



CITY OF KIRKLAND

Planning and Community Development Department
123 Fifth Avenue, Kirkland, WA 98033 425.587.3225
www.ci.kirkland.wa.us

MEMORANDUM

To: Design Review Board

From: Angela Ruggeri, Senior Planner

Date: January 28, 2008

Subject: **PRIVATE AMENDMENT REQUEST FROM TOUCHSTONE CORPORATION FOR PARK PLACE CENTER**
CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
File No. ZON07-00016

I. SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

Douglas Howe of Touchstone Corporation has submitted a private amendment request for the redevelopment of the existing Kirkland Park Place Center. The proposal includes up to 1.8 million square feet of office, retail and hotel floor area and approximately 3,500 parking stalls. The 11.5 acre site currently contains 250,700 square feet of office and retail uses along with 742 parking stalls.

The applicant is requesting the following amendments:

- A building height increase from 3-5 stories to 4-8 stories as measured from the grade of 6th Street and Central Way and to allow taller buildings next to Central Way and 6th Street.
- A building setback reduction from 20 feet to 0 feet on Central Way and 6th Street, and possibly from 10 feet to 0 feet next to Peter Kirk Park, and possible flexibility in other regulations such as lot coverage.

II. DISCUSSION ISSUES

The purpose of this Design Review Board (DRB) meeting is to discuss:

- The DRB's recommendation to the Planning Commission; and
- The design team's continued development of the proposal for the site.

III. PROCESS

The role of the DRB during the private amendment process for Park Place is to help staff and the Planning Commission develop appropriate Comprehensive Plan policies, development regulations

and design guidelines for the Park Place site. The primary issues that the Board is to focus on are site layout and building massing. The DRB's review of the conceptual development plans that the applicant has submitted provides a starting point for recommendations to the Planning Commission.

The design team will return to the DRB meeting on February 4, 2008 to receive further comments on their Conceptual Development Plan. This was originally to be the DRB meeting when recommendations to the Planning Commission on site layout and building massing for the Park Place PAR were to be completed. An additional meeting with the DRB has been scheduled for March 3, 2008. This meeting will allow the DRB additional time to complete their recommendations to the Planning Commission on the development of Comprehensive Plan policies, development regulations and design guidelines for the site. The main focus of both the February and March DRB meetings will be the completion of these recommendations. Two comment letters from citizens relating to the DRB recommendation are included as Attachments 1 and 2 to this memo.

IV. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. PRIOR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETINGS

The applicant made an initial presentation of the proposal to the DRB at the May 14, 2007 meeting. The applicant then returned to the DRB meeting on September 17 with a conceptual pedestrian experience plan. The DRB made a number of comments about the project massing and the need for an improved pedestrian environment at the September 17 meeting. These comments were addressed by the applicant's new design team at the DRB meeting December 3, 2007. The applicant presented additional information to the DRB at their January 7, 2008 meeting. A list of the DRB comments from that meeting and the previous meeting in December are included as Attachment 3 to this memo.

B. APPLICANT'S SUBMITTAL

The applicant has continued to develop their proposal. The drawings included in this packet represent where they are in the design process now (see Attachment 4). They plan to continue developing their proposal over the next week and will be providing additional drawings at the February 4 DRB meeting. The applicant is particularly interested in the DRB's feedback on the configuration of their public plaza and the "armature" of public spaces, streets and circulation which will provide the organization for the development.

V. DRB TOPICS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

The DRB will complete their recommendations to the Planning Commission at the March 3 meeting. The following outline includes the elements on which the DRB will make these recommendations. The Planning Commission will use the DRB recommendations to help develop regulations and guidelines for the site. The DRB should discuss each of these elements and the

related questions. The outcome of the discussion should be instructions to staff on what additional information will be needed for the March meeting, so that a recommendation to the Planning Commission can be completed at that time.

KEY POINTS FOR CONSIDERATION:

- **Open space and street network should provide the organizing structure for the project.**
- **There should be public benefits gained in exchange for allowing additional height.**

1. CONNECTIONS

Connection points for both pedestrians and vehicles entering the site and their relationship to the surrounding area should be designated. What else is important in considering connections?

a. Cars

- Internal grid of streets that connect with the existing external grid.
- Should there be special requirements to make the street adjacent to the park more pedestrian friendly if it is included?

b. Pedestrians

- Pedestrian connections through the site – internal hierarchy which feeds into the pedestrian connections that exist in the surrounding area.

2. OPEN SPACE

a. Interior open space:

- Plaza - Central public open space which is visually and functionally connected to the park and parallel to Central Way.
- Streets and pedestrian connections through the site provide some open space.

b. Perimeter Setbacks

- Existing zoning:
The existing Zoning requires a 20' setback from Central Way and 6th Street unless there are continuous retail or restaurant uses at the street level. In that case, 0' setback is required.

There is a required 10' setback from Peter Kirk Park, but no portion of a structure within 100 feet of the park can exceed three stories above average building elevation.

There are no required setbacks from lot lines of other adjacent sites.

- Central Way – possible options:
 - 1) Zero setback where there is pedestrian oriented retail and on street parking.
 - 2) Zero setback from slip-street where there is pedestrian oriented retail.
 - 3) X feet of landscaped setback in areas where there is no pedestrian oriented retail.

- 6th Street – possible options:
 - 1) Zero setback where there is pedestrian oriented retail and on street parking.
 - 2) X feet of landscaped setback or pedestrian oriented space.

- Park – possible options:
 - 1) Zero setbacks required.
 - 2) Zero setbacks required if there is a street adjacent to the park.
 - 3) X feet of setback required if no street to encourage active use next to the park and allow for outdoor spaces.

- Adjoining sites – Should there be a setback requirement?

- Gateway at 6th and Central – Should the gateway feature at the corner be subtractive or a grand statement?

Possible options for the gateway include:

- 1) Open space.
 - 2) Building with massing stepping back.
 - 3) Building allowed to fill the corner while addressing the gateway.
- c. Building Separation – Interior buildings and buildings on adjacent properties. Should a minimum separation be required?
- d. View Corridor – possible options:
- No requirement.
 - Require corridor through the site.
 - Across the northwest corner of the site into the park.
 - Further east on Central Way over the tops of buildings.
 - Hold back portions of buildings along Central Way to open up more of the horizon.
- e. Solar Exposure – what requirements?

3. BUILDING MASSING

- a. Height – measured relative to right-of-way if building is adjacent to a right-of-way. Use Average Building Elevation (ABE) if building is not adjacent to a right-of-way.
- Consider height in relationship to:
 - 1) Streets/adjacent sites (scale compatibility)
 - 2) Topography
 - 3) Peter Kirk Park
 - 4) Other buildings on the site

 - What should the maximum allowed height on the site be?

- Should there be zones of intensity (areas where certain heights are allowed)?
- Should buildings step down toward the park?
- Should there be a variety of heights on site?
- Should the height of perimeter buildings reflect surrounding development and/or pedestrian orientation with step-backs at appropriate levels?
- Should rooftop appurtenances be allowed to go above the height limit?

b. Floor plate size

- Consider floor plate size in relationship to :
 - 1) Buildings on adjacent sites
 - 2) Other buildings on the site
- Should floor plates be addressed?
- Should there be a maximum floor plate size allowed?
- Should there be a variety of floor plate sizes for different buildings?
- Should the floor plate size decrease for the higher floors? If, so, above what level?

c. Façade Length

- Consider façade length in relationship to :
 - 1) Buildings on adjacent sites
 - 2) Other buildings on the site
 - 3) Peter Kirk Park
- Should façade length be addressed?
- Should façade length be limited?
- Can design elements be used instead of or in addition to limitations on façade length?

4. USES

a. Require retail – possible options:

- Require a minimum percentage of ground floor area to be retail.
- Require a minimum amount of ground floor square footage to be retail.
- Require a minimum percentage of retail in relationship to total floor area.

b. Should residential uses be allowed?

5. DESIGN

a. What design elements should be required for the buildings proposed for the site?

- Discuss buildings in terms of top, middle and bottom – what design elements are necessary for each of these three zones?
- What can be used to make each building unique (heights, sizes, floor plates, roof forms, materials, etc.)?

ATTACHMENT:

1. Letter from Diane W. DeWitt and Curtis L. Thompson dated January 3, 2008
2. Letter from Kenneth Davidson dated January 25, 2008.
3. Comment lists from December and January DRB meetings
4. Applicant's submittal

Cc: Douglas Howe, Touchstone Corporation, 2025 1st Avenue, Suite 790, Seattle, WA 98121
Mark Arnold, LMN Architects, 801 2nd Avenue, Suite 501, Seattle, WA 98104
Planning Commission