

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
March 4th, 2010**

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD AND COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: David Scott Meade (Chairperson – DRB), Joe Palmquist, Lara Sirois, Scott Waggoner, Sadia Hasan, Miguel Llanos (LHC Member)

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Fischer, Principal Planner; Jayme Jonas, Senior Planner

The Landmark and Heritage Commission is appointed by City Council to provide additional incentives to, review of changes to, and expertise on archaeological and historic matters pertaining to properties designated on a national, state or local landmark register.

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.

LANDMARK & HERITAGE COMMISSION

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Landmark & Heritage Commission was called to order by the Miguel Llanos of the Commission, at 7 p.m.

Landmarks Commission Training with King County Historic Preservation Staff

Staff Contact: Jayme Jonas, (425) 556-2496, jjonas@redmond.gov

Ms. Jonas introduced Todd Scott with King County Historic Preservation, who has been a preservation architect with the County for the past three years. He will present some information about the Secretary of the Interior's standards for the treatment of historic properties, which are the standards used to evaluate any certificate of appropriateness applications that come before the Commission.

Mr. Scott noted that the Secretary of the Interior has four separate concepts that apply to projects of this nature. Preservation focuses on maintenance and preserving a property. Restoration means restoring something to its original use at a particular point in time, which is often used for museums. Reconstruction means starting from scratch and building something new, based on documentation of what was there previously. Fort Clatsop in Astoria, Oregon is a good example of that. The last standard is rehabilitation, which is taking an existing historic property and either using it for another purpose, or using it for its original purpose, but making changes. The LHC deals with this concept most often, rather than the first three.

Mr. Scott described several standards regarding the treatment of historic properties, and noted that any changes should require minimal change to the important historical values it has, including distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships. Mr. Scott reviewed the concept of using a property as it was historically, if possible. He noted that is not always possible with modern businesses. He showed photos of older buildings, like hospitals, which can turn into good housing units, for example.

Standard number two is that the historic character of the property will be retained and preserved. Any character-defining features should be preserved. For example, the Vincent Schoolhouse in the Snoqualmie Valley has a distinctive bell tower that should be preserved. A list of important features should be generated for structures like this. In some cases, the safety of the material needs to be considered, and may need to be removed. Mr. Palmquist asked about windows, and what happens when they do not meet energy standards. Mr. Scott agreed that windows are a problem, and the Commission should consider them on a case-by-case basis. In many cases, an insulated glass unit can be an appropriate solution. Mr. Meade noted that in some cases, the glass in older windows can be replaced, rather than the whole

window. Mr. Scott says that signs and landscape elements can be considered historical elements, and character-defining features, as well.

Standard three is that each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Mr. Scott says the idea is to retain the sense of historic development, not to add things that are on a building that were never there to begin with. He used an example of a Seattle skyscraper that incorporated a historic building in the design. Leavenworth has added several conjectural features to its downtown that were never there before.

Standard four is that changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved. Mr. Llanos asked about this standard, and Mr. Scott says later changes in the design could be potentially significant. Anytime a property is designated as a historic landmark, there is a period of significance that is identified. Mr. Scott used an example of a school built in 1900, with wings added in 1910 and 1920. That building's period of significance would be from 1900-1920. In King County, a minimum age for a historic building is 40 years. In most areas, the minimum is 50 years. Mr. Scott showed some examples of buildings in Seattle's Pioneer Square that had floors added to them, and how all the floors were historically significant.

Standard five is that distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques that characterize a property will be preserved. The short of that is to protect distinctive construction and craftsmanship. Mr. Scott showed the Commission some examples of these details and how rehabilitation projects were able to protect craftsmanship details.

Standard six is that deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. If a deteriorated feature can be repaired, that should be the first option. If it requires replacement, the new material needs to match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Mr. Scott showed some examples from Des Moines involving some deteriorated logs that had portions repaired rather than entire logs replaced. In some cases, materials do have to be replaced, however.

Standard number seven is that chemical or physical treatments should not be used if they are destructive. Some treatments can be used, if they do not damage the materials. Sandblasting old brick, for example, can be very destructive. Gentler methods can be used.

Standard number eight deals with archeology, saying that archeological resources should be protected. If resources have to be disturbed, then some mitigation has to take place. Mr. Scott showed some mitigation techniques, including a developer showing a dig to the public to show its archeological value.

Standards nine and 10 will impact the Commission the most, in Mr. Scott's opinion. Standard nine says, basically, developers can make alterations to the historic buildings and new additions to the historic buildings that are compatible with the historic building. Massing and scale are big issues in for Standard nine. Mr. Scott gave an example of a parking garage built around a historic site, and asked the Commission if it appeared compatible. Mr. Meade noted the material was not the same, and noted there were some spacing issues. Mr. Scott agreed that it was clear the developer, in this case, missed the mark in making the new building historically compatible. The overall scale is acceptable, but the smaller elements do not appear to be changed properly. Mr. Scott showed other examples of incompatibility in new projects added onto historic buildings. He showed some examples of buildings that do represent compatibility, in that similar materials are used and similar window patterns can be used as well.

Standard 10 says that new additions in adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired. So basically, new additions should be reversible. The other standards will have to be met, as well.

In summary, Mr. Scott pointed out some different resources online, including some ideas about which standards applied to certain situations. Redmond's minimum age for a building is 40 years, to be historic. Mr. Meade asked about the Redmond Hotel, which has had several layers added to it over the years. Mr. Scott said, if that site was determined to be a landmark, a baseline period of historical importance would be established, and most likely, those external layers would be removed. He added that owners of historic

buildings do have some say over that period of historic importance, but evidence of that time period would be reviewed and a final decision would come from the Landmark & Heritage Commission. One difficult point to enforce is the painting of previously unpainted brick; that point is not written into the Redmond's Code. Mr. Llanos asked about archeological resources, and who decides if those remains can be disturbed. Mr. Scott says state and federal authorities normally hold sway; but local authorities like the Commission can have important roles in those cases as well with specific sites in Redmond. Mr. Scott concluded his presentation, and noted that there were three landmark cases coming to the Redmond Regional Landmark Commission, which designates properties as landmarks in the City, in the next week.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY MR. LLANOS TO ADJOURN THE LANDMARK AND HERITAGE COMMISSION MEETING, SECONDED BY MR. MEADE. MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:55 P.M.

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CALL TO ORDER

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by the Chairperson of the Design Review Board, David Scott Meade.

MINUTES

MR. WAGGONER NOTED, REGARDING THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4TH, 2010 MEETING, THE PROPOSED MEDICAL BUILDING WOULD NOT BE AN EMERGENCY ROOM SITUATION, WITH AMBULANCES ARRIVING WITH URGENT CARE PATIENTS. IF PATIENTS DID NEED AN AMBULANCE TO TAKE THEM TO A HOSPITAL, ONE WOULD ARRIVE TO TAKE THEM AWAY. MR. WAGGONER WANTED TO MAKE SURE THIS POINT WAS CLEAR, AS THIS BUILDING WAS IN A FAR CORNER OF A SHOPPING CENTER, AND AMBULANCE ACCESS MIGHT BE DIFFICULT. WITH THAT CLARIFICATION, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WAGGONER, AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 4TH, 2010 MEETING. MOTION PASSES (5-0).

PROJECT REVIEW

L100035, Redmond Fire Station 17

Description: Construct a 16,819 sf, two-story fire station with sleeping facilities and drive-thru apparatus bays, wood-frame, CMU, metal siding and metal roof

Location: 16917 NE 116th Street

Architect: Myles Huddart *with* TCA Architecture

Applicant: Lisa Singer *with* the City of Redmond

Staff Contact: Steven Fischer, 425-556-2432, sfischer@redmond.gov

Mr. Fischer told the Board this project was up for a conditional approval. This project was before the Board last summer, but because of turnover on the Board, this is new to every member except for Mr. Palmquist. The City has had a plan for a fire station in North Redmond for many years. The City had purchased a piece of property with the intent of putting a fire station there, and began planning work two years ago in that area. Soon into that process, it was apparent that the property in question would not work due to slope, size, and drainage problems. So, the City explored a new piece of property, which happened to be one parcel to the west. In 2009, the City put together some site design and layout plans. This property is just over an acre and a half, and there were four issues brought up about this project last summer. First, the Board did not want the building to be too tall. The use of cisterns for irrigation was recommended. Room for future expansion was also recommended, as well as incorporating some form of public art into the design of the building or the open space in front of it.

The massing of the building is broken up with windows and dormers. The use of cisterns has been explored, but that been put aside due to design problems. There is an existing well on the property, and that well water will be used for a low-water, drip irrigation system. Room for expansion has been included to add to the sleeping quarters, as well as the rear of the building. There is a public space in front of the building that might be a space for public art, but Mr. Fischer says he understands the City is not moving forward with public art installations due to budget concerns. However, space will be left for that art, if it

can be installed in the future. Staff has identified some design concerns over security, regarding doors, windows, and exterior lighting.

Staff is recommending approval with the following conditions: doors leading out to the parking areas shall allow the user to see through to the other side; exterior lighting shall be provided at doorways leading out to parking areas; colors and materials as presented this evening shall be incorporated into the project; and the standard presentation materials inconsistencies shall apply.

Miles Huddart with TCA Architecture presented on behalf of the applicant. He told the Board this project is near the area of Educational Hill on 116th, and in a primarily residential area. The scale of the building is much larger than other buildings around it. It is 17,000 SF, with most of that square footage on the ground floor. To lessen the impact of the building on the site, the building has been moved farther back off the street. However, fire department vehicles need to respond quickly, so the design reflects that the building needs to be as effective as possible while remaining safe. There are parking places for visitors in the front and a security gate in the back for the crew. The landscaping meets the tree preservation requirements on the site; all the new landscaping is low-maintenance, and there will be no grass on the site to cut. The front of the property is designed as a public plaza, so there will be some paving and ground cover with seating areas. An existing Japanese maple will be preserved and incorporated in this public area. There will be a public lobby as well to do things like blood pressure checks, where a public bathroom will be provided. The interior of the building will have sleeping areas, room for equipment and a classroom area as well. A tower used for drying hose is also on the site; it is just under 50'. The rest of the building is under the 35' requirement.

The applicant is trying to break up the massing of the project while keeping it as simple as possible. The exterior materials are low-maintenance and very durable. The base of the building is 4" CMU veneer, with a main lighter color and a darker color for banding. Cement board wall panel will also be used. The roofing is a standing seam metal roof, and all the roofs are sloped. The trim and gutters will match that material. The windows will be aluminum-framed. The apparatus bays will have four-fold doors, and they are designed to allow for quick response for the fire department. They open more quickly, and require less maintenance. A lot of glass is on the north face of the building to allow more daylight in, as an energy-saving measure. The internal construction of the building will use 2 x 8" beams allow for more thermal massing to save energy as well. Rigid insulation will be added under the roof to help conserve energy as well. There is a detention vault below grade in the back of the site.

116th Street, near the site, is getting lowered 4.5' to improve sight distance for vehicles approaching the station. That will help the site with gravity drainage, toward 116th. Mr. Meade asked if recharging that water to the site would be a good idea. The applicant says that did not work in the design stage; that did not appear feasible. Mr. Fischer added that if such an infiltration project did not work, that water would go into neighbors' yards. Drainage computations, and soil analysis, did not pencil out for infiltration, and Mr. Fischer says there is no room for error considering the location of the site. The applicant will be using the well on the site for irrigation, and will house that with materials similar to what is on the site now.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Ms. Sirois:

- Was glad to see the height requirement kept to a minimum and liked the materials.
- In the front of the building, Ms. Sirois asked if there was a way to emphasize the public entrance more, perhaps using some sort of emphasis from that horizontal end. Mr. Mead suggested creating a void space in the ceiling, to make it vaulted and highlight it some more.
- Ms. Sirois suggested improving the signage for that public area, as well.
- She liked the iconic look of the hose-drying tower, and also liked the incorporation of the Japanese maple in the front of the public area.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked about the doors mentioned in the staff report, and their need for lighting. Mr. Huddart pointed them out around the exterior of the building. The applicant will put at least a vision light above those doors, to meet the Code requirements.

- Two light poles have been provided in the back of the project, as well. This is a small parking area in that back area; the station itself does not require a lot of staff.
- Mr. Palmquist says the applicant has incorporated most of what the DRB talked about the last time this issue was before the Board. He likes the form of the building, and the tower.
- Mr. Palmquist echoed the idea of the need to the public entrance; it may be possible to bring the gabled piece above the entrance out a little to provide that emphasis, or add more glass. He likes the building.

Ms. Hasan:

- Asked about lighting in the front entrance area. The applicant says there would be a light on the gable as well as a light in the ceiling. There will always be a light on in the lobby itself. In the front, there will be lighting for the flagpole and monument sign, as well as one streetlight.
- Ms. Hasan likes the project and the preservation of the Japanese maple.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Likes the massing of the building and how it fits into the residential area.
- Asked about the site plan and if an entry drive might be moved west about 5', to allow for all of the visitor parking on the building side of the driveway. The five crew spaces could be added on to the parking area in back.
- In doing that, the residential side of the driveway would be nothing but landscaping, rather than having fingers of parking spaces sticking out. Such a plan would put parking places closer to the doors, as well.
- The applicant pointed out the driveway is skewed for the sake of preserving existing trees on the site.
- Mr. Waggoner asked about public groups that visit the fire department.
- A representative of the fire department told the DRB that pre-schools and daycares are the primary groups visiting the stations, ages three to five, with groups of 10-15 people. Elementary schools rarely visit due to several half-day breaks during the year; they do not want to lose teaching time by making a visit.
- Junior high kids are less interested; high school kids are interested in jobs, and the fire department will go and visit them.
- The majority of the visitors show up in vans. Mr. Waggoner asked about bringing that parking closer to the building and increasing the size of the parking stalls for young visitors. The architect noted that in the case of a planned visit, parking in the rear area could be provided.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked about the physical fitness room. He says it is the jewel of the site, with gorgeous high windows and a nice lighted space. He would like to see that opened up, visually, to the adjacent patio, by adding more glazing.
- The fire department representative says that type of glazing was not provided in order to mount pull-up bars, using a structured wall. The station is set to go up to a 10-person staff, which will happen over the next several decades. The chief of the department had asked that this building be able to survive for the next 50 years.
- Mr. Meade asked about the top of the hose-drying tower, and why wood was used in the coping there. The applicant says if a ladder was put against the wall, that cap could get really beat up, so flashing would not be appropriate there.
- Mr. Meade was curious about how the wall would be framed in the workout area. The applicant says there will be a shelf angle to prevent sliding.
- Mr. Meade asked about the apparatus that will be in this site originally. The Council has approved two staff members, with an aid car. It's possible a paramedic supervisor might be moved to this site as well. An aid car and the supervisor's car would be on the site; the third bay would be used to store reserve apparatus.
- Mr. Meade also spoke to the idea of combining parking areas, even at the risk of losing one or two trees. He echoed the ideas of the other Board members regarding the entry area.
- Mr. Meade asked about steel lintels, and if a less expensive option might be used.

MOTION TO APPROVE L100035, THE REDMOND FIRE STATION #17, MADE BY MR. WAGGONER AND SECONDED BY MS. SIROIS, AS PRESENTED, WITH THE CONDITIONS THAT ADDITIONAL STUDY SHOULD BE MADE ON CONSOLIDATING THE PARKING ON THE CIRCULAR DRIVEWAY. STUDY SHOULD ALSO BE GIVEN TO THE VISITOR ENTRANCE OF THE FIRE STATION TO MAKE IT MORE OBVIOUS. STAFF CONDITIONS, AS PRESENTED, WILL BE FOLLOWED AS WELL. MOTION PASSES (5-0).

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION MADE BY MS. PALMQUIST, AND SECONDED BY MS. SIROIS, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. MOTION PASSES (5-0).

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY