CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
March 21, 2013

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, Arielle Crowder, Kevin Sutton, Craig Krueger, Mike Nichols, Scott Waggoner

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Mike Nichols

STAFF PRESENT: Steven Fischer, Principal Planner; Dennis Lisk, Associate Planner; Gary Lee, Senior Planner; Carl McArthy, Code Enforcement 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 MEETING MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2013 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (6-0).

IT WAS MOVED MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 21, 2013 MEETING WITH TWO REVISIONS. THE SPELLING OF MICHAEL CHEN'S NAME WAS INCORRECT (CHAN). MR. CHEN, WHO IS WORKING WITH THE APPLICANT ON THE 24-HOUR FITNESS PROJECT, IS ALSO NOT AN ARCHITECT, AS WAS INCORRECTLY NOTED IN THE MINUTES. WITH THESE REVISIONS, THE MOTION WAS APPROVED (6-0).

SIGN PROGRAM
LAND 2013-00446, Microsoft Redmond Master Sign Program
Description: Adopt a new coordinated Master Sign Program for the several Microsoft campuses located within the city limits of Redmond
Location: One Microsoft Way
Applicant: Merill Leonard *with* Gensler and Nick Lenington *with* Microsoft
Staff Contact: Carl McArthy, 425-556-2412 or cmcarthy@redmond.gov

Mr. Waggoner recused himself from this section of the agenda. Mr. McArthy noted that this was the first time Microsoft has had a Master Sign Program encompassing all the campuses in Redmond. Staff has been meeting with the applicant for several months. Mr. McArthy has listed out the Redmond Zoning Code sections referred to in the project. The Code says that, for multiple building complexes such as Microsoft, signs are based on a uniform sign concept, which is approved by the DRB. All subsequent signage would meet the criteria within the Sign Program. The applicant is proposing to adopt a new coordinated Master Sign Program for all campuses located in Redmond. The City has worked with the applicant and multiple design professionals for each of these properties. Staff believes the proposal is appropriate for the site and is recommending approval for the Microsoft Sign Program with one minor condition. The condition is that the final design of the primary "design plus" sign, the largest sign, which currently doesn't meet Sign Code, will require more work. Staff has come up with three or four different possibilities to keep the sign the same size, but the sign would either have gaps or space so that it meets Code. Staff is asking for approval, except that the one sign will need to be redesigned to meet Code. The

final design will be determined in coordination with City of Redmond staff. Mr. McArthy did not want to delay DRB approval due to one sign, as there are 386 signs involved in this project.

Mr. Meade asked about a landscape design noted in the DRB member's packages, and if that was a separate item. Mark Brumbaugh from Brumbaugh and Associates, a landscape architect, noted that some landscaping has been included in this application simply because landscape is integral to one of the signs in a major location. Most of the other signs will have fairly minor landscape improvements around them. Mr. Brumbaugh said he could review those improvements, but they would typically not trigger a permitting process. Mr. McArthy said the landscape plan presented would be representative of other parts of the project. Mr. Krueger asked about the sign Mr. McArthy had noted would require additional staff review. Mr. McArthy said the size of the sign was the only issue with it.

Yusuke Ito from Gensler Architects spoke on behalf of the applicant, and noted that Microsoft updated its logo last year, which meant it was time to update the company's signage system. The existing signs are composed of signs from the past thirty years, which presents a mixture of aesthetics that is no longer reflective of Microsoft. The new sign program hopes to better represent Microsoft in its current state and also have a timeless quality to last for several decades. The other point of the new Sign Program is to provide effective way-finding for visitors, vendors, and employees.

The proposed system is composed of a black metal background and a stainless steel base. Black was chosen to present a neutral color that would work with various scenarios. The metal is an aluminum that has a slight texture to it. The system deals with many different purposes, including a series of gateways welcoming people to the Microsoft campus, vehicular direction signs, and building identification signs. Four tall signs with color symbols are used primarily for visitors as a way to welcome them using the new Microsoft logo. The tall colored signs are within the campus, not at the perimeter. The last set of signs would be directional signs for pedestrians to promote walking rather than using a car or shuttle.

Mr. Ito displayed the large sign Mr. McArthy mentioned, located at the center of the campus at 156th and 40th. As Mr. McArthy said, the applicant will be working with City staff to find a good solution for this sign that meets City Code. Mr. Brumbaugh mentioned that a smaller sign would be lost at a busy arterial such as this one. Mr. Meade noted that a lot of people stop and take pictures in front of this sign, so it should not be undersized. The applicant took the DRB on a visual journey through Microsoft, displaying the welcome signs to begin and then the signs directing people to the east, west, north, and Redwest "neighborhoods" of the campus. The vehicular signs on the site will be larger as well as the letters on those signs. Special signs for the visitor's center have been developed using the Microsoft brand. Mr. Brumbaugh pointed out a special sign on the ground that pedestrians would use.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Ms. Crowder:

- Asked about the lighting and if any of the signs were lit internally. The applicant said the building identification signs have internal illumination of their numbers.
- The applicant said the gateway signs will also be internally illuminated. Seeing no other comments on the project, Mr. Meade asked for a motion.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked if the motion needed to require the condition noted by staff.
- Mr. McArthy said staff would work with the applicant so Microsoft gets the size of the sign it wants, but still has a sign meets Code. He said a small sign would not be appropriate at the gateway area, but the sign also needs to meet Code.
- Three or four different designs suggested by staff have been submitted to Microsoft.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE LAND 2013-00446, MICROSOFT REDMOND MASTER SIGN PROGRAM, WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE DESIGN OF THE LARGEST SIGN WOULD BE WORKED OUT WITH STAFF. MOTION APPROVED (5-0) WITH ONE ABSTENTION.

PROJECT REVIEW
LAND-2013-00178, 18300 NE Union Hill Road Garage
Description: Construction of a new multi-story parking garage to service an existing office park containing multiple buildings. Project is adjacent to Bear Creek.
Location: 18300 NE Union Hill Road
Prior Review Date: 02/07/13
Applicant: Brent Rogers *with* NBBJ
Staff Contact: Dennis Lisk, 425-556-2471, dwlisk@redmond.gov

Mr. Lisk noted that this was the second pre-application meeting for this project. It is a parking garage with about 455 stalls, to be located on the Millennium Office Park property off of Union Hill Road. The garage would be behind two existing buildings on the site and displace some existing spots on the site. It is just to the south of Bear Creek and Evans Creek, which are regulated by the City's Shoreline Management Program. The site is outside of the buffer area for one of the shoreline environments. However, the northwest corner of the garage does protrude into a shoreline environment that would require a 35-foot maximum building height. At the last meeting, the applicant was still finding solutions for that issue, which has now been accomplished. Staff has pointed out a few design issues and considerations for the DRB. Staff is generally pleased with the design of the garage. For a parking garage, there is a good amount of modulation and interruption of horizontal elevations.

The landscaping program for the garage would involve screening around the immediate perimeter of the garage, which Mr. Lisk said is a pretty good planting program. A green screen feature would be utilized on the north and south sides of the garage where there is a section of shared wall. The second main element of the landscaping is to the north of the garage, within the buffer area, where the applicant is planning to remove a substantial amount of invasive vegetation and replacing that with shrubs, trees, and ground cover plants. A trail corridor runs along the north side of the property, and no trees or large shrubs would be allowed in that corridor. The applicant is in the process of revising the mitigation plan for that area. The hope is the trees planted will provide some level of screening in the future for the garage from the north.

Staff is also concerned about the weather protection for the stair tower and elevator tower on the southwest side of the garage. Mr. Lisk spoke from staff experience with a parking garage on the City campus, where the enclosure of the elevator portion is protected from the elements. A similar weather pattern would hit the southwest side of the proposed garage. Staff is recommending for weather protection that the elevator be enclosed with glass. That would not be a requirement of the Code, but that would be the recommendation of staff.

Staff, when considering the lighting plan for the garage, wants to maintain a fairly low level of light for the garage to conform to the shoreline regulations, which require minimal light spill into the shoreline area. Staff is ready to recommend approval of the project in the future, assuming the applicant can answer any questions of the DRB. Mr. Meade confirmed that the applicant was not here for approval at this meeting, as the applicant has not officially applied yet.

Brent Rogers with NBBJ spoke on behalf of the applicant. He thanked staff for their work and said the applicant has embraced the staff's recommendations. He agreed with staff's ideas about site lighting and elevator enclosures. The height of the building has changed since the last time the DRB reviewed it. There is a different structural system in order to bring the building height down and conform to the shoreline setbacks and height limits. The new design is well within the 35-foot height limit required by the setback. The building is now more compact. The sheer walls, the structural systems, and the stairs have been moved out to the perimeter to provide modulation and interest to the façade. There are two sheer walls, one on the north façade and one on the south façade. The intent is to provide a matrix for plant growth, possibly using Boston ivy, such that the sheer wall turns into a green wall that would change throughout the year. The stairs and elevators have been pulled out to the perimeter, and a screen of expanded metal would be placed around the stairs to provide visual interest and articulation of the vertical circulation. The same screening would be used around the elevator.

Other changes include looking at the site circulation for pedestrian and vehicular safety. The two entry points to the garage have changed a little bit. The primary entry goes straight up a ramp and into the vertical circulation of the garage. The secondary entry loops around and goes up. The applicant said both entries were straightforward, simple, and safety-conscious. A series of sidewalks and crossings are well-lit and easy to navigate. The vertical circulation stairs link to a sidewalk.

A top view from Avondale Road shows the green wall and the main entry to the site. The applicant showed the DRB other renderings of the site as well to orient them with the project. The applicant said staff's suggestion for an elevator enclosure and protection is represented on the top floor with a steel frame and some translucent glazing material for weather protection. The exact glazing material is not known at this time. Some expanded metal has been proposed for the scrims around the stairs on the corners of the building. An aluminum system would hold the glazing material up. The material for the garage, concrete, would be a dark, neutral color to blend into the landscape.

The applicant reviewed the lighting plan and the foot-candle projections. There would be a drop-off of about two foot-candles on the site. Thus, once off the site, the light spill is less than half a foot-candle. Very sharp cutoff LED pole fixtures are proposed on the roof and throughout the site, so there would be no light bleed from the roof onto the site. Internally, a linear fixture has been mounted at the perimeter and focused into the parking garage to also reduce light spill.

Mark Brumbaugh presented on behalf of the applicant with regard to the landscape plan. He said the plan was straightforward. This garage is located in an existing office park that is about twenty years old, so the idea is not to make radical changes. The main intent is to make the garage structure low key such that it blends into the existing environment. Fortunately, the setback for the garage is a long way from anyone else. Some buffer enhancement has been proposed to remove some blackberries and replace them with new plantings. There are also landscape improvements right up against the structure itself.

There is a ten-foot landscape foundation planting all around the building to provide tall trees for screening. The focus is mainly on deciduous trees. Evergreens might screen a structure better, but this is a garage that will hold a lot of people and the applicant wants to have a lot of light in the structure. A seasonal change of color with the trees will be important as well. Deciduous trees, from day one, will be much taller than evergreens. The Code would allow for eight or nine-foot high evergreen trees, where deciduous trees would be closer to fifteen feet high from day one. The plant palette would be pretty straightforward, with an eye on low maintenance, low water use, and the incorporation of native plants where appropriate. Also, the plantings would be consistent with the existing context.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Meade:

- Asked about the acid-etched concrete presented by the applicant and if it were possible not to use this material. He noted that the acid etching can present an environmental disaster.
- The applicant said he provided the material mainly for color purposes. He does not plan on using acid-etched concrete. The idea is to use structural concrete and embrace that material.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Asked about the interior of the garage. The applicant said that would be concrete as well, and the lighting strategy is to light from the perimeter down as a way to mute the colors and provide some good safety lighting.
- Mr. Waggoner asked about the stair towers and how they might be enclosed. The applicant said he is proposing glass at the upper level of the elevator. The applicant says a wind screen and roof enclosure in this location would provide some sort of weather protection.
- The applicant said around the stairs and elevator, the expanded metal with diamond-shaped mesh would provide screening, allow for light and visibility, and give some articulation to the façade.
- Mr. Waggoner asked if the applicant had studied the idea of having a lid over the top of the stairs. The applicant said he had looked into that idea, but did not want to enclose the entire stairway.

Mr. Krueger:

- Said the applicant has done a good job of addressing the concerns of the DRB. Mr. Krueger really liked the idea of the sheer walls outside the project.
- Mr. Krueger said he was interested in seeing the colors and finish, because the massing studies at the last meeting showed a white, almost bright color for the garage. However, Mr. Krueger said the new colors proposed and the landscaping will do a good job of muting the structure.
- He liked the design and the materials proposed, and said the applicant did address the visibility of this project from Avondale.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked the applicant how long the Boston ivy would take to grow over the green screen. Mr. Brumbaugh said on some projects in the Northwest, green screens have only 20% coverage. He said on some projects, his firm recommends using a green screen with a good architectural character and also using vines that would look weedy and trashy in five years.
- The applicant is planning to use a raw, natural concrete with Boston ivy. The plant grows very quickly, and will grow all over the garage in about ten years. The beauty of using Boston ivy on concrete is that there is no issue with painting.
- Mr. Meade said the applicant should come back soon for approval. He asked the applicant to consider Mr. Waggoner's question about the lid over the stairs.
- Mr. Waggoner asked about the generator on the north side and if that was for the garage or for the neighboring office buildings. Shawn Mahoney with OAC, representing the applicant, said the generator already exists on site and would be relocated further away from the existing building.
- Mr. Waggoner asked about the generator enclosure. The applicant said it would be enclosed with sound baffling. Space has been left in front of it for green screening.

PRE-APPLICATION
LAND-2013-00203, Redmond Multi-family
Description: Development of a four story, 104 unit multi-family residential building with parking
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.
Staff Contact: Gary Lee, 425-556-2418, glee@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee noted this was the first pre-application meeting for this project. It is located on NE 83rd Street between 165th and 166th, kitty-corner from the recently reviewed Valley Furniture project. Staff is excited about this new project, which is not in the same zone as Valley Furniture. Thus, there would be some different design standards associated with this project. This site is in the Perrigo's Plat sub-neighborhood, and the standards call for architecture that is more compatible with the existing buildings and have period architecture and specific modulation. Staff says this project is moving in the right direction. Staff has included some architectural styles in its report that could be applicable to this project. The applicant is breaking up the project into three buildings, which could mean different roof types and styles to make the buildings look different from each other.

Kent Smutny with Veer Architecture presented on behalf of the applicant. He noted that this project is 105 units and four stories tall. Below-grade parking has been proposed, with 133 parking stalls. That creates a ratio of 1.25 stalls per unit within the parking structure itself. There is also a chance for additional street parking on 165th and on 83rd. The applicant said the site right now consists of many small residential buildings that have all been converted to various businesses. A number of large trees are on the property. A consulting arborist has determined a number of the trees have been topped, and one prominent tree at 165th and 83rd has rot in the trunk. Overall, the trees on the site are not in good condition. The applicant presented a massing plan for the project, which involved a four-story, J-shaped building. The site is surrounded by a number of building sizes, types, and uses, from small residential structures to larger multi-family projects and commercial use.

The applicant said, because of the site's exposure on two streets, there is an opportunity to relate the first floor units to the street. Front stoops are one possibility, as well as landscape walls or steps, to create a relationship with the sidewalk as well as some urban separation. The applicant is working on some ideas for a prominent corner on the project and considering green walls as an option. The idea is to create three

buildings on the site. Different contemporary materials are under consideration, which would help create bays or stoops to introduce modulation to the site.

Andrew Ruston spoke next on behalf of the applicant. He noted the three buildings on the site, and said that in between them, there are "green links," or recessed areas that would be celebrated with some green elements and would set of the masses that come forward. The applicant said he was comfortable with abrupt changes in style on the site from one mass to the next. For example, traditional angled bay windows are used on one building with stoops, covered porches, and some pitched roofs, which would contrast with a more contemporary box-bay design for units nearby. An eased edge, soft-curve concept is where the applicant is heading for the prominent corner of the project. The third building would be similar to the first building, breaking down into a traditional scale and similar to a number of other multi-family projects near the project.

From the west, the applicant's idea is to erode the corner of the building and have prominent porches that would give less of an urban feel and more of a domestic, residential look. There is about four feet from the base of the building to the sidewalk, so that provides an opportunity for intensive landscaping with stairs and stoops. On the other side of the site, there will be a garage entrance on two levels as well as a service entrance on 165th. A rooftop amenity has been proposed, though there are some Code limitations. The applicant wants to take advantage of the western exposure and provide some rooftop common space. Street side open space does not count toward the open space requirements for the site. The main common amenities would be provided in the residential lobby. There is a path from that lobby to an indoor common area and the outdoor courtyard. The applicant would like to link the path back to 165th as an entrance to the project, which could be used quite a bit as a connection to downtown Redmond.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Waggoner:

- Asked about the "green link" term used by the applicant and if that referred to the color, or the use of a green wall. The applicant said a landscape screen would be used, such as a trellis, to create a vertical landscape separation between each of the three buildings.
- Mr. Waggoner asked if some ground-planted material would grow up the sides of the buildings. The applicant said the material would grow up the building and down from the top. Intermediate planter boxes would be used to maximize the coverage and create a true, green, landscape wall.
- Mr. Krueger confirmed that the green wall would be right outside studio apartments. The applicant said those studio units would have Juliet decks and not a lot of outdoor depth, perhaps about a foot to eighteen inches. Planter boxes would be on those decks, as well.
- Mr. Waggoner asked if the general design would be a traditional look, with angled bay windows and hipped roofs. The applicant said the buildings on the ends of the site are more traditional. A more modern building is in the center.
- The applicant said the finished palette would be similar throughout, using cement products, but the way the finish would be trimmed, including the shapes for the bays, would help change the style. The applicant wanted to create three different, separate buildings.
- Mr. Waggoner asked if there was a difference in color, but the same material along the first floor of one building. The applicant said brick would be used at the lower level to provide a strong base for both the traditional building and more modern building.
- The applicant said the brick could run higher on the corner building, but could run lower on the end buildings to indicate a base, center, and top. Cement board finishes and brick would be used at the bases.
- Mr. Waggoner asked if there was any chance to create multi-level stoops to terrace down to the sidewalk, or if there was an issue of height in the garage that would necessitate keeping the slab for the first floor up higher.
- The applicant said that, to make the garage heights work, the same floor level has indeed been used on the end building and the center building to create a common parking garage. The applicant said there would not be enough room for the terracing approach Mr. Waggoner was suggesting, and said that berming was proposed.

- Mr. Lee noted that berming was not the preferred alternative. He noted that the Redmond Square apartments were able to use a terraced approach with a decorative wall at the base. Mr. Lee said staff frowns upon the berming option.
- Mr. Waggoner asked if there were multiple levels of parking. The applicant said there were two levels of parking proposed as the site ramps down from 165th. There are two separate entries to the garage.
- Mr. Waggoner suggested the applicant should study whether the parking level could be sloped under the high end to create more headroom underneath the highest corner of the building. With that, some portions of the first floor slab could be stepped down. He was well aware that the applicant wanted to minimize the excavation depth, but he suggested considering the terraced approach in some way.

Ms. Crowder:

- Appreciated the effort to break up the complex into three buildings, but she said the first and third buildings look like they have massive hipped roofs, which she found not very aesthetically pleasing.
- Ms. Crowder recommended looking at a different option to provide a traditional look without the use of a hipped roof. The applicant said the aerial images may show the hipped roof more prominently than what a person would see from the street. He said that he would bring more street level renderings at the next meeting.
- Ms. Crowder said more traditional items could be used in the material palette, but a contemporary look could still be achieved. She said the current design does not look very contemporary.

Mr. Meade:

- Liked the case study photos and context images the applicant provided. Mr. Meade did not see the need for three building types. He suggested doing one cohesive building type and doing it well.
- Mr. Meade shared the concern of Ms. Crowder's about the hipped roof and suggested using a parapet design. He asked about the design of the 165th end of the building at the top of the third floor, and what appeared to be a white fin design.
- The applicant said the fin would create a cornice line and differentiate the cap of the building. The fin also creates more horizontal surface to allow for larger decks with the top floor units. The applicant said this would create an opportunity for more outdoor space at that level as well.
- The applicant said that a portion of this space would be surrounded by rails. The idea was to create a continuous horizontal band for the cornice element. A portion of it would be usable and a portion of it would be an eyebrow of sorts at that level of the building.
- Mr. Meade asked if shingles would be used at this portion of the roof. The applicant said he was still exploring that idea, and cement board shingles were the option presented. He said the main idea was to differentiate the top level by using a different cladding material pattern.
- Mr. Meade said there would be some merit on putting a cap on the bay elements. On the 83rd face of the project, the balconies on top of the bays are uncovered. He suggested the applicant should put in a roof structure that could cover those spaces, as well.
- Mr. Meade said this cover element could draw on some historic references and also create some cover. He suggested that some roof modulation could occur on this face of this building, too.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Said Ms. Crowder's concern was the most important issue for him, in that the hipped roof would not be successful if it were just a hip. Mr. Palmquist understood using this as a form, but adding other roof elements that would define the bays would be important, in his opinion.
- Mr. Palmquist noted that Bellevue Townhomes, which the applicant used for a case study, would be a good project to emulate if a hipped roof were used. He suggested treating the bays as individual elements and using more roof elements to define the bays.
- Mr. Palmquist asked to see the main floor plan. He noted that the residential lobby was out on the corner of 166th and 83rd, but said that the traffic patterns for pedestrians would be all over the site. He said the lobby is almost a back way out of the project.
- Mr. Palmquist asked the applicant to celebrate all the different pedestrian traffic patterns, as there are amenities on just about all sides of the site that pedestrians would be going to. He said the applicant should find ways that pedestrians could easy move to the northwest, southwest, and southeast, and not just focus on the corner of 166th and 83rd.

- Mr. Palmquist said that on the southwest side of the project, there was an opportunity for a stronger corner element. He said corners can be very difficult. He noted that the applicant was on the right track, and appreciated not seeing the tower elements he has seen on other buildings.
- Mr. Meade asked about the interior outdoor courtyard and if it would see any sun. The applicant said the open site is facing due west, so there would be some sun in the summer.
- Mr. Palmquist echoed Mr. Meade's idea to create one cohesive building design rather than three. He liked the idea of three buildings, which was unique, but he said the separation between the buildings would need to be more deliberate. He suggested not only stepping the building back, but bringing the height of that building down.
- Mr. Palmquist suggested doing a one or two-foot recess going back to a hallway of sorts to create a void that would emphasize the look of creating three buildings. He said the applicant's current design was too subtle.
- Mr. Palmquist liked the idea of the green wall, but noted that other projects near this site have not been successful with green walls. He suggested, once again, a way to define the buildings with something different that would create a serious, definite break of two or three feet. He said that this concept could begin on the second floor and go all the way through the roofline.

Mr. Krueger:

- Said there was a project in Seattle, just south of the Eastlake Bar and Grill, that has a look of building breaks that is similar to what Mr. Palmquist is suggesting.
- Mr. Krueger echoed Mr. Palmquist's point that pedestrians will access this site from many sides. He suggested emphasizing the southwest corner of the site, as well.
- Mr. Krueger spoke about the four-foot stoops and finding different ways to avoid using the berms the applicant has proposed. He said a project just to the southwest of this site found a different solution for a height differential without using a berm.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the setback for this site at the corners. The applicant said that distance was fourteen feet on 83rd and eight feet on 166th. Mr. Krueger said, with that amount of distance, some terracing should be possible.
- Mr. Krueger liked the idea of three buildings, but said the designs between the three did not have to be completely different. He suggested using more vertical elements to create a distinct look between the buildings.
- He likes hipped roofs, but said the ones presented in this project are massive and need to be mitigated. He liked the concept of the Bellevue Townhomes that Mr. Palmquist suggested.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the softened edge on the corner element, and said he was nervous about the stucco used in this area. He said this could potentially have a very flat look, and suggested using some brick in this spot to echo other parts of the building.
- He asked if the building was within the height limits of its zone. The applicant said he was indeed within those limits. The building is four stories with some common recreation space on top of the building. Mr. Krueger said he would encourage the use of a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) to achieve higher height limits.
- Mr. Krueger asked if the recreational space on the roof fit within the Code. Mr. Lee said he would check into that, and said the applicant may need to use affordable housing credits for the upper floors, or TDR's, or the green building program, to use that recreational space. There is a possibility that roof area might be considered another floor of the building.
- The applicant said that the roof recreational space would have to be smaller than what has been presented. The area would be limited to 750 square feet, because creating assembly occupancy could not happen at the roof level. Mr. Krueger confirmed that the 750 square feet would cover the indoor and outdoor space.
- Mr. Palmquist made another query about the berms suggested for the front of the building and confirmed that the applicant was working with a landscape architect. Mr. Palmquist suggested involving the landscape architect at this point in the project. A similar project, the old VFW building, was successful recently by using a landscape architect early in the process.
- Mr. Meade asked the applicant to look to improve the green wall element.

Mr. Sutton:

- Said he was also not a fan of the different styles used between the three buildings. He liked the idea of breaking up the design, but did not think two different styles was the way to go. He asked why the

contemporary style-building was closer to traditional buildings surrounding the project and not located closer to downtown.

- Mr. Sutton said the hipped roof comments were well taken, and noted that such a roof would be an unfortunate thing to look down on from the common roof space.
- Mr. Sutton was concerned about how the different styles of the buildings would come together on the back side of the project.
- Mr. Meade asked about the penthouse piece on the site. The applicant said this area was proposed to be an interior common space. The idea was to have indoor and outdoor space at this level, but it would be smaller in scale, based on the Code limitations for upper level common space.
- Mr. Meade applauded this idea and said this could be a hidden secret for the residents rather than something visible by pedestrians from the building edge. He suggested pulling this element back so that it does not fight with the massing of the building below.
- Mr. Krueger noted that the roof area would definitely be smaller, based on the 750 square foot limitation noted earlier. The applicant said 500 square feet inside and 250 square feet outside was one option under consideration.
- Mr. Meade suggested making this roof area more of an amenity. The Nintendo site in Redmond could be a model, where the applicant had some modulations in foam and green roof elements that surrounded the roofscape area and gave it a creative sense of place.
- Mr. Meade said this was a great, important site and he looked forward to seeing the next iteration of the design. The applicant thanked the DRB members for their time.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:40 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (6-0).

MINUTES APPROVED ON _____ **RECORDING SECRETARY** _____