

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

February 18, 2021

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

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Diana Atvars

Board Members: Henry Liu, Stephanie Monk and
Shaffer White

EXCUSED ABSENCES:

STAFF PRESENT: David Lee, Niomi Montes De Oca and Cameron
Zapata, Redmond Planning

MEETING MINUTES: Carolyn Garza, LLC

CALL TO ORDER

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Ms. Atvars at 7:00 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.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Ms. Monk to approve the January 21, 2021 Meeting Minutes. MOTION seconded by Mr. White. The MOTION passed unanimously.

APPROVAL

LAND-2020-00029 LMC Marymoor South Park

Neighborhood: Southeast Redmond

Description: Demolition of existing commercial buildings and parking lots; construction of two five-story multi-family buildings

Location: 17371 Northeast 67th Court

Applicant: Blair Stone *with* Encore Architects

Prior Review Dates: 02/20/20, 09/17/20, 11/19/20

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

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Liu:

- Asked if there were still options for façade treatments.

Mr. Brad Machat *with* LMC replied that there are before and after renderings.

- Mr. Liu stated liking all renderings.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked the applicant team to explain the flattening of the north elevation.

Mr. Bruce Kinnan *with* Encore Architects replied that the area was changed to allow for an adequate bedroom closet. The metal skin will protrude out approximately six inches. There will be a line but not as pronounced as before and the rendering does not depict accurately.

- Ms. Atvars asked for clarification regarding wood looking material and white.

Mr. Kinnan replied the dark.

- Ms. Atvars stated that the change in the image is between white and wood color.

Ms. Monk:

- Thanked the applicant for clarifying the question of Ms. Atvars, a concern that has remained for staff.
- Ms. Monk stated being happy with the changes made.
- Ms. Monk stated that the west elevation façade, page 22, did not appear eclectic.
- Ms. Monk stated liking the art wall concept and how the project connects to the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. White:

- Stated being disappointed in a recess at the northeast corner, now in plane with white, and asked if the corner design could return to a previous condition.

Mr. Kinnan replied that if the Board felt strongly, the corner could be studied.

- Mr. White stated liking the black metal.
- Mr. White stated that if the recess can return, there would be no hesitation to approval.
- Mr. White stated that either design of the north end cap is good and up to the design team.
- Mr. White stated appreciating the Juliet balconies but had hoped for more, page 25.

Mr. Kinnan replied that there are some nuances to a new energy code. Some units are smaller in square footage without an abundance of exterior skin and the building is required to have a minimum distance between the exhaust and intake.

Mr. Machat replied that there was a concern that Juliet balconies would compete with art on the art wall.

- Mr. White asked for clarification that the code requirements could not be worked around.

Mr. Kinnan replied yes.

- Mr. White asked if the same situation occurs in the other courtyard as well, page 28.

Mr. Kinnan replied with an explanation of balcony placements.

- Mr. White asked if balconies alternate on facing levels.

Mr. Kinnan replied that units facing south are on the top three levels, two units wide.

- Mr. White suggested a condition for approval that the recess on the north end be brought back.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated having the same questions and concerns as Mr. White.
- Ms. Atvars stated wanting to see the recess.
- Ms. Atvars stated having hoped for more Juliet balconies but understanding the restrictions.
- Ms. Atvars stated that the art walk appears to be a very engaging space.

Ms. Atvars asked the Board to confirm the various Administrative Design Flexibilities (ADF) requested.

Regarding the front façade building placement, the Board was unanimously okay.

Regarding the back façade building placement, the Board was unanimously okay.

Regarding rooftop modulation, the Board was unanimously okay.

Regarding the upper-story setback, the Board was unanimously okay.

Mr. Atvars stated that the only modification requested was to attempt to bring back plane change on the north elevation.

Ms. Zapata stated that an approval will be a recommendation for approval to the City Council and asked if the project would need to come back to the Board with the north elevation. Mr. White suggested leaving the decision to staff. Ms. Zapata stated that the Motion should state to move to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for clarity. Mr. White asked why the project was subject to a recommendation of approval to the City Council and Ms. Zapata replied that the project is a Master Plan and Development Agreement Type Five Land Use Action.

MOTION BY MR. WHITE TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL THE DESIGN OF LAND-2020-00029 LMC Marymoor South Park AS SHOWN IN THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MATERIALS PRESENTED AT THIS FEBRUARY 18, 2021 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING AND FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL OF THE FOUR ADFS OUTLINED WITHIN THE STAFF MEMO. THIS APPROVAL INCLUDES ALL STANDARD CONDITIONS ALSO OUTLINED IN TONIGHT'S STAFF MEMO AND ALSO INCLUDES THE CONDITION THAT A PLANE CHANGE BE RECREATED FOR THE NORTHEAST ELEVATION BETWEEN BROWN AND WHITE FINISHES, CHANGE TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF FOR COMPLIANCE.

THE STANDARD CONDITIONS ARE AS FOLLOWS: WHERE INCONSISTENCIES BETWEEN THE FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS ARE FOUND AFTER THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HAS APPROVED THIS PROJECT, THE ELEVATIONS APPROVED BY THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AT THEIR MEETING WILL PREVAIL. IF, AFTER THIS DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL, THERE ARE ANY INCONSISTENCIES FOUND IN THE INFORMATION PROVIDED FOR THE ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LANDSCAPE PLANS, LIGHTING PLANS, MATERIALS AND COLOR BETWEEN THE PRESENTED MATERIALS AND ANY FOLLOWING SUBMITTED PLANS, THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AND REDMOND PLANNING STAFF WILL REVIEW AND DETERMINE WHICH DESIGN VERSION

WILL BE FOLLOWED FOR BUILDING PERMITS. MOTION SECONDED BY MS. MONK. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2020-00894 Redmond Sunrise Apartments

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: Demolition of existing retail and new construction of a six-story mixed-use apartment building with 93 residential units

Location: 8460 - 164th Avenue Northeast

Applicant: Aya Rojnuckarin *with* Urbal Architecture, PLLC

Staff Contact: Niomi Montes De Oca, 425-556-2499 or nmontesdeoca@redmond.gov

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Monk:

- Stated being impressed so far.
- Ms. Monk liked the sky lounge, a great space as well as a break- up of the roofline.
- Ms. Monk stated liking the color scheme.
- Ms. Monk stated liking materials shown on page 25.
- Ms. Monk stated that the ADFs are reasonable.
- Ms. Monk stated hoping to see further visuals and graphics for more detail.

Mr. Liu:

- Stated liking the site planning.
- Mr. Liu asked if all accent colors feature lighting or only at a staircase.

Ms. Ilse Torres *with* Urbal Architecture, PLLC replied no, illuminated accent lighting is only at the stair tower facing 164th Avenue Northeast. The fins around the buildings are not illuminated.

- Mr. Liu asked if a podium is a public amenity, accessible by all residents.

Ms. Torres replied private residential patios.

- Mr. Liu asked if the patios are divided or shared.

Ms. Torres replied divided by planters for privacy screening, shown on the level two landscaping plan, page 27.

- Mr. Liu stated liking the overall scheme.
- Mr. Liu stated that the design language is good and concept images are good references, but the northwest corner facades are fighting for prominence.
- Mr. Liu stated that the retail plaza is under-designed and asked if something can be done at the pedestrian amenity such as canopies for interest.
- Mr. Liu stated that the south side has the best solar access and asked if the symmetry of the building could be broken with a balcony or design for units above.
- Mr. Liu stated design is simple and effective providing modulation on the façade.
- Mr. Liu stated that accent colors at window frames are distracting or competing.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the project looks great for a first Pre-Application.
- Mr. White stated that the accent colors would be more appropriate in the Marymoor area and asked for a less bright alternative such as a faux wood fin.
- Mr. White stated that massing and execution are nice.
- Mr. White stated that modulation is fine.
- Mr. White stated that a small detail section showing the fin condition would be helpful.
- Mr. White stated liking the penthouse space.
- Mr. White asked why side panels on balconies are opaque.

Ms. Torres replied that the side panels are opaque, a similar tone and finish to other wood-like tones on the building.

- Mr. White stated that the east elevation is under-designed with the center mass and a larger pattern could occur.
- Mr. White stated liking the outdoor spaces and that seeing detail on a section through the rooftop deck where benches occur would be helpful.
- Mr. White stated liking the color palette apart from accent colors.
- Mr. White stated agreeing with Mr. Liu regarding another gesture to highlight ground-floor retail space.
- Mr. White stated liking how the retail recesses.

Mr. Chad Lorentz *with* Urbal Architecture, PLLC replied that views have been presented to accentuate colors in every view; when the building turns, the colors disappear. The colors have been pumped up in renderings to exploit the concept, but there is a subtlety that can be shown also.

- Mr. White asked for perspectives with more realistic view angles, coming down the street and from across the street.
- Mr. White reiterated that the eclectic design would work well in the Marymoor district but here a more subdued approach might be more beneficial.
- Mr. White asked for closer perspectives of southwest and northeast service areas.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that the design is a strong start and well-developed.
- Ms. Atvars stated that colors read neon on one computer screen and recommended paint chips be photographed outside next to each other, as well as the entire palette interacting with typical Redmond overcast conditions, for better understanding.
- Ms. Atvars stated slightly more muted colors would accomplish the concept.
- Ms. Atvars stated that the design feels more *sunset* than *sunrise* due to the top amenity space facing west.
- Ms. Atvars stated that the top amenity space is very good.
- Ms. Atvars stated agreeing with Mr. Liu regarding further development of the north plaza at the retail area; some seating areas could be covered.
- Ms. Atvars stated that regarding the modulation ADF, the east side can be more developed; south and west sides look great. On the north, the plane change can be accentuated more. Ground plane changes such as a canopy could help.
- Ms. Atvars asked for clarification regarding materials on non-window facing fins with accent colors.

Mr. Torres replied the intention is to paint dark, blending in with the backdrop.

- Ms. Atvars hoped to see the fin details and scale in future renderings.

Mr. White:

- Suggested that fins could begin muted and dark at the bottom, gradating up to the color at the top.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that seeing options for the fins would be good.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that seeing how the colors will feel from a pedestrian perspective would be helpful.

- Ms. Atvars stated that the stairwell could be a good accent piece.
- Ms. Atvars stated hoping to see more information on how the light fixture will be executed.

Ms. Atvars stated that in summary, options are always appreciated in presentations and that options for the accent colors, minor modulation changes and further refinement of the north ground plane should be brought back.

Mr. White:

- Suggested further development of the east elevation and more views.
- Mr. White stated that the suggestion of Ms. Atvars to provide photos of color chips in real lighting conditions is good, as well as images of the material in another application or project if possible.

Mr. Liu:

- Stated having made a comment regarding balconies on the south side if possible, to break symmetry.

Mr. Atvars:

- Stated that balconies are always welcome although there are codes to consider.

Ms. Torres stated that there were no further questions and thanked the Board for feedback.

Ms. Montes De Oca asked for clarification regarding the ADF requests. Ms. Atvars stated that most suggestions are toward refining the ADFs in general; the justifications for ADFs make sense but even better compliance can be achieved.

OTHER ITEMS

Mr. Lee stated that the two new Design Review Board members will be joining the March 4, 2021 meeting onward.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY MR. WHITE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:08 P.M. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. LIU. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

April 15, 2021

MINUTES APPROVED ON

Carolyn Garza

RECORDING SECRETARY