

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD – November 7, 2005

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m. by Chair Todd Kilburn. Members Present: Carter Bagg, Steve Cox, Paul Duffy, Todd Kilburn, Kevin Oremus, Eric Shields, Phyllis Warman. Member Absent: Brian Berg. Jon Regala and Jeremy McMahan represented the Department of Planning and Community Development. The City's Special Legal Counsel, Rod Kaseguma, was also present.

READING APPROVAL OF MINUTES

August 1, 2005

Motion by Mr. Oremus and second by Ms. Warman to approve the Kirkland Design Review Board Meeting Minutes of August 1, 2005, as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

August 22, 2005

Motion by Mr. Oremus and second by Ms. Warman to approve the Kirkland Design Review Board Meeting Minutes of August 22, 2005, as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

Mr. Kilburn reviewed the agenda.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE: None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None

DESIGN RESPONSE CONFERENCES

a. Totem Lake Mall Design, File No. DRC05-00005

Mr. Regala presented a checklist of items for the DRB to consider for discussion that included:

- Pedestrian Network
- Orientation of Retail to Pedestrian and Vehicular Network
- Public Amenities
- Landscaping
- Building Design Techniques
- Loading and Service Areas
- Subsequent Process and Modifications
- Lapse of Approval Date
- Review Plaza Design

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD – November 7, 2005

Bill Fuller 1411 4th Avenue, Suite 1306, Seattle, applicant for the project, presented information on the application via a PowerPoint presentation. His presentation included the following topics:

- Aerial Photo of Existing Conditions
- Conceptual Master Plan 9.12.05
- Comparative views of Original Concept and Alternate Concept
- Revised Conceptual Master Plan 11.7.05
- Overall Aerial View
- Aerial View of 120th Avenue from South
- Ground View of 120th Avenue from South
- South Half of 120th Avenue from South
- North Parking Garage
- Approaching Project from North along 120th Avenue
- North Half of 120th Avenue from North
- View of Main Intersection Looking East
- Office Building from Main Intersection
- Southeast Corner of Main Intersection
- Southwest Corner of Main Intersection
- Northwest Corner of Main Intersection
- Boulevard from West
- West Half of Boulevard from East
- West Elevation along 120th Avenue
- South Half of West Elevation along 120th Avenue
- North Half of West Elevation along 120th Avenue
- North Elevation along New Boulevard
- East Half of North Elevation along Boulevard
- West Entry Landscape Plan
- West Boulevard Landscape Plan
- Landscape Plan at 120th and New Boulevard
- East Boulevard Landscape Plan
- Typical Boulevard Landscape Section

Mr. Bagg, referring to the East Boulevard Landscape Plan slide, asked the applicant to describe further the view of the parking garage from the mall.

Steve Johnson, applicant, said that garage will not look like a parking garage from the mall. Instead, it will blend in with the surrounding structures, mimicking the look of the adjacent office building.

Mr. Duffy asked what the turning radius is for the traffic circle in front of the office. The applicant responded that it is about a 60- foot diameter on the outside which should accommodate cars and small trucks. The applicant added that there is no reason for large trucks to come into that area. Instead, there will be a special loading area internal to the buildings that will accommodate large trucks. It will screen the visual and noise impacts of the trucks while having natural ventilation.

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD – November 7, 2005

Mr. Cox asked the applicant to clarify that the 2,000 stall parking garage supports all but residential parking. The applicant concurred and said that the garage would support primarily retail, office, and cinema parking.

Mr. Kilburn asked what section of the main boulevard the City owns. Mr. Shields responded that the City will buy the street sections from Totem Lake Boulevard to 120th.

Mr. Kilburn asked the applicant if Council has seen this plan. The applicant responded yes and that it would be inappropriate to show Council plans that the DRB had not seen yet.

Ms. Warman said that she understood that Council preferred a narrower boulevard and asked the applicant to explain this further.

The applicant said that the advantages and disadvantages to a wider versus a narrower boulevard were presented to Council and the Council expressed preference for the boulevard to be narrower.

The applicant explained that formerly blank walls will be wrapped with “liner shops” which adds more interest and active storefronts.

Mr. Kilburn asked if the square footage of the project changed. The applicant said yes, that the retail square footage had increased 28,000 square feet.

Mr. Cox asked what the width is of the double drive-out. The applicant responded that it is a 15-foot sidewalk with a 24-foot wide two-way drive out.

Mr. Shields asked if the 2.27-acre plaza becoming narrower caused 120th Avenue NE to become wider. The applicant yes, that the right-of-way dimensions are being modified due to dimension restrictions on the parking garages. He said however that the overall feel should not change.

Mr. Shields asked how buildings on the lower mall, such as Old Country Buffet, will be treated as part of the project’s development. The applicant responded that the buildings will either be blended with the others by providing minor alterations or will be demolished if blending is not architecturally possible. He said that the goal is for the buildings to feel urban and not suburban.

Mr. Oremus asked if the facades of the lower mall would be redone in phases. The applicant responded yes.

Mr. Bagg asked the applicant if residential units could be built on top of the Old Country Buffet building. Charles Worsham, representing the applicant, said that residential element can be built on top of the existing buildings without interfering with the first phase of the project.

Mr. Shields asked what the setback from the sidewalk will be for the parking structures on 120th. The applicant responded roughly 15 – 20 feet from the curb. He added that the

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD – November 7, 2005

setback can be adjusted to accommodate landscaping and a 10-foot minimum sidewalk. The majority of the screening of the garage will be done architecturally and not with landscaping. Street trees will be used as a consistent design element throughout the project and more detail on the parking garages will be provided later.

Ms. Warman asked the applicant to further describe the location and scale of the café seating. She expressed concern about the size of the setback being just 15 feet. The applicant explained that the illustration shown is probably not a realistic representation of the area and that it is larger than it appears. He said that a lot can be done in that amount of space. In addition, tenants will all add their own flavor and vitality to the design.

Mr. Cox asked how high the first floor will be. The applicant responded that it will be 20-foot floor to floor for retail.

Mr. Cox said that he is concerned that the sequencing of the project may be awkward with design occurring in different stages. The applicant responded that the project is a retail driven mixed-use project and that the office and the residential are adjustable. The retail is the foundation and building of the office and residential will come later. Mr. Cox responded that they should all be designed together and that phasing is dangerous. The applicant responded that the design will begin with this applicant and that whether this applicant or another develops the rest of the property in the future, the project will be taken seriously and the DRB's concerns with articulation, screening, etc. will be addressed and adjusted to fit the DRB's recommendations.

Mr. Kilburn asked the applicant to address any of the points of discussion from Mr. Regala's checklist previously mentioned. The applicant said that he had reviewed the checklist with Mr. Regala and it would be more appropriate to address the finer details of the identified issues later during the subsequent review for the DRB. He agreed to address the points in general tonight in regard to the CMP. His comments are as follows:

Pedestrian Network and Orientation of Retail to Pedestrian and Vehicular Network

The applicant said that the pedestrian connection to the transit center will be achieved on 120th Avenue NE with sidewalks rather than having pedestrians working their way through the multi-level parking garages.

Mr. Shields said that the main concern is that the hillside is steep up 120th and asked how the applicant would accommodate those who are not physically strong enough for the hill. The applicant responded that the design will have to include a vertical element to accommodate those that may be physically challenged.

Ms. Warman asked if the pedestrian area will be covered. The applicant responded that it might be covered, but there are no guarantees.

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD – November 7, 2005

Regarding the issue of providing access to physically challenged pedestrians, the Board, the applicant and staff discussed the original site plan of the area and the possibility of an elevator to accommodate those who cannot climb the hill.

Public Amenities

The applicant addressed the “and suitable uses” section and stated that will not be reflected in the CMP at this time. This item will be more appropriately addressed in the development agreement.

Regarding how to address residential garages, the applicant said that there is not room for the retail liner.

Landscaping

The applicant stated that there will be removable planters on the top decks of the parking garages using a hardscape effect rather than planting trees in tree grates in the sidewalk.

Mr. Duffy asked how many stalls are anticipated if the residential units will be studios and one bedrooms. The applicant responded that the market will dictate the design of the residential building and there is no clear answer at this time. He said that the design will allow for additional parking levels if needed. The applicant is currently planning for over one and a half stalls per unit. However, the number could be as high as two or the number could go down.

Regarding the preliminary landscape plan, the applicant said this item would be more appropriately addressed at phasing of each project.

Building Design Techniques

The applicant said that the items addressed in this section are more appropriately brought back for discussion at each phase review.

Mr. Duffy asked what the City’s interpretation of “design standards” is. Referring to items F1 and F2, Mr. Regala responded that issues like bulk and massing have already been addressed and that the discussion should be policy oriented instead of detail oriented.

In response to Item F1, “Larger tenant spaces shall contain multiple entrances at regular intervals,” the applicant said that the tenants find the two points of access problematic due to issues such as security at each door and cashiers being required at each door. The design is simply not feasible for multiple entrances. Much of the planning surrounding this project is tenant driven and the applicant cannot mandate multiple entrances at this point.

Mr. McMahan asked the applicant to clarify if they are trying to avoid one tenant taking up the entire the ground floor. The applicant concurred.

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD – November 7, 2005

Mr. Cox said if there ends up being a single tenant on the ground floor, there should be a liner retail or another element that retains the appropriate grain and texture at the sidewalk. The applicant responded that there would be no blank walls. The applicant responded that the goal is to draw people from plaza to shops. There is a chance that there will be one tenant, but extra entrances will not enhance the activity.

Mr. Shields suggested that this issue constitutes a finer level of design and should be continued later.

Regarding Item I1, Subsequent Process and Modifications, the applicant stated that the design will be brought back for a more detail-focused study and that all phases of the project will be brought before the DRB.

The applicant responded to the item, I2, Lapse of Approval, by saying that this will be tied to the development agreement which is fifteen years out.

Responding to item I3, Review Plaza Design, the applicant said he believes that the direction presented tonight is what the Council wants to see and hopes that the DRB concurs with it also. On the last comment in this item, "these recommendations will be forwarded to the City Council for a final decision," the applicant said that the schematic drawings will become part of the DA and when that is approved, the phases will be brought in for the DRB to process later.

Mr. Regala said that he received two letters that will be passed on to staff to address. One is from the Kirkland Cultural Council that addresses the involvement of the Cultural Council in the art decisions for the project. The second letter is from the owner of the medical office property north of the property who is concerned about truck loading and unloading impacts to his property.

Mr. Bagg asked if there is a percentage of the City's budget set aside for art since the property will be a public place.

Mr. Shields responded that the City will have a budget for art. He then asked the Chair of the Cultural Council to come forward to speak along with any audience members who wanted to speak about the project.

Robert Larson, 1201 1st Street, Kirkland, Chair of the Cultural Council, said that the Council is excited about the project and would like to be involved in the process of integrating art into its design. He said if that is to happen, it must be sooner rather than later since art should be incorporated into projects to match design, materials, layout, landscape, etc. If the community is involved early on, they might have input and opinions on what style of art and which artists should be chosen for the project. This provides a sense of ownership for the area and a project often goes more smoothly if the community feels involved. He closed by saying that the Cultural Council is available to help with this project.

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD – November 7, 2005

Mr. Shields responded that the project is on a fast track and asked Mr. Larson if it is possible for the Cultural Council to get involved now.

Mr. Larson said that the Council has come onto projects as late as the last two months before completion. The Council is flexible, but it's important to be mindful about the art that is chosen. If an artist is determined up front, the result is very different than if the design is laid out and the art is "thrown in" later. He said that he could provide multiple examples of previous projects to share with the Board.

Ms. Warman asked what the DRB's role is in regard to art. Mr. Shields said that the DRB cannot force the issue, but they can coordinate facilitation of the project with the appropriate parties.

Jim Huntzman, 13224 116th Place NE, Kirkland, said that there will be a lot of pedestrian traffic in the area of the project. He requested that with the narrowing of the road that the applicant consider putting small islands within the area for safety. 120th Avenue is a major traffic street and traffic will be an issue. The traffic will be split between Totem Lake Boulevard and 120th which are the two major paths through that complex. Quieting the traffic on 120th will throw all of the traffic back on to Totem Lake Boulevard. One solution might be to allow the traffic pattern up the hill and connect to 124th Avenue and into the hospital area. It would be a direct path that would provide two ways of getting around the complex and quieting the entire area.

Mr. Kilburn asked staff if a traffic analysis had been done on the area.

Mr. Shields responded that there was a traffic analysis done to measure the effect of the mall traffic on the gross area considering intersections. There will be impacts to Totem Lake Boulevard and 120th and Mr. Shields said that Mr. Huntzman's idea was an interesting one and it will be forwarded on to the traffic folks.

Mr. Kilburn suggested that staff and the DRB review Mr. Regalia's checklist point by point.

Mr. Bagg said before going through the checklist, the point to consider which will affect all other pieces of the design is what the interim treatment of Phase One of the lower mall will be without the residential element.

Mr. Oremus commented that the applicant is coming back and the DRB is setting policies and procedures in place.

Mr. Cox said that he doesn't think Phase One can be cut in half and then sit for ten years.

Mr. Kilburn said that the applicant would have to present their design to the DRB and get it approved.

Mr. Oremus said that the DRB should consider what will happen if Phase Two never gets built.

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD – November 7, 2005

Mr. Shields said that the DRB could ask the applicant to address the timeline of the residential portion of Phase One. They do not need to address this in the CMP, but the DRB could include language that requires the applicant to address this issue in the next plan.

Mr. Cox responded that the design cannot simply be a concrete structure built on top of what is already there.

Mr. Shields answered it is the applicant's intent that there will be residential units built in the future, but the applicant simply cannot predict when.

Mr. Kilburn commented that the DRB is used to responding to an actual design.

Mr. Duffy said that the DRB needs to be able to control the strategy for how the property is developed and that must be incorporated into the plan. There must be a commitment to the community to finish the project.

Mr. Cox added that the DRB cannot review the design of one phase without the other and all the applicant is providing is Phase One.

Mr. Kilburn asked if the DRB has the authority to require that Phase One and Phase One A happen at the same time. Mr. Shields responded that the DRB can require the applicant to address what happens if other phases come in later.

Mr. Cox asked if Phase One can come before Phase One B. Mr. Shields responded there are four components to be considered: the lower mall, the retail portion, the residential portion and retail component on the second floor. All of these integrate into the overall plan but the residential element cannot be predicted at this time. There is nothing in the zoning requirements that force the applicant to include residential or office. There is nothing that dictates phasing. The DRB has a legitimate concern as to how the overall design works, or how the residential will fit with the rest of the design if it comes along. Some phasing of the project should be expected.

Mr. Cox responded that if it will be ten years until the residential portion comes along, he doesn't want to see a strip mall shopping center with expensive streets running through it.

Mr. Duffy responded that perhaps the housing does not need to be figured out now. However, he would like to see greater detail reflected in the early phases of the design and what it might look like if and when residential comes. Mr. McMahan answered that if the applicant does not have that worked out, they will need bring it back and explain how the residential will be tied into the retail.

Mr. Oremus asked if it will come back as a pre-design conference. Mr. Shields responded that it should come back as a pre-design process but could also come back as a design response conference.

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD – November 7, 2005

Mr. Shields asked the applicant if there has been any thought given to the how the residential might fit with the rest of the project and how much detail they could provide on possible residential designs if someone else will be designing it.

The applicant responded that they will have to consider how the retail will carry over to residential. However, the residential baseline would be set by the DRB.

Mr. Duffy said that a residential architect would need to be involved early in the design stages.

The applicant repeated that subsequent phases of the project will be market driven. They cannot address details like window treatments. There also will not be an architect in Phase One of the project and they cannot predict the future of the project. However, a schematic design of the Phase One retail could show what would be a complimentary direction for the project, knowing that the developer will change it. At least that would give a symbiotic feel to the two of them and make it clear that it will not be a one-story strip mall.

Mr. Cox responded that he said he has never seen a successful building done that way and does not believe it will be anything great.

Mr. Worsham said that the facts of the market and the project are what they are. The developer could be incentivised to have the subsequent phases happen sooner or later. The DRB will have review rights on the project.

Mr. Shields asked the DRB to consider additions to the master plan that would address what will happen if the residential doesn't come to fruition and what kind of guidelines there will be for residential to ensure it will end up being compatible. He said that the DRB can address these issues when approving Phase One.

Mr. Cox agreed and said that Phase One design guidelines for the residential portion should be determined so that the important elements such as step backs and continuity can be evaluated at the same time.

Mr. Oremus agreed that Phase One must stand on its own.

Mr. Bagg commented that he is concerned about the view of rooftop appurtenances of the project from surrounding properties and would like to see some visual interest added to the roofscapes.

Mr. Shields responded that rooftop screening is required by the zoning code. Zoning regulations do address vertical and horizontal modulation but they do not pertain to the TL2 zone.

Mr. Kilburn asked if the DRB can look to the design guidelines in this area.

Ms. Warman commented that clear language should be added to avoid problems that have arisen in the past in similar situations.

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD – November 7, 2005

Mr. Shields read the zoning regulations that state, “all buildings shall include design techniques which clearly define the building’s top middle and bottom. The following techniques are suggested with regard to the top: sloped roof, strong eave lines, cornice treatments, horizontal trellises or sunshades, etc.”

Mr. Worsham responded that due to the challenges surrounding the layout of the existing buildings, the roofscape would most likely be flat.

Mr. Kilburn clarified that the DRB is simply asking the applicant to consider the roofscapes in their design for review by the DRB at their next meeting.

Mr. Kilburn suggested that the discussion move on at this time using staff’s checklist as a guide.

Pedestrian Network

1. Staff recommends that additional language be included in the CMP that specifically addresses how the following items are incorporated into the pedestrian network:
 - a. Totem Lake Boulevard
 - b. Office building atop east parking garage
 - c. Third-story Cineplex
 - d. Stand alone retail in west parking lot

Mr. Regala stated that Item 1a, Totem Lake Boulevard, has been addressed by the applicant. Regarding Items 1b and 1c, the pedestrian network connections are unclear regarding the Cineplex to the plaza. The addition of text and graphics should be added.

Mr. Shields responded that the CMP does not need to be changed, but that clarifying language should be added to address future design phases.

Mr. McMahan responded that the CMP’s text and graphics should all be in accordance when the phases come around.

2. Staff recommends that with the redevelopment of the Totem Lake Mall, a pedestrian pathway on the Mall property mall connect to the planned connection on the Evergreen Hospital property. This connection should be reflected in the CMP.

Mr. Kilburn said that Item 2 requires more discussion.

Ms. Warman said that both issues should be addressed. The DRB has spent a lot of time developing this and the issues should not be abandoned.

Mr. Oremus responded that the DRB should come up with language that addresses the secondary connection.

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD – November 7, 2005

3. An existing pedestrian connection exists, on the lower Mall, to an adjoining medical office building to the north at 12707 120th Avenue NE. Staff recommends that this connection remain and be included in the CMP.

All DRB members agreed with staff's recommendation.

4. Staff recommends that there should be pedestrian connections from the end of the sidewalk at Comp USA to Totem Lake Boulevard and 120th Avenue NE.

Ms. Warman asked if there are any walkways in the parking other than down the driveways so that pedestrians aren't forced to walk through traffic, but can instead walk past the fronts of parked cars.

Mr. Shields said that the existing layout is challenging in that respect.

Mr. Cox said that pedestrians should go up the main spine of the parking lot.

The DRB members decided that Item 4 is reasonable.

B. Orientation of Retail to Pedestrian and Vehicular Network

1. The DRB should determine if the narrowing of the public plaza is necessary to create liner retail space to front the length of the plaza, the eastern terminus of the Plaza (base of the office building), and along 120th Avenue NE where parking garages are located.

Members commented that they are in an awkward position on this decision since Council previously decided that the narrower version was preferred.

Mr. Kilburn said regarding the base of the office building and residential on 120th there should be a signature architectural element to celebrate the end of the boulevard.

Mr. Duffy said that he also struggles with this issue. The focal point does not match the model that was presented by the applicant.

Ms. Warman agreed that the focal point deserves extra attention and that this issue should be stressed now in case it doesn't come up again for a while.

Mr. Shields said that this is a conceptual plan, but there should be a pleasant, inviting feeling for pedestrians such as an entry to the garage, a focal point.

Mr. Duffy commented that the entry to the parking garage be more subtle.

Mr. Cox added that the gateway to 120th Avenue NE will be a delicate design issue.

2. Staff recommends that language be added to the CMP which states that uses other than retail, restaurants, taverns, and fast food restaurants, such as office (general and medical), not be allowed on the ground floor unless there is an

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD – November 7, 2005

intervening retail or restaurant use at least 30 feet in depth along the Plaza or 120th Avenue NE.

Mr. Shields said that the design should allow for other uses that might go in the space such as a mini city hall. The space should not be limited to strictly retail.

C. Public Amenities

The DRB should identify locations, to be included in the CMP site plan, suitable for public amenities such as art, sculptures, fountains, or benches. The CMP site plan should be revised to reflect the location of the proposed Plaza with a description of the types of amenities and suitable uses (e.g. plaza may be closed off for public events).

Mr. Oremus asked if conceptual ideas included in the graphics such as water fountains will suffice until finer details come forward for approval.

Mr. Regala responded that language and graphics could be included in the CMP that will require amenities to be part of the plaza for the review by the DRB and will be decided upon during the development agreement. The amenities should be reviewed during each phase of the project.

D. Parking Garages

The CMP contains the following guideline regarding mitigating parking garages: *If it is not possible or practicable to locate parking structures behind a building or underground, structural parking should be developed, oriented, and screened to complement adjacent buildings, reduce automobile/pedestrian conflicts, and support the pedestrian environment.*

The DRB should determine if this CMP guideline is adequate in mitigating for parking structures along pedestrian oriented streets if it is determined that retail space in front of parking garages is not required.

The DRB members stated that mitigation regarding parking garages has been adequately addressed by the applicant.

E. Landscaping

1. Staff recommends that trees be added to the following areas:
 - a. Pedestrian walkway along western frontage of lower Mall
 - b. 120th Avenue NE and the proposed Plaza
 - c. Totem Lake Boulevard fronting Shucks Auto Supply
 - d. Lower Mall parking lot
 - e. Top level of parking structures
2. The DRB should determine areas where additional landscaping may be appropriate and performance standards/goals for project landscaping.

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD – November 7, 2005

3. A preliminary landscape plan should be submitted with the CMP.

Mr. Kilburn said that the areas where the applicant shows landscaping at the ends of stalls makes sense.

Ms. Warman asked what the minimum percentage of trees is in the design guidelines.

Mr. Shields said the requirement is for 1 per 8 parking stalls and currently the applicant provides 0 per 8.

Mr. Cox said this is an opportunity to encourage better environmental practice than acres of asphalt. The area should also be shaded. Guidelines language should be included to require 1 tree per 8 stalls.

The applicant responded that there are challenges in the leases that they inherited.

Ms. Warman said that the design simply won't work unless this issue is addressed.

Mr. Kilburn said that trees at the ends of the stalls would work fine.

Mr. Shields said that specifics don't need to be addressed at this time but could be brought back at the phase review. Some kind of landscaping on the top level of the parking structure or some kind of landscaping would be good.

Mr. Bagg commented that shade structures or some type of landscaping would be good.

Mr. McMahan said that the DRB should determine what they want to achieve in this language.

Ms. Warman said the language needs to be stronger to ensure that a special treatment is used. Currently the language is too vague and there is the risk that the requirements will disappear if not made clear now.

Mr. Shields responded that it's important to make sure the requirements don't disappear during phasing and that phasing submittals are measured against the DRB's requirements.

Ms. Warman said that on point 3, a preliminary landscape plan should be included. She added that landscaping, not necessarily trees, should be required. The city is trying to get away from its dependency on sidewalk grates.

The DRB agreed on the preliminary landscape plan and that it will be reviewed at subsequent phases.

F. Building Design Techniques

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD – November 7, 2005

1. Design techniques on window treatments, utilizing architectural elements, building modulation (horizontal and vertical), and color treatment have been included in the CMP. In addition, Staff recommends the following language to address other design elements:

The Totem Lake Mall project shall include diverse forms of overhead weather protection where adjoining a pedestrian walkway.

Larger tenant spaces shall contain multiple entrances at regular intervals.

Changes of color and materials shall be utilized to help break up the mass of the buildings.

The DRB members agreed that the retail environment should contain multiple entrances at intervals.

2. Design standards should be outlined in the CMP that address how portions of the lower Mall to be retained will be architecturally consistent with the new construction.

Mr. Kilburn said he agreed that the language should be architecturally consistent.

Mr. Regala read the design guideline language regarding building fronts: "All building fronts should have pedestrian-friendly features such as transparent or decorative windows, public entrances, murals or artwork, public bulletin boards, display windows, seating or street vendors. Blank walls should be mitigated where feasible, using architectural techniques such as recessing the wall niches, artwork on the surface or installation of trellises or similar architectural features."

The DRB members stated that this language is sufficient to replace the language on multiple entrances and should be referred to throughout the design process and future phasing.

Mr. Shields said in regard to F1 and F2 the portions of the lower mall to be retained will need to be architecturally consistent.

G. Loading and Service Areas

The DRB should determine if additional design guidelines are needed to address impacts to adjoining properties of loading and service areas. Current guideline reads: *Place loading and service areas away from 120th Avenue NE and pedestrian areas.*

Mr. Shields suggested that language be added that requires the applicant to provide further detailing on design and location of loading and services areas to address impacts on adjoining properties, residential screening and pedestrian areas.

I. Other Items

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD – November 7, 2005

In addition, at the Design Response Conference (DRC), the DRB should review the CMP for the following issues:

1. **Subsequent Process and Modifications** - KZC 55.21.010 Special Regulation 2 requires that the Mall CMP contain provisions outlining the process under which subsequent development will be reviewed. The DRB should determine the process, Administrative Design Review (ADR) or Design Review Board (DRB), for subsequent development of the property. Staff recommends that, unless additional information is provided in the CMP regarding specific design solutions for Phase I, all phases of the Totem Lake Mall redevelopment project should be reviewed pursuant to KZC Chapter 142.35 DRB, Design Board Review. See *Section III below for further discussion.*

Mr. Kilburn stated that this item will come back to the DRB in the future.

2. **Lapse of Approval Date** – Staff recommends that the lapse of approval date be consistent with the Development Agreement. See *Section VI.B below for further discussion.*

Mr. Kilburn stated that this item is out of the DRB's control.

3. **Review Plaza Design** - In addition to reviewing the CMP, the DRB should also provide recommendations on the plaza design to City Council. The City is looking at purchasing the proposed east/west-oriented Plaza to help with the redevelopment of the Mall. The design of the Plaza is therefore very important to the City. The DRB should continue to provide recommendations on the design of the proposed Plaza. These recommendations will be forwarded to the City Council for a final decision. See *Section IV below for further discussion.*

Ms. Warman said that the plaza design should continue to be looked at.

Additional Items for Deliberation or Discussion:

Mr. Kilburn asked if there were any more items for deliberation or review by the Board.

Mr. Bagg said that the DRB should discuss the roofscapes so that the applicant can better understand the DRB's concerns. He referred to the existing aerial photo and gave the applicant direction to address screening issues in the design elements and consider the view from above that the neighbors have.

Mr. Regala stated that there are Zoning Code regulations on this.

Mr. Bagg asked what the comments were in the letter previously mentioned from the mall's neighbor regarding the parking easement. Mr. Regala responded that the office property was once part of the mall and when the property was sold, there became a shared parking situation that the new owners need to work out. The DRB does not address these types of issues.

KIRKLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD – November 7, 2005

Mr. Cox moved and Mr. Duffy second to accept the CMP subject to the discussion the DRB had and ultimate approval of the final language by Mr. Kilburn. Motion carried (6-0).

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS AND DRB DISCUSSION

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE: None

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Mr. Bagg and second by Mr. Duffy to adjourn the meeting at 10:14 p.m. Motion carried (6-0).

Todd Kilburn, Chair
Kirkland Design Review Board

Jeremy McMahan, Planning Supervisor
Department of Planning and Community Development

Recording Secretary: Susan Hayden
PROFESSIONAL OFFICE SERVICES