



**MEMORANDUM**

**To:** Design Review Board  
**From:** Angela Ruggeri, Senior Planner  
**Date:** December 21, 2015  
**File No.:** DRV15-01250  
**Subject:** **POTALA VILLAGE DESIGN RESPONSE CONFERENCE (CONTINUED FROM AUGUST 24, 2015)**

**I. MEETING GOALS**

At the January 4, 2016 Design Review Board (DRB) meeting, the DRB should continue the Potala Village Design Response Conference from August 24, 2015 and determine if the project is consistent with the Design Guidelines for Pedestrian Oriented Business Districts, as adopted in Kirkland Municipal Code (KMC) Section 3.30.040.

During the Design Response Conference, the DRB should provide feedback on the applicant's response to the key points brought up by the DRB at the August 24, 2015 meeting.

**II. PROPOSAL**

The subject property is located at 1006 Lake Street South, which is currently a vacant lot. The applicant is proposing to construct a new mixed-use project that would consist of approximately 7,000 square feet of ground floor commercial retail space and approximately 58 residential units. Structured parking is proposed.

**III. DESIGN RESPONSE CONFERENCE**

The Design Review Board reviews projects for consistency with the Design Guidelines for Pedestrian Oriented Business Districts, as adopted in Kirkland Municipal Code Chapter 3.30.

The DRB comments made at the Design Response Conference meeting on August 24, 2015 are summarized below and addressed by the applicant on page 7 of their submittal (Attachment 1). The applicant's submittal is organized with sheets labeled "DRC 1" reflecting the design presented on August 24<sup>th</sup> and sheets labeled "DRC 2" reflecting the revised design for review on January 4<sup>th</sup>.

The list below summarizes the key points that the DRB discussed at the meeting on August 24, 2015 and includes suggested discussion topics.

**DRB Direction:**

1. Study fenestration patterns/differentiate between retail and residential.  
**DRB Discussion:** Do the fenestration patterns on all elevations adequately represent the commercial and residential uses?

2. Work on landscape design – study courtyard, water feature, green wall, fence options, provide more variety in plant pallet for a more dynamic design/varied color pallet.  
DRB Discussion: Review the new landscape design provided by the applicant (see pages 18-21 of Attachment 1). Also determine if the proposed buffering on the south and east sides of the project is adequate.
3. Propose more open fence type (no more than 50% of the fence face can be open for required land use buffers).  
DRB Discussion: Review proposed fence type shown on page 22.
4. Show perspectives with accurate plant size when planted.  
DRB Discussion: Do new perspectives provide the information needed by the DRB for review purposes?
5. Study retail elevations – provide perspectives at ground level.  
DRB Discussion: Do new perspectives provide the information needed by the DRB for review purposes?
6. Bring material samples (provide large pieces of various materials).  
DRB Discussion: Material samples are available for review at City Hall and will be brought to the DRB meeting on January 4<sup>th</sup> (also see pages 31 through 33 of Attachment 1).
7. Propose ways to break up the roof.  
DRB Discussion: Do the proposed changes to the roof design shown on page 30 adequately break up the roof?
8. Revisit the concept of the white “picture frame” features (proposed design is too repetitive/symmetrical and makes project appear larger than it is).  
DRB Discussion: The white frames are still being used as a major element in the design. Are the changes that have been made to them adequate?
9. Propose ways to make the building seem more like two separate buildings.  
DRB Discussion: Does the design meet the intent of the SEPA mitigations listed on pages 3 and 4 of this memo?
10. Modulate east wall – too long.  
DRB Discussion: Is the proposed modulation of the east wall enough? Does it meet the intent of the SEPA mitigations listed on pages 3 & 4 of this memo?
11. Explore shifting east wall of plaza forward and staggering east elevation.  
DRB Discussion: This change was not made to the design.
12. Provide wall sections through building as it climbs 10th Avenue South.  
DRB Discussion: See pages 34 and 35.

13. Show how cantilever will work (wall sections).  
DRB Discussion: See pages 34 and 35.
14. Review if proposed amount of glazing is allowed (energy modeling).  
DRB Discussion: See explanation on page 7.
15. Study step back of upper floors at corners.  
DRB Discussion: The new design includes a stepdown at the corners and an open picture frame (see page 30). Is the proposed stepdown at the corners adequate? Does the design meet the intent of the SEPA mitigations listed on pages 3 and 4 of this memo?
16. Study possibility of moving driveway closer to Lake Street South to reduce height of ground floor retail (can be moved to within 50 feet of Lake Street South per Public Works review).  
DRB Discussion: See response on page 7. Is more explanation needed?
17. Review required right-of-way improvements with Public Works Department.  
DRB Discussion: The applicant is working with Public Works on the requirements.
18. Make drawings (particularly the landscape plan) more readable.  
DRB Discussion: Are drawings on pages 18-21 adequate?

#### **IV. STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES ACT**

The City has also conducted an environmental review for the development of the property in accordance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). SEPA is the state law that requires an evaluation of a development proposal for environmental impacts. A Final Environmental Impact Statement was issued on November 2, 2012 that reviewed a previous proposal for the Potala Village project. A SEPA Addendum will be required for the current proposal. Although the project has changed substantially, the mitigating measures should still be considered. Those relating to building massing and size are of particular interest. The mitigating measures proposed in the EIS discuss the following points:

- Top floor setback along the west building façade.
- Reducing the perceived mass of the building by providing two distinct building wings.
- Providing exterior wall modulation on the east, north and south facades.

The Environmental Impact Statement mitigations that address building massing and size impacts are shown in italics below. The DRB should determine if the intent of these mitigations is met by the applicant's proposal.

- *Set back the top floor along the west building façade an average of 10-feet from the façade on the floor below.*
- *Reduce the perceived mass of the building by dividing it into two distinct building wings that are located on the north and south portions of the site with the wings separated by at least 40 feet where the building extends above the grade of adjacent properties. On the west side of the building where four floors are visible from off site, the separation should occur between all four floors. On the east where approximately two floors are below the adjacent grade, only the top two floors need be separated. The main building wings could be joined by a narrow connection if the connection is sufficiently recessed toward the interior portion of the site. A deeper recess along the west façade would be preferred given its greater prominence and visibility.*
- *Along the north and south facades, provide exterior wall modulation for floors two through four that meets the intent of KZC Section 92.30 for vertical definition.*
- *Incorporate measures to achieve architectural and human scale, as described in the Design Guidelines for Pedestrian-Oriented Business Districts and KZC 92.30.4 and 6.*

Numbers 8 through 11 and number 15 in the DRB list of key points relate to the above SEPA mitigations as well as applicable design guidelines.

## **V. ATTACHMENTS**

1. Applicant's Proposal