

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

July 23, 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:** Scott Waggoner, Lara Sirois Craig Krueger, Mike Nichols

**EXCUSED ABSENCE:** David Scott Meade, Joe Palmquist, Jannine McDonald

**STAFF PRESENT:** Steve Fischer, Principal Planner; Dennis Lisk, Associate Planner

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Susan Trapp, 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 stand-in Chair Scott Waggoner at 7:05 p.m.

**MEETING MINUTES**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2012 MEETING. MR. KRUEGER NOTED THAT ON THESE MINUTES, THE BANK OF WASHINGTON DISCUSSION WAS A PRE-APPLICATION RATHER THAN A PROJECT REVIEW. WITH THAT CORRECTION, THE MOTION WAS APPROVED (4-0).**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. NICHOLS AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE MAY 9, 2012 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MS. SIROIS AND SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE MAY 17, 2012 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE JUNE 13, 2012 MEETING. MR. KRUEGER NOTED THAT ON THIS MEETING, THE SUNBELT RENTALS DISCUSSION WAS A PRE-APPLICATION, NOT A PROJECT REVIEW. WITH THAT CORRECTION, THE MOTION WAS APPROVED (3-0) WITH ONE ABSTENTION.**

**PROJECT REVIEW**

**L120282, FedEx Ground Distribution Facility**

**Description:** 212,000 square foot package sort and distribution facility

**Location:** NE 76<sup>th</sup> Street and 188<sup>th</sup> Ave NE

**Applicant:** SunCap Property Group

**Staff Contact:** Dennis Lisk, [dwlisk@redmond.gov](mailto:dwlisk@redmond.gov) or 425-556-2471

Mr. Lisk noted that this project involves a 212,000 square foot warehouse distribution facility. In that footprint is an 8,000 square foot office area. There are about 480 parking spaces proposed for employees along the south and east sides of the building. Additional parking for trucks and trailers are along the west and north sides of the building. There is a stormwater pond proposed in the northeast corner of the site as well as a substantial amount of landscaping. The landscaping was a major design concern for the DRB at the last meeting on this project. The applicant has responded to that with a planting plan, Mr. Lisk said, that will provide a fairly lush amount of vegetation to provide a buffer along 188<sup>th</sup> and the corners of the building where the building is closest to the public right-of-way. The applicant has advanced the design of the project overall with some fine-tuning details. Staff is supportive of the project and recommending approval. The applicant has formally submitted an application for site plan entitlement.

Architect Rick Grimes spoke on behalf of the applicant. He noted that this is the third meeting on this project, and he updated the DRB on the changes to the project since the last meeting. The site itself has not changed at all, with the same building in the same place with the same parking. The only change to the area around the building is that an exterior trash enclosure has been added to the northwest corner of the building. The enclosure is covered and has gates. The floor plan has changed very little. There is an office area and package processing area, as before. On the south elevation, the man doors have not moved, nor have any overhead doors. The color scheme has not changed nor any modulation. Some additions include light fixtures in the office area and the details such as the bollards around the building. Clear glass windows with aluminum storefronts are still being used. The canopies have been modified from the horizontal metal canopies shown before, which the Board had questions about. The applicant has now presented a semi-prefab canopy that is very simple. It is metal on the exterior, with metal trusses 24 inches on center attached to the walls. There are small metal canopies on the front entry to the building.

Large panels will be used on the building, 36 feet, 6 inches to the top. The top of the typical wall is 33 feet, 3 inches. On the east façade, there will be lighting standards sticking out about six feet away from the face of the building. Some elements sit on top of these standards, which are used for air exhaust from the interior. Each one sits on darker-colored metal panels with a light fixture over the top. The idea was not to emphasize these elements, but there was the recognition that there was an opportunity for a little bit of modulation. The northwest corner has a trash enclosure that includes three double gates and a metal over the top of it. It is roughly 650 square feet in area. Fresh air intakes are along its east side. The metal canopy idea has been added in this area as well. However, the metal canopy breaks wherever there is a downspout off the roof of the building. At the south elevation and the southwest corner, the building jumps back up four feet from the dock level to on-grade. There is a view of the roof here, but there is virtually nothing on the roof beyond four small elements. There are two eight-inch diameter restroom exhaust ducts and there are two four-inch diameter vents for plumbing, but that is all for a roughly 200,000 square foot roof area. There are no skylights, smoke vents, no HVAC, nor any other exhaust. It is a simple, clean roof.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

##### Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the view from the west and what appears to be a wing wall. The applicant says that is an element that sticks out to the north and is indeed a wing wall. There is a continuous line around this wall, however, with corresponding color changes.
- Mr. Krueger likes the colors and changes.

##### Mr. Nichols:

- Asked about the light fixtures that cantilever outward. The applicant said that those fixtures cantilever out on all four sides of the building at a distance of six feet.
- Mr. Nichols confirmed that all of the lights were all four hundred-watt high-pressure sodium lights. The applicant noted that FedEx is requiring the facility to be a LEED Silver building, and the fixtures may change to LED lights, which would save energy and money for FedEx. Mr. Nichols said that LED lights would be preferred.
- Mr. Nichols asked about the three rooftop units, or the two units and the access hatch on the roof area. The applicant confirmed that there are three rooftop units, and said the tallest, largest unit at its highest point is a foot below the top of the parapet. Therefore, no screening of the units is proposed.
- Mr. Nichols said he is in line with what the applicant had proposed regarding building design, and said the project looks good. He looked forward to the landscape proposal.

##### Ms. Sirois:

- Said the project looked great, and liked the dark gray panels presented and how they break up the massing.
- She asked if skylights were not provided as a requirement for FedEx. The applicant noted that in daylight hours, there would be almost no one in the back of the warehouse. Therefore, skylights were not needed. Ms. Sirois had no other comments on the building.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Asked about the light fixtures and their colors, including the housing and poles. The applicant said they would be black.
- Mr. Waggoner asked about the door signs around the building over the roll-up doors. The applicant said those would be surface-mounted, and would be a simple numbering system. He did not know if those would be illuminated.

Landscape architect Mark Wiseman next spoke to the Board about the landscaping on the project. One change includes the incorporation of a trash enclosure with good screening. The applicant has reduced the wall height around the site. One five-foot wall is now three feet. The last significant change involves the deletion of all lawn area around the site. In going for LEED certification, the applicant had to look for water-conserving plants, which precluded a lawn. Low-massed ground cover is now proposed in the frontage areas. In the detention pond, there is a non-irrigated mix of plants. Beyond that, the applicant will be using taller trees, as requested by the Board at the last meeting. The evergreens are up to 14 feet high in some critical areas. There are six layers of landscape material before the building is seen in areas where it might be revealed to the public. The applicant noted there was screening all the way around the building.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

Mr. Nichols:

- Said the applicant addressed the concerns of the Board regarding screening from the street. He liked what he saw, especially regarding water conservation.
- He had no objections to the landscaping.

Mr. Krueger:

- Said his question was answered with the lawn issue. He asked about the lawn portrayed in the west corner by the parking. The applicant said that lawn area was now gone. The applicant added that the soil would be improved site-wide for moisture retention.
- The lawns have been removed in all areas, as they are useless for the public's use or for employees, of which there are very few during the day.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the parking. The applicant said there were 480 parking stalls, and said at the start, this facility would be at a half or two-thirds capacity, ramping up in about four years.
- So, at first, 280 to 300 employees would be onsite, but during holiday times, a lot of temporary workers would come in, which would fill up the parking spaces. Some parking spots may be removed to earn more points under the LEED qualifications.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the overall landscaping concept. The applicant explained the tree massing on the site, the massing of shrubbery, and the dense evergreens that open into the entry area and allow for some modulation and a public view of the entry.
- Ms. Sirois said her questions about this site were answered.
- Mr. Nichols asked staff if everything presented with this application was within the noise guidelines for the City. Mr. Lisk said the operations of the facility would indeed fall within Redmond's standards. The applicant has agreed to route truck traffic north of the facility to avoid heavy trucks going through Woodbridge to the south.
- The applicant said a community meeting was held recently, with 1,700 notices sent out. Three people showed up with traffic issues, and were told that FedEx does not want to introduce new traffic to the neighborhood. This project does not appear to be controversial, the applicant said.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Said the project has come a long way and answered all the concerns of the DRB over the last few meetings. He asked for a motion.

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. NICHOLS AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE THE FEDEX GROUND DISTRIBUTION CENTER, L120282, WITH THE STANDARD CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).**

### **PRE-APPLICATION**

#### **PRE120014, Legacy at Town Square**

**Description:** A six-story mixed-use development with 200 apartments and structured parking

**Location:** 160<sup>th</sup> Ave NE & NE 83<sup>rd</sup> Street

**Applicant:** Michelle Kinsch *with* Tiscareno Associates

**Prior Review Date:** 05/03/2012 & 06/21/2012

**Staff Contact:** Dennis Lisk, [dwlisk@redmond.gov](mailto:dwlisk@redmond.gov) or 425-556-2471

Mr. Lisk said that this was the third pre-application meeting for this project. The project is a six-story mixed-use building along 160<sup>th</sup> Avenue at 83<sup>rd</sup> Street. It would have about 180 apartments, six ground floor live-work units and a section of ground-floor retail. A mixture of subterranean and mezzanine level underground parking has been proposed. The building's east side would have a mid-block pathway, which currently runs north and south on that side of the site. There would be improvements along that pathway, which will be discussed tonight. At the last meeting, the primary design discussion was with regard to the front setback along 160<sup>th</sup>. The applicant had proposed a solution that included the required amount of pedestrian zone there. To do that, the applicant basically moved the building east by a few feet, which impinged on the required setback area for the east side of the site. The Board's preference was that if there would be some infringement, it would occur on the east side. The applicant has answered that concern with the design presented tonight. Mr. Lisk said, of its own merits, the design for the east side is a good proposal for a narrower area that is more enlivened. The mid-block pathway would be rebuilt on the east side of the building to create more of a plaza that flows out onto 83<sup>rd</sup>. The applicant needs a deviation from design standards to achieve that, and staff is recommending approval of that request.

The applicant is also requesting a deviation along 160<sup>th</sup> for the amount of transparency that needs to be provided. A certain percentage, 65% of the façade, between two and seven feet along that side of the building, needs to be transparent. The applicant has proposed 49%, an increase from the earlier design. The staff appreciates the applicant's efforts, but asked if there was any way to bump up that percentage even further to get to the requirement. Another change from the applicant is along the north side of the building. The applicant has bumped up a portion of that façade to create some loft areas on the top floor. Mr. Lisk said this helps provide more modulation along that long side of the building, which makes it more interesting. Staff wants the Board to discuss colors for this project. In general, the colors are pretty good, in Mr. Lisk's opinion. He asked the Board to consider the cinnamon color and the yellow color, which have been used in many parts of Downtown and may make this building look too similar to other buildings.

There are two other deviation requests from the applicant. The applicant needs to achieve a certain percentage of the façade to provide overhead weather protection. The applicant wants to leave some areas without canopy to get water to some planter beds. Staff believes that is okay, but would like the Board's opinion on that. Finally, at the corner of 83<sup>rd</sup> and 160<sup>th</sup>, there is an overhang that is 17 feet above ground level, which is above the height normally allowed for overhead weather protection. The applicant has extended the corner doorway, which helps, but a deviation would be involved to allow that overhead feature count as overhead weather protection.

Bob Tiscareno spoke on behalf of the applicant. He showed the detail of the sidewalk in front of the project, and how the building was shifting to the east to allow for wider sidewalks and stoops in front of the street front units, which the DRB had requested. City staff has said this is a good solution. The applicant also increased the depth of the retail store at the corner by about five feet to make that more generous and strengthen its appeal. The mid-block path and property line are now closer to each other due to the shift. The live-work units are code compliant, as is the street width in the front, which the DRB had also requested earlier. The design elements include canopies, stone frames, planters, and an attractive pergola on the upper level. The canopies have been extended out another two feet to help with weather protection. The windows have been lowered to the floor line in some areas to improve transparency, which was a

concern of the DRB's. The planters and stoop baselines have been modified to give the look of sculpted, concrete elements, which provide good screening and variety on the street front.

The DRB had asked for more clarification on the street transparency. The area is two feet and seven feet above grade, which is now at the 49% level, with a requirement for 60%. The applicant showed how much additional glass has been put into the project by creating taller storefronts for the live-work units. Looking south at 160<sup>th</sup>, the applicant has displayed the white vinyl windows that would be used with detailed mullions. The commercial storefronts will be a dark bronze for variety. At the corner retail space, the applicant has made many changes, including increasing the depth of frame to five feet at the corner for better weather protection. Signage has been added above the canopy to make it visible. The sidewalk has become wider, allowing for sidewalk café seating and adding to the pedestrian experience of the project. The material palette has been updated, as well.

On the east elevation, there are a few changes. The DRB had asked for a simpler color scheme to make it consistent with the approach on other facades. The applicant has changed the color scheme in the middle of the building, reducing it to a single color of cinnamon. The applicant has also changed the fenestration pattern due to a change in the unit types on this side. Some decks have been popped out, creating full five-foot decks and some relief to that façade as well. Landscape changes have occurred on the mid-block path as well, which the applicant said he would address later.

The applicant showed the changes to the color scheme, before and after, on the east elevation. Decks now punch out over the mid-block path to provide open space. Staff had requested some artistic wall treatments to the CMU wall treatments in this part of the project, and the applicant has added that to increase the variety of the materials at grade level. On the north elevation, a deviation has been proposed from the north setback line. The DRB had also commented that this area did not have enough modulation. The applicant has added significant modulation by creating a major roofline change and extending the balconies in three areas to create additional relief to the façade. The applicant said with the new changes, there is a new focal point for the north wing and the east wing of the building. The DRB had asked about material detailing and colors at the last meeting, and the applicant showed a material palette that included a copper panel with an open joint reveal. He also displayed a silver panel with a flush joint. The idea is to create a finer detailing on the façade area with two different materials. The concrete in the planters will be a smooth finish with joint lines and score lines.

Tom Rengstorf, landscape architect, spoke on behalf of the applicant with regard to landscaping. On the planters, he noted that tree grates were used before. Now, a planter will be used for the trees, which should increase the feel of the planting from a harder, urban landscape to something softer. The height of the planters will drop due to a sight triangle issue at the entry and exit to the building. At the corner, the planters are now narrower with the existing trees. The scoring and texturing of the concrete has changed as well to provide more excitement and a way to highlight the entry areas. The plan for the lower planters will include a green screen against the building. Vine maple and lower native plantings will be used. Regarding the mid-block paving, staff recommended that the applicant should redesign the brick edging so that it carries through the mid-block area. That would not affect the design regarding plant material. The moving truck and fire truck lanes this spot is designed for would retain the same scale and purpose. The applicant presented the color and material boards and asked for questions.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

##### Mr. Nichols:

- Said he liked the changes made to the plan based on input from staff and from the Board at the last meetings. He liked the colors and said they looked good.
- He said he had no objection to the colors, even in light of the other colors seen in Redmond developments.
- He said the Board would need to discuss with staff the location of the building on the east side, but said if the landscaping concerns are addressed, the Board would likely be okay with that change in dimension.
- Mr. Nichols had no significant issues with the project.

Ms. Sirois:

- Asked about the height of the canopies and the concerns staff had about that. Mr. Lisk noted that he was focused on the corner of 160<sup>th</sup> and 83<sup>rd</sup>.
- Ms. Sirois said it appeared the applicant had addressed this concern with a deeper element for weather protection.
- Ms. Sirois said the two-foot tradeoff from one side to the other works well, especially if the landscaping can be maintained on the mid-block path.
- She likes the other changes, and says the stretch along the live-work units is looking better. She asked about the tree grates flush with the sidewalk in the last proposal. The applicant said that the tree grates are out and planters have replaced them.
- Ms. Sirois asked if there was a concern from staff about those planters. Mr. Lisk said that the Code calls for a four foot by six foot tree grate in this part of the City to help pedestrian flow. However, this does not mean a deviation could not be called for in this area.
- Ms. Sirois said that was a concern, in that the applicant is giving back two feet, but then taking up walking surface space and sidewalk width using tree planters.
- The applicant responded that the idea was to provide variety on the sidewalk. In some areas, there is eight feet of space and in others there is sixteen feet of open space. The pedestrian experience will widen out considerably near the retail space. The applicant added that the City arborist would most likely prefer planters over tree grates.
- Ms. Sirois said the concern was the width of the sidewalk, in that while two feet have been added to the sidewalk, four feet have been taken up with the planters, which creates a net loss.
- Mr. Waggoner noted that the DRB also had a concern about the appearance of a single, spindly tree trunk coming out of a grate with hardscape all around it versus a pool of landscaping with trees and shrubs included in a planter.
- Ms. Sirois added that not everyone is willing to walk on a tree grate. Mr. Waggoner said there was a balance between the added sidewalk space and the added planter width. The applicant said the sidewalk width, even with the planters, would be adequate for the amount of foot traffic.
- Ms. Sirois likes the changes made and said she was fine with the colors as presented. She said the cinnamon color was used judiciously. She said the project is moving in the right direction.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the colors and the difference between the drawings and renderings. The applicant clarified the colors, and confirmed with Mr. Krueger that on the east elevation, the wall colors would be used.
- Mr. Krueger does not have a problem with the colors, but asked why the applicant used them after getting some pushback from staff about the prevalence of this type of palette downtown.
- The applicant said he looked at a number of the buildings downtown for a unique color scheme. That is why the metal panels have been used as well as the two primary colors and different textures. He said the overall design is strong and unique with regard to colors and materials.
- Mr. Krueger said the applicant got a lot of good feedback from the DRB and staff and likes how the project turned out. Mr. Krueger does not have any problems with the deviations requested, from the east side pathway width to the height of the weather protection to the reduction in the transparency.
- He liked the pergola and how it would look. He asked about the northeast corner and if there were any way that people could see it more and appreciate it. The applicant said it would serve as a nice urban surprise for the residents.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Echoed his fellow Board members regarding support for the project. Mr. Waggoner noted that the roofs are all rendered as slabs, and asked if any kind of material or coloration would be used. The applicant said they would be wrapped in a metal skin to match the metal panel, with a light silver color. The roofs will extend to provide some shadow modulation.
- Mr. Waggoner said the percentage of transparency along the street would be fine, as well as the breaks in the canopies. He asked about the mid-block pathway and if it would have a uniform color to it. The applicant said that would indeed be the case.
- Mr. Waggoner asked staff about the size of the building reveals separating the different sections of metal paneling. Mr. Lisk said he was concerned about the amount of spacing between different

sections of panel, especially on the lower end of the building. A wider separation might create more interest, in his opinion.

- The applicant said there was a half-inch gap on the lower portion of the building, in the copper areas. This is a standard detail. The applicant thought this would be best down low, but up top, for variety, a flush joint would be used.
- Mr. Waggoner asked about the finish of the concrete and staff's concerns about that. Mr. Lisk had expressed concerns about the height of the stoop wall, and the applicant is now showing that height as four feet in the front entry area. Mr. Lisk had wondered if, at that height, the finish of the concrete created too much of a bunker-like look.
- Mr. Lisk asked if a lower concrete height, or a different concrete finish, or a taller metal feature on top of the concrete should be used. Mr. Nichols said that the four-foot level seemed a bit imposing.
- Mr. Krueger said that the four-foot wall was only for a short distance, and there are different heights to the concrete, as well. The concrete columns on the north and south wing are taller to present other expressions of concrete, with a lot of variety across the project.
- Mr. Waggoner asked if some finish could be used on the lower concrete walls. The applicant said he was still working on that detail. Mr. Waggoner said he did not have a problem with the concrete and a smooth look for it on the lower wall. A stain might help change the texture a little bit in this area.
- Ms. Sirois agreed with Mr. Krueger that it would be nice to see the rendering reflect the height of those lower walls to see the overall effect. Mr. Lisk asked if that could be seen at the next meeting on this project, and the applicant agreed. Mr. Lisk said he wanted to make sure the elevations and renderings line up.
- Mr. Waggoner said that rendering could help remove any contradictions. Mr. Lisk asked for clarification on the height of the concrete and its color. He said there was no Code issue with the stoop wall, as presented, with regard to height and finish.
- Mr. Waggoner said the Board was in alignment regarding the variety of wall heights, smooth finish, and different railing heights. The only request was to see the final application materials truly reflect the intention of the designer. Mr. Krueger agreed, and asked for a better view of the wall diagonally to see the rhythm of the wall and its modulations.
- Mr. Lisk said staff is ready to advance this application to project review status barring any other concerns.
- Mr. Nichols said the Board would want to see the rendering with the elevations of the walls, where they are located, what their heights are, and the location of any reveals. He asked if the Board wanted to see a smooth finish rendered, as well.
- Mr. Waggoner said it would be appropriate for the applicant to bring in samples of the color boards and a concrete finish sample. He said the wall height reconciliation issue is the one sticking point for the Board. He added that it would make sense to have the applicant make a formal application rather than have another pre-application with the DRB for that one item.
- Mr. Nichols said the submittal should address the rendering issue discussed. At that point, the project could move to the next step.
- Mr. Lisk said he would go back and check the Code regarding tree grates versus planters to verify what the City requires and if a deviation would be required. Mr. Waggoner said Mr. Lisk could work with the applicant on that issue. Any deviation would go to the Technical Committee for final decision. This issue may also involve a discussion with Public Works.
- Mr. Waggoner would prefer the planters over the tree grates to provide better landscaping, and says there is still plenty of area for pedestrians. Mr. Nichols agreed, and Mr. Krueger and Ms. Sirois did not voice any objections to this idea. Mr. Waggoner said the applicant was good to go.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION MADE BY MR. NICHOLS AND SECONDED BY MS. SIROIS TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:35 P.M. MOTION PASSES (4-0).**

**September 6, 2012**  
**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**RECORDING SECRETARY**