

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

January 16, 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, Henry Liu, Ralph Martin and Shaffer White

EXCUSED ABESENCES: Stephanie Monk

STAFF PRESENT: David Lee, Gary Lee, Tom Mauriss, Aaron Ruffin, Cameron Zapata, 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 OF MEETING MINUTES

MOTION to Approve the Meeting Minutes from November 7, 2019 by Mr. Krueger. MOTION seconded by Ms. Atvars. MOTION passed unanimously by the Board members then present.

MOTION to Approve the Meeting Minutes from November 21, 2019 by Ms. Atvars. MOTION seconded by Mr. Krueger. MOTION passed unanimously by the Board members then present.

MOTION to Approve the Meeting Minutes from December 5, 2019 by Mr. Liu. MOTION seconded by Mr. Martin. MOTION passed unanimously by the Board members then present.

APPROVAL

BLDG-2019-00228 Microsoft Refresh – Whatcom Village

Neighborhood: Overlake

Description: Construction of four mixed-use four and five story buildings

Location: South of Northeast 36th Street and east of 156th Avenue Northeast

Applicant: Michael Huey *with* CBRE

Prior Review Date: 05/02/19

Staff Contact: Aaron Ruffin, 425-556-2925 or aruffin@redmond.gov

Mr. Ruffin stated that the applicant is requesting to modify components of the building elevations, terraces and material types. The project was previously Approved by the Design Review Board on May 2, 2019. Staff has reviewed each request and all meet the intent of the Redmond zoning code. A correction needs to be made to design update #1 to reflect an error contained within the Staff Report; a change impacts the northwest facades of buildings N, O and P as well as building Q.

Mr. Gid Palmer *with* Microsoft thanked the Board.

Mr. John Chau *with* LMN Architects presented updated renderings. Two Approvals are sought, for base design and ultimate design.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Sutton asked the Board if there were any objections to the column and there were none.

Mr. Sutton asked the Board if there were any objections to item four and there were none.

Mr. Sutton asked the Board if there were any objections to a material change.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated agreeing with staff.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked why staff had not agreed with a change to concrete panels.

Mr. Ruffin replied that the design proposed does not include variation for character to the structure; variation in the pattern would be more visually acceptable.

- Mr. Krueger asked what facades would be impacted by the change in concrete.

Mr. Chau replied that almost all facades will be internal and that the pattern would not provide shadow lines but can be done if agreed on by the Board.

- Mr. Krueger asked if renderings of elevations could be reviewed

Mr. Chau displayed the requested slides.

- Mr. Krueger stated that vertical was okay.

Mr. White:

- Stated that side by side, the original was preferred but the judgement of the designer was okay.

Mr. Martin:

- Stated that the materials and vertical are better and that the pattern would only be visible up close.

Mr. Liu:

- Agreed that vertical is better.

Mr. Sutton:

- Agreed as well that vertical is better.

Mr. Sutton asked the Board to comment on landscape terraces.

Mr. White:

- Stated concern regarding soil exposure.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated support for the idea of the designers.

Mr. Martin:

- Stated liking the new landscape but agreed with Mr. White regarding more landscaping.

Mr. Liu:

- Stated both new and old plans were okay.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that occupied spaces look well designed and liked a second example slide with more purposefully placed driftwood; materials are fine.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that if the client is pleased the change is okay but more development in design would have been hoped for.

Mr. Sutton asked the Board for comments regarding the fins.

Mr. Liu:

- Stated liking the fins which add another dimension to the façade but stated being okay with removing if a cost cutting measure.

Mr. Martin:

- Suggested fins only on the upper story.

Mr. Krueger:

- Agreed with Mr. Martin regarding keeping some variety; the Staff Report stated that staff did not necessarily want fins removed, but that alternatives besides only eliminating fins would be good.

Mr. Chau suggested changing to a six-inch extension. Mr. White asked for clarification and Mr. Chau replied that the southeast and southwest facades have horizontal two-foot extensions. On the northeast façade there are none.

- Mr. White asked if there were a trade-off for upgrading the glazing system.

Mr. Chau replied that glare is controlled in the afternoon and evening hours.

- Mr. White asked if there will still be vertical fins if the update is Approved.

Mr. Chau replied no; southeast and southwest facades will have two-foot horizontal extension and both the northeast and northwest facades will not have any exterior shading devices.

- Mr. White stated being okay with design either way.

Ms. Atvars:

- Supported the revision.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated liking the fins but was okay with the revision.

Mr. Sutton asked the Board if another design round was necessary regarding the fins.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that what the designers and client have chosen is okay.

Mr. Martin:

- Stated that while preferring fins aesthetically, understanding why fins are being removed.

Mr. Sutton stated that the Design Review Board is responsible for aesthetics and asked again if the Board was comfortable removing the fins.

Mr. Liu:

- Stated feeling okay but not completely happy with the change.

MOTION BY MR. WHITE TO APPROVE ALL FIVE DESIGN UPDATES TO BLDG-2019-00228 Microsoft Refresh – Whatcom Village. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL

LAND-2019-01249 Microsoft Refresh Building R 207

Neighborhood: Overlake

Description: Construction of a mixed-use building in the central location of Microsoft Campus Modernization site

Location: 15800 Northeast One Microsoft Way

Applicant: Kyle Hughes *with* CBRE

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

Mr. David Lee asked Mr. Gary Lee to verify that materials distributed to the Board at this meeting had previously been submitted electronically to the Design Review Board for review. Mr. Gary Lee asked the architects if the hard copy is the same as what has been submitted electronically. Mr. David Lee confirmed that both versions are the same.

Mr. Gary Lee stated that staff is ready to recommend Approval as presented but with one suggestion; that the auditorium portion of the building be raised in height to provide variation of the roof line and to make the building more prominent.

Mr. Ben Gilmartin with Diller, Scofidio and Renfro stated that the presentation would be geared toward visually responding to questions. The auditorium suggestion was received in a memo in the last week and can be spoken to, but the other earlier questions would be responded to within the presentation. Renderings were described.

The auditorium was formed after the last presentation to the Board. Looking at the building from a distance, the roof line helps the building cohere into a single building, not two buildings side by side. The roofline will feel articulated up close.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. White:

- Stated not having been present for the Pre-Application.
- Mr. White was concerned that details shown may not translate as clean and pristine as in renderings.

Mr. Gilmartin replied that glass would feel transparent.

- Mr. White agreed that transparency should be kept, without heavy mullions in example.
- Mr. White stated not being concerned about the auditorium and other building speaking to each other and liked the idea of popping up the auditorium roof, not a requirement however.
- Mr. White asked if roofs are accessible.

Mr. Gilmartin replied visually only, but there are deck terraces in between.

- Mr. White stated that the project looked very good and had no conditions.

Mr. Liu:

- Asked if all four materials would be used combined.

Mr. Gilmartin replied that maintenance is a commitment; there will likely be a combination of materials based on accessibility of the material location, for daily use and experience and for maintenance. The louvers are the most questionable use of natural wood due to maintenance issues, but there are good wood engineered products easier to maintain. The duct surfaces are reconstituted wood that is very maintainable. Soffits and facias would likely be a laminate product. In different conditions, materials will be assembled in different ways for best performance and aesthetic qualities. These details should be decided on in the coming months.

- Mr. Liu had no other questions and stated the project was exciting.

Mr. Martin:

- Stated the project was outstanding and dynamic.
- Mr. Martin asked about the skylight development.
- Mr. Martin stated the structure was incredible.
- Mr. Martin stated that the independent cubes could rotate back into the building.
- Mr. Martin asked how gardens on top of cubes would be maintained.

Mr. Gilmartin replied that a tie off for maintenance was being researched.

- Mr. Martin agreed that the glass issue mentioned by Mr. White should be looked at.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated the project was awesome and dynamic.
- Mr. Krueger liked the transition from north to south.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that the building does more programmatically than any other building in Redmond.
- Ms. Atvars stated that changes presented appear to be refinements and asked if there were any changes not presented.

Mr. Gilmartin replied that design has been detailed further but there are no substantial changes.

- Ms. Atvars stated that if anything is discovered in the structural design process that will impact the look of the building, the Board would like to see again.
- Ms. Atvars asked how often the auditorium will be occupied and active.

Mr. Gilmartin replied that Microsoft would need to be responsible for a formal answer, but there will be daily lectures and discussions, daily programming, gaming and executive functions. Activity would occur each day.

Mr. Keith Donovan *with* Microsoft replied that the ground floor space, retail space and auditorium are heavily activated. Programmatic elements are being curated at a business level as well as product launches and all-hands meetings. Activation will draw employees, customers and the public to this center part of the campus.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated the project was cool.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the night renderings are awesome.

MOTION BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE LAND-2019-01249 Microsoft Refresh Building R 207 SUBJECT TO STANDARD RECOMMENDATIONS. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WHITE. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2019-01263 Microsoft Refresh – Site/Garage

Neighborhood: Overlake

Description: Microsoft Refresh Site Landscape

Location: South of Northeast 36th Street and east of 156th Avenue Northeast

Applicant: Michael Huey with CBRE

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

Mr. David Lee asked Mr. Gary Lee to verify that materials distributed to the Board have been previously submitted to the Design Review Board for review. Mr. Gary Lee replied correct.

Mr. Gary Lee stated that full application has been made.

Mr. Guy Michaelson *with* Berger Partnership representing Microsoft addressed details in renderings asked for at the last presentation. Materials and palettes were displayed. The full Appendix of plants was not included in the Board materials but had been sent digitally.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked where water will go with the various paving situations throughout the campus and if there are drains penetrating.

Mr. Michaelson replied that water will be sheeted to one side of walkways, collected there either in a drainage or subterranean structure or infiltration as opposed to basins. Chip seal asphalt wear will not change grade.

- Ms. Atvars stated that the project looks solid.

Mr. White:

- Stated appreciation of the additional details.
- Mr. White stated that landscaping still did not reinforce the forest thread theme.

Mr. Michaelson asked if the issue was regarding robustness through the plaza. Mr. White replied yes, a lushness is not established.

Mr. Michaelson replied that instead of pushing conifers against buildings, an island is created in the middle. Further detail can be rendered. The comment is a fair point.

- Mr. White stated that landscaping should be lush enough to pull through the forest thread.

Mr. Michaelson replied that a challenge is creating the ability for emergency vehicles in.

- Mr. White stated trusting the landscape team to do what is best.
- Mr. White stated liking lower lighting but the pole appears utilitarian; covering as much area as possible is understood however and is internal to the campus.
- Mr. White stated that the rest of the design looks great.

Mr. Krueger:

- Appreciated the nuances of lighting and paving.

- Mr. Krueger asked if detailed landscape plans in the Appendix are reviewed by staff as far as materials and correlating to the presentation.

Mr. Gary Lee replied yes.

Mr. Martin:

- Asked if chip seal is recycled.

Mr. Michaelson replied that asphalt is frequently made of recyclable content but did not know if the product is sourced as recycled. Any ground asphalt is recycled.

- Mr. Martin asked how patinaed wood would be sealed.

Mr. Michaelson replied that any wood will silver out in time; wood is exposed to high heat in treatment making the wood less susceptible to deterioration. No chemicals are used.

- Mr. Martin asked if there would be artificial turf in the large center field area.

Mr. Michaelson replied that the soccer field is synthetic turf surrounded by concrete band with a transition to natural turf. The cricket pitch is also synthetic turf. The softball field has a skinned infield with the outfield natural turf.

- Mr. Martin asked if there is up lighting cast in place into the hardscape.

Mr. Michaelson replied that some walls and trees will be up lighted.

Mr. Liu:

- Asked if roof terraces are part of the scope.

Mr. Michaelson replied that the roof terraces presented earlier by Mr. Chau are a part of the project scope. The other terraces are being designed by other groups.

- Mr. Liu asked if there are water features.

Mr. Michaelson replied Lake Bill and that another feature is being explored although possibly may not be viable.

- Mr. Liu asked about site furniture besides built-in seating elements.

Mr. Michaelson replied that a full range of movable and programmable site furnishings will be brought in; tables, chairs and benches.

- Mr. Liu suggested a water feature to compliment the buildings.
- Mr. Liu appreciated the logic behind systems and lighting.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that although the project could be Approved at this meeting as full application has been made, Mr. Liu appeared to be hoping for more information.

Mr. Krueger replied being ready for Approval and if a water feature could be brought back to the Board later if chosen. The Board agreed with Mr. Krueger.

MOTION BY MS. ATVARS TO APPROVE LAND-2019-01263 Microsoft Refresh – Site/Garage LANDSCAPE SCOPE. THE BOARD APPROVES THE PRESENTED MATERIALS AND OVERALL DESIGN SUBJECT TO STANDARD INCONSISTENCIES. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2019-01178 Harmony

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: Approximately 100 residential suites and nine studio apartments with ground floor commercial and ground floor mechanical parking. Targeting LEED Platinum certification

Location: 8550 – 164th Avenue Northeast

Applicant: Robert Pantley and Angela Rozmyn *with* Natural and Built Environments, LLC

Prior Review Date: 11/21/19

Staff Contact: Cameron Zapata, 425-556-2411 or czapata@redmond.gov

Ms. Zapata stated that minor changes have been made since the last presentation such as color, the north stairwell and art on the front façade. The Arts Commission will review the planned mural. Staff encourages the applicant to consult with the City-wide design in downtown design standards. Staff would like Board input on the code requirement to create a sense of privacy and if an easement will meet the intent of the 15' setback, given that the easement is verified.

Ms. Angela Rozmyn *with* Natural and Built Environments, LLC stated that additional information addressing privacy concerns had been added but not uploaded for the meeting. The information could either be reviewed on a computer or in hard copies but would not be within the presentation slides.

Mr. David Lee stated that the Design Review Board had not received copies of what had been added and did not have a chance to review. The information was submitted today to staff and staff also did not have a chance to review. Because of the submittal date of the new materials, these were not able to be transmitted to the website and public in general for review impacting public comment. Mr. Lee suggested that the Board either defer the materials to the next available agenda or consider only the materials submitted to the Board by the appointed submittal date.

Mr. Sutton stated that the originally submitted materials should be the focus with new information reviewed at the next presentation.

Mr. Jim Lawler *with* Milbrandt Architects stated that a permanent easement to the north will be primary access and required fire access will be located to the east; 164th Avenue Northeast is to the west and an adjacent property under contract to be developed is to the south. The target of the project is to be the first Passive House on the eastside to be constructed.

Ms. Rozmyn stated that Puget Sound Energy (PSE) has been meeting internally and expresses hope that the project will be a pilot for the area regarding Grants and involvement for Passive House to occur. There is a meeting scheduled between the applicant and PSE in February.

Mr. Lawler described changes in renderings.

Ms. Rozmyn stated that a Passive House designer has been met with again and the applicant was informed that Passive House windows are a next step up from traditional triple pane, narrower and taller and not square. To keep the square look, trim will be utilized.

Mr. Lawler continued displaying renderings.

Ms. Rozmyn described an alternative to address the privacy issue and asked if the concept made sense to the Board to pursue.

Mr. Lawler asked for input on colors and materials and comments regarding amenities and the proposed solar aspect.

Ms. Rozmyn stated that an overwhelming majority of residences will be affordable. No state or taxpayer money is being received so costs will have to be watched while making the project as environmentally friendly as possible.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Liu:

- Stated that the building appeared complicated despite environmental and cost saving concerns.
- Mr. Liu did not understand the square trim around the rectangular windows.
- Mr. Liu stated that the building mass should be simplified to the minimum, leaving only absolute necessary elements related to design to achieve the Passive House.
- Mr. Liu stated that the renderings show a stark contrast in color scheme.
- Mr. Liu asked what the wall materials would be.
- Mr. Liu stated that too many elements are occurring for a building that needs to be cost efficient.

Mr. Martin:

- Asked for clarification regarding windows on the south façade.

Mr. Lawler replied that rather than have the windows facing south, the windows would be oriented to face into the central courtyard straightening the wall. The mural would continue on the south façade.

Mr. White:

- Asked how units are accessed.

Mr. Lawler displayed a floorplan.

- Mr. White asked for clarification that the corridor runs along glazing as in a hotel.

Mr. Lawler replied correct; the updated version has private open space into the courtyard from balconies. The view would be not into a wall but into the amenity space gaining a private balcony.

Mr. Martin:

- Stated that the Board would need to see the renderings of the option explained to Mr. White.
- Mr. Martin agreed with Mr. Liu.
- Mr. Martin asked how the final artist design is approved.

Ms. Rozmyn replied the Arts and Culture Commission.

- Mr. Martin asked about perforated mesh location.

Mr. Lawler replied the same application for the balcony walkways and garage concealment.

- Mr. Martin did not like the heavy base, not inviting from the street.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked for clarification regarding the number of floors and modulation regarding stepping.

Ms. Rozmyn replied that the project is being reviewed as a Pre-Application by staff and not yet reviewed technically.

- Mr. Krueger asked if the charred wood is real wood.

Ms. Rozmyn replied yes and can be seen on the downtown Kirkland Plaza.

- Mr. Krueger asked for clarification regarding question number five, solar on face in lieu of green wall or angled awning tops.

Ms. Rozmyn replied that showing solar more clearly from a pedestrian level had been suggested at the last presentation.

- Mr. Krueger asked for clarification regarding the purpose of a blank wall.

Mr. Lawler replied that the wall helps with mitigation, but primarily that the concept of the building is to be in harmony with the environment and as much greenery is incorporated as possible to emphasize. The wall could alternately be used to emphasize the point of the project.

- Mr. Krueger asked if 10% of the project would be Affordable Housing.

Ms. Rozmyn replied yes as far as ARCH (A Regional Coalition for Housing) covenant, but residential suites are naturally affordable due to size. All are anticipated to be rented for below 80% of the median income. Approximately 79% of residents earn the below 80% median income figure.

- Mr. Krueger was okay with the palette but suggested the black could be muted more.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the verticality of the windows can be celebrated more to clearly show the Passive House design.
- Mr. White stated that the wood balcony at the mezzanine level feels tacked on and preferred reduced metal.
- Mr. White stated not liking how the green wall is picture framed.

Mr. Lawler replied that the green wall is addressed in updated renderings.

- Mr. White stated not liking the stucco finish, particularly to the northwest.
- Mr. White hoped to see massing next door.
- Mr. White asked about a glazing unit at the south elevation.

Mr. Lawler replied fire access for egress purposes for the windows. The podium level has an approximately five-foot ledge, a tunnel that goes into the courtyard for fire egress.

- Mr. White suggested that the area be treated differently.
- Mr. White stated preferring a different materiality at the north elevation.

Mr. Lawler replied that the north elevation is addressed in updated renderings.

- Mr. White stated that windows could be more playful.

Ms. Rozmyn replied that the Passive House designer has stated that dark windows are not an issue, but that shrouds give a moderate, minimal positive effect.

- Mr. White stated that the design could be executed with more design thought.
- Mr. White stated that renderings of zoom-in enlargements of windows and the interior courtyard should be brought back.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked for clarification regarding which side staff is concerned about for privacy.

Mr. Lawler replied that the property line is the building edge. An easement was identified on a rendering but not for the audio recording. The privacy issue for staff is regarding the south façade with the new building next door going up.

- Ms. Atvars asked Ms. Zapata to confirm areas requiring review.

Ms. Zapata replied that in original discussions only the north façade had been discussed. As the application moves forward the various facades will be brought back.

- Ms. Atvars stated that flipping units to the inside was difficult to visualize and cautioned against creating too much of a blank wall, privacy versus dark and boring. Adding more mural may be too much in such a narrow space.
- Ms. Atvars asked for a rendering to show how close the new building will be sitting next to this building.
- Ms. Atvars stated that the streetscape is very bare and asked if there would be an opportunity for more landscaping, greening up the ground level.
- Ms. Atvars asked where artificial cedar siding would be located.

Mr. Lawler pointed out areas on the rendering but not for the audio recording.

- Ms. Atvars stated that materials appeared the same in rendering, but different in person.

Ms. Rozmyn asked if Ms. Atvars had a preference in material.

- Ms. Atvars stated not feeling strongly for either.

Mr. Krueger replied that photographs could be requested of where the materials have been used in other projects. Mr. White agreed that clarification is needed.

- Ms. Atvars stated that using a material not identified for the audio recording in canopy and roof deck soffits could help to warm up the ground level.
- Ms. Atvars agreed that a flatter look, rather than stucco, could simplify hardy panel.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated being comfortable with massing.
- Mr. Sutton stated that a notch in the southwest corner does not fit and a different solution needs to be found.
- Mr. Sutton stated that a change in plane around a corner needs to occur.
- Mr. Sutton stated that a stair inconsistency needs to be addressed.
- Mr. Sutton stated that the building needs to stand on own, and stated concern specifically regarding the south wall being blank while waiting for construction next door.
- Mr. Sutton stated that as long as easement language is permanent, a 40' setback is fine on the north side as well as for the east side.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated a rectangular look to the windows should be created.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated hoping to see material match a wall in a corner.

Mr. White:

- Suggested adding further vertical elements to create a more dynamic experience and to break up heaviness.

Mr. Martin:

- Asked to see the north elevation.

Mr. Sutton replied that there is a 15' residential setback.

- Mr. Martin stated that solar, translucent windows could help with privacy.
- Mr. Martin agreed with Mr. Sutton regarding a change in plane needed around a corner.

Ms. Zapata stated that the project is still in the design phase and has not been reviewed technically. There has not been coordination regarding affordability but there is not a requirement for affordability on residential suites. Ms. Rozmyn stated that 162ten Apartments in Redmond has a 10% covenant with ARCH. Ms. Zapata stated that staff would connect the applicant to the affordability partners (ARCH).

Mr. David Lee asked for a MOTION to extend the meeting.

MOTION BY MR. WHITE TO EXTEND THE MEETING. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2019-01288 Avalon Redmond

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: Strip and re-clad of eight existing apartment buildings and 20 small garage/carport structures. Visual changes are limited to new cladding, new paint colors and new rails. There is no change to footprint, occupancy, property line, landscaping or impervious areas.

Location: 8935 – 160th Avenue Northeast

Applicant: Jordan Blake *with* Soltner Group Architects

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

Mr. Mauriss stated that feedback is sought on materials chosen and overall design.

Mr. George Singer *with* Soltner Group Architects described changes and repairs made to the building since 1980. Current and future change renderings were displayed.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. White:

- Asked for clarification regarding a beaming aesthetic.

Mr. Singer replied that flashing lines must occur but not necessarily a contrasting element.

Mr. Mauriss stated that if there are minimal concerns, the hope was to move toward approval at the next presentation.

- Mr. White stated that a double height area felt monumental.

Mr. Singer replied that a band was necessary to meet manufacturer requirements at the floor line. The goal is to blend in and not be as pronounced, however.

- Mr. White liked the idea of separating buildings with different wood tones, but cascade slate is too close to other materiality, losing contrast.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked to see the southeast corner of Building A which faces Bella Bottega, and asked if the darker color could be brought up another floor due to prominent visibility northbound on 160th Avenue Northeast.

Mr. Singer replied yes, the suggestion is an opportunity.

Mr. White:

- Stated feeling good about all material except cascade slate upper right of a rendering, a cold feeling.

Mr. Krueger:

- Agreed with Mr. White, a wood tone was preferred.

Mr. Martin:

- Showed a sketch to Mr. Singer but did not describe with location details for the audio recording.
- Mr. Martin suggested that top windows could be connected to bottom windows, connected with a different material.
- Mr. Martin stated that wood at ground level under balconies should be horizontal.
- Mr. Martin stated that [inaudible] could be a different color or accent color.
- Mr. Martin stated that an accent color could be used to highlight entry and breezeway, an opportunity for pops of color at the base.

Mr. Liu:

- Stated that three different materials were okay but there are many other buildings with a base, body and head.
- Mr. Liu liked the previous or existing color scheme.
- Mr. Liu stated preferring that the entire building height be the same color.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that the red paint color is nostalgic and suggested mixing the same type of red back in to trim or signage.
- Ms. Atvars liked the belly band.

Mr. Singer replied that adding colors could become too busy and red next to full stain would not work well.

- Ms. Atvars asked what material would go on chimneys.

Mr. Singer replied flat panel.

- Ms. Atvars stated that if an accent color were made more prominent, a more neutral wood tone may work.
- Ms. Atvars stated that on a main angle displayed, a wood feature should come all the way down.
- Ms. Atvars stated that gray banding should be removed.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated liking the comments of Mr. Liu, not breaking horizontally as much.

- Mr. Sutton stated that there was not enough consensus for approval at this meeting.

Mr. Singer replied that the renderings would be redesigned, but the split in comments from the Board was confusing.

- Mr. Sutton suggested focusing on only one building with two options, with either improvements or a scheme similar to what currently exists but with proposed materials.

Mr. White:

- Did not want all gray with wood tones.
- Mr. White suggested changing materials, gray flat panel for smaller masses and larger fields of lap siding.
- Mr. White asked for clarification regarding bay windows.

Mr. Singer replied panel.

- Mr. White continued to suggest colors and materials but not by location for the audio recording.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that more ideas could be brought back but liking what was presented at this meeting.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked if Approval would include garages and any other buildings on the property.

Mr. Singer replied that the garages do not need to be accentuated, same schemes and colors and natural stain materials similar to fences.

- Ms. Atvars asked if the clubhouse would be changing also.

Mr. Singer replied no.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked for clarification regarding the garage roof color.

Mr. Singer replied that the rendering color was not accurate; there would be a blend of browns and grays.

Mr. Martin:

- Suggested using only one stained wood look.
- Mr. Martin suggested simplifying with pops of colors for each pod to make unique.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that the applicant should come back with two scenarios; one scheme cleaned up, as well as an alternate to choose from.

Mr. David Lee thanked the Board for Sound Transit comments received. Further drawings of the Downtown Station with base options would be ready soon. Sound Transit has asked for a two-week turnaround for a base decision in order to incorporate design.

Mr. Sutton was concerned, due to the number of comments, that an Approval for Sound Transit Downtown Station would not occur at the next presentation. Mr. Lee replied that offline discussions can occur to narrow the comments. Mr. White asked if there were a desire for the project to be as eclectic and Mr. Lee replied yes, the same eclecticism as surrounding developments.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY MR. KRUEGER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:47 P.M. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WHITE. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

February 20, 2020

MINUTES APPROVED ON

Carolyn Garza

RECORDING SECRETARY