

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

June 4, 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, Scott Waggoner

**EXCUSED ABSENCE:** Mike Nichols

**STAFF PRESENT:** Steve Fischer, Manager; Ben Sticka, Planner

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Susan Trapp *with* Lady of Letters, Inc.

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Chair David Scott Meade at 7:00 p.m.

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**LAND-2015-00596, Redmond Hotel**

**Description:** New 124-room hotel on approximately 1.8 acre commercial parcel

**Location:** 7045 180<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE

**Applicant:** Matt Hough *with* CPH Consultants

**Staff Contact:** Ben Sticka, 425-556-2470

Mr. Sticka noted that this was the first pre-application meeting for this project. The applicant is proposing a new three-story, 124-room hotel. The hotel meets minimum Code requirements regarding parking, setbacks, height, and lot coverage. Staff believes there are several opportunities to enhance the existing building as proposed. Staff would like the Board's input on the following items:

1. The possibility of orienting the building closer to 180<sup>th</sup> Avenue
2. Variations in the building height along the front and rear elevations
3. The possibility for eyebrows or shade covers on a portion of the guest windows
4. The possible extension of roof materials
5. The addition of modulation along the front façade to add visual interest
6. The addition of trees in the parking lot.

Matt Hough spoke on behalf of the applicant, as well as Mike Nielson with West 77 Partners. Mr. Nielson noted that the brand of this hotel has gone through a transition in the last six months. The brand is now WoodSpring Suites, and was started by the originator of Residence Inn. There are 200 WoodSpring Hotels along the East Coast and in the Midwest, as well as a handful of operations in the West. The developer has obtained the rights to build these hotels in Washington State in locations including Redmond, Everett, and Tukwila.

The hotels offer an extended stay to clients, and the average stay in a WoodSpring suite is 29 days. Many are transitory workers starting off at a location like Microsoft, for example, while they look for a more permanent home. The exterior of the hotel is based on WoodSpring branding. These hotels are usually four stories tall, but this project has been reduced to three due to the zoning of this location on 180<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The hope is to bring in a Northwest theme with some modern elements. The exterior is a slight modification of the WoodSpring prototype.

The applicant noted that a formal presentation had not been created. The site plan is under development right now, and the schedule is to come in with a more detailed submittal in the week following this DRB meeting. The applicant is hoping to get some feedback from the DRB that could help inform the submittal ahead. The applicant said this was a suburban hotel, which is slightly different than a major urban hotel. Parking is mainly on the surface as a way to avoid major excavation and concerns over the water table. The applicant said there are multiple facets of materials that are aesthetically pleasing and efficient in their use and application. Panels have been used in the upper areas of the project. Hardy panel and stone are the other major elements used.

The front of the hotel has an awning that is a flat roof with a modern look. Some timber elements have been added to give a Northwest theme. Roofing materials will include asphalt shingles. A standing seam roof will go on top of the awning with a slight slope to it to allow for drainage. The rear of the hotel sits up against the green belt along 180<sup>th</sup>. The hotel does not have a pool and most of the activity is concentrated to the front of the building. Access to the back of the hotel is very limited, by design. In response to staff's concerns to move this project closer to 180<sup>th</sup>, the applicant thought his proposal worked best to get the parking needed and also answer landscaping requirements.

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

##### Mr. Sutton:

- Would like to see more interest around the front awning element. Mr. Sutton said some of the improvements involving stone on the back of the building might be better used on the front. The applicant said that could be a good idea.
- Mr. Sutton said the flat roof at the entry might need to be reconsidered. A truss element or another idea could add some more interest, in his opinion.
- He said the colors and materials were fine, but overall, Mr. Sutton said more work should be done on the front of the building.

##### Mr. Palmquist:

- Said the flat roof on the front awning did not fit with the rest of the project. Mr. Palmquist said with the long elevations, the gable ends involve two sets of windows. This design might work in better proportion with four windows or something with bigger massing. He said these elements need to pop out a bit more.
- Mr. Palmquist liked the color scheme.

##### Mr. Meade:

- Liked Mr. Palmquist's idea to expand the gables to include four windows bays. Mr. Meade said the roofline should be raised so it does not dive into the wall. He said more depth was needed in the modulation of the design.
- He said the "eyes" of this project were too far apart, and something was needed between them to add some visual interest. He noted that the design needed more development and interest, especially around the front entry. The applicant said a cedar-like product was what he was looking for. Mr. Meade said the best cedar product was cedar itself.
- Mr. Meade said the color scheme seemed appropriate, but the gables might need the lap siding all the way up rather than the panel material. He said keeping the gables a darker color might be more powerful for the overall design.
- Mr. Meade said there was more opportunity to add detail, perhaps above the upper windows with a color change or something that would add more pop.
- He did not like the flat roof on the front awning, and suggested a pitched roof. He agreed with Mr. Sutton's suggestion to use the money spent on the stone element in the back to the front, which could possibly mean the use of real cedar at the front entry.
- The applicant asked if a butterfly roof would be appropriate for the front element as a way to add a modern look. Mr. Meade said the applicant could explore that at the next meeting. That could change the roofline around the front element. Mr. Meade said more changes to improve the front entry would be welcome.

- Mr. Meade asked about the banding between the lap siding and the upper panels. He suggested dropping that panel such that it would become a head trim for the second floor windows. Mr. Meade asked if EIFS panels, suggested in the design, were the best choice. The applicant said those panels might be best in terms of the requirements of the energy code.
- Mr. Meade said another panel material would be acceptable, or stucco. The applicant said his knowledge of Northwest design was that stucco might not be best for this location. Mr. Meade said a hardy panel, such as Swisspearl, could work for this building and would be better than EIFS, which can capture moisture.

Mr. Krueger:

- Said the most modern feature of the project is the roof over the front awning. Beyond that, Mr. Krueger did not see that modern design anywhere else throughout the building. He said a shed roof, or butterfly roof, might be a good idea.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the landscape plan on the project. The applicant said he did not have a full landscape plan, but that it is in development. He said water-efficient plantings would be used.
- Mr. Sticka noted that landscaping is required at the end of every row of ten parking places. Sixteen spaces are shown in the current design. There is some landscaping in the center of these spaces. One tree is required within the interior landscape areas for every four parking stalls, and that is not reflected in the plans right now. The applicant said he would meet the standard requirements.
- The applicant is working on this site with the knowledge that a major road project will be underway soon on 180<sup>th</sup> which will take away some of the right of way outside the hotel. That is the main reason the project is set back where it is off of 180<sup>th</sup>.
- Mr. Fischer asked if the right of way would impact the project's parking. The applicant said when the right of way was taken the site would be able to remain where it is.
- Mr. Fischer said he would be interested in how the applicant orients the parking lot around the main structure. Redmond's design standards speak to moving parking more to the rear rather than in front. The applicant said moving the parking would be difficult in light of the different constraints on this project. Mr. Fischer said some of the parking could be moved to the back, but not all of it.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the design guidelines in the area around the hotel that deal with parking. He noted that there are some very urban buildings in this suburban location, and many of those locations have their parking lots in back. He said having more private space behind the building could speak to the idea of an extended stay for guests and a second home, of sorts.
- The applicant said the lobby is in the front of the building, and having more parking in the back would involve guests walking around the entire building. He said the comments were well taken, however.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Said the entry to the building appears to be more of a pedestrian entrance, and could be improved. Mr. Waggoner said an extended awning, or porte-cochere, could be considered for the main entry drive aisle to make a stronger design statement.
- He said lining up landscape islands between each row of parking could help create a pedestrian path from the hotel to 180<sup>th</sup> and the rest of Redmond. The applicant asked if a porte-cochere would improve the design. Mr. Meade said the porte-cochere, plus more landscaping, could improve the entry. The applicant said he would see if a porte-cochere would fit in the hotel branding.
- The applicant said a path between 180<sup>th</sup> and the hotel, along with the porte-cochere, would create a safer, more inviting way to bring guests into the building.
- Mr. Waggoner agreed with Mr. Palmquist about adding more windows under the gables to create some modulation, especially at the front entrance. Mr. Waggoner said the siding elements should be coordinated between the front and sides of the building. The applicant said more cedar could be added throughout the design, as well.
- Mr. Meade suggested adding some stone. The applicant said the sides of the project could indeed echo the center of the project in a more direct way. Mr. Waggoner said the upper bay at the center of the hotel could pop out a bit more to add some visual interest.
- Mr. Waggoner said having similar roofs between the porte-cochere and the main building would help tie the project together.

- Mr. Meade said the gables in the front could match up more closely with the gables on the sides. The applicant said he would look into that idea as well as a reverse shed roof, an expansion of the gable size, and other concepts brought up by the DRB.
- The applicant asked the DRB and staff if the porte-cochere concept would help answer the concern about bringing the hotel closer to 180<sup>th</sup>, or if parking had to be moved in the back. Mr. Fischer said the design standards checklist would be a good guideline, and that checklist would suggest moving the parking spaces. He said parking should be a major focus for the applicant.

#### **PRE-APPLICATION**

##### **LAND-2015-00489, 166<sup>th</sup> Avenue Townhomes**

**Description:** The project is 18 three-story townhomes to be constructed in four buildings of four and five units each.

**Location:** 166<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE & NE 85<sup>th</sup> St.

**Applicant:** Ashworth Homes. LLC

**Staff Contact:** Ben Sticka, 425-556-2470

Mr. Sticka said this was the second pre-application for this project. The last meeting for this project was on April 2, 2015. At that time, the board was supportive of the proposal, but did have questions related to the cedar veneer material proposed. There was also a question about the height of the material on the exterior of the patio railings. The applicant has added a few colors to the elevations that were previously wood veneer. Purple, green, red and blue have been proposed, and staff would like the DRB's opinions on those colors.

Architect Dan Umbach spoke on behalf of the applicant. He said there were no major changes to this project since the DRB last saw it, but some minor details have been added. Some modifications have been made to preserve some trees on the site, and some low-income units have now been proposed. In the earlier version of the plan, the back corner would have been re-graded. That area will not be graded in the new design as a way to preserve trees and thus the ground will not come up to the second floor level. The low-income units are the same as the others, but are smaller and have decks in the back rather than on the roof. A parking place on the north side of the building, close to a retaining wall, is now more difficult to access due to the plan to preserve trees. The plan just barely meets Fire Code requirements for parking and access.

The Code allows the applicant to substitute a certain amount of street parking for onsite parking. Six new parking spaces will be created on the south side of 85<sup>th</sup>. The design of the unit near this retaining wall may have to be adjusted. All of the units have a gray hardy panel siding with cedar elements on the units that are visible from the drive aisle and the street. Each unit has a secondary color in its hardy lap siding, which would involve darker but muted colors. The bright colors are used on the garage doors.

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

##### **Mr. Meade:**

- Liked the body colors, but was not fond of the purple that was used. Mr. Meade asked if this project was ready for approval. Mr. Sticka said this project would have to come back again because it was not all the way through the PREP process.
- The applicant said he was hoping for approval to submit for the site plan, and he was not sure what the process was going forward. He confirmed with staff that he was close to the end of the PREP process, and he did not see any significant changes to the design.
- The applicant noted this property had a condo building designed for it five years ago, so part of the process has already been established. The only issues ahead were establishing proper site triangles on the property and de-watering the site, which he did not believe would impact building design.
- Mr. Meade asked about the railings, which was a concern at the last meeting. The applicant said the material that was used on the railing was meant to tie into the cedar elements. Mr. Meade said the new railing looked good and had a good, urban look.
- The DRB had no other comments to make on the project, and Mr. Meade said the project was ready for approval. Mr. Fischer confirmed that the issues of colors and decking were covered with the DRB.

**PROJECT REVIEW:**

**Gates of Redmond and Old Redmond**

**Description:** The repainting of two older apartment complexes

**Location:** 15325 Redmond Way, 7001 Old Redmond Road

Mr. Fischer talked to the DRB about two apartment complexes near each other in Redmond that are contemplating a change in colors. Due to a computer problem, the materials were not immediately available, and Mr. Fischer said the meeting would have to be adjourned. Mr. Meade noted that, in general, repainting projects should not end colors on an outside or inside corner.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:13 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).**

**MR. MEADE RECONVENED THE MEETING AT 8:20 P.M. AFTER MR. FISCHER OBTAINED THE MATERIALS IN QUESTION REGARDING THE REPAINTING PROJECT.**

**PROJECT REVIEW:**

**Gates of Redmond and Olde Redmond**

**Description:** The repainting of two older apartment complexes

**Location:** 15325 Redmond Way, 7001 Old Redmond Road

Mr. Fischer said the applicant is repainting two older apartment building complexes, Gates of Redmond and Olde Redmond, which are surrounded by trees and not seen very easily from the street. The existing colors are a combination of red, white, orange, beige, and a dark olive color. The proposal is two groups of colors set in pairs, and Mr. Fischer displayed these colors to the DRB. For the Gates of Redmond, one half of the building would have one color combination, involving a yellow color, and the other half would have the other color combination, involving green. Mr. Fischer showed how the different buildings on the site would be affected and the lighter color that would be used on the trim. Mr. Waggoner confirmed that the first floor was a darker color and that the upper floors were a lighter color. Mr. Fischer said one additional group of colors would be used on the Olde Redmond complex, but it would be in line with the Gates of Redmond project. Mr. Meade said the colors were fairly subtle, and he noted that this was a very private location. Staff is recommending approval of color changes at interior corners.

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WAGGONER AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO APPROVE THE COLOR CHANGES FOR GATES OF REDMOND AND OLDE REDMOND, WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE COLOR CHANGES OCCUR AT INTERIOR CORNERS. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MR. MEADE RE-ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 8:30 P.M.**

**July 16, 2015**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

*Susan Trapp*

\_\_\_\_\_  
**RECORDING SECRETARY**