

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

January 2, 2020

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. If you would like to listen to the recorded meeting, please submit a public records request for a copy of the audio tape at <https://www.redmond.gov/777/Public-Records-Requests>.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Kevin Sutton

Board members: Diana Atvars, Craig Krueger,
Stephanie Monk and Shaffer White

EXCUSED ABSENCES: Henry Liu and Ralph Martin

STAFF PRESENT: Elise Keim, David Lee, Tom Mauriss and Aaron Ruffin, Redmond Planning

MEETING MINUTES: Carolyn Garza, LLC

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting, and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

Projects up for Approval have 10 minutes for a presentation, and Pre-Applications have 15 minutes for a presentation.

CALL TO ORDER

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Mr. Sutton at 7:00 p.m.

APPROVAL

BLDG-2019-08428 King County Housing Authority (KCHA) Avondale Manor

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: Exterior remodel

Location: 17107 Northeast 80th Street

Applicant: Levi Jette *with* SHKS Architects

Staff Contact: Tom Mauriss, 425-556-2499 or tmauriss@redmond.gov

Mr. Mauriss explained that the approximately two-acre site is currently zoned R-30. The site has five low income residential buildings and one community building. All six have been identified for needed upgrades consisting of siding, windows and doors. Exterior changes will exceed \$50,000.

Mr. Levi Jette, Project Manager *with* SHKS Architects added that concrete stairs will also be replaced and that fences at unit entries would be removed while adding awnings. Landscaping, location, form and massing will remain the same. Texture and color will be updated with fiber cement lap siding at the pedestrian level, flat panel siding above and a belly band, while colors will be warm earth tones and doors will be accentuated. The Housing Authority is generally conservative in terms of design.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked to see where colors would specifically be used.

Mr. Jette replied by describing a rendering without detail for the audio recording.

- Mr. Sutton asked for clarification regarding the base materiality.

Mr. Jette replied existing concrete foundation.

- Mr. Sutton asked where metal and dark browns would be located.

Mr. Jette replied metal at band and base deck trims on the back, and that dark browns are awnings over doors.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked what color the roofs are.

Mr. Jette replied white TPO (thermoplastic polyolefin).

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked for clarification regarding a portion dropped down on the backside.

Mr. Jette replied for the warranty for flat panel siding, which is limited to 30% of the exterior façade if not a rain screen application; the project budget does not allow for rain screen.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked for clarification regarding the choice of lap siding on edges.

Mr. Jette replied that bringing panel around the side did not transition well.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked if downspouts are white and Mr. Jette replied yes.

Ms. Monk:

- Asked what the awning material would be.

Mr. Jette replied metal with a tie-back rod, as thin as possible.

- Ms. Monk understood the reasons for proportions, due to restraints.

Mr. White:

- Asked how many buildings were to be Approved.

Mr. Jette replied all buildings, which are similar except for the community building.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked if panel height was the reason for a short section that needs an eave at the ends of the building.

Mr. Jette replied yes, with the 30% restriction. The buildings are set back from the street.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked a question regarding Google Maps street view that was inaudible.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked if another configuration of siding had been considered.

Mr. Jette replied that panels are not projecting very far out, the desire was to express the upper level.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked if new windows would be white framed.

Mr. Jette replied white vinyl windows.

- Ms. Atvars asked that if there is budget remaining that more be invested in windows; tying dark bronze in more places would be suggested.
- Ms. Atvars asked to see more of the community building and asked why flat panels are not on the community building.

Mr. Jette replied height; the lower level is concrete and panels have less of a residential feel. Lap siding is located where there is circulation around decks.

- Ms. Atvars asked what the community building is used for.

Mr. Jette replied not knowing specifically. An unidentified speaker replied space for residents to hold a meeting or party.

Mr. White:

- Stated being okay with Approval.

Mr. Mauriss stated that staff analysis determined that the project meets design requirements and that draft motion language for Approval was in front of Board members in the event that the Board concurs.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that the project has been brought to the Board due to the budget of over \$30,000, and the project was acceptable.

Mr. White:

- Asked for clarification that all residential buildings would receive the same treatment.

Mr. Jette replied yes.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that the project was a huge and well-deserved improvement on the facility.

MOTION BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE CHANGES MADE TO BLDG-2019-08428 King County Housing Authority (KCHA) Avondale Manor; ANY ADDITIONAL CHANGES MADE IN THE FIELD TO BUILDINGS NOT APPROVED AT THIS MEETING OVER WHICH THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HAS AUTHORITY SHALL REQUIRE A SEPARATE APPEARANCE IN FRONT OF THE BOARD FOR APPROVAL. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WHITE. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2019-01263 Microsoft Refresh – Site Landscaping

Neighborhood: Overlake

Description: Comprehensive Landscape Plan for Microsoft Campus modernization

Location: Microsoft Main Campus

Applicant: Michael Huey *with* CBRE

Staff Contract: Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or glee@redmond.gov

Mr. Ruffin presented the project on behalf of Mr. Lee. An Administrative Modification to the Approved Land Use Entitlement is to review and approve the detailed landscaping and exterior lighting for the entire project. Staff is supportive thus far but suggests that night renderings be provided at the next presentation.

Mr. Guy Michaelson *with* Berg Partnership Landscape Architects stated that the garage and all services lie under the site, and landscape will be used to address and mitigate screening and access. The campus will become more transit-oriented in 2023 with the opening of Sound Transit. A predominantly native planting palette, with some non-native plants, will be used. Renderings of the overall site were described.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Monk:

- Stated liking the Building K courtyard and water aspect.

Mr. Michaelson replied that the marsh area is actually a stormwater garden.

- Ms. Monk asked if the pond has been re-imagined in a slightly different spot.

Mr. Michaelson replied the very much the same spot and footprint, but slightly re-imagined as the former Lake Bill required major repair.

- Ms. Monk liked the gradual change over of the forest thread from busy urban areas to more forested areas and the allowance for some non-native plantings in the palette.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the presentation was a high-elevation look and details such as lighting and the CUP building landscaping had not been discussed

Mr. Ruffin replied that if the Board would like to see detail such as around the CUP building, the applicant can be requested to come back with this.

- Mr. Krueger stated that at some point the detail would be appreciated.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the overall design is awesome.
- Mr. Krueger asked if the underground parking garage constrains what is done in landscape materiality.

Mr. Michaelson replied not greatly, but that the team had agreed that robust planting would be needed to be sure the beginning and end of the garage could not be identified. The garage design has a robust structure to allow for significant planting on top.

Mr. Ruffin stated that staff has received a detailed Landscape Plan for the entire site and asked if plant materials are detail that the Board would like to see. Mr. Krueger replied that the Board typically reviews a detailed Landscape Plan. Mr. White replied that features, benches and materiality that can be misperceived in rendering views. Mr. Krueger stated not being clear regarding rendering views of reflective areas, in example. Mr. Michaelson replied that the scale of the project makes the detail requested a challenge. Mr. Krueger suggested that bringing detail from the public realm only would be sufficient.

- Mr. Krueger stated that other than needing the detail discussed, the team can be commended on how the project is coming together.

Mr. Aaron Dunston stated that there is a prepared presentation regarding lighting but the presentation time limit did not allow. The Board can decide if presentation time should be extended for lighting. Guidance regarding specifics in what the Board would like to see within the 15-minute presentation time would be helpful. Mr. Sutton asked if

full sets could be accessed by the Board. Mr. Ruffin replied that the lighting presentation could be uploaded, but the size of the overall project presentation may be a challenge.

Mr. Sutton stated that after the landscape presentation, the general lighting presentation could be given.

Mr. White:

- Asked if there would be differences in plants used between the different villages.

Mr. Michaelson replied that buildings are already distinct and different and to further differentiate would be a mistake; landscape is a unifier to the campus.

- Asked if there was an opportunity for a delicate accent hardscape material for wayfinding.

Ms. Monk:

- Agreed with Mr. White regarding adding a small unifying detail.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that in regard to presentations, overall components are needed and then unique elements for an idea of the palette for the Board.

Ms. Atvars:

- Commended the design team and asked if renderings depict the correct species of plants.

Mr. Michaelson replied that the renderings are interpreted for scale and evergreen spaces but not for specific species.

- Ms. Atvars agreed that the detail on renderings is hard work, but some planting detail in general is needed by the Board; renderings cannot be completely relied on.
- Ms. Atvars stated that in other presentations featuring the villages, plantings incorporated into the buildings have been shown, but the landscape presentation does not; how building landscape features relate would be helpful.

Mr. Dunston asked Mr. Ruffin if the landscape presentation should also cover the buildings. Mr. Ruffin replied that the question would be researched.

- Ms. Atvars stated being interested in more information regarding the forest thread at the plaza.
- Ms. Atvars suggested varying the size of rectangles.
- Ms. Atvars stated being interested in seeing closer renderings of plantings at the ground plain and possibly raised beds for seating.

Mr. Michaelson replied that how to landscape the plaza for both normal traffic and for large event gatherings as desired by Microsoft is a challenge.

Ms. Monk:

- Liked more trees in the plaza.
- Ms. Monk suggested the potential of seating could be presented to Microsoft.

Mr. Michaelson stated having only renderings of fixtures but not the overall lighting strategy and therefore lighting would be brought to the next presentation.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the possibility of public art around the campus and plaza that could be disassembled, if necessary, for large gatherings.

Mr. Michaelson replied that Microsoft has a robust art program focused on collections inside buildings, but are more recently commissioning outdoor installations. The potential for one significant commission is being explored. The project is in the front end of three years of construction, and the art and way finding programs will fill out with time and research regarding how people move. What is shaping is an experience map, intuitively navigable with landmarks and not necessarily signs. Architecture, landscape and a wayfinding plan will provide key signatures throughout the campus but all details are not defined at this stage.

Mr. Sutton suggested that the design team be given more time for the next presentation. Mr. Michaelson stated understanding the detail requested.

Mr. Michaelson continued to discuss the project but away from the microphone and inaudible for the Minutes.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2019-01277 Vision Five

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: Remodel of existing property to expand the affordable residential suite count at Vision Five. Addition to the south deck of approximately 17 residential suites

Location: 8525 - 163rd Court Northeast

Applicant: Angela Rozmyn *with* Future Wise Investments, LLC

Staff Contact: Elise Keim, 425-556-2480 or ekeim@redmond.gov

Ms. Keim stated that the project had been approved in 2012. The applicant requests an Administrative Modification in order to add residential suites on floors three, four and five at both the north and south sides of the building. Staff has done a preliminary review and comments have been provided in the staff memo. Guidance is sought regarding building modulation, residential privacy standards, design of the covered open space and blank wall treatments.

Mr. Robert Pantley *with* Vision Five stated that the building is certified LEED Platinum and explained benefits to affordability. The goal of design is a timeless style with a strong base, LEED Platinum sustainability and long-term functionality for residents. Slides of the property were displayed.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. White:

- Asked if about an egress staircase and an exit.

Mr. Pantley replied that the Building department had been consulted to be sure an egress is allowed.

- Mr. White asked for clarification regarding window placement.

Mr. Pantley replied that the current setback of existing windows to the property line is seven feet and logic was to put windows to sides.

- Mr. White asked about materiality on a blank wall that existing units would face.

Mr. Pantley replied the purpose was to open up light, air and depth, and stated being open to any direction the Board would like to go with the wall.

- Mr. White stated that someone walking at a railing could look into a unit across, six feet away.

Mr. Pantley replied correct.

- Mr. White stated being against an open railing and asked about a possible setback requirement.

Mr. Pantley replied privacy window distance at the south property line and glass size.

- Mr. White asked who a typical tenant would be.

Mr. Pantley replied an age range from early 20's to 80's from different cultures and professions, retired and working; 35% over 35 years of age and 15% over 50.

- Mr. White asked for the ceiling height of a new covered space.

Mr. Pantley replied nine feet to the bottom of the ceiling and a 12' beam to match floors.

- Mr. White asked about structural requirements for the mass above an inaudible location.

Mr. Pantley replied that the beams are plate loaded to posts below. A structural engineer has examined.

- Mr. White asked about triangles on a rendering.

Mr. Pantley replied these are private concrete patio enclosures.

- Mr. White asked about a floor in a patio space.

Mr. Pantley replied that the center of the building is a common area.

- Mr. White asked if a rooftop sundeck had been considered.

Mr. Pantley replied that this is not allowed under ADA rules as there is no elevator access. The open space will remain the same but become more usable through the year.

- Mr. White suggested using an interesting treatment of blank walls and not only wall panels.
- Mr. White stated that a staircase would make the interior units uncomfortable.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked if the rooms are 200 square feet on average.

Mr. Pantley replied yes.

- Mr. Krueger stated that the common areas offset the limited area of the private spaces.
- Mr. Krueger asked, in regard to the Administrative Modification, if the covered courtyard would have met open space requirements when originally Approved in 2012.

Ms. Keim replied that courtyards have a specific definition in the code, open air with nothing above. The new covered courtyard is considered residential space but not with required courtyard dimensions. The courtyard is acceptable as it meets the building code minimum height for common open space.

- Mr. Krueger stated having no issues with the project.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated liking the project particularly because of the need for more affordable housing.
- Ms. Monk liked the amenity space opportunities year-round.
- Ms. Monk stated liking option one, more variation on the exterior.

Mr. White asked if, in the future, two elevations could be displayed side by side. Mr. Pantley agreed.

- Ms. Monk asked if privacy coating could be used on windows for light.

Mr. Pantley replied that there is not a lot of traffic passing by.

- Ms. Monk asked if there were an option for no window at certain units.

Mr. Pantley replied no, there must be windows for light and air. Mr. Pantley asked if there should be a solid wall at the corridor or an open railing. Ms. Monk replied open railing.

Ms. Atvars:

- Preferred a solid wall over open railing and asked for a camera shot looking down at the area with both options for better discussion; if a walkway, there needs to be lighting and the lighting may be more of a negative than people outside windows for the units in question.

Mr. Pantley proposed bringing a third option of a screen. Ms. Atvars replied yes.

- Ms. Atvars stated not being concerned with the modulation and blank walls.
- Ms. Atvars asked about an open space next to the building.

Mr. Pantley replied that the patio areas have been open to a deck since built and the area is actively used by residents.

- Ms. Atvars stated that the covered patio will be a great amenity.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that the design was an improvement on the outside.
- Mr. Sutton stated that there are opportunities to move mass if more space is needed.
- Mr. Sutton agreed that a screen would be a better idea.
- Mr. Sutton stated that functional space was better on the plaza level.
- Mr. Sutton stated being generally in favor and while hoping for creation of more light and space for existing units, the Developer should be deferred to knowing what residents will want.

Mr. White:

- Asked if all units need to be ADA usable, in example, door clearance.

Mr. Pantley replied that all units on floor two are ADA required and compliant. Above floor two the units are not.

- Mr. White suggested a design to internalize corridor space.
- Mr. White agreed that seeing options between the railing, wall and screen would be helpful.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated not seeing the courtyard as subject to required dimensions.

Mr. Pantley stated hearing that alternate one is preferred, solid cedar, but renderings would be brought again to the next presentation.

Mr. Sutton asked Mr. Lee if there was any further business. Mr. Lee replied that regarding Sound Transit presentations in December which had limited Board member attendance, as many comments as possible on both the Downtown and Southeast Redmond stations are needed for further development. Materials for both stations could be sent to the Board with comments then returned by the February 6, 2019 Design Review Board meeting. Mr. Sutton replied that at the Downtown presentation, metal and brick options were shown but Board members asked for alternatives; the scope at this point needs to narrow. Mr. Lee asked if the Board would be amenable to reviewing the Southeast Redmond station for comments from the Board members who were not present. Mr. White asked if there would be a live document where all comments could be viewed for any projects going forward on large document sets such as the Microsoft projects. Ms. Atvars suggested selecting Reply All when emailing comments.

Ms. Atvars asked when December Meeting Minutes would be available, and Mr. Lee replied at the January 16, 2019 Design Review Board meeting. Mr. Lee stated that in the future, meetings will be recorded on Skype and all presentations will be available on video as well and posted on the City website.

Mr. Lee stated that the term Affordable Housing has been used frequently and reminded the Board that the term is defined in the Redmond Zoning Code are units reserved for people who earn 80% of median income and priced as such. The Vision Five units presented at this meeting are more affordable because the actual size of the units are smaller but still priced at market rate per square foot, and not specifically reserved for those who make 80% of median income in the County. Ms. Keim replied that code is evolving; a new residential development with 10 or more dwelling units require 10% to be set aside as Affordable Housing. Mr. Lee stated that, regarding treating blank walls or placing Luxury Units to solve the issues, Design Review Board decisions must be made on design issues under Article III of the RZC and not use. Ms. Keim stated that the term Luxury Unit is not a code defined term.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY MR. KRUEGER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:00 P.M. MOTION
SECONDED BY MR. WHITE. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

February 6, 2020
MINUTES APPROVED ON

Carolyn Garza
RECORDING SECRETARY