



## **MEMORANDUM**

**To:** Design Review Board

**From:** Angela Ruggeri, AICP, Senior Planner

**Date:** September 14, 2009

**Subject:** **DESIGN RESPONSE CONFERENCE #7**  
**TOUCHSTONE (PARKPLACE)**  
**FILE DRC09-00002**

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Touchstone's proposal is for design review of a 1.8 million sq. ft. mixed-use project that includes 1.2 million sq. ft. of office space and an additional 300,000 sq. ft. of retail. Other uses include a hotel and athletic club.

The approved Master Plan has established the building and open space locations, access points and grid for the internal road system. The Zoning specifies building heights, setbacks and other development parameters. The Design Review Board is now in the process of working with the applicant on the design of the buildings and open spaces. The approved Design Guidelines for Parkplace will be used by the DRB to guide this process.

*\*\*Please bring your copy of the Master Plan and Design Guidelines for Parkplace. The applicant will bring their revised drawings for Building A to the meeting on 9/21/09.*

### **II. PREVIOUS DESIGN RESPONSE CONFERENCES**

The Design Review Board continued the Design Response Conference at their meeting on 8/31/09. At this meeting the DRB discussed the latest design drawings for Buildings A, B and C and the Design Guidelines that apply to these buildings. A list of questions/concerns relating to the application of the Master Plan and Design Guidelines to the buildings was completed at the meeting. It was determined at the meeting that the applicant would bring revised drawings for Building A for discussion at the meeting on September 21. The applicant was asked to provide all four elevations of the building for review.

### III. ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED AT THE 9-21-09 DESIGN RESPONSE CONFERENCE

The key compliance issues addressed by the DRB are those related to design guidelines for mass and scale, the gateway/portal into the site, and engaging pedestrians along Central Way. The following is a summary of the main issues addressed at the meeting on 8-31-09. The DRB discussion and direction on these issues are shown in italics.

#### **Page PO-5: 8. Design Intent**

2. Site Planning “Connections” – Create strong emphasis on streetscape and provide clear and inviting public access.
4. Enhance the Pedestrian Environment – Create visual interest along the street.
7. Appropriate Massing and Scale – Consider scale, massing and detail of individual buildings and express human-scale, detailed street level building facades.

#### **Page MP-6: 9. Program Requirements**

- C. Green Building Commitment - *explain how addressing requirements.*

#### **Page MP-7: Retail/Restaurant Frontage**

Center drawing on page shows retail and restaurant frontage along Central Way.

#### **Page DG-15: All Districts: Site Planning**

1. Streetscape – c. Ground floor level separate storefronts, pedestrian-oriented signs, etc. to add interest and give human dimension to street-level facades.

#### **Page DG–19 All Districts: Building Design**

1. Orientation to the Street
  - a. Frequent entrances for walk in traffic
  - c. Principal building entry should be visible (*obvious*) from the street.  
*There was concern among Board members that these guidelines had not been met for Building A.*

#### **Page DG–20: – All Districts: Building Design**

2. Massing /Articulation:

Intent: to create a variety of form and massing through articulation and use of materials to maintain a pedestrian scale.  
*There was concern that the current building design does not meet the intent of the guidelines.*

  - a. Break down scale and massing of buildings into smaller and varied volumes.  
*Concerns with the Building A Central Way elevation. Does weave concept address pedestrian scale?*
  - b. Responsive to context of surrounding environment.  
*Need more information on this. Don't see how buildings are responsive to surrounding environment and buildings. Buildings can respond to the context in a different way without directly emulating. This is still an issue, but not one of the most critical. It is difficult because there is not one existing style in the area. Need to speak the same language – not*

- necessarily the same vocabulary. May not be about the materials, may be about the massing.*
- d. Buildings should distinguish building base.  
*The gasket addresses this, but is still a concern in some areas.*
  - e. Provide clear pattern of window openings.  
*Is order important? Classical or more abstract? BIG PICTURE: What's important? Order & scale, base, roof edge.*
  - f. Use of ribbon windows.  
*Be careful spandrels don't look like ribbon windows.*
  - g. Use major architectural expressions for important gateways & intersections.  
*Buildings B & C need more of this. Where is the entrance to Building A?*
  - h. Building modulation.  
*Same discussion as e above.*
  - i. Roof Silhouettes.  
*Scale & massing comes first and then roof solution will follow.*
  - j. Rooftop equipment – *to be discussed later.*

#### **Page DG-22: Gateway District – Site Planning**

Intent: To create a welcoming feature to the Parkplace development and downtown Kirkland. This area should create an inviting entryway that is representative of the community through the use of art, landscape and architecture.

*The DRB is concerned about how the current design meets the site planning intent for the Gateway District expressed through the guidelines on pages DG-22 and 23.*

##### 1. Gateway Garden (a, b, c & d):

*Need more design on gateway concept (relationship of plaza to building), need updated drawings and landscape plan for this area. Need more of an "ah ha" moment!*

*There was discussion among board members about whether the gateway garden should provide an actual view into the site or more of a welcoming idea that would also lead the visitor to the atrium/breezeway space. Maybe more symbolic rather than an actual entrance...this is still a concern and the applicant needs to demonstrate their response.*

##### 2. Triangular Lot public space:

*See gateway garden comments.*

#### **Page DG-23: Gateway District – Site Planning**

##### 4. Atrium/Breezeway Space:

*See previous discussions of 1 and 2. The view may be one that indicates a connection to the corner of 6<sup>th</sup> and Central Way (see examples on pg. DG-23)*

#### **Page DG-24: Gateway District - Building Design**

##### 1. Ground Level Treatment:

- a. Ground level setbacks from street – *relates to previous conversation.*
- b. Retail/restaurant uses - *concern*

c. Details visible at different movement\_speeds – *don't have at this time so it's a concern*

2. Upper Levels:

b. Upper levels step backs:

*Concern remains about whether design meets this guideline. This shouldn't just happen in one area of the building.*

c. Top floor/roof edge:

*This will develop with the massing. Look at how the building steps back and that will determine how to address the top of the building.*