



CITY OF REDMOND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

January 12, 2023

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the hybrid meeting.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Shaffer White, Vice Chairperson Josiah Cline, Board Members Kaitlyn O’Neill, and Wanqin Su

ABSENCES: Board Members Ana Cisneros and Henry Liu

STAFF PRESENT: David Lee, Carl McArthy, and Tim McHarg, Redmond Planning

MEETING MINUTES: Carolyn Garza, LLC

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Mr. White at 7:16 p.m.

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 OF MINUTES:

MOTION by Ms. Wanqin to approve the October 20, 2022 minutes. **MOTION** seconded by Ms. O’Neill. The minutes passed unanimously.

APPROVAL

LAND-2022-00310, Together Center/Polaris Sign Program

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: Sign Program.

Location: 16255 Northeast 87th Street

Applicant: Mike Yeung *with* Fastsigns

Staff Contact: Carl McArthy, 425-556-2412 or cmcarthy@redmond.gov

Mr. McCarthy presented the project. No public comments had been received.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. O'Neill:

- Stated liking the signs and appreciated consideration of brightness.
- Ms. O'Neill stated that directional signage should be clear to everyone.

Ms. Wanqin:

- Stated not having any comments and being ready to approve.

Mr. Cline:

- Stated agreement that the design is a great concept.
- Mr. Cline stated that, regarding Exhibit C, sign types are labeled differently in the packet.

Mr. Mike Yeung *with* Fastsigns replied that there was a labeling error only.

Mr. White:

- Stated that there will need to be enough contrast between text and background.

MOTION by Mr. Cline to approve LAND-2022-00310, Together Center/Polaris Sign Program, as presented in the agenda packet with all standard conditions. MOTION seconded by Ms. Wanqin. The MOTION passed unanimously.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2022-00282, 16701 Cleveland

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: Proposed project consists of a six-story mixed-use building over one level of below grade parking. The building would include approximately 4,000 square feet of retail, approximately 110 residential units, and 77 parking spaces. A roof-top common amenity space, a ground level interior courtyard, and associated site and frontage improvements are also proposed.

Location: 16701 Cleveland Street

Applicant: Chie Yokoyama *with* Ankrom Moisan Architects

Staff Contact: Tim McHarg, 425-556-2414 or tmcharg@redmond.gov

Mr. McHarg presented the project. No public comments had been received.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Wanqin:

- Stated that the landscape and architecture are very cohesive and respond to the street level even with site constraints.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that the overall design is simple and effective.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that more design details addressing the pedestrian, cyclist and transit experience on the ground level will be helpful in future reviews.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that more details will be looked forward to, for example, if there will be glazing at corners at ground level.

Mr. Cline:

- Stated that the retail corner on the ground floor will be a great part of the project.
- Mr. Cline stated that seeing how the retail space can spill out into the corner will be helpful through plaza design such as benches, where pedestrians and cyclists will want to stop.
- Mr. Cline stated liking the rooftop amenity space and asked for renderings of the pedestrian experience.
- Mr. Cline stated that the interior courtyard is a good idea, but stated concern because of building height, how much light will penetrate the space.
- Mr. Cline stated liking the massing; the east wall may need to be broken up more, however, more engaging to the light rail view.
- Mr. Cline stated that residential units at light rail height will need screening options.
- Mr. Cline stated agreement with the side yard setback Administrative Design Flexibility (ADF) request.
- Mr. Cline asked for further concept behind why the other ADF is needed.
- Mr. Cline asked staff if first floor residential needs to be live-work units.

Mr. McHarg replied potentially, but that the review process is in early stages. For some ground floor units, only small entries will be at the pedestrian level. Issues will be worked through in the design review process.

- Mr. Cline stated liking the bicycle storage on level one and suggested that storage be enclosed.
- Mr. Cline stated that the project was off to a good start, needing only more articulation and detail.

Ms. O'Neill:

- Stated liking level two, the open concept between buildings.
- Ms. O'Neill stated mechanical screening will be needed.
- Ms. O'Neill suggested exterior furniture and canopies for businesses.
- Ms. O'Neill stated that exterior lighting will need to be addressed.
- Ms. O'Neill stated that walk up customers from the trail can be addressed.
- Ms. O'Neill stated that parking makes sense.

Mr. White:

- Stated that massing was a good start.
- Mr. White stated that the project is a unique opportunity for something special.
- Mr. White asked if there is a requirement or goal for amenity space, page 16.

Mr. McHarg replied that there is an open space standard in Downtown that must be met, but that can be modified administratively.

- Mr. White stated liking the idea of benches, ways to engage at street level.
- Mr. White stated that the south could include small retail spaces.
- Mr. White stated that modulation could include more rooftop garden space.
- Mr. White stated that materiality and detailing will be looked forward to.
- Mr. White stated that rooflines will be interesting to see developed.
- Mr. White stated that the interior courtyard is an interesting concept and asked for more understanding of visual connections.

Mr. J.P. Emery *with* Ankrom Moisan Architects replied that the intent is to provide an opportunity to open the building and let more air and light into the center.

- Mr. White suggested opportunities for people outside of the building to understand the volume contained within as well as a materiality surprise.
- Mr. White stated that the ADFs are understandable.
- Mr. White stated that screening at the light rail level is needed.
- Mr. White asked for renderings of the ground floor experience walking around the building.

- Mr. White stated that the east elevation blank wall, southeast corner, will need attention.

Mr. Emery asked for more information, ideas, or questions regarding a three-foot overhang to develop for the next presentation.

Mr. Cline:

- Stated concern regarding the amount of weather protection in rain and asked for additional views at ground level.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2022-00272, Modera Bel-Red

Neighborhood: Overlake

Description: Proposes to demolish the existing structures and improvements and to construct a 416-unit multi-family residential structure and associated site and right-of-way improvements.

Location: 12260 - 152nd Avenue Northeast/2233 Northeast Bel-Red Road

Applicant: Steven Austin *with* Tiscareno & Associates

Prior Review Date: 10-06-22

Staff Contact: Tim McHarg, 425-556-2414 or tmcharg@redmond.gov

Mr. McHarg presented the project. There had been one Public Comment from the property owner to the south concerning road grades, and the property owner was referred to the engineering team.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Cline:

- Stated preferring the current southeast courtyard design to previous design.
- Mr. Cline stated that a dark brow on the eastern façade is successful, anchoring the entry point. Details will be helpful.
- Mr. Cline stated that the west side could have somewhat of a top and that massing is diminished with striping of the facade.
- Mr. Cline stated that using an office vocabulary for a residential building is interesting.
- Mr. Cline asked staff for clarification that ground level units need to be live-work units.

- Mr. Cline stated that first-floor recessed areas will be beneficial, possibly for engagement with the urban pathway to allow for users to stop and rest under weather protection.
- Mr. Cline stated that the rooftop amenity space is on the right design path and asked for pedestrian views to the roof deck.
- Mr. Cline stated that canopies could benefit the rooftop so that the space can be used year-round.

Ms. O'Neill:

- Asked to confirm that there are balconies or Juliets.

Mr. Bob Tiscareno *with* Tiscareno & Associates replied that there will be a combination of balconies and Juliets around the building. There will be more in illustrations in the next package.

- Ms. O'Neill asked if the balconies and Juliets would extrude out or have a canopy.
- Ms. O'Neill asked where dumpsters would be located.

Mr. Tiscareno replied that service vehicles will enter the garage with the dumpsters on either side of the garage entry, out of sight.

Ms. Wanqin:

- Stated appreciating details added since the last presentation.
- Ms. Wanqin stated having asked about push and pull at the last presentation, but has not heard this addressed, in order to understand how the massing responds to the environment.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that there is a lot of gray color.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that added plants are promising, page 21 of the PDF file, particularly at the east courtyard, the most usable pedestrian amenity, and more details will be helpful.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that the we entry courtyard has potential for another pedestrian experience.

Mr. White:

- Asked if the project could possibly read as more than one building, or more detail if a single linear building is desired.

- Mr. White asked for a material board.
- Mr. White asked to understand the north elevation further.
- Mr. White stated that chamfered corners may be dated.
- Mr. White stated that previous matching models expressed more vertical modulation and encouraged opportunities.
- Mr. White asked for clarification regarding shapes on a rendering.

Mr. Tiscareno replied to be integrated into a banded concept.

Mr. Tiscareno explained design intent and influence from the neighborhood. Office lines are intentional. Bookends and center blocks break down the building but in a unified concept. Punctuating end caps will be explored. The tripartite will be worked on further for the next phase. Regarding push and pull, design elements are strong and legible. Courtyards will also be focused on.

- Mr. White asked if different materiality or additional transparency, glazing can be explored at the east bookend. The volume is successful but can be improved on.
- Mr. White stated that the office parti can be played with for variety.
- Mr. White stated that the applicant knows what needs to be achieved with the auto court.
- Mr. White stated that further ways to engage and activate the space for pedestrians and cyclists will be helpful.
- Mr. White stated that more renderings of the ground floor experience at different corners will be helpful.

Mr. Steven Austin *with* Tiscareno & Associates explained the Auto Court space on page 41. The visible entrance and landscape buffer gives a resort feel for residents and guests.

Mr. Tiscareno stated, regarding an issue in the staff report around the maximum façade length of 120', that the push pull concept creates deep ports on two sides that offset the long façade length.

- Mr. White stated that there can be flexibility as long as materiality and overall massing and detailing are addressed.

Mr. Cline:

- Stated agreement with Mr. White and suggested a roofline break.

OTHER ITEMS

Mr. Lee reminded the Board that the meeting next week has been cancelled. The next meeting will be in February.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Ms. Wanqin to adjourn the meeting at 8:40 p.m. MOTION seconded by Mr. Cline. MOTION passed unanimously.

February 23, 2023

MINUTES APPROVED ON

Carolyn Garza

RECORDING SECRETARY