

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

January 15, 2015

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, Mike Nichols, Scott Waggoner

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Kevin Sutton, Craig Krueger

STAFF PRESENT: Gary Lee, Senior Planner; Steven Fischer, Manager

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 Chair David Scott Meade at 7:03 p.m.

PROJECT REVIEW

LAND-2014-01563, The Village (aka Monroe Property)

Description: Development of a five-story, 96 unit multi-family residential building with associated parking to accommodate 117 parking stalls

Location: 8336 & 8360 165th Ave NE and 8357 166th Ave NE

Architect: Kent Smutny *with* Veer Architecture

Applicant: Gary Noyes *with* Northwest Pacific Development, LLC

Prior Review Date: 09/04/14 and 10/16/14

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

Mr. Fischer presented for staff on behalf of Mr. Lee. He noted that this building had been before the DRB twice in the fall of 2014. The proposed development is to the north of the Core 83 Project, which the DRB has reviewed as well. The Village has an L-shape that plays off the site planning of the Core 83 building. The Village is five stories tall and is broken up along the north property line to create two separate wings as a way to break up the massing. All the ground level units will have front doors and stoops connected to the street and sidewalk. At the last pre-application meeting on this project, the DRB said this project was ready to be submitted, and the applicant is now seeking approval. Staff finds the design of the project meets the goals and intents of the neighborhood and of the City's design standards. To address suggestions made by staff and the DRB at the last meeting, the designer has darkened the main building colors and has made some other detailed changes to highlight the clerestory windows. With that, staff is recommending approval of the project with the standards inconsistencies condition.

Architect Kent Smutny presented on behalf of the applicant. He showed the southwest corner of the building on 165th, which has several changes. The windows have shifted slightly to respond to the site plans for the individual units. The bays to the building have been widened by six inches to work with the room modulations as well. Larger changes include moving an open space from the top floor to the first floor at the plaza level. The applicant essentially traded a unit on the first floor, moved that up to the southwest corner, and made a unit's worth of space available in the ground floor courtyard. The center of the building has been popped out a foot on the southwest elevation. The applicant has raised the plate at the center to provide additional articulation in lieu of the step back that was in the common space before.

On the 165th Street side, the DRB had some comments about the tops of the corner bays. The applicant has provided additional articulation at the top of the bays, including additional reveals that spring out from the corners of the punched windows. The applicant has added another detail to the band between the larger windows and the punched openings at the top, creating a crown around the corner bays. Also on

165th, at the double bay at the end of the building, the applicant has popped out the top floor two feet, which should work better with the site plan of the units at the corner. That presented an opportunity to provide more articulation at the top floor and add another hipped roof form. At the corner on this elevation, the deck has been changed at the northwest corner. The short end previously faced 165th. Again, playing off the site plan of the unit, the applicant has rotated the deck.

The DRB also raised some concerns about the decorative lighting on this project at the last meeting. The applicant has provided wall lights on the sides of the bays along 165th. The decorative lighting within the brick veneer now has a random pattern. The entry lighting and sconces provide some downward-pointing light. The plaza on the south side of the building is well-lit, also. The material board has been revised. The first scheme for this project was quite yellow, especially at the top floor and the bays were a stark white. A new, more muted palette of colors has now been provided. A third, earth-tone type color has been proposed at the top of the project. The color on the bays is more of a cream color. At the last meeting, the DRB also asked about the reveal system. The applicant showed the DRB two examples of reveal systems he was considering.

The applicant has revised the deck column design at the advice of the DRB at the last meeting. Two different designs for the columns have been proposed. A 10' by 10' column will be used to give a sturdy look. A typical deck would have a column at the corner. But, on 166th, due to the shorter elevation, the applicant is looking to articulate the decks differently. On those decks, the column has been set back to be in line with the bay and the deck edge is in front of the column. Elsewhere on the site, on the plaza and the north side of the building, where the building structure does not come right up to the street, the corner column design has been used.

The landscape within the building niches has been changed, including the inside corner niche and the niche that breaks up the north elevation. The hope was to provide some landscaping without piling dirt up against the building. A series of closely-spaced planters has been proposed. The applicant said he has responded to the DRB's comments and asked if there were any questions.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Nichols:

- Said he liked the colors and detailing around the top floor. Mr. Nichols said the applicant had addressed the concerns of the DRB and had nothing else to add.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Liked the increased refinement and detail around the top of the building and the additional modulation there. Mr. Waggoner said the color palette has added some good contrast and interest to the project.
- He said the project has come a long way and is ready for approval.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Said the project has progressed each time the applicant has come before the DRB and was ready.

Mr. Meade:

- Agreed with the rest of the DRB that the color scheme has evolved. Mr. Meade said the use of brick was excellent and the brick itself had a timeless quality. He said the project has met the design standards for this neighborhood, and he asked for a motion.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. NICHOLS AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO APPROVE LAND-2014-01563, THE VILLAGE (AKA MONROE PROPERTY) WITH THE STANDARD STAFF CONDITIONS REGARDING MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

PROJECT REVIEW - Revision

LAND-2013-00203, Core 83

Description: Minor modifications to approve building elevations

Location: 8324 165th Ave NE, 8301 166th Ave NE, 8323 166th Ave NE and 8345 166th Ave NE

Applicant: Reed Kelly *with* DRK Development, Inc.

Prior Review Date: 03/21/13, 05/02/13, 06/20/13 and 10/03/13

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

Mr. Lee joined the meeting at this point. He noted that this project had been previously approved and is now under construction. A minor change to the approved elevations has been proposed. The applicant would like to remove some brick in the niches on this project, similar to what the DRB had just seen in the previous project. The applicant has also proposed adding some columns to the balcony area. Staff has recommended that the DRB deny the reduction of the brick, but approve the addition of the columns. The columns, in staff's opinion, keep in character with the Victorian cottage look of the project.

Kent Smutny presented on behalf of the applicant on this project. The applicant would like to remove the brick on the two niches, one on 83rd and one on 166th. The brick veneer wraps from the street façade to the back of the niche in both areas. The back of the niche has large, glazed windows. Looking on 83rd, the applicant would like to bring the brick back and bring the plank siding down. The brick would still wrap around the corner and maintain the substantial appearance of the brick front. The niches are heavily landscaped and the applicant believed that the proposed change on the first floor would be nominal. On the 166th side, the applicant noted that there were some different conditions compared to the 83rd side. There is a window at the corner on the 166th side, and to keep the window framed, the applicant has proposed wrapping the brick to two feet on the far side of the window. On the other side of the niche, the brick acts like wainscoting. At this corner, there is a bay facing 166th and the brick goes up to the sill of the windows. There is very little difference with the design of the brick on this side of the building. The brick has been pulled back slightly to align the top of the brick with the top of the sill of the bay.

The other change proposed has to do with the columns on the building. The columns on the decks between bays would be unchanged. The other decks are up against a bay, and the applicant has proposed terminating these bays with columns. This, the applicant believes, is in line with the traditional design requirements of the Perrigo's Plat sub-area overlay. At the intersection of 165th and 83rd, there are decks that would gain a column. A longer deck has been proposed adjacent to the main entry corner that would have a new column design as well. The applicant went around the building to show the DRB the different areas where the column placement would be adjusted.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Nichols:

- Asked Mr. Lee about the columns and the one location staff was apparently concerned about. Mr. Lee noted that the column next to the garage door could pose an issue, and could be struck by a vehicle. Mr. Nichols said something would be needed to build up that column, which could get hit by a car. The applicant said the area in question was a service entrance area.
- Mr. Nichols was concerned a Waste Management driver could run into this column. The applicant said some bollards could be added for safety. Mr. Lee suggested the use of brick pilaster around the column, or a brick wall coming off the main wall. Mr. Meade said that either of those ideas would help protect this column.
- The applicant said a larger base for the column could be expressed with concrete or brick veneer. Mr. Meade said that detail could be worked out with staff.
- Mr. Nichols said he agreed with staff that the brick removal request should be denied. He believed the brick should continue back. Stopping the brick short makes it look more like an appliqué rather than the look of a structural, masonry foundation. He supported the moving of the columns, aside from the one column near the service entrance noted above. Aside from that, he said the project was good.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Agreed with Mr. Nichols that the original design with the full return of the brick had a more substantial look. Mr. Waggoner said the brick in the original design appeared to enclose the ground floor, and the proposed design made the brick look insignificant.
- Mr. Waggoner said if all four walls on the two niches were more similar, he might think differently about removing the brick. With the narrowness and depth of the niches, and with the heavy landscaping, he noted that not much of the brick would be visible. But in the early years of the landscaping, the front corner would have a lot of visible brick and should remain substantial.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Said he liked the idea of removing the brick, in a dissenting opinion. Mr. Palmquist asked about the return on the niche, which the applicant confirmed was two feet. Mr. Palmquist said that was a substantial distance and would not look like a cheap façade. If the brick was detailed properly, it would come parallel to the face of the building.
- Mr. Palmquist said he did not like the brick going just past the window and stopping, which looks arbitrary. He said the brick should go all the way back around the building, as originally proposed, or stop at the two-foot mark. A similar design for the brick should be used all around the building.
- He said he did not have a problem with the columns as long as the spacing and the design of the columns was the same around the building.
- Mr. Palmquist asked if any traffic would be going around the service entrance where staff had an issue with column placement. The applicant said no trucks would be going through this area, but people would be rolling out dumpsters. Residents would have access to this service area and might have moving trucks nearby.
- Mr. Palmquist said the column in the service area could have bollards around it rather than an encasement of brick.

Mr. Meade:

- Said any of the column solutions would be fine and he would let the applicant work that out with staff. Mr. Meade wanted to make sure the potential for impact would be addressed.
- Regarding the brick, Mr. Meade agreed with the staff's suggestion to keep the brick as it was. He was not sure how removing the brick would warrant any substantial savings for the applicant. If there was a two-foot return and some color-matched siding, that might be a different story, but he did not see a reason to take out the brick.
- Mr. Meade said, for this building to stand the test of time, the full brick wrap would be his preference.
- Mr. Waggoner said this was a situation of one extreme or the other, and he said staff's recommendation was the right one. Mr. Meade said it would be a trivial detail to add more brick.
- Mr. Waggoner noted that a wrap of some sort on the column in the service area would look better than bollards standing out. Mr. Meade agreed that was a cleaner-looking choice. The column could also be integrated into a wall. Making a separate set of bollards would clutter the design.
- Mr. Nichols said staff could work out this detail with the applicant. Mr. Lee confirmed with the DRB that bollards would not be an acceptable solution. Mr. Meade said a more substantial wrap around the column or a wing wall to hide the column would be better ideas.
- Mr. Palmquist said the brick in question either needs to go all the way back or go two feet. He did not think the applicant's solution to bring the brick back part of the way was a good idea.
- Mr. Meade agreed, and said the applicant's proposal for the brick looked like an appliqué. He requested a motion from the DRB members.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. NICHOLS AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER TO APPROVE LAND-2013-00203, CORE 83, WITH A DENIAL OF THE APPLICANT'S REQUEST TO MODIFY THE BRICK. THE REQUEST TO MODIFY THE COLUMNS WILL BE ALLOWED WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE APPLICANT WILL WORK OUT DESIGN DETAILS FOR THE EXPOSED COLUMN IN THE SERVICE ENTRANCE AREA WITH STAFF. THE STANDARD MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES CONDITION WILL ALSO APPLY. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WAGGONER AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:46 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

March 19, 2015

MINUTES APPROVED ON

Susan Trapp

RECORDING SECRETARY