

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
March 19, 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, Craig Krueger, Scott Waggoner, Kevin Sutton

**EXCUSED ABSENCE:** Joe Palmquist, Mike Nichols

**STAFF PRESENT:** Ben Sticka, Planner; Kim Dietz, Senior Planner; Sarah Stiteler, Senior Planner; Steven Fischer, Manager

**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 Chair David Scott Meade at 7:00 p.m.

**MINUTES**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WAGGONER AND SECONDED BY MR. MEADE TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 15, 2015 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (2-0) WITH TWO ABSTENTIONS.**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2015 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WAGGONER AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 19, 2015 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (3-0) WITH ONE ABSTENTION.**

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**LAND-2015-00354, Redmond Elementary School**

**Description:** Approximately 11,000 square foot, seven classroom addition with a central shared learning space, restrooms, and support spaces. Create a rain garden to provide water quality treatment for existing parking lot.

**Location:** 16800 NE 80<sup>th</sup> Street

**Applicant:** Lukas Shu *with* Studio Meng Strazzara

**Contact:** Michael Romero *with* Lake Washington School District

**Staff Contact:** Ben Sticka, 425-556-2470, [bsticka@redmond.gov](mailto:bsticka@redmond.gov)

Mr. Sticka said that this proposal was an addition to Redmond Elementary School on NE 80<sup>th</sup> Street. The project would be located on the southwest portion of the site. The addition would be 11,000 square feet attached to the existing 54,000 square foot campus. The addition would include seven classrooms, restrooms, and a staff lounge. The building itself would be 30 feet tall and one story in height. An existing brick veneer and aluminum windows would be used, which are found on the existing school building. A cement fiberboard material has been proposed as opposed to the stucco which is used on the existing building. Overall, staff is pleased with the building, but staff would like input on the cement fiberboard.

Lukas Shu spoke on behalf of the applicant and introduced Michael Romero, the project manager. Mr. Romero noted that the Lake Washington School District has been the fastest growing school district in the state for the last three years. There has been an increase of more than 2,000 students. Over the next four to seven years, an increase of 500 students a year is anticipated. A few years ago, the schools realigned

grades to respond to this growth, making its elementary schools K-5. After being unable to pass a bond in 2014, which would have added three new elementary schools, the District has re-established boundaries for all of its elementary schools based on population pressure. The District is currently in what it calls an interim capacity project. This addition at Redmond Elementary is just one among sixteen remodeling projects across the District while a long-term plan is developed.

Mr. Shu showed the DRB where the school was in the East Hill neighborhood. The school has three wings, including a west wing with three stories. The wings are attached to a rotunda, which houses administration offices. The addition is going onto the southwest corner of the site, which is one of the few open spots on the site. Mr. Shu's firm is the original designer of the building. The addition would match the construction type of the existing building, which is wood frame and fully covered by sprinklers for fire protection. The addition will fit into the site without any site improvement or road development.

The buildings are brick with articulated facades and aluminum windows. The applicant is proposing a one-story addition to blend in with the existing buildings with similar roof lines and similar materials, including a metal roof. The floor plans show that the footprint of the building will not differ much when the addition is added on. The mechanical platform for the addition is housed below the roof line, just like the original building, so there is no exposed mechanical equipment. A gable roof has been proposed with a hip on the left. The roof tapers down where it connects with the building. A tower element would serve as an intake and exhaust.

The detail on the facades includes intricate brick coursing work. The exact same bricks would be used as in the original project. The applicant showed the DRB samples of the brick. Andy Rasmussen, landscape architect, next spoke on behalf of the applicant. He said the addition would be put in an area that has a lawn and some deciduous trees in poor health. None of the trees are significant. Basically, that lawn will be filled in, keeping the existing bus route to the south and not impacting vehicular and pedestrian activities. A more compact urban courtyard will be put on the right of the new building addition, which will serve as a bus and parent gathering area. Beyond that, the building will be surrounded with landscaping. The building will be about a foot above the existing sidewalk, and shrubs and groundcover will be used to transition down from the existing building to the ground level. Mr. Meade asked where the proposed hardy panel material would be used. The applicant said the brick coursing would stop on the first story, and the panel would be placed near that area. The stucco on the existing buildings is in a similar location.

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

##### Mr. Krueger:

- Asked why the structure was not two stories instead of one. The applicant said that having that many more students would burden the shared spaces of the school. However, a second story could be added in the future, if needed. Due to the number of students, one of the existing wings cannot be modified because the school cannot afford to lose that space during construction.
- Mr. Krueger clarified that the stucco was an accent feature on the existing buildings, and was painted a dark color similar to the brick. The hardy panel proposed would follow the same pattern.

##### Mr. Sutton:

- Said the siding was challenging, but he was not sure where else it could be placed. Mr. Sutton said he was on board with matching all the detailing of the existing building. He said having hardy panel instead of stucco made sense to him.
- He asked if the kids would lose an entrance to the school due to the placement of the new building. The applicant said no existing doors would be closed. The addition would connect to a blank wall on the existing building.
- The applicant said the existing classrooms have a door that exits to the exterior. That is not done anymore, as classrooms are intended to be secure perimeter buildings. Thus, the façade would be different in that there would be just main entry doors, main exit doors, but no doors interspersed with every classroom.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Said the site plan is trying to create some space between the existing wings and the new addition by angling the new addition, which puts a bit of a pinch on the existing drop off site. Mr. Waggoner said it appeared a fairly wide sidewalk would still be proposed at the drop off site, which should be able to handle the drop off routine.
- Mr. Waggoner said the floor plan of the addition had the same module of the existing wings, which should help it blend in. The roof pitches appear to be the same as well. The hardy siding would be in flat panels to appear like smooth stucco.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked about new portables that appear on the site plan. The applicant noted that there are three separate applications happening at this site, but the only land use application in front of the DRB is the addition. A stormwater project has been requested by the City due to the school's location in a wellhead protection zone.
- Mr. Meade said the project is fine if the addition matches the existing detailing. He said the hardy panel would be a reasonable choice to go with the stucco element.
- Mr. Krueger said the removal of the doors on the addition appeared to be a good thing in terms of the look of the building from the perimeter. Mr. Meade said the project could come back at the next meeting for an approval.

**DISCUSSION**

**Topic:** Historic Core Plan

**Description:** Discussion regarding design standard concepts: building base, middle, cap, material, mass, height, and stepback.

**Staff Contacts:** Kim Dietz, 425-556-2415, [kdietz@redmond.gov](mailto:kdietz@redmond.gov) and Sarah Stiteler, 425-556-2469, [ssiteler@redmond.gov](mailto:ssiteler@redmond.gov)

Ms. Dietz noted that the chair of the Landmark Commission, Tom Hitzroth, had joined her to answer any questions. She noted that the staff's review of the Historic Core Plan could use more feedback from the DRB. The Planning Commission has asked staff to get some input from the DRB as the Historic Core Plan is developed. The Community Character, Urban Center, and Historic Preservation elements have been drawn in from the Comprehensive Plan to guide this discussion.

Ms. Dietz noted that the DRB had met with the City Council as the Landmark Commission in 2013, which set the stage for the work on the Historic Core Plan. She said that some design elements have been developed that the DRB could comment on. Those comments would go back to the Planning Commission, which would start the process of a full amendment of the Historic Core Plan that would go into the Zoning Code.

In the Community Character portion of the Comprehensive Plan, there is a call for the City to use design standards and design review to deal with structures, including historic ones. The integrity of zones such as the Old Town Zone is a priority. This is where the Historic Core located. Ms. Dietz said the Historic Core would be an overlay that sits on top of the Old Town zone. The overlay would help maintain the unique and historic qualities that people think of when they think of Redmond's history. The City's Historic Preservation policy says, when a building is adjacent to a landmark property, it has to be compatible with that property's architecture and design. The Historic Core is seen as a village, and going forward, the height limit of buildings and the pedestrian orientation of the streets and storefronts should be preserved.

Ms. Stiteler talked to the DRB about the City's update to the Zoning Code several years ago. This was an extensive process that did not change content to any great extent. When the Code Rewrite Commission got to the design standards, it was acknowledged that a lot of work had to be done to elevate the level of design in the City. The City Council approved funding to overhaul design standards throughout the City. The Historic Core was determined to be an area that might need its own design standards. The policy direction says the Historic Core should be recognized as a unique, historic area, and the standards may need to be further reviewed. Ms. Stiteler said the design standards she is discussing deal with Old Town, but even further, the Leary Corridor, which has its own specific standards.

Ms. Dietz showed the Historic Core on a map and where historic and landmark properties were located. For a building to be historic, it must be forty years or older, but that does not mean a preservation program is required. She asked the DRB for input on design elements. She presented the Bill Brown Saloon building side by side with a building in San Antonio, which illustrated how older construction has an application in newer buildings today. She said it is possible for newer buildings to reflect historic buildings. The hope is that the Old Town Historic Core can carry out many elements of an urban village.

The current Redmond City Code does provide for a lot of historic elements to come through using new materials. As new construction comes in, Ms. Dietz wants to make sure the design looks right so that the City does not have to wait another fifty years to rectify the situation. She wants to allow for flexibility and innovation, but also have some respect and compatibility with existing buildings, which have many different styles over 100 years of history in Redmond.

The City recently had an assessment done on the Historic Core, with input from building owners and the development community. Ms. Dietz asked the DRB if there were design elements derived from that assessment that were not important to be addressed. She also asked for any questions from the DRB members. Mr. Krueger said he did not see any elements that should be eliminated, as they all appeared to relate to the Historic Core's priorities. He would like to add a focus on streetscape design. He asked about roof design, and Ms. Dietz said she would cover that issue later in her presentation.

Mr. Meade asked about a term Ms. Dietz found in an architecture dictionary. Mr. Meade said he had not heard of the term, but recognized it dealt with an Italian detail. He said many historic masonry buildings have a parapet of some sort, and the design of those parapets is important. He did not see that in the design elements Ms. Dietz had listed. Mr. Meade said a design standard could be specific to masonry, but could also speak to roof elements, in general.

Mr. Waggoner asked if canopies and weather protection could be added to the list of design elements. Ms. Dietz said she is focused on the streetscape, and some developers like to cantilever over the sidewalk. The hope is to maintain the setback and instead create alcoves into buildings for a better pedestrian experience. She said Mr. Waggoner asked a great question, in that there are many temporary canopies or awnings added onto historic structures. She said staff could work on that issue. Mr. Waggoner said a lot of developers might not want to set back a storefront to create an alcove simply due to the loss of square footage. Having a canopy could help maximize a store's size and still keep the sidewalk alive.

Mr. Meade said weather protection is lacking in the Downtown area. He said that weather coverage can attract pedestrians and shoppers. He said there may be opportunities to have stores with additional height to encourage larger transom windows. Mr. Meade said a minimum height and depth for canopies would be an important design element to determine. He noted that typically, the cantilevered design Ms. Dietz alluded to earlier is not what the DRB is seeing.

Mr. Meade asked also about masonry detailing and how that would be expressed. He said some 1950's architecture has punched openings in the concrete, which is not always appropriate. He noted that the modulations and color of new buildings in Redmond is something the DRB has pushed for in the past. He said newer-looking brick facades along Cleveland Street do not always fit in with the historic nature of the surrounding buildings. He said the Matador building, for example, does a good job reflecting the historic brick buildings around it.

Mr. Krueger asked again about canopies, and said Ms. Dietz's packet of information had some good photos from other cities that showed some examples of what a nice looking canopy could be. Mr. Meade said a current commercial awning could even help with historic buildings to preserve their pedestrian scale. Mr. Waggoner said he would not like to limit canopies to one type of material. Segmented canopies were inserted over individual windows on many of Redmond's historic buildings, he said. Mr. Meade said higher windows on older buildings were used to add light, but as design changed, those higher windows were not used. Mr. Meade wanted to make sure that a number of design ideas were embraced to allow some flexibility within the concept of respecting architectural history. Mr. Waggoner wanted to make sure weather protection was considered as a way to encourage people to visit older buildings.

Ms. Dietz began a discussion of a list of design standards by talking about the base, middle, and cap of a building. Older structures do not always have these three elements. The Code today calls for different treatments, but does not break up a building into these three categories. Staff is suggesting, based on a look at other cities, that the additional level of specificity regarding a base, middle, and cap should be considered. This could help reinforce the historic nature of the Historic Core. There is a question, noted in the City's study of this issue, about whether the City's standards should address the lower stories of a building in a more detailed way compared to the higher stories. Ms. Dietz showed the DRB how Redwood City and Boise broke down a façade based on the type of street and the types of uses applied to the buildings, such as office or retail. This helps the overall design of a neighborhood get synced up. In Emeryville, the idea is to respect the historic structures a building is near or adjacent to. Photos give examples of what is appropriate in that city's code.

Ms. Dietz said Redmond's City Code could be enhanced in some ways to help developers. Mr. Meade said design ideas from the City of Redmond should be used, not designs from other cities. Ms. Dietz referred once again to the base, middle, and cap. The base could be more than the first floor, but would visibly anchor the project to the ground. The cap would be the top or the top several floors, and would define the highest points of the building. The middle would be everything else in between. Ms. Dietz said the point of these definitions could help create distinction through architecture, soften the massing, and provide an engaging pedestrian experience that still respects the historic core.

Ms. Dietz asked the DRB if the base, middle, and cap were appropriate design standards for a building. Mr. Meade said they were indeed appropriate. This concept is difficult to apply to one-story buildings, but it is possible. Mr. Waggoner said he liked seeing the historic profiles attached to the base, middle, and cap concept. He said the exact historic profile did not have to be determined, but he wanted to find some way to promote a historically respectful design. Mr. Meade said many elements can define a historic design, including brick styles and the window orientation.

Ms. Dietz asked the DRB if this design approach would encourage a cookie-cutter look in the Historic Core. Mr. Meade said that was not the case, if there was not too much specificity in the Code language. He said organizing a building using a base, middle, and cap would be fully appropriate for a historic area and would be something developers would embrace. He did not look at these guidelines as restrictions on architects, but proper parameters which could actually aid the design process. Mr. Waggoner said those guidelines should not have specific proportions attached to them as a way to encourage variety. Mr. Meade noted that, in the past, projects in the Historic Core were brought before the DRB with far too many restrictions. He wanted to make sure that applicants were allowed to be creative. He reiterated the idea of asking for local examples from Redmond to help guide the process.

Mr. Hitzroth said he wanted to make sure new buildings complemented the Historic Core without overwhelming it. He wanted pedestrians to notice when they were in the Core, and was concerned specifically about building height. Mr. Meade agreed with this concern, and said an appropriate response might be that anything on the street frontage should not be taller than 40 feet. Ms. Dietz noted that it was actually a three-story limit. Mr. Meade said, after stepping back from the street frontage, buildings could go higher. That could make for a more cohesive look for the street with buildings of similar scale. In many cases in the Historic Core developers will not have room for overly large, new projects.

Ms. Dietz spoke next to the base concept to buildings and how that is respected. The proposal was to note that bases should not be constructed of certain materials, including un-faced concrete, corrugated metal, metal composite wall panels, fiber cement, aluminum panels, and vinyl siding. She asked if this list was too much or not enough. Mr. Meade said sacked or parched architectural concrete would be acceptable. Ground, polished CMU would work, but split-faced CMU would probably be a bad choice. The rest of the materials noted by Ms. Dietz were acceptable, Mr. Meade said. Mr. Waggoner asked if stucco should be added to this list. He was concerned about seeing flat, slick panels, but he said City boards like the DRB could push developers in that direction rather than having defined limits in the Code.

Mr. Meade said codifying material was always a challenge. He said the material is often less to blame than the people who are executing the design. He noted that even materials seen as cheap in the past,

like hardy panel, have been elevated into something extraordinary. Vinyl siding, on the other hand, would never be elevated in that way. Mr. Meade said metal could be eliminated from the list, and suggested that the Code could say the City is encouraging the creation of a solid base from a durable, timeless material. Ms. Dietz clarified that the discussion was about materials for the base. Mr. Meade agreed, and said other sections of the building might have other direction. Mr. Krueger said he liked the idea of suggesting using materials that are timeless and represented elsewhere in the Historic Core, and asking developers to avoid a few certain items rather than a long list. Mr. Meade said restricting materials can lead to buildings that do not always stand the test of time.

Ms. Dietz asked if it were appropriate to call attention to the plinth or the bulkhead in the Code. In some cities, thicker walls and a change of color or material are required. Mr. Meade said that was restrictive, and used the example of the Matador building, which has brick going all the way to the ground and does not have a traditional base. Mr. Sutton said he would like having the ability for a column to come to the ground. A plinth could go underneath the windows and a column or pilaster adjacent to it should be able to have a different look. He did not want that restriction. Mr. Waggoner noted that, when very plain designs come before the DRB, the Board has suggested looking at elements like the plinth or bulkhead to add some articulation. He said each project could define these elements for itself. Ms. Dietz said she was okay with offering only a suggestion with regard to these elements.

Ms. Dietz asked about the kickplate treatment and noted that some cities require materials for a kickplate. Mr. Meade said this was another situation where a suggestion was more appropriate. He said buildings could have glass going all the way to grade but still appear to be historically respectful. He noted that a kickplate was used in the past as a way to protect windows, but glass technology is much more advanced now. Mr. Waggoner said the Code should reflect a developer's ability to bring glass to the ground if that were so desired. That would help create some flexibility and variety of design.

Ms. Dietz asked next about storefronts, which are talked about in code language in different cities. She wanted to guide that treatment and speak to the sense of entry of buildings in the Historic Core. She suggested a variety of storefront designs and noted that character and pedestrian experience are very important. Thus, a storefront that does not project into or over the back of the sidewalk would potentially be reinforced in the Code. She had some examples from Redwood City, and noted that giving some suggestions about storefronts to developers might be appropriate.

Mr. Sutton said making this suggestion could be a good option, but not a strict requirement. He said he was concerned about limiting scale of buildings, especially in smaller spaces where developers would be leery to reduce their amount of available real estate. He liked the idea of having a "build to" line and not allowing additional projection over the sidewalk, but did not want many requirements beyond that. Mr. Krueger said the boundaries of Old Town Redmond are fairly confined. He recommended that developers should pay attention to details of the historic buildings and respect that, without having to get into all the details noted by Ms. Dietz regarding storefronts.

Mr. Meade said additions to historic buildings were another concern and should be reflected in the Code. He said adding stories to an existing historic building can help protect them for another 100 years. Ms. Dietz said much of what she is suggesting deals with buildings that are historic, but do not have landmark status. Mr. Hitzroth said individual buildings in the situation Mr. Meade is discussing could be reviewed on the Landmark Commission on a building by building basis. Ms. Dietz spoke next to design standards such as horizontal dimensions, repeated patterns, and a variety of treatments that could be found such as stepping back with cornices, string course, and other architectural details. Windows will be a separate discussion item. The DRB had no further comments on the design standards proposed.

Ms. Dietz next spoke to the cap element of buildings in the Historic Core. She noted that the cap should fit with the context of the building, but color, material change, sculpted elements, or any combination of these could be used to physically differentiate a building. Treatments could include pediments and cornices, for example. She asked if buildings should be definitely capped or not. Mr. Meade said a definite cap would be appropriate, and added that such an element helps protect the masonry.

Ms. Stiteler next reviewed building materials with the DRB. She showed some examples of different materials that have been used around Redmond. Current design standards speak to these materials, but in many cases, these material types are suggestions and not requirements. There are modulation requirements when developers use brick or stone. The study commissioned by the City on this topic showed a desire for historic context through the use of materials and that there could be a way to incentivize preferred materials. The study also suggested that historic material could be emphasized on the lower floors of buildings in the Historic Core. Ms. Stiteler showed examples of materials requirements in different cities, such as Bellingham, Boise, and Kirkland. Some cities call for developers to avoid tinted glass and use high quality coatings. Redmond's Code speaks to durability and high quality. Bainbridge Island's code talks about horizontal wood siding and other treatments. It is the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate that his or her materials meet the intent of that city's guidelines. She asked the DRB what the best solution would be for the Historic Core.

Ms. Stiteler had some suggestions about creating prescriptions or allowing for flexibility in the Code. Some of the language she proposed including a recommendation that a building shell would incorporate materials similar to those on existing historic structures. Some inappropriate materials were listed, as well. She hoped to allow for flexibility with some materials on a case by case basis, but noted that if those materials were used, they should be similar in character to the historic buildings and provide a human scale for a better pedestrian experience. Much of the Code regarding historic design standards uses the words "should" instead of "shall," and speaks to the entire Old Town area. She said a lot of questions can come into play about how specific the Code should be and if a more prescriptive Code would preclude creativity.

Mr. Meade said the "un-faced concrete" Ms. Stiteler has listed should be taken off the list, as well as corrugated metal. Metal wall panels should be permitted and fiber cement materials could be used at higher levels of a project. Precluding those materials, he said, would be punitive. Mr. Meade said masonry should be required for a historic building, but the Code should encourage developers to be creative. Mr. Krueger said requiring masonry would not always be appropriate based on some historic buildings with different roof lines. Mr. Meade said Bainbridge Island was not a good comparison for Redmond and its historic areas. Mr. Krueger said, however, there are many different types of materials in Redmond's Historic Core. Mr. Meade said most buildings in the Core would be parapet buildings, and he would recommend a requirement for masonry. That material feels more timeless and durable to him.

Ms. Stiteler asked if a masonry requirement should be in place for the first through third stories, or if it should go higher. On Leary, and a half block to the east and west, the buildings are limited to three stories. Outside of that overlay, buildings can go up to six stories tall. Transitioning from three to six stories can be difficult. Mr. Meade said architects can figure out the details, but requiring masonry would not be all that restrictive and would allow for flexibility. The incentive would be to create a historic form but execute that in a creative way.

Mr. Fischer said the challenge is often asking developers to use this material up to a certain level on a building. He said if some height threshold was not set, lower quality could be the result. Mr. Meade suggested an incentive method, such as allowing a developer to have an eighteen-foot lower floor if brick is used. The hope would be to allow for a taller building if brick is used to a certain level. He said using brick up to 18 feet high would be appropriate. If brick is not used, the first floor would only be allowed to go to 14 feet. Mr. Meade said that would potentially drive developers to do what the City wants. He said cast stone would be acceptable as well as brick, and said "masonry" would be an appropriate term. He noted that the DRB could review each case as it comes in and determine if it is appropriate. He said that aluminum panels could be appropriate in some cases, but that material is not coming before the DRB anyway. If it does appear, it most likely will be in a creative way. Precluding highly reflective materials would be a good idea, but also a commonsense concept.

Mr. Krueger said the Code should read that developers "shall" use materials that are appropriate, representative, traditional, timeless, and appropriate for the historic core. The Code should also say developers "should" avoid inappropriate materials to allow for some wiggle room. Mr. Meade said the emphasis should be to future-proof the Code so that it does not need to be constantly edited. He wanted to make sure quality design was not overly limited by the Code. Ms. Stiteler said she was trying to find a

balance of encouraging an appropriate design while also creating some flexibility that would allow for creativity. Mr. Meade agreed with that concept, such as requiring the use of masonry while allowing for different designs. Ms. Stiteler confirmed that Mr. Meade and the DRB wanted a requirement for masonry up to the 18 foot level. Mr. Meade said the entire façade might not need to be all masonry if a larger building was involved. He said he would prefer leaving the percentage amount of masonry as an open amount. He wanted a true expression of what a masonry structure would look like at the street level. If pedestrians cannot see the brick, it does not need to be a requirement on all sides of a building.

Ms. Dietz said she and Ms. Stiteler would return to the DRB with more suggestions at one or two meetings in the future. She suggested a walk-through of the Historic Core to make sure the Planning Commission could understand what the DRB is talking about. She said it would be great for DRB members to join that tour to get a better understanding of building heights and design.

### **DISCUSSION**

Topic: Redmond Design Standards

Staff: Steven Fischer, 425-556-2432, [sfischer@redmond.gov](mailto:sfischer@redmond.gov)

Mr. Fischer noted that staff has concluded the first phase of the Design Standards rewrite, which was the evaluation portion. Now, the City is looking at how to approach the second phase, which is the actual writing of the Code. Ms. Dietz and Ms. Stiteler are working on this issue through their work on the Historic Core standards, which has started with the DRB at this meeting and will continue through the Planning Commission and head on to City Council. The Planning Commissioners are troubled by design standards, in that they are not architects. They would rather stay at a higher level on these issues.

Mr. Fischer proposed that the Design Standards would be drafted by staff and reviewed by the DRB. The DRB would send the standards to the Planning Commission, where there would be a public hearing. Then, the Planning Commission would send the standards to the City Council. Mr. Fischer suggested that when Design Standards are discussed in the DRB, a liaison from the Planning Commission would join the meeting. When that Code is brought to the Planning Commission, a member of the DRB would reciprocate and join the Planning Commission in that meeting. Mr. Fischer asked for the DRB's opinion of this proposal and noted that drafting Code is a time-intensive process. He said that it would be a challenge to juggle the discussion over the Design Standards with the day to day work needed to process applicants looking to build projects. He did not know if the Code discussions should take an hour per meeting or if separate meetings should be set up, which he knows could be a burden for the DRB.

Mr. Krueger said the DRB should have the Design Standards discussions after the usual business with applicants at its meetings. He asked if the liaison concept was truly necessary. He noted that the Planning Commission was an intelligent group, but did not think they needed to be part of the discussion about the Design Standards. However, having a DRB liaison at the Planning Commission meeting as a resource could make sense. Mr. Meade said if a Planning Commissioner wanted to attend a DRB meeting, they could. He agreed that a DRB member could attend a Planning Commission meeting to help, as needed. He said keeping the design discussions on the same meeting days would be preferable to him rather than setting aside new meeting nights. Mr. Waggoner said he liked promoting collaboration with the Planning Commission and wanted to make sure the DRB was available to help. Mr. Waggoner asked if individual DRB meetings could be slated for a Design Standards discussion without a public project, potentially. Mr. Fischer said that was possible. At certain intervals, the discussion would have to take place and public projects would fit into that schedule. Mr. Sutton said he would like to stick to the current meetings the DRB has set aside. He did not mind running a bit longer on meetings as long as he could prepare for it.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SUTTON AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:23 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).**

**April 16, 2015**

---

**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

*Susan Trapp*

---

**RECORDING SECRETARY**