

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES - OCTOBER 3, 2005
Amended 12/12/05

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. by Chair Todd Kilburn. Members Present: Brian Berg, Paul Duffy, Kevin Oremus, Eric Shields, Phyllis Warman. Members Absent: Carter Bagg, Steve Cox. Tony Leavitt and Jeremy McMahan represented the Department of Planning and Community Development.

READING APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

Mr. Kilburn reviewed the agenda.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None

DESIGN RESPONSE CONFERENCES

a. **Almond Condominiums – File No. DRC04-00004**

Mr. Mc Mahan announced that the purpose of meeting tonight is for the applicant to check in with the DRB regarding the type of tree species to be planted along the property's east property line, standards for the Leyland Cyprus hedge to be planted along the south property line, and a revised window plan for the Building Type A units. Mr. McMahan requested that the DRB review the staff memorandum regarding the applicant's proposal.

The Board members had no objections to the applicant's response to the DRB's concerns.

The applicant had no further questions.

b. **Totem Lake Mall:** Mr. McMahan requested a motion to continue the Totem Lake Mall Design Review Conference to November 7th, 2005.

Mr. Oremus moved and Mr. Kilburn seconded to continue the Totem Lake Mall Design Review Conference to November 7, 2005. Motion carried (5-0).

a. **State Street Condos, File No. DRC05-00002**

Tony Leavitt presented an overview of staff's requests via a PowerPoint presentation:

- Site Location
- A Project Description
- Design review board process
- Design response conference
- Bulk and Scale of South Façade

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES - OCTOBER 3, 2005

Amended 12/12/05

- Treatment of Proposed Entry
- Setback Variation Request
- Building Materials, Color and Detail
- Additional Requested Items

Following his presentation, Mr. Leavitt submitted a public comment letter to the applicant for review.

The applicant said the team spent the bulk of the time addressing the two major issues that the DRB brought up: the south façade and the entry. He said their goal tonight is to gain approval from the Board and move forward with the project. He then turned the presentation over to the other members of his team.

Blaine Weber gave an over view of the major changes to the project in response to Board's comment:

- State Street Condos: Design Review Two
- Bulk and Scale of South façade
- Treatment of Proposed entry
- Setbacks Variation Request

Brian Slick showed a presentation including illustrations of the following:

Part 1:

- State Street Condos (existing south elevation)
- South Elevation Concept Studies
- State Street Condos Departure Request
- State Street Pedestrian Crossing
- State Street Proposed South Elevation
- State Street South Terrace
- State Street View from Second Avenue Treatment of South Façade

Part 2:

- State Street Corner Entry Concepts (Option D preferred)
- State Street Proposed West Elevation
- State Street Entry
- State Street View of Main Entry Corner of State and Second
- State Street View of Main Entry

Landscape:

- State Street Landscape Plan at State Street and Second
- State Street Landscape at Fire Access Lane

Mr. Shields asked the applicant to provide the Board with details about the dumpster area in relation to the sidewalk. The applicant responded that dumpsters will be located on a pad as a temporary holding place for trash on garbage pick up days only.

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES - OCTOBER 3, 2005
Amended 12/12/05

Ms. Warman asked how residents will transport the trash to that area. The applicant said there will be a small tractor set up for the residents with which they can pick the trash up on garbage day to transport it to the pad. Ms. Warman then asked who would regulate this area. The applicant responded that management would and predicted that trash would only sit in that area a couple of hours.

Mr. Berg asked if the applicant had more definition on the cap piece. The applicant referred to the physical model as the best example of the building's proportion. He said it is a careful balance to find the right scale and that the proportion shown is accurate. Mr. Berg requested further study of a larger cap.

Mr. Berg asked the applicant to describe the treatments on the railings. The applicant described the three types of railings that will be used.

Mr. Berg inquired about the trellis treatment. The applicant said they are using galvanized metal which allows a lacier open-style trellis casting a finer grade shadow and sense of permanence. He added that the design might have a nautical feel to tie in with the rest of Kirkland.

Mr. Berg said that he likes the presentation styles and the organization of the drawings. However, he said that some of the detail included makes it difficult to see what is really left of the building. He requested that the applicant show the style of the building in one illustration and provide another image with the style stripped off.

Mr. Oremus asked the applicant to discuss the design departure of the setbacks. The applicant said the departure is not much different from the original request. He described Sections A, B and C and their respective projections. Mr. Oremus asked if the applicant is pushing the corner unit back. The applicant responded no. The applicant and the Board discussed in detail the setback lines and measurements.

Mr. Duffy asked if the stairwells would be private. The applicant responded that they may be able to develop connectivity from the private terraces to the sidewalk. The applicant and Board then discussed grade. The applicant said he needs to discuss this issue with Public Works. He said that the design will be terraced situation, not just a slope and it will have a garden type affect.

Mr. Kilburn asked the applicant to discuss what the terracing and grade will look like along State Street. The applicant responded that the design is similar to what was just discussed. He said there will be a wall at the northern edge of the entry walk and would include terraced walls stepping up to State Street, providing light but also privacy.

Ms. Warman asked what the applicant had in mind for the landscape planters between the units. The applicant said that they would build higher end GFRC planters that are lighter weight and come in a variety of textures. He said they would work to make them blend in with the cast in place elements. They would be free standing with a variety of

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES - OCTOBER 3, 2005

Amended 12/12/05

heights and having some greenery that spills over. It will be up to management to decide what plants residents will put in them, although the planters are intended to be part of the residents' private space.

Ms. Warman asked the applicant to describe which part of the landscape treatment for the corner unit is private, which is public, and how it will all tie in with the rest of the landscape. The applicant responded that although an area is private, it is also considered part of the public domain. The owner will control which plants are put in the planters.

Ms. Warman than asked the applicant to describe what types of trees would be planted in the sidewalk grates. The applicant responded that Sweet Gums and a variety of Ash are planned but the applicant is open to the City's suggestions. He clarified that the trees are not are in sidewalk grates, but instead in landscaping strips.

Mr. Kilburn asked how the awning will be maintained and cleaned. The applicant said that near the canopy there are is not a lot of planting, so he does not anticipate drainage being a problem. However, for maintenance, the awning would be hosed off every couple of weeks.

Mr. Kilburn asked the applicant to describe the State Street sign. The applicant responded that it would be a thin rod-type frame hanging from the upper façade with the letters floating above the canopy.

Mr. Shields said that many of the designs discussed are verbal representations and asked the applicant to provide drawings. The applicant suggested that the DRB put a condition the project, describe it and remand it to the planners to execute the final details.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Carolyn Hayek, 102 State Street, Kirkland, said that she is concerned about the proposed plan for garbage and recycling. Tractors hauling garbage may not be a workable solution because the building will generate a lot of garbage and recycling and pickups do not always occur at the same time or on same day. The trash room is located on the lowest garage level and the homeowner's association will likely need to pay someone to haul trash around at least three days a week. In addition, she predicts that the dumpster will sit out on the street for extended periods. She concluded that perhaps the applicant has a plan to make this arrangement work, but in her experience as a condominium homeowner, she does not think the plan as presented sounds workable.

The applicant responded that they will accommodate the trash situation in every way possible. In the larger projects, he said it is common to have one or two people employed by the homeowners association who are responsible for coordination of the trash. In addition, tractors and pulls to haul trash are commonplace.

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES - OCTOBER 3, 2005
Amended 12/12/05

Mr. Berg asked if 60% of the units are sold if the sold commission is relinquished back to the board. The applicant said that is mandated by state law and he has no authority over that decision. He said that he can write CC&Rs. Mr. Berg then asked how the CC&Rs will be implemented. The applicant said that the rules will be drafted for the board and the rules will mandate that there is a full time maintenance person responsible for trash and recycling coordination. He cannot control how the board will handle the matter in the future. However, he said that with the price that residents are paying for the units, residents will not tolerate a dumpster sitting out on the street for hours on end.

Mr. Duffy asked what the plan is for the recycle totes. The applicant responded that the recycling will be handled the same way as the trash. He added that Waste Management may be able to pick up the garbage but predicts that the incline is too great for the trucks.

Mr. Kilburn asked if the trash area will be open or screened. The applicant responded that either can be done. The driveway needs to be visible and therefore, if screening is used, it can't be too high.

Mr. Duffy asked if there was a trash compacter. The applicant responded yes.

Mr. Duffy commented that it is a reasonable solution to have a tractor to haul garbage and recycling up to the corner. If the service happened twice a week, that would be acceptable.

Mr. Kilburn agreed that on the limitations explained, it is a good solution.

Mr. Berg said that he likes the new design and the new massing and that the design has come a long way. The corner is well resolved and he likes the signage at the entrance. Regarding the dumpster, he thinks the tractor is a good idea, but is a bit skeptical if the plan will work. He is not comfortable with cap because the trellis is busy and detracts from the rest of the building. There are competing design styles that are not compatible and are not as resolved as the other elements. He asked the applicant to provide a summary of all design elements, take one more look at the cap and provide decisions on the materials. He is also concerned about the glass-style railings which look bulky. The applicant said that the illustration may be misleading. Mr. Berg closed by saying that the trellis could be removed.

Mr. Duffy said that the solutions on the south elevation are helpful. He likes the private feeling on the lower levels and the town home feeling. He also likes the entry and the idea of using stucco there. He is satisfied with the south side, and ~~agrees with Mr. Berg~~ that a smaller cap might look better.

Mr. Kilburn said that he agrees that the applicant did a good job with modulation and massing and likes where the design is headed. He said the trellis is not working. He said

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES - OCTOBER 3, 2005

Amended 12/12/05

perhaps it would be better not to have the cap the same all the way around. He likes the galvanized metal accents to bring out the nautical feel. He is concerned about the different perspectives of the buildings because it is hard to see what the elements will actually look like.

Mr. Oremus agreed that the design is headed in the right direction. He doesn't necessarily want to see the trellis removed, but would like a more defined design that is integrated into the architecture of the building. He said the railings require the same attention and all of the elements should be put together in one cohesive package.

Ms. Warman said she is confused by the different drawings and is not clear how the final design will look. She said the details need to be made clear, but she is excited to see what changes the applicant will come up with. She is impressed with how far the design has come since the last meeting. She said the sidewalk view of the landscape treatment along 2nd Street is confusing. She is not concerned about the garbage situation and is not sure it is a concern for the DRB. Perhaps it should be a concern for Public Works.

Mr. Berg said that the garbage could end up sitting in its pickup location all the time. He suggested putting a metal fence there with slats and solving the problem of transporting the garbage all together. Mr. Shields suggested that the DRB make it a condition that the garbage can only be there for a certain amount of time.

Ms. Warman said that Sweet Gums and sidewalk grates are not a good choice because the Sweet Gums are too fast growing. She said there are many other good tree choices that could be used. The applicant said they would work with staff to come up with a tree that works. Ms. Warman said that she looks forward to seeing the planters and how they will look in the end. Since the planters cross the line between public and private, they will require maintenance to make sure they look nice.

Mr. Kilburn said that he would like to see the final elevations and take another look when the applicant returns.

Mr. Duffy moved and Mr. Berg seconded to approve the project in the massing concept with the layering of the façade and the design departures. The applicant is required to return and present to the DRB the siding materials, further explanation of elements such as the trellis, railing, cornice, signage, lighting, color scheme, and tree choices in landscaping. They must present complete elevations of the building. The dumpster pad must be a temporary location for use on garbage pick-up days only. Dumpsters shall not be left out nor will there be a structure identifying it as a dumpster location other than the pad. Motion carried (5-0).

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS AND DRB DISCUSSION

a. Update on Joint Meeting with City Council (dates and topics)

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES - OCTOBER 3, 2005
Amended 12/12/05

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE: None

ADJOURNMENT

**Motion by Mr. Berg and second by Mr. Duffy to adjourn the meeting at 9:47 p.m.
Motion carried (5-0).**

Todd Kilburn, Chair
Kirkland Design Review Board

Jeremy McMahan, Planning Supervisor
Department of Planning and Community Development

Recording Secretary: Susan Hayden
PROFESSIONAL OFFICE SERVICES