

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
December 20, 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: Joe Palmquist, Arielle Crowder, Kevin Sutton, Mike Nichols, Craig Krueger

EXCUSED ABSENCE: David Scott Meade, Scott Waggoner

STAFF PRESENT: Steven Fischer, Principal Planner; Sarah Stiteler, 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 Vice Chair Joe Palmquist at 7:00 p.m.

MINUTES

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

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. NICHOLS AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 15, 2012 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (3-0) WITH TWO ABSTENTIONS.

DISCUSSION

Senior Affordable Housing Proposal

160th Avenue NE Site in Downtown Redmond

Ms. Stiteler noted that she works in the Long Range Planning Division of the Planning Department. She was joined by Klaas Nijhuis, a Senior Planner at ARCH, A Regional Coalition for Housing. Ms. Stiteler asked the DRB for help with the concept of developing affordable senior housing on a City-owned site on 160th. The site is about three-quarters of an acre and is located across from the City Courthouse parking lot and the entrance to the municipal campus. Ms. Stiteler is working on a Request for Proposals to develop the site as a multi-family building for affordable senior housing, targeting seniors of low to moderate incomes. The exact levels of income will depend upon what kind of public financing is available. She asked the DRB what the most important objectives would be to develop this site as a way to help develop the Request for Proposals, expected to be distributed at the end of February. Review of proposals would happen in mid-March.

Mr. Nijhuis added that this would be a public resource on public land that is capitalizing on public funding from the state, King County, ARCH, and low-income housing tax credits. He said he wanted to engage the public to develop the right facility for the needs of Redmond, satisfying the people who live on the site and the people who would pass by it. He said the housing development would not maximize the site, in that there are finite resources available to build. Mainly one-bedroom units would be built in a five over one construction, probably not exceeding through TDR's what may be allowed on the property. Thus, there would be between 40 and 70 units of housing with structured parking underneath. Mr. Nijhuis said he was aware of design guidelines in Redmond, but said overall, he wanted to do the right thing and get some guidance from the DRB.

Mr. Palmquist asked about the site and noted that it was located in a mid-block area. He asked if there were any way to cross 160th to get to the site directly, or if people would have to go to the ends of the block to get to a signalized crosswalk. Mr. Nijhuis said there was no signalized connection direct to the site, and currently no pedestrian route connecting to NE 87th St, but Mr. Krueger pointed out a crosswalk that was indeed mid-block.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Said ARCH is a great organization. He was excited about this project coming through.
- Mr. Krueger said walking would be very important to future residents of this site, and said a direct walkway to the senior center nearby would be a good resource.
- He asked about vehicular access and if it would come off the alley on the north end of the site. Ms. Stiteler said that had not been established yet, but said it would be difficult to have that access from the alley due to impacts on other private properties.
- Mr. Krueger asked about TDR's. Mr. Nijhuis said TDR's would most likely not be used. He wanted to be respectful to neighbors in terms of height and be a catalyst to how this area may evolve over time.
- Ms. Stiteler said this would be a very visible property, and would receive funding from the City. She wanted to have good design concepts for this project to make it something the City could be proud of.

Ms. Crowder:

- Said she would love to see something different from what Redmond has already, something more modern. She suggested more public art for the campus.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Encouraged Ms. Stiteler to keep some open space at the ground level on the site so that the seniors living on the site can experience the outdoors without crossing the street. He suggested making that outdoor space part of the sidewalk experience, as well.
- Mr. Palmquist said trying to make this site different from the other five over one style buildings in Redmond would be important. He said designers should be cognizant of defining the street edge of the site and advancing the idea of a more urban downtown. He suggested making sure this was a project that could last several years.
- Ms. Stiteler reiterated that the idea was not to maximize the size of the building, but rather, have a good development result.

Mr. Nichols:

- Agreed with Mr. Palmquist about the need for open space. He wanted to make sure the project was not the same cookie-cutter five over one design seen elsewhere in the City, though he understood there would be funding limitations for the project.
- Mr. Nichols did not want this site to feel institutional, but rather fit the neighborhood now and in the future. Beyond that, he was supportive of the idea of providing more affordable senior housing.
- Ms. Stiteler noted that this project would go through the formal design review process in the future.

Mr. Sutton:

- Said he respected the thought of not maximizing the size of the building, but said the project should not limit itself. He suggested approaching this project in the context of what it would be ten or fifteen years from now.

Mr. Krueger:

- Said that the site will have to relate to the street, and will have requirements for glazing and other standards such that the building is open to the street. He said the first floor would be very important with regard to providing pedestrian access and an overall openness to the project.
- Mr. Krueger said the upper floors would have a great view to the west and east. He said the interface with the sidewalk would be the most important interface for the project.

Mr. Nijhuis and Ms. Stiteler said they were trying to recruit people to help with selecting developers through the request for proposal process. Ms. Stiteler asked the DRB members to email her or call her if they would like to be involved. She said the project would be moving quickly, with a Request for Proposals set to go out by the end of February 2013. She noted that if someone from the DRB wanted to commit to helping guide this project, there would be a couple meetings lasting two to three hours at the most. Ms. Stiteler is also seeking input from the Redmond Senior Advisory Committee as well as the Human Services Commission. She thanked the DRB for its input.

PROJECT REVIEW

L120482, Valley Furniture

Description: 215 units of multi-family residential over 4,500 square feet of retail and parking

Location: 8178 – 164th Ave NE

Applicant: Liz Soldano

Architect: Doug Oberst

Prior Review Dates: 04/05/12, 09/20/12, 10/04/12, and 11/01/12

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

Mr. Fischer said he was sitting in for Gary Lee on this project this evening, which is up for approval. It is located at the corner of 164th and NE 83rd Street, and would create a building that fronts out onto three streets. It would be six stories high and would allow for ground floor commercial space. There would be 215 units of housing provided. The project has been before the DRB four previous times, and staff has seen the project evolve and move forward. Staff believes that the design of the project meets the goals and intentions of the neighborhood, and is consistent with the vision of the neighborhood. The materials, colors, architectural detailing, lighting, and landscape concepts are all satisfaction. Staff is recommending approval, but there is one outstanding comment regarding building details. At the last meeting, staff and the DRB expressed concern over the monotony of the building façades on the south and east, and the recessed portion on the east elevation. It was suggested that some details on the street front elevations should be added to the recessed, interior-facing elevations. The east elevation has been updated to include larger windows and more division, but there has been no addition of accenting building materials. Staff believes that the south elevation has been revised satisfactorily. The staff report makes a note about administrative design flexibility, which the Technical Committee, not the DRB, would decide upon.

Staff is recommending approval of the building elevations, colors, materials, lighting, and landscape plan with the following conditions:

1. The presentation material inconsistencies, which is standard.
2. The final number of building units allowed in the development would be subject to final review and approval of building permits, including parking and other related dimensional and quantitative requirements and/or a fee in lieu.
3. The architectural detailing of the recessed east elevation and elevations of the interior courtyard shall be modified to include additional design features to reduce the monotony of these façades to the satisfaction of staff through the building permit review, if the DRB and applicant cannot reach an agreement at this meeting.
4. If there is no agreement regarding the modifications between the Planning staff and the applicant during the building permit review phase, these elevations shall be brought back to the DRB for review and approval.

Mr. Krueger noted that he is a land planner, and he does some work for Intercorp, the applicant, though not in the multi-family division, but rather in single-family development. He did not believe he needed to recuse himself from the proceedings. Randy Gould spoke on behalf of the applicant and reviewed how the project was working to address staff concerns. He showed the DRB a sample of the wood material that would be used on the project. The applicant said there were two issues at the last meeting he wanted to address: the interior elevations and the changes in the courtyard area. The south elevation has been reviewed and has been supported by Planning Staff. Metal siding has been added to this elevation, which is a repetition of the pattern on the front of the building. It bumps out from the building by a foot. Another change is that the building has been pushed in five feet, such that there is another step in the building on the east elevation.

The east elevation is the one staff has issues with. The shadow line shows how the façade has been pushed back five feet. Color bands and patterns have been added to match other parts of the building. He noted that this east elevation was not visible from across the street, though he recognized that staff wanted to make sure some changes were made to it. The applicant has taken some of the patterns from the other side of the building and used them in the courtyard with some less intense material changes. The interior elevations that do not face the street are a bit quieter and less articulated, in that the applicant would like to focus on the courtyard element. He did not want clutter on the interior elevations, which he said was consistent with what the Zoning Code asks for. The applicant said the inner courtyard elevations serve as a backdrop for the design in this area. He said the courtyard itself was the star of the show, not the walls behind it. Yellow and red colors from the other elevations are repeated in the courtyard area, replicating the vertical lines and color bands. The pattern of lighter colored panels above the line at the top of the building is repeated in the courtyard area as well. Landscaping on the site includes bamboo and other plantings to buffer the building from neighboring sites. A community room in the courtyard will have amenities for the residents, and three-foot and two-foot tall planters will be outside it to provide sitting opportunities for residents. The door over the community room will the yellow accent color used on other parts of the site. Alternating vertical swaths of color connect with horizontal bands of other colors throughout the site.

Andy Rasmussen next presented to the Board on behalf of the applicant with regard to landscaping. He said there have been some minor changes to the landscape elements due to the site plan review process. The utilities and light poles have been updated. Generally, three sides of the building are similar with continuous landscape banding, with evergreen hedges that play off the angles of the courtyard. Light poles on the site have reduced the number of street trees that can be used. Landscape buffer is planted along the townhome portion of the project, including evergreen trees and a row of bamboo in planters. The bamboo would filter views in and out of the courtyard from neighboring properties. The courtyard is meant to be a large gathering space that would be interesting to look down on. There are two different colors of pedestal pavers and wood decking, with some movable and permanent seating opportunities. A roll-up door has been placed on the community room, such that people would spill out of the room onto the courtyard. Long bands of colorful landscape material, including evergreens, have been used. Lower height plant materials have been used so as to not completely block the views of people on the site. Mr. Gould said that he was seeking approval at this meeting, and said he has taken care of everything staff was concerned about. He wanted to make sure that the most recent changes made were to the DRB's liking such that this project could move ahead.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Nichols:

- Asked about the four courtyard trees and what size they would be when they were planted. The applicant said they would be good-sized trees.
- Mr. Nichols said the exterior, outward facing elevations have received the proper attention from the applicant and address the concerns raised about the blander elevations on the east and south.
- Mr. Nichols asked Mr. Fischer if staff was comfortable with the flat, no-modulation, inward-facing elevations presented. Mr. Fischer said that Mr. Lee has not seen the most recent changes presented and would not be back in the office until after Christmas break.
- Mr. Nichols said the modulation has been handled with color, not any material modulations. Mr. Fischer said Mr. Lee has asked that this point would be reviewed through the building permit process.

- Mr. Nichols said deferring to that process on the interior site would be best. He said it was great that some differentiation in color has been presented. The applicant asked if the interior treatment met with DRB approval, which is something that could be presented to staff to avoid a future meeting with the DRB, as requested by Mr. Lee.
- Mr. Palmquist confirmed with Mr. Fischer that if the DRB approved this application tonight, all of the Board's concerns should be addressed at this meeting in order to move forward.
- Mr. Palmquist asked that if there were major concerns, DRB members needed to voice those and give guidance to staff on what the project should look like.
- Mr. Nichols said the interior courtyard design reflects a step in the right direction with the change in colors, but said the flat planes are monotonous. He said there was an opportunity to make those planes less one-dimensional. Beyond that, he said the project addressed the earlier concerns of the DRB and was able to be approved.

Mr. Krueger:

- Said that the applicant has addressed a lot of the comments of the Board. He asked to defer to Mr. Palmquist's opinion of the interior. Reviewing the minutes, Mr. Krueger recalled that Mr. Palmquist was focused on the interior and the backside of the building.
- Mr. Krueger said the south elevation was addressed nicely.
- He asked if there was an elevation differential between the courtyard and the south side of the site. The applicant said the courtyard was about four and a half feet above the grade adjacent to it. Thus, the trees on the site are below it, growing up. A railing has been provided on the courtyard.
- Mr. Krueger likes the change in the colors in the interior elevation.
- He said he liked the exterior balconies, but wondered if more balconies could be added to create units that would yield additional rent over the courtyard area. The applicant responded that the budget would be spent on the exterior of the site and the courtyard, which the public would see and the residents would use the most. He wanted to make the courtyard simple and quiet.
- Mr. Krueger said the courtyard felt a little constrained. The applicant said he looked into adding more interest to the apartments facing the courtyard, and that is why more windows have been added to the units facing that amenity.
- Mr. Krueger said he liked the courtyard and also how the building had been pulled back five feet on the east-facing, south end of the building.

Ms. Crowder:

- Said she had only seen one version of this project beforehand, but said overall the project looks fine. She said the exterior street-facing sides look good.
- Ms. Crowder said, with the interior courtyard, the flat walls do not bother her. She said the trees and the volume of the space, and all the activity in the courtyard, render that concern not a big issue for her. She noted that this space and the community building in this spot would get a lot of use.
- She liked the greenery surrounding the courtyard.

Mr. Sutton:

- Said he was all right with the courtyard. He said this was an interior portion of the building, and the focus should be on pleasing the tenants. If it could be sold to the tenants, it was fine by him.
- However, he did not grasp why the south elevation was not punctuated with a different material, as is the case on every other corner on the street-side. He asked why the corners of the building that move toward the interior did not have the same sort of treatment.
- Mr. Sutton would like to see other materials extend the length of the façades that face south. He said the applicant could keep the interior as is.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Said he disagreed with Ms. Crowder and agreed more with Mr. Nichols. He said the courtyard still leaves a lot to be desired. He said it appeared that some color has been applied in random patterns and nothing has been gained for it. There are still flat façades, and they do not relate to the other sides of the building.
- Mr. Palmquist understood the idea of spending money on the public-facing sides of the building and being more subdued on the inside, but he said what the applicant has presented is not the way that such a subdued design should be done.
- He said less is more is a good concept, but there has to be a lot of design behind that concept to get it to work. He felt there was a line of demarcation between the elevations the applicant cared about and the ones that bear little or no concern.
- Mr. Palmquist said the applicant could work with the Planning Department to make this design work. He noted that more glass has been added around the corners, but said that more glass would not necessarily be the key. He suggested that treating the blank walls with materials could be done well and might even cost less than using glass.
- Mr. Palmquist noted there were constraints on the site, but said comments from the DRB have not quite developed in the way he expected. He suggested that two center units could come out on the elevations in question, maybe just a foot or so, to create some modulation. He said, then, a color shift or the red bands used would not be needed.
- Mr. Palmquist said, in some cases, colors have been added for the sake of adding them and addressing comments from the Board. He suggested some material changes on the portions of the design that are bumped out, for example, and reducing the amount of color changes.
- Mr. Palmquist said he did not believe the interior elevations were worth holding up the project for approval, but he did want his comments in the record so that staff knew that more steps are needed for the interior elevation. He said the project has progressed leaps and bounds over the previous four meetings, but said the interior elevation was still struggling.
- Mr. Palmquist said he would entertain a motion on this approval, with an awareness of his comments and staff's comments.
- The applicant said the horizontal bands were added to the interior elevations to combat the vertical, high wall around the courtyard. The bands replicate the color rhythm from other sides of the building. He said he could talk to staff about what would be possible, and noted that not a large amount of bumping out would be needed to get more modulation. He said he would investigate that.
- The applicant said he was trying to develop a design rhythm with different colors and shapes.
- Mr. Palmquist responded that it appears the applicant knows what needs to be done, but said that every time the project comes back, the DRB's comments and the applicant's apparent willingness to work on those issues is not reflected in the design.
- Mr. Palmquist said the changes do not need to be expensive, and he appreciated the concept of being subtle and silent. He did not want to overpower the courtyard, but said the proposed design almost does the landscaping and the courtyard a disservice.
- Mr. Fischer appreciated the comments of the Board, which would be submitted to Mr. Lee. With that, staff is still recommending approval with the conditions noted above.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the departure from the parking requirements on the project and if there was parking space required for each unit. Mr. Fischer was not aware of those requirements.
- The applicant said there was a traffic study done that helped determine the parking space numbers. Mr. Lee has reviewed this topic thoroughly, and the overall amount of parking has been reduced. Mr. Fischer said the Technical Committee, not the DRB, will handle the parking requirements.
- Mr. Fischer said a mention of parking was put in the conditions so as to put it on the record with the DRB. The final number of dwelling units on the site is subject to the final review and approval of the building permits, which involves parking and other quantitative requirements, which could also include a fee in lieu.
- The applicant was not sure why the parking condition was added by Mr. Lee. He said, however, that the parking has been part of a technical review, and the parking space number was developed by a traffic engineer based on another project in town.
- The applicant, after a brief review, noted that a parking deviation has been approved by the City.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. NICHOLS, AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER, TO APPROVE L120482, VALLEY FURNITURE APARTMENTS, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE STANDARD PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES, AS DEVELOPED BY CITY STAFF, WILL APPLY.**
- 2. THE FINAL NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS ALLOWED ON THE DEVELOPMENT WILL BE SUBJECT TO THE FINAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE BUILDING PERMITS, SUBJECT TO PARKING AND OTHER RELATED DIMENSIONAL AND QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS. AND/OR IN LIEU FEES.**
- 3. THE ARCHITECTURAL DETAILING WITHIN THE COURTYARD WILL BE REVIEWED THROUGH THE BUILDING PERMIT PROCESS, AND THE COMMENTS PROVIDED BY THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD WILL BE CONSIDERED BY CITY STAFF IN THE REVIEW OF THOSE PERMITS.**

MOTION APPROVED (5-0).

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. CROWDER AND SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:02 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).

January 17, 2013
MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY