

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
September 6, 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, Mike Nichols

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Fischer, Principal Planner; Dennis Lisk, Associate Planner; Gary Lee, Senior 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 Chairperson David Scott Meade at 7:02 p.m.

MINUTES

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WAGGONER AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JULY 23, 2012 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (2-0) WITH TWO ABSTENTIONS.

PROJECT REVIEW

L120351, Legacy at Town Square

Description: A six-story mixed-use development with 178 apartments and structured parking

Location: 160th Ave NE & NE 83rd Street

Applicant: Michelle Kinsch *with* Tiscareno Associates

Prior Review Date: 05/03/12, 06/21/12 & 07/19/12

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

Mr. Lisk said this building would be located on a corner that is currently undeveloped and vacant. The proposal would have approximately 173 apartments on five floors over a ground floor of live-work units and some retail space and amenity space for the building. There is some subterranean parking proposed as well, as at-grade structured parking. The DRB has reviewed this proposal at three pre-application meetings before this evening, and there have been a variety of design issues discussed. Generally, staff is very pleased with the project and ready to recommend approval. The applicant has worked on the appearance of the stoops for the ground floor units, and some different options have been presented to the DRB that have some varied heights for the concrete walls of those stoops.

Bob Tiscareno presented on behalf of the applicant. He showed the DRB the site plan, which had some minor changes. Both are related to previous DRB recommendations, including canopy coverage along 160th, which is now slightly greater to be closer to the requirement. The mid-block paving pattern now goes to NE 83rd. Along 160th, there are a few more minor changes. The zoning regulations allow a six- to eight-story building by the adjacent buildings. Potential signage has been noted in the elevations. The canopies are slightly longer above the stoops or retail spaces, in accord with the change on the site plan. The DRB had asked for a better concrete sample, which the applicant provided.

There are some new options regarding the guard rail material at the stoop and the height of that rail. The first option, preferred by the applicant, brings the concrete portion of the guard rail on the left side of the stoop up 24 inches to provide more privacy. The concrete is a smooth finish with score lines. The second option brings the concrete portion of the guard rail on the left side down to the level of the live-work units,

which would provide a more open feeling to the live-work units. However, this would not provide much protection for items left out on the stoop.

The DRB had requested that the applicant extend the paving pattern and brick border on both sides of the mid-block path all the way to the sidewalk. The applicant has done that in the new plan. The tree grates are now in a four by six dimension. The applicant has provided a site lighting plan, including a photometric study of the foot candles by the proposed fixtures. The idea is to provide adequate light for safety with a contemporary, modern look to match the look of the building.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Said that the applicant addressed each of the DRB's comments. Mr. Krueger liked the idea of dropping a portion of the wall of the stoop, which is the preferred alternative of the applicant. He confirmed that the stoop wall would return back into the building with a ninety degree turn.
- Mr. Krueger said the stoop would look nice, especially with the planters along the edge with the live-work units and the varying heights and depths.
- Mr. Krueger likes the colors and variety of materials. He was pleased with the end result.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Also liked option one for the stoops. Mr. Palmquist said it would be a good idea to have a little bit of an area to hide some things from the street.
- Mr. Palmquist said he was ready to approve this project.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Liked the option one for the stoops, which he thought would create a rhythm along the street side that reinforces the vertical column or partition along that front wall. The stoop should shield some of the outdoor items like barbecues, as well.
- Mr. Waggoner said he was against seeing tree grates at the beginning of this proposal, but he appreciated and accepted the fact that the City requires grates in this area.
- He said this would be a good-looking project that should have some good greenery other than the street trees. He was happy with the project and said it was ready to go.

Mr. Meade:

- Supported option one for the stoops, which he saw as a very unexpected but likeable twist.
- He said the project was ready for approval. He said this was an excellent project, and appreciated how the applicant progressed through the process of approval. He said it was a pleasure seeing the project get to this point and was looking forward to giving it a DRB award in the future.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST, AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER, TO APPROVE L120351, LEGACY AT TOWN SQUARE, WITH THE STANDARD PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES CONDITIONS. OPTION ONE WILL BE USED FOR THE STOOPS, AS PRESENTED. MOTION PASSES (4-0).

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE120041, Value Village Retail

Description: Proposed loading dock addition with updated façade and landscaping

Location: 16771 Redmond Way

Applicant: Joe Donahou *with* DDG Architects

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

Mr. Lee told the Board this was the first pre-app for this project, which is an exterior remodel and a small addition in a back loading dock. Staff has a few comments, including a concern over where the parapet rises on the roof line. Staff would like to see returns so they are not just flat facades that simply rise up. On the north elevation, facing the street, there is a blank wall that staff says needs some dressing up. On the west elevation, in the back, there is a small notch between the buildings that has no parapet there. Staff would recommend raising the parapet or putting a rooftop screen in that location. The trash enclosures on

the site need to be brought up to code, and should be enclosed and screened. Also, the applicant should upgrade the landscaping while this remodeling project is underway, in staff's opinion.

Architect Brooke Dayton-Dittrich presented on behalf of the applicant. She noted that this was a two-phase project. The first phase is the tenant improvement, which is primarily inside. However, the applicant is also including a loading dock. The City has recommended a landscape screen on the back to shield that from the pedestrian path. The second phase of the project is updating the façade from the view of Redmond Way. The applicant received the staff comments, and would like some clarification.

The applicant showed the expansion inside the project and the demolition of an outdoor area that has been used as a donation pick up and drop off. The loading dock is all open air with no enclosure. The landscaping has been shown in the new drawings, as well. The dock is about four feet deep and includes a bay for the trash compactor and another bay for about three vehicles. The applicant has limited the landscaping on the drawings to make the site more visible. Arbor vitae trees and box shrubs would be used closer to the pedestrian access area. The arbor vitae would be outside the fence so as not to restrict any of the parking. This would actually help the pedestrian path, which does not have much vegetation right now and collects a lot of garbage. Thus, this planting of arbor vitae could benefit the City and the tenant.

The second phase includes a hierarchy of entrances that all tie together. However, the entrances have different focal points of entry and create an undulation of the façade. The materials include a hardy panel throughout the north and east elevations. Below the hardy panel will be a box rib and a darker, grayer slate. The applicant says this should increase the quality of the materials on the site and the depth of tones there. That also incorporates the industrial metal and steel canopies that add another level of texture to the façade. The west elevation has been shown to display the updated painting and the coping and colors there. However, that elevation is never fully visible from the street, as it is right up against the building.

The applicant next showed the second building on the site, which ties together the overall view from Redmond, incorporating the main staple of Value Village at the main entrance. Angled metal structural pieces cap the ends, creating bookends for the area. Both buildings have smaller versions of this with angled metal used in some areas. In both of the canopies, a skylight feature has been added to bring more light below. The details included show the existing canopy and also where the additions for better drainage are. The applicant is building up for cost purposes, and not tearing the whole site down and then building up. The idea is to build up and have the drainage go back down onto the roof.

The applicant spoke to the staff concern over the raised area above the general roofline, and pinpointed the Verizon area, which does become more of a line that does not have mass or structure behind it. The applicant said that one area could possibly extend back about four feet to create more massing. The applicant clarified the concern by staff over the blank wall on the north side, and said perhaps a vegetation screen could work. Mr. Lee said a green wall could work, but not just another set of arbor vitae. Mr. Meade suggested some columns to pick up the band of color on this wall. The applicant said she had some other ideas to change this area, as well. With regard to extending the parapet to provide screening for the mechanical area, the applicant said it would be possible to extend it down to where the second door is. However, for the most part, she said that the mechanical area was not primarily visible. The applicant noted that the property owners would be open to DRB recommendations.

Mr. Meade suggested creating a corner piece at the parapet to address the blank wall and address the mechanical screening issue. That element could look like the other corner element presented on the site. The applicant said that would be possible. As for enclosing the trash receptacles, the applicant was considering creating a concrete pad and encasing the trash on that pad. Mr. Lee said any type of screening and organization would be acceptable. The applicant noted that once the loading dock goes in, that would help, as well, in terms of screening with landscaping from the path. Mr. Lee said the trash receptacles should be screened all the way around. Regarding the landscaping, the applicant said the site has had its landscaping updated in the past year, and asked for more direction. The site is pretty well vegetated and the applicant did not want to pull out what was on site at present.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Palmquist:

- Liked what has been done on the front of the building. He said the Verizon parapet did need to have some returns on it to create more volume.
- Mr. Palmquist said the remodel is not going far enough. He said this building used to only be visible only from the front, but with the new trail coming in and other growth in Redmond, there is only one side that is not visible from some prominent area.
- With that in mind, Mr. Palmquist said the redesign needs to come around the back and around the side, areas that may in the future have through access to Redmond Town Center or an access off the trail. It would be strange to approach the building from the side that is not remodeled.
- Mr. Palmquist said the parapet on the first building needs to come around the east and south, all the way back to the loading dock. He said that would make a lot more sense, in that those areas could become the front of the building, based on the current growth of Redmond.
- He noted that the second building is visible on all four sides now that the railroad grade has been removed and a trail has been put in. He said this building needs upgrades all the way around.
- For the north elevation, Mr. Palmquist said the blank wall issue could be solved with some offsetting color patterns. Pilasters against the wall could help, but landscaping alone would not do the job.
- Mr. Palmquist said the hedge row does not feel like a good solution with the trail going into that area. Because this is a more public area, so close to Redmond Town Center, he would like to see something different that has other pedestrian connections. He suggested breaking the landscaping to provide future access to the trail.
- Overall, Mr. Palmquist said this project had been conceived as Town Center has been before and not where Redmond is going, in terms of opening the back side of the project to the trail.
- Mr. Palmquist likes the colors, the elevations, and the corner entries. He said what had been presented was a good start.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Echoed many of Mr. Palmquist's comments. He likes the overall application of new materials, which could present a better concept of permanence with long-lasting, durable finishes. He likes the new awning and signage treatments, which have good opportunities to give more order and regularity.
- Mr. Waggoner likes the hierarchy of main entrances presented and the new canopies at the major tenant locations.
- He said the new loading dock needs more order, and more screening. He noted that fully enclosed areas are the norm for trash receptacles, especially when they are part of a parking lot that is accessible by the general public.
- Mr. Waggoner agreed with Mr. Palmquist that this center was becoming more and more visible on all sides, and thus the corner element ideas presented by Mr. Meade, including extended awning treatments and pilaster additions, could help provide some pattern or texture.
- Mr. Waggoner said the back side should look like it has been updated in a similar way to the front.

Mr. Krueger:

- Said he was also concerned about the back side of the building, and noted that this was not really the back side any more with the enhancement of the trail in that area. He suggested that the applicant should look at the plans for that trail, and consider other plantings than arbor vitae in that area.
- Mr. Krueger noted that were some extensive improvements proposed in this application, and reiterated that the back side needed more attention, as it would be more visible as the trail is developed. He said opening the back side in some way to encourage the flow of pedestrians would be more welcoming.
- Mr. Krueger said hiding the trash receptacles has to happen. He liked the canopy over the loading dock, which he thought would help add some shadows and interest to that plain part of the elevation.
- He suggested something other than a chain link fence on the back side of the project to embrace the trail in that area.
- Mr. Krueger liked the colors and materials, and liked the work done to enhance the entrances. He hoped the applicant could find some direction about the future of Redmond and the future of this project from the Board members.

Mr. Meade:

- Said that the DRB would be looking for each of the elevated entry pieces to have a return of about four feet so that it would look like a mass from a distance.
- Mr. Meade said he uses the back entrance to FedEx all the time, so a raised parapet piece and signage would be a good idea. He would like to see the color coming around the building, and said that could help integrate the project without too many additional improvements to the building.
- Mr. Meade asked about the existing canopy outside of Value Village and the steel pipe columns in that area. The applicant said she was hoping to remove those columns and create a different structure. Mr. Meade it would be acceptable to make them bigger or make them go away.
- He asked about any improvements to the paving on the site, again as a way to integrate the design of the building as a whole.
- Mr. Meade said the color scheme looks good, and it similar to many of the other projects that have been presented.
- Joe Donahou with Donahou Design Group next spoke on behalf of the applicant, and asked about the returns the DRB had been talking about. He noted that the corner where Verizon used to be could have that corner treatment, and asked where else that type of treatment would be applicable.
- Mr. Meade said the FedEx piece was one spot that could use such a return treatment. Mr. Donahou said the intent of those other corners was to create a free-standing structure that cantilevers out over the existing roof to the parking. He said there were some structural limitations as to how far back those corners could go and not affect the space behind them.
- Mr. Donahou said these corners would have their design improvements in front of the existing canopy and not make improvements that would require a support inside the space of the building. He is trying to simplify the design.
- Mr. Palmquist said putting in returns would not require that much support. Mr. Meade said some sheet metal could be used to suspend it from the roof element. The applicant clarified that the DRB wanted the addition of a vertical wall where the overhang currently exists. Mr. Meade said this was mainly a closure piece. The applicant accepted this idea.
- Walter Scott next spoke to the Board on behalf of the applicant. He works for Legacy Commercial, which owns the building. He wanted to make sure of the direction on the canopy element over FedEx.
- Mr. Scott said that this building had been added on to three times, and was originally a B&R food store. He said that this building is living on borrowed time, and is not the density it should be.
- Mr. Scott said the current application could help bring the building along for the next ten years. He is also considering simply extending the current leases for five years and leaving the building as is.
- Mr. Scott said that Legacy Commercial takes pride in its projects, and his company puts its money where its mouth is. The plan, though, is to amortize this current improvement project over ten years. That is not to say the building would be here for ten years. He estimated it would be here for fifteen years or perhaps longer.
- Mr. Scott did not want to create any misconceptions for the DRB. The idea is to do a nice job and be efficient with money. He said the DRB's ideas were good and he would come back with the suggestions and requirements noted by the Board members in mind.
- However, Mr. Scott was not sure about the return on the FedEx canopy or, for that matter, on the canopies on the second building. Mr. Meade showed, on building two, where the applicant could drop a closure piece down off the back edge, going from the new roof piece to the new column in that spot.
- Mr. Meade said the idea is basically to create a more solid look, with a closure piece that could suspend from the new structure.
- Mr. Scott asked about wind load on all of the elements that would have a new return treatment, as suggested by the Board. He said he would look to make a plan to meet the DRB's ideas, which he said were very good ideas.
- Mr. Meade said the application has gone beyond what the DRB might have hoped for on this project in terms of changing materials. He added that many of the comments at this meeting could be solved with color, and the simple addition of paint to wrap a design theme around the building.
- Mr. Scott asked about the back of the building, and agreed with the DRB that there were some opportunities in this area. He asked about the dumpster enclosures, and noted that Value Village was a heavy user of loading. He said that parking and loading the dumpsters is a logistical problem now.

- Mr. Scott said the Value Village store is proposed for expansion because leasing to smaller mom and pop tenants is simply not happening. He reiterated that the idea was to reposition this project for the next ten or fifteen years, and would like some ideas about the back of the building that would make the improvements the DRB is considering with cost-efficiency in mind.
- Mr. Meade said, at the FedEx entry, the parapet should be popped up in a similar way to the parapet on the front side of the store. He said wrapping color around, as well, could be enough to celebrate the rear of the building.
- Mr. Palmquist suggested using the simple arch on the second building, which is just an eight-inch step up. He said the look in this area would not have to be as extravagant as the front, but the color and designs need to come around the corner of FedEx and the northeast and southwest corners of the second building.
- Mr. Palmquist added that from the end of the indent on the west elevation, all the way around through the loading dock, is the back of the building that cannot be seen from anywhere. But the south side of FedEx is visible from many locations.
- Mr. Scott said wrapping the building all the way around on the first building seemed like a lot. Mr. Meade clarified that Value Village would not be included in that, merely the FedEx piece.
- Mr. Meade said picking up the front canopy lines in paint and color and coming around to FedEx to finish the lines off would be acceptable. He suggested popping a small parapet above the FedEx entry similar in mass to the front of FedEx. Columns or pilasters supporting that parapet would be enough to celebrate the rear elevation.
- Mr. Scott asked about the east elevation along the cut of the buildings. Mr. Meade said new paint would be acceptable there.
- Mr. Scott noted that parking in this back area is a big problem for leasing. He noted that Verizon has moved out to Bear Creek Village, which has better parking. To that vein, he was concerned about a garbage enclosure structure and its impact on parking.
- Mr. Lee asked the applicant to clarify where the trash receptacles would be located. Mr. Lee said the landscape screening was helpful in terms of screening, but part of the trash area is completely open. Screening is required for the trash enclosures, which could mean gates.
- Mr. Lee said at least two walls would have to be added, in that the trash receptacles are large and would require additional screening. Mr. Scott said the dumpsters may have to be moved. He asked if one of the dumpsters could go into the loading dock, thus limiting the enclosure size.
- Mr. Lee said the dumpster was not typical, in that it is the size of a freight container. That could be a screen by itself, but the idea is basically to create an enclosed pen for trash. Mr. Scott said he would try to engineer the trash pickups in a different way.
- Mr. Lee noted that the trash did not present a very good view with the trail coming into this area. Mr. Scott agreed, and hoped to create something new to improve the look of this area.
- The applicant said that the trash receptacles could be relocated to the end of building two, as well. He was concerned about the gravel space leading up to that area.
- Mr. Krueger asked why all the big dumpsters were required. Mr. Scott replied that the Value Village in this location processes about 20,000 items per day. The sell-through is about 25%, and half of what is taken in does not even make it to the floor.
- Mr. Scott says that many donations are recycled. He noted that there are a lot of complex activities in the rear of this building, and the non-rectangular design of Value Village adds to the confusion for large trucks. He said there were many logistical problems in the back of the building, but he hoped this would be an opportunity space for the site overall.

- Mr. Scott said he was willing to do something behind the other building on the site, as well, with its trash receptacles. Mr. Lee said the basic idea was to keep trash receptacles enclosed, and said discussing that other building would be a subject for another time. He said paving this area, which the applicant would like to do, could be a challenge.
- Mr. Scott, Mr. Lee, and the DRB thanked each other for their time.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:13 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

October 18, 2012
MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY