

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

January 3, 2019

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Craig Krueger

Board members: Diana Atvars, Ralph Martin,  
Stephanie Monk, Kevin Sutton and Shaffer White

**EXCUSED ABESENCES:** Henry Liu

**STAFF PRESENT:** Kim Dietz, Gary Lee, Beth Mountsier, Amy Tarce,  
Benjamin Sticka, and Cameron Zapata, Redmond  
Planning

**MEETING MINUTES:** Carolyn Garza, LLC

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Mr. Krueger at 6:00 p.m. (early start for Marymoor Village Design Guidance and Standards Discussion).

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTIONED BY MR. WHITE TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 6, 2018 MEETING MINUTES. SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**DISCUSSION – Marymoor Village Design Guidance and Standards**

**Staff Contacts:** Kim Dietz, 425-556-2415 or [kdietz@redmond.gov](mailto:kdietz@redmond.gov) and Beth Mountsier, 425-556-2476 or [emountsier@redmond.gov](mailto:emountsier@redmond.gov)

Ms. Mountsier began by introducing Ms. Dietz and Mr. Keith Walzak, Consultant *with* VIA Architecture. A presentation had been given two months ago to the Design Review Board regarding the purpose of Design Guidance and Standards for the Marymoor Village area. A history had been provided as well as a status report.

Mr. Walzak continued the presentation. VIA Architecture along with other partners have been contracted by the City of Redmond to assist in developing Marymoor guidelines. During the last few months, draft design has been worked on and actual Policy will be developed in the new few months. The guideline policy document is intended to stand alone and Design Review Board feedback is very important for the guidelines to work.

A visioning workshop was held in October and a visual preference survey was conducted in November, the first phase or kick-off of the project schedule. Staff had been met with before the holidays. Principles are forming from input received to this point but all are a part of a process that will continue to evolve. Upcoming work sessions with staff will occur in January, February and March. The first topic will likely be massing and scale, followed by public streets, art, wayfinding, building materials and colors. A draft document will then be ready for review by the staff and Board. The Design Guideline Policy is anticipated to be prepared by May or June along with illustrations to support concepts in the stand-alone document.

Ms. Dietz displayed a map which showed the land use pattern established by the Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan and Marymoor Subarea Plan as well as infrastructure adopted as a plan by City Council. Ms. Dietz asked if the Board had any questions at this point and there were none.

Mr. Walzak continued. Future uses and street typology are set but how the frameworks are designed around is the discussion now. The visioning workshop and visual preference survey were conducted prior to any design discussions to have a sense from the community regarding values for the space and desired characteristics. The workshop in October was well attended. Each individual was asked to write down one or two words to describe Marymoor today as well as what core values of the community were in design characteristics. The raw information was clustered together for themes. Results included sustainability, pedestrian-friendly, aesthetics, accessible design, activated, artistic and contextual. Key take-aways were that people generally feel that Marymoor Village is fairly isolated but does have strong connections to Marymoor Park. There are many small businesses, the area is walkable and there is a strong sense of nature on the streets. Maintaining affordable rents was important.

The visual preference survey in November included approximately 40 participants. Preferences were asked for to particular questions. Every attendee had a checklist or passport. Three categories were Streets, Parks and Public Spaces. In Streets, the preference was for more people-oriented activities at the street level, landscaping toward nature and walkability, pedestrian spaces adjacent to streets, and materials other than concrete and curbs to create a distinctive character. On Parks and Public Spaces, preferences were green landscape areas, informal spaces, bikes and paths, intimate people places and soft, contemporary plaza spaces. Preferences regarding

architectural style leaned toward lower scale which surprised the team; this included human scale buildings, less box like design and naturalistic and organic materials and colors.

Slides of the presentation boards displayed at the visual preference survey were shown and explained. Mr. Walzak encouraged the Board to read these and formulate feedback as well.

Ms. Mountsier explained that the next step would be to conduct a survey online in January in order to tap a broader group of local participants. Some people at the November survey expressed that the presentation boards with multiple images were overwhelming, and in the online survey only four images will be displayed at a time. When the survey is available there will be a notification.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked who had participated in the October visioning workshop.

Ms. Dietz replied that the event had been advertised via existing channels of Redmond social media and with other targeted invitations, a mix of the general public, and business and property owners. Every business in Southeast Redmond was notified. Aside from people directly connected with the City, interested developers and people who had participated in previous neighborhood planning processes were also reached out to. Boards and Commissions in Redmond were represented.

Mr. Walzak displayed City of Redmond Draft Principles. Ms. Mountsier stated that the Principles had been reviewed and liked by City Council in regard to Urban Center design standards but not formally approved. Mr. Walzak continued with ten basic principles; scale and character, context, pedestrian environment, variety of heights, enhancing historic buildings, public spaces, sustainable benefits, quality materials, distinctive design and design consistencies. Themes to address include eclectic and creative design, avoiding repetition and sameness and encouraging flexibility in innovation. Patterns are being examined such as a desire for a walkable community to facilitate access to new transit facilities and creating a distinct character.

Mr. Walzak stated that the Design Review Board is on the front line interpreting the City design policies and feedback regarding what works, areas of concern and clarity of the policy statements would be appreciated. An important question was if there is a core difference between development standards, code building standards and design guidance policy as this document would be a balancing of all.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

### **Mr. Krueger:**

- Stated that design guidelines are developed by the Design Review Board and policies are developed by the Planning Commission. Both are reviewed by staff and subsequently brought to the Commission and Board regarding details. Applicant presentations at meetings is important.

Mr. Walzak replied that with the Marymoor project, there is an opportunity to shape policy and realized the Design Review Board would not develop policy but rather would interpret guidelines and make recommendations to move projects forward. Per City Council, there has been a pattern of architectural responses Downtown with mixed reviews and Marymoor is an opportunity to achieve eclectic and creative design. Design Review Board recommendations will help staff move a policy forward.

### **Ms. Monk:**

- Asked if fewer guidelines for more freedom in creativity were needed and appreciated that flexibility was a key point of the process.
- Ms. Monk suggested that challenging projects such as the Emerald Heights project could be specifically examined.

### **Ms. Atvars:**

- Asked if the deviation process could be more flexible but with built-in alternatives.
- Ms. Atvars asked that public involvement and extensive surveys continue, with a check in the next several years as to the effect; public attendance at Design Review Board meetings tends to only occur when a community or individual is upset.

### **Mr. Sutton:**

- Stated that the street blocks are very large in Marymoor because of the size of ownership parcels, and asked if there would be enough design guidance.

### **Ms. Atvars:**

- Added that as people are leaning toward smaller developments, there is a limit to what the Board can accomplish due to the large lots.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that near Whole Foods and near the transit center, the interface with the park and height limits were an issue.

Mr. Martin:

- Stated that there should be some kind of modulation on super blocks such as a public right-of-way through.
- Mr. Martin stated that eclectic design and design consistency are different; designs could be grandmother and granddaughter, similar but different in that sense.

Ms. Monk:

- Asked if there could be a requirement to break up larger masses to a more human scale.
- Ms. Monk was interested in whether people on a larger scale have a preference for a townhome type of area, or if there is an acceptance that the area may need to be denser to keep up with housing needs.

Ms. Mountsier replied that the survey would not give specifics in terms of design guidance but rather around tolerances for design types. There is interest in incorporating existing businesses as the economic demand is there for mixed-use and residential use. The survey would probably not relate precise information and the intent is more to further explore values and characteristics and subsequently preferences and architecture.

Mr. White:

- Stated that flexibility should be incentivized, rewarding more creativity with more freedom in setbacks, height requirements and F.A.R.
- Mr. White suggested that a neighborhood gallery be compiled from developers so that plans for adjacent properties can be visualized.
- Mr. White stated that projects could make concessions to keep a current business in the new building to maintain the fabric already present.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that working with older regulations and design principles do not match with a goal of eclecticism and the new guidelines will be helpful to both the Board and applicants. Eclecticism should be not only be considered street block by street block but within street blocks; unique, different and celebrated. The new guidelines will be an opportunity to create a gathering place and generate curiosity.

Mr. Walzak replied that what was being heard was that while there needed to be flexibility, there also needed to be standards and incentives.

- Mr. Krueger stated that the guidelines should allow the area to be interesting.

Mr. Walzak replied that clear direction to an applicant was necessary as an interpretation of the aesthetic may be different. Consistent messaging was required.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that applicants would need to be aware going into Marymoor that Downtown design a few years ago was not the goal. Different, respectful and attractive should be relayed and the applicant can back forms, materials and colors.
- Mr. Krueger hoped for a guideline that requires applicants to be open to color variety, but not mandated.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that there could be an eclectic mix of guidelines for the Marymoor neighborhood and different applicants could use, for instance, five out of eight in any combination. This would create uniqueness as well as consistency.
- Ms. Monk stated that there could be a historical preservation aspect.
- Ms. Monk asked when the next presentation to the Design Review Board would occur.

Ms. Mountsier replied that draft guidelines would be brought next but that more meetings could be held, and stated being aware, however, that the Design Review Board had many projects upcoming. The timeline and a way for the Board members to communicate with staff would be provided.

Mr. Walzak asked how the Board as a collective group gives a recommendation to an applicant on an exemption as far as opinions or a metric. The Board members replied

opinions, and considered if ultimately an exemption would lead to an improved design or building. Departures may be acceptable but the applicant must prove the design would be better.

Mr. Sutton

- Stated that there would have to be incentives as few developers launch with eclectic design.

Mr. White??

- Commented that at the Landmark Lenora building, design did not step forward until a setback requirement was removed. First iterations were minor in changes.

Mr. Martin

- Agreed that if the guidelines are clear, there is opportunity to get started soon on desired design.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated there should be a give and take.

**REGULAR MEETING BEGAN AT 7:00 P.M.**

Ms. Tarce asked the Board if meetings at 6:00 p.m. rather than 7:00 p.m. would be preferable. The consensus was that 7:00 p.m. was a better start time.

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.

**APPROVAL**

**LAND-2018-00566, Esterra Park, Block 2A/2B**

**Neighborhood:** Overlake

**Description:** Eight story multi-family building with 620 apartments

**Location:** 15300 Northeast Turing Street

**Applicant:** Larry Flack *with* Runberg Architecture Group

**Prior Review Dates:** 07/19/18, 09/06/18 and 11/15/18

**Staff Contact:** Cameron Zapata, 425-556-2480, [cazapata@redmond.gov](mailto:cazapata@redmond.gov)

Ms. Zapata stated that at the last meeting, discussions were around roofline modulation and the color palette. The applicant has responses to these concerns. Staff looked forward to the response of the Board, and if in support, a separate recommendation of approval was requested as well as which color palette the Board supports.

Mr. Larry Flack continued that clearance had recently been obtained from Land Use for a complete SPE application. In regard to the roofline modulation, heard at the last meeting was eliminating strata banding at the top level. In regard to color, more detail in ground-level cladding conditions was requested.

Using regional land forms and patterns to inform buildings is mentioned in the Overlake Master Plan for zone four and the Land Use code. The Group Health site is unique in grade change with a transition of approximately 50 feet between a commercial zone and Microsoft. The building has been grouped into levels of three floors as the slope steps up.

The Land Use code identifies exterior elevations longer than 100 feet for roof modulation issues. Slides were displayed of newly proposed roof modulation, the preferred solution to cant out the exterior walls for most perspectives, ground to 30 feet above grade. The possibility of illuminating strata banding at the top level received negativity from staff; seeing continuous bands through the site strengthens the concept. Canting the elements out is more consistent with the architectural vocabulary of maintaining a consistent stratification of the building.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

#### **Mr. Krueger:**

- Liked how the roof modulation pops up, providing variety and breaking the monotony of the windows.

#### **Mr. White:**

- Stated that the pop-up was helpful.
- Mr. White asked if there was an overall view from the park.

Mr. Flack replied no. All 100 foot or longer elevations are either on building ends or the north side and the park ends are short and compliant. Overall, there are five conditions. Mr. Flack suggested popping up two, adjacent to the muse.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked if the white surface of frames angle out.

Mr. Flack replied that the white angles out.

- Ms. Atvars stated that mixing up more would be desirable, but was satisfied with canted.

Ms. Monk:

- Did not have a strong opinion in regard to the canting or pop-up but believed people living in the pop-up areas may appreciate windows to let more light in.
- Ms. Monk stated that either helps break up the roofline, which is good, and doesn't interfere much with the strata concept.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked about views from the north for office buildings or pedestrians and if the view was from a distance or much closer.

Mr. Flack showed a north side view from the northwest corner. The canting solution is in keeping with the desired design concept.

- Mr. Sutton suggested that if the view is for pedestrians, the canted solution is good.

Mr. Martin:

- [Inaudible]  
**Mr. Martin looked forward to seeing the project. MINUTES**  
For approval: January 3, 2019

- Agreed with Mr. Sutton regarding the elevation views but did not have a recommendation.

Mr. Flack continued with colors. What was taken away from the last meeting was that closer views of level one frame elements were desired, storefront with white spandrel glass; more contrast between colors and strata levels, and an alternate scheme with a lighter color at top.

A project done in the Seattle Ballard neighborhood was displayed, similar in materials and scale but with an aluminum anodized storefront.

Regarding contrasting colors at strata levels, the proposed material is a pre-finished metal panel with varying width reveals randomly placed. Flashing from floor to floor would give the building more texture. Mr. Flack suggested that the metallic colors of the product be retained.

Color study one was a champagne color and Vintage, a brownish metallic color not on the material board. The darker color creates the contrast.

Color study two included Zaktek, a pre-finished metal made to appear as zinc cladding. Mr. Flack suggested that the color occurring in the floor levels be consistent to calm the elevation and create very subtle vertical movement of an eye through the building, consistent window and spandrel colors moving through.

Color study three simply shifted same colors as requested by the Board.

A European window manufacturer is being worked with which has a wider range of colors available. There is not a commitment at this time but Mr. Flack believed that this manufacturer could be used for the price of the project. White versus light grey vinyl window renderings were displayed. Approval was desired for the white vinyl window with the ability to work with staff in the future if an internal interest for a different color arises.

Metal cladding has a metallic finish which creates different light reflection on various facades. Mr. Flack believed that there were three different variations to consider.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked if the preferred was color study number two.

Mr. Flack replied that this was correct.

Mr. White:

- stated that color studies one and two could work but did not like three.

Ms. Monk:

- stated liking color study three but all were agreeable.
- Ms. Monk thanked staff for extra renderings in the presentation.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated liking color study two.
- Ms. Atvars favored keeping the window frames white with white spandrel

Mr. Flack agreed and stated that windows that could be an alternate color would be within the rest of the strata levels.

Mr. White:

- Stated liking spandrel colors repeating on different levels.

Mr. Sutton:

- Preferred color study one in the choice of colors, but also liked three with darker colors.

Mr. Martin:

- Stated that lighter colors would be fine.
- [inaudible]

Mr. Krueger:

- Preferred color study three.
- [inaudible]

Mr. White:

- [inaudible] materials bleeding into each other.

Mr. Flack replied to an inaudible question that it was around the corner in the courtyard.

- Mr. White asked if the bands were in the same plane.

Mr. Flack replied no.

- Mr. White asked for clarification regarding the roof deck detail.

Mr. Flack replied that in all cases, the Corten frame is proud of the adjacent strata banding, flush with the outside corner created by the roof deck but beyond.

- Mr. White stated that this was good.

The Board agreed that there were no specific strong feelings regarding the color studies and that they all were good.

Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ stated preferring two pop-ups on the north and one pop-up on the south where not needed for modulation, for balance.

Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ stated that consistent datum should be maintained on the park side for various elements and that the first choice would be to cant all, second choice being to pop-up two.

**MOTIONED BY MS. MONK TO APPROVE LAND-2018-00566, ESTERRA PARK, BLOCK 2A/2B, WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATION, STANDARD CONDITIONS AND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD SUGGESTIONS FOR POP-UPS ON THE NORTH SIDE AND CANTS ON THE PARK SIDE; COLOR PALETTE NUMBER THREE PREFERRED; KEEP WHITE WINDOWS. SECONDED BY MS. SUTTON. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

#### **APPROVAL**

#### **LAND-2017-00727, Rose Hill Cottages**

**Neighborhood:** Willows/Rose Hill

**Description:** Construction of 28 detached residential units and necessary site improvements

**Location:** 13xxx Northeast 112<sup>th</sup> Place

**Applicant:** Albert Torrico *with* TOLL WA, LP

**Prior Review Date:** 12/06/18

**Staff Contact:** Benjamin Sticka, 425-556-2470, [bsticka@redmond.gov](mailto:bsticka@redmond.gov)

Mr. Sticka stated that the proposed cottages are on 10.85 acres. The Design Review Board had six comments at the last meeting; existing grades were requested, aging in place, possible locations for a [inaudible], information requested regarding the orientation of units one through 12 and specifically garages, additional screening and landscaping adjacent to cottage products on the western property line, and information requested on variation of design of cottages.

Staff believed that the applicant had submitted a code compliant project.

Mr. Torrico introduced Justin Julian with Dahlin Architects and Aaron Hollingbery with Toll Brothers. Mr. Greg White was not able to be present.

Addressing requests for further clarification from the 12/06/18 meeting, a sheet had been provided to the Board members showing existing contours of the site; slopes of 40% or more, 20% and 10% or less were superimposed on top of the proposed site plan. Only 5.25 acres would be undisturbed with the remaining developed.

To handle landscape buffer issues, there is an agreement with an adjacent neighborhood that a six-foot cedar fence, retaining wall and mixed evergreen landscape buffer be provided. In the public right-of-way, deciduous and evergreen trees as well as mixed shrubs are proposed to address the 15 feet. Finally, there is an agreement with another property owner to a use easement and a six-foot cedar fence; a hedge consisting of Emerald Greens, Leland Cypress or similar, as well as a mixture of evergreens and deciduous plants. As planning is at a preliminary stage, slide renderings were concepts only with the exception of what is written in the agreements.

A question from the Board had been if Garages P1 and P2 should be flipped. There were several engineering standards that could not be met with the original design such as sewer manholes and fire access. The new design solved the problems and City staff were happy with how the engineering issues had been addressed. The current design has also improved grading.

Mr. Hollingbery continued the presentation. A request was to consider accommodating a tot lot within the common open space. TOLL has constructed a number of cottage communities and due to the home sizes, families are not usually part of the demographic. Entry level one or two-person households, empty nesters or downsizers post children become the community and a tot lot doesn't receive much use. A community gathering place, such as the community building, is effective and would be utilized, however.

Another question had been if aging in place was an opportunity within this project. The answer is yes; with smaller homes, the demographic is downsizing empty nesters. Units are 1,300-1,500 square feet of livable area.

A concern regarding accessibility to the units had been expressed. Over half of the units would be easily accessible with minimal use of stairs. All homes have crawlspaces. There are 15 to 18 homes that will have at most one or two stairs into the home due to topography.

Mr. Julian displayed a site plan to show massing, textures and materials from the common green spaces. There are three plans with three different styles; Craftsman, shingle and farmhouse. The Cottage Design Code requires a maximum of 1,500 square feet, 25 feet maximum overall height and a 6 and 12 roof pitch for heights over 18 feet.

Glass at the front of homes put homes at one with the common green space. On second levels, sloped ceilings created more space.

More playful roof forms and the use of corbels with the Craftsman style on primary and secondary roofs were proposed, and clipped gable ends are playful as well. In the shingle style, bold forms, gable ends with wood shingles and more shadow would be created with various materials. The farmhouse style would utilize board and batten as well as simple and symmetrical massing.

The community building color scheme and texture has been changed to more of a natural setting.

Mr. Krueger asked if there were questions from the audience and there were none.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

##### Ms. Atvars:

- Asked if paving material would change at the lowest part of the site due to white color on the site plan.

Mr. Torrico replied this area would switch from asphalt to concrete because of grade, a City engineering requirement.

- Ms. Atvars stated that the agreements with neighboring parcels made sense and thanked the applicant for the landscape exhibits.

##### Mr. Sutton:

- Asked if [inaudible] were a part of the record.

Mr. Torrico replied that all documents were recorded last year and are current.

##### Mr. Martin:

- Believed all questions had been addressed and that the project should be approved.

##### Mr. White:

- Had no further comments.

Ms. Monk:

- Thanked the applicant for answering the questions.
- Ms. Monk appreciated the blending of architectural styles.
- Ms. Monk would approve the project based on what had been presented.

Mr. Krueger:

- Believed that the upper cluster added to the streetscape.
- Mr. Krueger asked if the applicant had any further questions for the Board.

Mr. Torrico replied no.

Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ stated that the separate entitlement was for the 28 cottage units.

**MOTIONED BY MR. WHITE TO APPROVE LAND-2017-00727, ROSE HILL COTTAGES, WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND STANDARD CONDITIONS. SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**LAND-2018-01453, Microsoft Refresh**

**Neighborhood:** Overlake

**Description:** Landscape and architecture for campus design

**Location:** Microsoft Main Campus, south of Northeast 36<sup>th</sup> Street and west of 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast

**Applicant:** Aaron Dunsdon *with* Microsoft

**Staff Contact:** Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or [glee@redmond.gov](mailto:glee@redmond.gov)

Mr. Lee stated that the last presentation had been a general overview and that this presentation would include concepts regarding landscaping and architecture.

Mr. Dunsdon stated that the plan was for three meetings with the Board. Ms. Ruta Patil *with* Microsoft and Guy Michaelson *with* Berger Partnership were introduced. Mr. Michaelson commented having had worked with Mr. Lee on Downtown projects and the Redmond Central Connector, and that this project would also have a great effect on Redmond.

Mr. Dunsdon continued that the challenge for Microsoft globally is to look at building and delivering connected, accessible and sustainable campuses and how this can create the best experience for employees. Questions from the Board that would now be addressed were if material had been given to the five different architects as a guide to

work from in design, as well as how the high-level concepts for landscaping would tie the design together.

Ms. Patil stated that another challenge was how to express the Microsoft brand and culture through exterior spaces and that the conclusion became a document titled Exterior Design Language. A survey was created with participation of the Employee Advisory Panel in order to give a voice for employees in the process. Results were that the design should be human, connected and intelligent. There was consistency in what people wanted to see. A compilation of images from the survey were displayed. A graphic summary of desired sensibilities for place was shown.

Historically, indoor and not exterior work spaces have been the focus. Outdoor spaces have begun to be thought about more intentionally in the last few years. Very positive feedback has been received from employees. Creating meaningful connections to nature includes programming outdoor spaces to be used year-round. Human scale and comfort in spaces are a focus; in example, heating. Massing façade with texture, ground plane to include amenities, artist expression, modulation and shelter all assure that buildings will be visually interesting. Also to be considered are a choice of views, history of the location, respect for the local climate, native plants and using local materials provide urban context.

Mr. Michaelson addressed project character; a technology campus rooted in the Northwest with finger prints reflecting global impact and presence. The overall project is actually four different smaller village projects. Villages named for local lakes infer ecology and sustainability.

A rendering of the site over time was displayed. In addition to connections to natural features such as Lake Sammamish, there is mindfulness regarding connections to Overlake and the eastside. Between the heavily wooded legacy stand of trees to the north and the forest to the south is a deliberate meadow open space that will provide recreation, escape and a gathering place for events. Elements in the landscape that people will choose to experience despite the weather are important. Materials will move from raw wood and stone to a hierarchy of paving.

Mr. Dundson also stated that the presentation was an opportunity to show the Board where thinking was in preliminary designs and urban planning. The next meeting would be in late February with all architecture teams together for feedback. The model had been brought to this meeting.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

### **Mr. Krueger:**

- asked if a Landscape Architect would also be hired for each village.

Mr. Dundson replied that Berger Partnership is working with all of the architects on landscaping. There is only one Landscape Architect for the entire project.

- Mr. Krueger stated that the project would present an interesting challenge to work in the individual villages with the overall environments being created.

Mr. Dundson replied that there was coordination between architects and landscape design.

Mr. Krueger asked if there were questions from the audience and there were none.

### **Mr. White:**

- Stated that the project looked good and asked when the project would be brought back to the Board.

Mr. Dundson replied the third week of February.

- Mr. White stated that if there were materials that could be examined prior to the February meeting to absorb the ideas behind the different lake villages, this would be helpful.
- Mr. White looked forward to seeing the next presentation.

### **Mr. Krueger:**

- Asked if the Board could borrow photographs to inform plan ideas.

Mr. Dundson replied that Microsoft corporate could be worked with regarding photographs.

### **Ms. Atvars:**

- Stated not being familiar with the large corporation in personal work history and found it challenging to imagine, for example, sports fields available to employees year-round; that the concept resembled a large college.
- Ms. Atvars stated that a good job had been done so far on the project.

Ms. Patil replied that research is done regarding the employee base so that what is built is meaningful, and that as demographics change over time spaces are utilized differently.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated loving the inclusion of land languages.
- Ms. Monk asked if there were information regarding integrating native art and influences into design.

Mr. Dundson replied that artwork had not been explored at this point but would be brought to the Board when ready.

- Ms. Monk asked how current landscaping would be worked into this side of the campus.

Mr. Dundson replied that current landscaping would be considered to continue develop spaces and what works well for employees would be recreated. New spaces are important for interest as well. Ms. Patil agreed.

Mr. Sutton:

- Did not have any comments at this point.

Mr. Martin:

- Asked if there were long range plans for the campus in expansion.

Mr. Dundson replied that creating buildings that are flexible for the long term was a priority. Microsoft wants the buildings to be useful for decades.

- Mr. Martin [inaudible]

Mr. Dundson replied that looking at sustainability targets, there may be portions of campus using solar panels and green roofs. There will be a better idea of percentages when the architects meet with the Board. Some roofs may be accessible decks as amenities for employees.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that because of how fast technology is changing, designing for the future is similar to trying to hit a moving target and that looking a few years ahead may be difficult much less thirty years.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the project was exciting.

Mr. Dundson replied that designing for the future is an interesting challenge but always considered.

Ms. Tarce, Redmond Planning staff, stated that older buildings reflect Microsoft history and asked if thought were put into preserving the Microsoft story for the future.

Ms. Patil replied that this was a favorite subject. Mr. Dundson replied that the challenge was not to maintain places for nostalgic reasons as a time capsule but to re-imagine with new purpose. In example, the legacy grove is in a star shape because of the star buildings, but even as the star buildings are removed the star form from the trees will remain, echoes within new purpose.

Mr. Krueger stated that comments and questions were complete and thanked the applicant and staff. Mr. Dundson stated being available to discuss the model after the meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTIONED BY MR. WHITE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:48 P.M.  
SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**March 7, 2019  
MINUTES APPROVED ON**

**Carolyn Garza  
RECORDING SECRETARY**