

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

May 21, 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, Craig Krueger, Kevin Sutton, Mike Nichols

**EXCUSED ABSENCE:** Scott Waggoner

**STAFF PRESENT:** Gary Lee, Senior Planner; Steve Fischer, Manager;  
Kim Dietz, Senior Planner, Sarah Stiteler, Senior Planner,  
Carl McArthy, Code Compliance Officer

**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. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 16, 2015 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (4-0) WITH ONE ABSTENTION.**

**DISCUSSION**

**Topic:** Historic Core Plan – Design Standard Concepts

**Description:** Discussion regarding massing, height, and setbacks

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

Ms. Dietz noted that this was the final consultation regarding this topic before the Technical Committee and Redmond Planning Commission officially review it. Robert O'Hara, chair of the Planning Commission, introduced himself to the group at this time as a liaison to the Planning Commission. Tom Hitzroth, chair of the Landmark Commission, was present as well.

Ms. Dietz noted that the Historic Core is a place where Redmond has most of its landmark properties. It was the original business core of the City. She said she planned to cover setbacks, height, and massing at this meeting. Ms. Stiteler spoke to the DRB about setbacks. Current design standards in the Historic Core are governed by a height limit overlay in Old Town, an area which covers a major portion of the Historic Core. The standards in Old Town speak to having buildings and development that fit in the historic context and using techniques to break up scale. Setbacks would be an example of one of those techniques. Setbacks are required in several Downtown zones.

The MAKERS consulting report looked at setbacks in Redmond and said that in terms of reducing mass, it would be good to reconsider upper story setback provisions. There is some Code language that says "should" instead of "shall" on this topic. Also, the consultants recommended having some modulation requirements that would limit façade widths, reduce mass, encourage more variation on roof designs to add more detail, and call for more variety and complexity in the visual experience. The DRB has covered similar issues in the Core over the last few meetings regarding the pedestrian experience and creating a base, middle and cap in building design. Other cities have code language that talks about reinforcing the historic building scale of two to four stories in height and minimizing abrupt transitions between buildings adjacent to the Historic Core. The city of Kirkland calls for a reduction of massing in the upper stories. The

city of Boulder relates the height of buildings to neighboring structures at the sidewalk's edge. That city recommends a minimum setback of 15 feet from the front façade to reduce the perceived height.

Staff is looking for ways to reduce mass through the use of setbacks. The question is if the City should require specific setbacks or provisions for streets such as Leary or Gilman, especially in light of the three-story height limit for Leary and a six-story limit on Gilman. If a property takes up an entire block between Leary and Gilman, there could be a complicating height limit factor. Ms. Stiteler showed some examples of building massing downtown, which is closely related to setbacks. Articulation can be used to break down massing, and there is some flexibility on the techniques that can be used. Appropriate illustrations should be included in the code, the MAKERS consultants recommended.

Overall, the intent is to have projects that reduce the image of the box and find ways to create some varied designs with structures that are respectful of the historic nature of the neighborhood while also incorporating higher heights than three stories. Redwood City, CA, has some examples of sculpted massing in some buildings to provide articulation. Kirkland has some vertical definition and horizontal modulation mentioned in its code with upper story setbacks. Decks and balconies help break up the massing as well.

Ms. Stiteler noted that the building cap can provide some definition. Questions on this topic include allowing roofs to slope and if the number of sloped roofs should be limited. The idea behind this is a lot of shed rooflines exist in Downtown today. Staff is recommending allowing no shed roofs in the Historic Core, with a provision to allow a portion of shed roofing to be used for solar power. Currently, there are flat and pitched roof in the Core. Staff is looking for ways to accentuate flat rooflines to create a distinctive termination of the buildings. Flat roofs could become community amenities at the top level of a building. The Code recommendations staff is making would be contained to the Historic Core unless this concept was favored for the City's overall design standards.

Ms. Stiteler said these recommendations would go to the Technical Committee the week after this DRB meeting. There will be three meetings with the Committee through June 10. The Planning Commission review will happen on June 24. A public hearing for this topic is July 8 and study sessions with the Planning Commission will occur through July and August. Another public hearing may be set for August 5, at which time staff may have additional information about setbacks and height limits.

Mr. Krueger clarified that staff would have a complete document on these design recommendations in time for the July 8 public meeting. That seemed like an aggressive timeline. Ms. Dietz said that was indeed the plan, and said staff's work was on schedule. She noted that this is not a rewrite of the Code, merely an overlay of additional design standards. The work with the Technical Committee will help guide this process. Mr. Krueger asked to see the boundaries of the Core and where the interaction of the three-story and six-story standards would happen. Ms. Dietz showed a map of the area in question between Leary and Gilman. She asked the DRB for some recommendations on how to get from three stories to six in the buildings in this area. Mr. Krueger said it was hard to consider how to transition from three to six stories within what appears to be a skinny, half-block area.

Mr. Meade asked where the height limit was in place. Ms. Dietz noted that the limit goes from the Justice White House and goes up to 80<sup>th</sup> Street, which is the top end of the Historic District. The height limit was created in 2000, and property owners at the time were very interested in maintaining the allowed height in Old Town. She noted that the three-story limit could be expanded into certain blocks where there appears to be a conflict of height limits. Mr. Meade said that would be preferable rather than trying to create a setback within a half block between three and six-story buildings. Mr. Nichols said it would make more sense to apply the height limit to whole block rather than split it between six and three. Mr. Meade said four stories might work rather than six. That would keep the pedestrian experiences the same.

Mr. Fischer asked staff if the recommendation was to go a full half-block back from Leary with a three-story limit and then begin to step up to higher levels on the Gilman half of the block, or if the setback would happen more on the Leary side. Ms. Stiteler said both scenarios are possible. Mr. Palmquist said he liked the idea of leaving the transition at the mid-block area between three and six stories. He said letting the buildings be three and six stories could be an option, without a transition. He said those

masses were not too out of line with each other. In some places where a lot line goes down the middle, six stories might not be as good of an option, so the three-story limit in those cases might be better. Lower roof spaces can be nice for upper floor building amenities. Mr. Palmquist said without laying on more requirements and leaving the Code as it is, the Core could see more building design variety. Mr. Sutton agreed that the Code should stay as it is. He asked if the intent is to encourage development of these sites. If the buildings are limited to three stories, it would not always be worth it for a new developer.

Mr. Krueger said a massing study might need to be done to see what the recommendations would look like. He asked if there would be a possibility for a hybrid Code where some incentives would be given for buildings of increased height. He wanted to make sure developers would have some interest in restoring the older buildings in the Core. He was concerned that the height of stories is not laid out clearly in the Code, and some buildings with taller stories could unintentionally create a disparity of heights. He said he was having a hard time visualizing how this would affect the Historic Core. Ms. Dietz said staff is considering a massing study. She asked if one of the questions should be to call out specific heights for three and six-story buildings. Mr. Krueger said it would be crucial to set some sort of height limits. Mr. Nichols said if three and six story buildings were allowed without a transition, it could create a wall of six-story buildings against the three-story buildings. Mr. O'Hara said this raised a number massing questions.

Mr. Meade said a massing study would be a good idea, and said having a height limit would be important for the Historic Core. He said setting those standards could help shape the character of the neighborhood. Ms. Dietz said these comments would help guide staff's process going forward. She asked about the roofline recommendations made earlier. Mr. Meade said shed roofs have no business in the Historic Core and flat roofs and parapets should be used. Anything else would be out of place. Mr. Sutton asked about the building cap and if roof access should be required for gardening. He asked if that type of requirement would bring developers something in return, because making a rooftop garden can be very expensive. Mr. Meade echoed Mr. Sutton's sentiments. Mr. Fischer verified with all the DRB members that they felt the same way about shed roofs.

Ms. Dietz asked about the building height limits and where the six-story limit should be extended in the Core, or where three stories should be required. Mr. Meade said the massing study should help answer this concern. He said going from three stories to six could be a big jump in some areas. He said he was in favor of reducing the height limit to three stories around the historic garage building. Around Ashley's Attic and Victor's, he did not have a preference, in that those buildings would likely be renovated soon. Mr. Krueger said a massing study throughout the Core, showing the current regulations and the proposed changes, would help guide the discussion. Ms. Dietz said the study would take some time and might happen after the review with the Planning Commission. She asked if the DRB would like to see that study before the height issue goes before the Planning Commission. Mr. Krueger and all the members of the DRB said yes. Ms. Dietz said she would be back with the study for the DRB soon.

## **PROJECT REVIEW**

### **LAND-2015-00654, Seluca Building**

**Description:** Master Sign Program

**Location:** 8630 164<sup>th</sup> Ave NE

**Applicant:** Melina Guerrero *with* Amigo Arts LLC

**Staff Contact:** Carl McCarthy, 425-556-2412 or [cmcarthy@redmond.gov](mailto:cmcarthy@redmond.gov)

Mr. McCarthy said staff is recommending approval of this Sign Program. He showed the DRB the maps, illustrations, and building elevations of the project. The Redmond Zoning Code 2144010-G-11 states that from multiple building complexes and multiple tenant buildings, signs shall be based on a uniform sign concept approved by the DRB which will be known as the approved Sign Program. All subsequent tenant signs at that location must conform to that program in addition to the sign review criteria defined in the Sign Program. Staff has made some tweaks on this Sign Program and Mr. McCarthy has no issues with it. He would recommend approval from the DRB. He clarified that one sign that will be vertical based on the material of the building. The other two signs are horizontal, again, based on building material. The vertical sign is in a unique corner area of the building. The sign wraps around two sides of the building. Staff believes this is appropriate.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked if there were only three signs proposed for the building on the west side. Mr. McArthy noted there were no signs on the north elevation. On the south, there is a sign that wraps around the building.
- Mr. McArthy said a sign could be put on the north and another one could go on the south with regard to the Sign Code. The owner of the property has not made that recommendation, and the amount of signs was understated, in Mr. McArthy's opinion.

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS TO APPROVE LAND-2015-00654, SELUCA BUILDING MASTER SIGN PROGRAM, WITH THE STANDARD PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES CONDITIONS. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).**

**PROJECT REVIEW**

**LAND-2015-00690, Oppidan – NE 24<sup>th</sup> & NE 152<sup>nd</sup> Ave**

**Description:** Tenant remodel with minor west and north façade modifications

**Location:** 15301 NE 24<sup>th</sup> Street

**Applicant:** Brad Potestio *with* Oppidan

**Staff Contact:** Dennis Lisk, 425-556-2471 or [dwlisk@redmond.gov](mailto:dwlisk@redmond.gov)

Mr. Fischer spoke on Mr. Lisk's behalf for the staff presentation. This project has been before the DRB before as a pre-application. This project is in Overlake Village and is the former Office Depot location. Right now, it is two tenant spaces and will be converted into a single tenant space for Orchard Supply. Mr. Fischer noted that the staff report indicated that this would be a pre-application, but the agenda for tonight's meeting indicates that this would be an approval if the Board believes it is ready. Mr. Fischer said this project was received favorably by the DRB at the last meeting. The proposal involves a modest change to the front façade of the building. Overall, staff supports the application and the modification and is recommending approval of the site plan, colors, materials, and landscaping as presented.

Architect Paul Reed presented on behalf of the applicant with Roger Bernstein of Oppidan Investment Company. The applicant noted that there were no requirements to change the site plan with this project. The focus is on the building alone. The current building is bland, plain, and ugly, and the plan is to give it a facelift. The plan is to keep the existing colonnade, which has structural implications, for outside displays. The proposed elevation has a gable incorporated into the existing colonnade. The small two-foot wall on the existing storefront will be extended to the full height of the storefront in the section underneath the gable. Any other storefront that can be replaced with new storefront will involve taking out the short wall. There is a small section of sheer wall that will be required to replace some parts of the storefront, but otherwise, the plan is to open up visibility into the space.

On the east side of the building, there are new openings into the new indoor nursery. On the north side, some new openings have been added as well that would be surrounded with wrought iron fencing. The applicant said it was a simple concept, but it would enhance the building quite a lot. To the right of the gable, there is a shed roof canopy and some outdoor display areas. The other three elevations, north, south, and east, will have a fresh coat of a vibrant color of paint. The gable is centered on two existing pilasters of the colonnade, and those pilasters are wrapped in a new structure that is clad in corrugated steel.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

Mr. Nichols:

- Said the project was a big step up from the current site. Mr. Nichols said he was good with this proposal.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the color program. The applicant said there would be brown and green colors throughout. Around the columns, the gray corrugated metal would provide a different color. The gable

is part of the new Orchard branding with an open wood truss and standing seam roof. Each column will have a light on it.

- The applicant said the standing seam shed roof to the right of the gable is also part of the national branding. The shed roof was not able to move to the other side due to seismic upgrade concerns. To tie that roof to the project, the colors of the frontage have been coordinated appropriately.
- The north side, to the left of the entry colonnade, will have wrought iron in front of the nursery and on other openings around the building as well. The parking lot will be restriped and the landscaping will be freshened up with native plantings.
- Mr. Krueger said he liked the project. Mr. Palmquist and Mr. Sutton agreed.

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE LAND-2015-00690, OPPIDAN – NE 24<sup>TH</sup> & NE 152<sup>ND</sup> AVE, WITH THE STANDARD PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES CONDITIONS. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).**

### **PRE-APPLICATION**

#### **LAND-2015-00874, Redmond Triangle**

**Description:** Proposal includes combining four parcels and a new six-story mixed-use building with two levels of parking

**Location:** 16450 NE Redmond Way

**Applicant:** Kate Miller with Tiscareno Associates

**Staff Contact:** Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or [glee@redmond.gov](mailto:glee@redmond.gov)

Mr. Lee said this was the first pre-application for this project, which is bounded by 79<sup>th</sup> Street on the north, 166<sup>th</sup> on the east, and Redmond Way on the south. This is a redevelopment of the entire block. Staff has put some constraints on this property by requiring some additional right of way dedication on Redmond Way. About 15 to 17 feet of dedication will be required on the frontage on Redmond Way, which is substantial. This creates a unique parcel in its size and shape and a good design will be required. Staff found what appears to be a computer graphic error on one part of the ground floor. The live/work units on the ground floor may be a deviation that the DRB would have to approve or could be part of the residential standard for units on that street. Staff has a minor concern over the light yellow color presented, which may be a graphic error as well. Many deviations have been requested, including a tree exception request to remove more trees than are allowed.

The balconies extend over the right of way, which would require a deviation as well. A reduction in the requirement of the balconies has been proposed. The requirement is that a minimum of 50% of the units should have balconies. A request for a waiver for the fee on the deviation has been made. Staff cannot waive that fee, but there could be a reduction in the size, shape, and quantity of the balconies. There is also a request for a cantilever that is more than five feet over the sidewalk. Five feet is the general allowance for projections. In a couple of spaces, there is a request for closer to ten feet over a 14-foot sidewalk. A small deviation has been requested for a garage at the back of the sidewalk as opposed to having a garage separated by commercial use. There is also a request for the residential lobbies and leasing spaces to be on the ground floor. The Code does not allow residential uses on the commercial street front, but this would be the leasing space and amenity space, not an actual residential unit. That should not be considered a deviation. In general, staff is excited about this project. The applicant appears to be going in the right direction, and the deviations requested are minor issues.

Mr. Krueger clarified that the live/work units where residential uses are allowed on the streets proposed, but residential units that are not live/work have to be set back and stepped up, like brownstones, in general. Mr. Lee noted that the units proposed are not traditional brownstones, and are stepped back and raised up. They are live/work units like the Mile House project nearby. Mr. Lee said this was not a bad concept, but it needs clarification with regard to whether or not a deviation is needed.

Bob Tiscareno, the project architect, presented on behalf of the applicant. He said he would review site analysis, design precedents, massing views, and requested deviations in his presentation. The site is 40,199 square feet, and multi-family, residential, general sales and services uses are allowed. The applicant is proposing a six-story mixed-use building with 182 residential apartment units, seven live/work units, and 6,000 square feet of retail. There will also be two levels of below-grade parking. Blocks within

Downtown Redmond have four sides, but this site is triangular and bordered by Redmond Way to the south, NE 79<sup>th</sup> to the north, and 166<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the east. The site is within the Anderson Park Zone and Old Town Zone is to the west. The massing studies show the applicant can build out to the property lines on all sides of the envelope. Six stories of development would be allowed via the Green Building program and mixed-use development is encouraged by the City.

Developing with a triangular site is challenging and affects the parking layout, retail space, residential units, and general access. The site is generally flat and has long frontages on two streets. Today, the site has many existing curb cuts and narrow sidewalks. There is one-way traffic on Redmond Way and two-way traffic on other streets. Most of the present buildings surrounding the site are set back from the sidewalk and there are small parking lots facing the street. Future development is expected to the north and east of the applicant's site.

The site is widening Redmond Way for two-way traffic, which will increase the commercial visibility of the site at two corners. The sidewalk along 166<sup>th</sup> will be widened as well, which will cause a 22% reduction in the size of the site area. The creation of a wide sidewalk will allow for a future bus stop and curbside parking. The opportunity is to take advantage of the three corners on the site and strengthen the pedestrian character along each street. The hope is to develop the site for the full potential and provide the density that is allowed, create vehicular access to 79<sup>th</sup>, and create views for residential units where possible. To do this, some deviations to Code will be needed.

The site is near a future light rail station, Redmond Town Center, and Anderson Park. Many of the buildings near the site have been recently built. New and mixed-use buildings define the street edge. The proposal focuses on the site's relationship to the street front, having a good pedestrian experience, developing a unified architectural concept, orientation, scale, and treatment of blank walls. The courtyard amenities and active pedestrian street edges speak to the blank wall concerns.

The massing shows a triangular-shaped building at the base with retail and lobby spaces along the edge. The residential floors above include a courtyard to break up massing along Redmond Way. Thus, two distinct massing expressions are created on Redmond Way. The three corners are articulated with shifting rooflines and create an identifiable building. The massing addresses desired neighborhood scale. At the intersection of Redmond Way and 166<sup>th</sup>, the massing has been shifted back to the corner. The second level courtyard includes a community club room. There is a small roof deck proposed on the sixth floor. Looking southwest along 79<sup>th</sup>, the massing is pushed up to the street. The scale is broken up with balconies and deeper recesses. The corner of 79<sup>th</sup> and 166<sup>th</sup> is very visible, and applicant considers this a portal to the city.

On Redmond Way, the ground floor will include retail and live/work units at the three corners. Residential amenities like a lobby and leasing spaces are included. On 79<sup>th</sup>, live/work units are better suited to relate to residential homes across the street. Two vehicular entries are on 79<sup>th</sup>. The west entry access connects to two levels of below-grade parking. The one on the east accesses a hotel-style parking court. There are 20 stalls for use during the day. Loading, trash, and services are accesses from the interior, not the street. Live/work units wrap around the northeast corner and create a transition between the sidewalk and the residential units. Some units are slightly higher than the sidewalk, but ADA access is provided to all areas. The residential units will have secure access and bike parking.

The residence area has a courtyard that is about 3,600 square feet. There are other amenity spaces off the court, including a clubhouse. On the north edge, there are three significant setbacks to provide modulation. Mezzanine units have been proposed at the corners. Pending code compliance, a roof deck and patios for the units will be provided. The residential units will have good views into the courtyard.

One challenge in developing a high density building is maximizing parking at or just below grade. There are limits to going below ground in terms of the water table. The lobby has been set back off of Redmond Way, which will allow for a planter that would create a buffer. The courtyard has direct access to a clubhouse amenity. The applicant said this project was still early in the process, but he showed a concept of how the project's façade related to the street. He said the main corner could be likened to the Triangle Pub in Seattle's Pioneer Square. The corner will have a two-story retail space and will angle towards the

sidewalk. Glazing will continue from the corner up through all the floors, but another material such as a panel will be used on the sides as a way to provide contrast. On the 79<sup>th</sup> Street side, there will be extended balconies.

At the opposite corner, along Redmond way and 166<sup>th</sup>, the architecture is less dramatic, but there is a strong edge at the sidewalk with projections over the right of way. The retail stores and lobby will have street level transparency. The clubhouse amenity will be like a pavilion, engaging with the sidewalk and the retail units across the street from the site. Window openings and deck recesses add articulation in the horizontal and vertical direction. On 79<sup>th</sup> and 166<sup>th</sup>, the design language reacts to the concept of streets that are not as busy. The transparency at the lower level is evident on all corners. The architectural screening will integrate services. The roofline is lower at this corner, and the deep modulating bays will reduce the massing.

Tom Rengstorf, the landscape architect, next presented on behalf of the applicant. This will be a fairly urban site. The planting standards call for tree grates along the streets. But along 166<sup>th</sup>, because there is no parking allowed, denser planting will be called for. Planting bulbs will be placed at the entrances to the garages and at the corners, too. The types of trees will be more columnar along the narrower sidewalk, allowing a view from the balconies behind them. Redmond standards applying to massing will be applied to the project to make final decisions on tree species. On the second level amenity courtyard space will have plantings, as well as the six by ten-foot private patios. A screen buffer planting will go along the edge of Redmond Way. A fire pit could be used on the courtyard, and the courtyard itself can be divided into at least two spaces. Roof gardens are not allowed in this space, according to Redmond Code, but the applicant would like to include this amenity.

Kate Miller with Tiscareno Associates next spoke on behalf of the applicant. The applicant would like to have balconies over the sidewalk on 79<sup>th</sup> to provide some interest on the long façade as well as desired exterior space along the fire street. The applicant is also asking for a reduction in the requirement for private balconies. The applicant thinks too many balconies will complicate a building of this scale. The applicant would also like to provide smaller balconies that what the Code calls for. The courtyard and possible roof deck would offset this need. Alternative Juliet balconies should provide the desired natural light and ventilation while avoiding decks that might be used for storage. The applicant is asking for an increased cantilever over the right of way at the corner of 79<sup>th</sup> and 166<sup>th</sup> to provide a stronger corner expression.

Along Redmond Way, the applicant is looking into having the clubhouse amenity extend further beyond the allowable five-foot limit to ten feet as a way to strengthen the lobby and entry expression. The last deviation is a request for parking frontage along 79<sup>th</sup> and Redmond Way. As mentioned, the high groundwater and the triangular shape are restricting underground parking. The applicant is compliant along 166<sup>th</sup>, so overall the garage frontage is less than 10% of the façade on all three street faces. The applicant is looking into developing creative design solutions to enhance these areas with special screening to play with light or possibly add a sculptural element.

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

##### Mr. Sutton:

- Said he was in favor of the deviations, especially in regard to all the property the applicant had to give up due to street and sidewalk widening. Mr. Sutton said the requests were reasonable.
- He would like to see more study on the primary corner of the site and how the pieces would come together, which is not apparent to him at this time. He liked the massing and the recesses that have been drawn up. He appreciates the bold ideas throughout the site and said he was happy with the project.

##### Mr. Palmquist:

- Said the massing is off to a good start, especially on a difficult site. Mr. Palmquist was in favor of the deviations requested. He said the facades along the street are fine and the massing looks good, especially along 79<sup>th</sup>.

- He said the corner at 79<sup>th</sup> is the best example of a corner element he would approve of. He said the top is a bit undetermined, so how that element works out will be important. Other corners need more work, especially on the lower right-hand corner of the site.
- He said the prominent corner has a sliver of roof that needs to have a different shape or be occupied, possibly, by a residential unit. In general, he was in favor of this project.

Mr. Krueger:

- Said the project looked awesome and would be a great portal to the City. Mr. Krueger liked the massing along Redmond Way, especially with the clubhouse element. He asked about the awnings along Redmond Way and he would like to see more details on them.
- He said the lower right-hand corner of the site could need more work and more explanation in order for the DRB to grant a deviation there. He said the project was off to a great start.

Mr. Nichols:

- Said this was a challenging and unique site. Mr. Nichols said, with regard to the amount of property the applicant was giving to the City, there would be an opportunity to grant the deviations requested. He liked the modulation and the massing overall.
- Mr. Nichols said he was looking forward to seeing some high-quality materials proposed for the project as well as more details on the roof elements. He said this project was off to a great start.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked about the colors that Mr. Lee had expressed concern about earlier. The applicant said they were for illustration purposes only and did not reflect the actual colors.
- Mr. Meade said he was in line with his colleagues and their comments. He really liked the courtyard element. He was in favor of the minor deviation for the clubhouse element if it continues to be a dramatic, strong piece.
- He said the lower right-hand corner of the site could use more refinement, as mentioned earlier. He said the courtyard was a master stroke and would help bring light into the project. He confirmed with the DRB that everyone was in favor of the deviations presented.

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**LAND-2015-00895, Genie B17/B18**

**Description:** A 5,000 square foot showroom addition to an existing building on the west campus (Building 18). The showroom will be used for display of Genie products. As part of this project an enclosed second level walkway is proposed to connect the second level of Building 17 to Building 18.

**Location:** 4200 150<sup>th</sup> Ave NE

**Applicant:** Jason Anderson *with* JPC Architects

**Staff Contact:** Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or [glee@redmond.gov](mailto:glee@redmond.gov)

Mr. Lee said this was a minor change to an existing building for the Genie project. A showroom would be added to the site to store the company's lifts. Staff says this is a nice addition to the site and staff supports moving this project on and having the applicant file an application.

Architect Jason Anderson spoke on behalf of the applicant. Genie has a campus at 6464 185<sup>th</sup> on the east business campus. The company is consolidating out of a lot of their buildings into one campus headquarters. The proposal for this pre-application is to create a showroom and a connection bridge between two buildings, Building 17 and 18. The showroom would be 5,000 square feet and would serve as a space to show clients Genie's lifts and equipment. The site plan shows how the addition would nestle into the existing site. The landscaping will be simple. Most of what is in place will remain and any dead or dying plants would be replaced. The landscaping will be improved on the sides of the site with grasscrete to allow for driving in and out of the project.

The existing building is a concrete tilt-up with paneled lines. The applicant plans to play off those lines and use an aluminum panel to set off the showroom element. The lines would carry through from the existing building onto the new building. The panels would mimic the color of the existing architecture but would be slightly different in texture. Glass canopies and glazing would set off the showroom and give a view of a "jewel box" of lifts. The connection between the two buildings would be a skywalk. The idea is to move

quickly between the two buildings at their upper levels. The hope is to make the showroom a simple steel structure. There is an existing covered walkway adjacent to the project connecting Building 18 to the site, and the detail of that walkway would be mimicked in the skywalk.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

Mr. Krueger:

- Said this building would not be visible from the public right of way. The applicant confirmed that was true. Mr. Krueger said even if this building were visible, the applicant has done a great job of extending it off the existing building and connecting colors and materials.
- Mr. Krueger said this project was ready for approval with a little more detail on the landscaping.

Mr. Nichols:

- Said this was an attractive building that fits in well with the site. Mr. Nichols said the glass canopies classed up the showroom quite a bit. He said the generator outside the building might need some more screening.
- Mr. Nichols said the grasscrete was well placed. He said this project was ready for approval.

Mr. Sutton:

- Liked the design, but asked if a color that did not match the overall building might be considered. Mr. Sutton said beyond that, this project was fine.
- Mr. Palmquist said the project looked good. He echoed Mr. Sutton's thought of displaying a different color for the building.

Mr. Meade:

- Agreed that the showroom could be a plainer, whiter color, possibly. Mr. Meade said this project looked like a BMW showroom. He recommended that the applicant check out some of those showrooms locally for ideas about color.
- He said the grasscrete was well placed and the Genie blue corporate color looked cool. At the next meeting, he asked the applicant to show some ideas about screening the generator, providing some different color ideas, and showing an example of the materials. He said the project was ready for approval.
- The applicant confirmed that the landscaping plan at the next meeting should include some detail about how to screen the generator on the site with an evergreen plant.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:55 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).**

**July 2, 2015**

---

**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

*Susan Trapp*

---

**RECORDING SECRETARY**