driveway on 73rd.

Bob Schilken with Dow Engineers next spoke on behalf of the applicant. He gave the DRB some background on the size of the site and the orientation of the building. The site is fairly flat, with a 3% grade, but that would result in a 36 foot differential over the length of the site. Initially, the designers oriented the project from north to south. However, that orientation would create a situation with the slope that the applicant said simply would not work. The next idea for orientation was to put the building along 188th Avenue, with offices pointing west. The basic problems with this include another grading issue between the building and its neighbors. Also, there is an issue with the truck trailers all being loaded up in this location, very visible from the street. So, the applicant flipped the building so that the truck trailers were in back and the offices were in front. That creates a problem with employee parking and potentially

disabled access. Therefore, FedEx has worked with Public Works to reorient the future 73rd Street so as to fit the building in properly, and has put the parking areas all around the building. The applicant said this was a shoehorn fit and most likely the only way the project could work.

Mark Weisman from Weisman Design Group next spoke on behalf of the applicant. He reiterated that everyone going into the FedEx site will come into the secure gate on the site, which is a challenge. He said the most interesting part of the building is the administrative office. He said that element should be dynamic for people driving by it on the street, with layers of landscape in front of it. The applicant said some strong evergreen plantings on the west side will be added to the vegetation currently there to help with screening. There is a water quality storage feature on the low end of the site, which could be a nice element, in the applicant's opinion. He noted that there was no public parking on this site. He is hoping to provide some paths into the site for pedestrians to deal with that issue. Much of the parking onsite is for storage and delivery vans. Much of the facility is automated. He agreed that getting people into the building was a challenge. The applicant is hoping to use a tiered effect to create pathways through the project. Street trees will be planted along the street, and this will be a very energy efficient building. The applicant will look into LEED certification, but the energy usage is very low. The landscape will be designed with native plantings that are easily maintained. The parking fields have been split up due to the nature of the site. The actual planting requirements are not clear on where planting would be needed inside the parking areas, and the applicant would like help from the DRB on that topic specifically.

Architect Rick Grimes next spoke on behalf of the applicant. He reiterated that this is a large building, but noted that there are other large buildings in some areas near the site, including UPS. The applicant will end up hiding most of the building behind some landscaping. The FedEx building will be a simple concrete tilt-up structure 34 feet high to the top of the parapet at the higher grade. The loading dock doors will be around the back side of the building, so as to keep larger trucks in the rear. The only push in the building is out front, where the administrative buildings are. There are no modifications possible on the interior function of the building, which creates some height restrictions. Around the front of the building, however, there are some modifications possible. The office buildings are around 9 or 10 feet high, which could mean some height modulation in those areas. The applicant would like some input from the DRB about how to modify that front area.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Ms. McDonald:

- Mr. Fischer noted that Ms. McDonald's written comments included three points. The first was that clear pedestrian access from the employee parking lot is needed.
- Her second comment dealt with signage and a question about what types of signs would be used, from monument signs to building signs.
- Her third comment was a suggestion to use some color blocks to break up the long, linear quality of the building. She noted this was a difficult building type for modulation.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked for a better look of where the administrative piece of the building would be located. The applicant pointed out that location to the Board.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Asked if there were multiple floors in the administrative space, and the applicant noted that there was no intention to create a mezzanine floor to this area.
- Mr. Waggoner asked if there would be a problem with cladding this location with a different material than the concrete tilt-up material. Mr. Waggoner suggested some glazing. The applicant said that would be possible.
- Mr. Waggoner confirmed where the drop-off in slope would happen on the side. The applicant pointed that area out, specifically where a break point was that would allow for better punctuation and modulation through landscaping.
- Mr. Waggoner asked if there would be a retaining wall along the site with fill dirt added in. The applicant said that there would be some walls of that nature, and they might be exposed.

- Mr. Waggoner asked if the building could step up to different parapet heights, even with an interior floor that would stay flat. The applicant said that would be possible, but it was unclear if anything would be gained there.

Ms. Sirois:

- Asked if the height of the administrative center could step down from the main building.
- The applicant said that might not be a bad idea, but added that increased landscaping could perhaps be an even bigger help to break up the massing of the building.

Mr. Krueger:

- Confirmed that all the trucks coming in and out would be going through one driveway, which the applicant said would be a challenge.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the fencing around the project. The applicant said he had not figured out that material, whether it would be a wall or a black chain link fence. Different materials could be used in different areas of the site.
- Mr. Krueger noted that the UPS building nearby has a black metal fence, which might be a good option. The applicant said that some of the fencing may end up buried in evergreen landscaping, and noted that hiding the building is probably the best option to take care of massing concerns.
- Mr. Krueger said the entry area concept seems smart rather than a 30-foot high wall. He was hopeful the applicant would have fun with that entry area.
- Mr. Krueger appreciated the process that had to be used to orient the building. He realized that there were several site planning constraints. The applicant noted that much of the design was based on keeping the large delivery trucks in back of the site, to hide them from the residential area.
- Mr. Waggoner asked how this building was ventilated with all the traffic inside of it. The applicant said there was no air conditioning, but some high-volume fans in the warehouse. Mr. Waggoner asked if there were any chance to add ventilation through the use of clerestory windows near the roof line, which might provide some modulation and functionality as well as helping sustainability efforts.
- The applicant said, from an architectural standpoint, looking at more vertical changes might be an option and would be considered.
- Mr. Krueger asked what the colors on the project were. The applicant did throw some color options out. FedEx does not like the use of bright colors on its doors. The standard includes conservative colors on their building sites.
- Mr. Krueger asked if the banding around the building could change such that the corners of the project could be broken up into different modules. The applicant said that some of the HVAC elements could be brought out, with some color, to provide modulation along the banding.
- The applicant asked about where landscape would have to be provided in the truck parking zone. It was determined that some landscaping would be required there, but the applicant noted that this was a high traffic area as well. The applicant said he was over the 20% landscaping requirement for the site, but staff noted that the truck parking area had to be included in that area as well.
- The applicant noted that perhaps some of the landscaping could be shifted to other parts of the site to make it a more rational design. Staff will look forward to furthering that discussion. The applicant said it would not make sense to have a lot of trees around the truck parking area.

Mr. Meade:

- Said that there are some opportunities for modulation, including colors, the gate design, and landscaping. He said it would make no sense to build a 34-foot high entry area where only 8 feet of it would be used.
- He added that other large facilities in the area have been able to hide themselves, and he was optimistic that some gorgeous landscape on this site could hide this machine of a building.
- Mr. Krueger confirmed with the applicant that 188th would be punching through this site.
- Mr. Meade suggested some color massing and some new parapet locations could provide some modulation.
- Mr. Waggoner noted that some of the older Boeing buildings had clerestory buildings and saw-tooth roofs that could be emulated on this site. Mr. Krueger wondered if some solar energy could be gained from such a large roof. Mr. Waggoner said there had to be some way some scale could be gained on this building design.

- The applicant asked what the DRB wanted the design team to come back with. The applicant is considering building a three-dimensional model as well as providing street views of the proposed site for the next meeting with the Board.
- Mr. Waggoner asked that the applicant should come back with some different design options. The applicant noted that this was an expensive site, from the new road to landscaping to the building itself. The applicant said he would work within the budget provided by FedEx to provide some good options for the DRB. Mr. Waggoner supported that idea.
- Mr. Krueger said the project was a challenge, but it could be a lot of fun, too. He hoped this building could be a trendsetter for other FedEx buildings around the world.
- Mr. Meade urged the applicant to take advantage of the resources available on this site to make the best FedEx building possible. He asked the applicant to pay particular attention to the landscaping. He asked the applicant to hurry back with more details.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:09 P.M. MOTION PASSES (5-0).

May 17, 2012

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY