

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

February 21, 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, Henry Liu, Ralph Martin, Stephanie Monk and Kevin Sutton

EXCUSED ABESNCES: Shaffer White

STAFF PRESENT: David Lee, Gary Lee and Amy Tarce, 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.

CALL TO ORDER

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

APPROVAL

LAND-2019-00096, Gill Investment Company

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: Multi-family exterior alteration including: replace all windows and patio doors, replace stair handrails and guards, replace balcony privacy partitions and guards, replace entry doors and install accessible door hardware, re-side entire building, install patio amenity area with stairs, and create accessible parking space

Location: 9110 Redmond Woodinville Road Northeast

Applicant: Jaspaul Gill

Prior Review Date: February 7, 2019

Staff Contact: Lawrence Chung, 425-556-2404 or lmchung@redmond.gov

Ms. Tarce began the presentation by stating that there were two options for revised elevation and staff was requesting guidance as to which option should move forward.

Mr. Craig Pontius *with* Citizen Design continued that there had been a number of comments from the Board at the last meeting. Two options were prepared in response.

Option A restores the original belly bands to original locations, eliminates gaps and replaces the two upper thirds of lap siding with a second siding color to go along with grey at the base. Also, part of Option A was the Burgundy red doors, dark trim to go with the roof and the proposed black windows. A material board was on display with paint samples.

Option B uses the same basic material palette but switches locations. Where Option A had a consistent two thirds board and batten at the top and lap siding on the bottom, this option takes advantage of the existing split at the middle. On the west street-facing side, the top two thirds of the building would remain board and batten from Option A, and the belly band the same color as siding for textural difference. The bottom two thirds of the other side have lap siding using the same belly band color trick to allow the dark band between the materials emphasize division.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Krueger:

- Suggested having the upper two floors in board and batten and the same cream color for the belly band.

Mr. Sutton:

- Liked the north and south elevations of Option B, but liked the black belly band trim, a hybrid of the two options.
- Mr. Sutton stated that a point of contention at the last meeting was the visible side of the building from street-side and liked the uniform black bands on Option A.
- Mr. Sutton stated in summary liking Option B for the north and south elevations and black belly band for the east and west elevations.
- Mr. Sutton believed the original design was lacking but liked the new designs.

Ms. Monk:

- Would be happy with either option and stated these were a great improvement over the original design.
- Ms. Monk liked the darker belly band and Option A but did not have a strong opinion around Option B; either would be a great improvement.

Mr. Martin:

- Believed Option B was more site responsive.

Mr. Liu:

- Liked Option A as is.

Ms. Atvars:

- Liked Option B.
- Ms. Atvars stated that of the east and west elevations, the east was better. Two-thirds of darker grey and lighter on top at the elevation visible from the street would read better with the height.
- Ms. Atvars suggested that only the balconies retain the darker punch of accent.
- Ms. Atvars did not believe the band needed to carry through the other sides.

Mr. Krueger:

- Liked Option B.
- Mr. Krueger suggested that the architect work with City staff to research the suggestion around color on the east end of the building for diversity to the color scheme.

MOTIONED BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE LAND-2019-00096, GILL INVESTMENT COMPANY, WITH THE STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR INCONSISTENCIES, THE BOARD PREFERENCE FOR OPTION B, AND FURTHER STUDYING WITH STAFF THE EAST ELEVATION COLOR. SECONDED BY MR. MARTIN. 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 36th Street and west of 156th Avenue Northeast

Applicant: Aaron Dundson *with* Microsoft

Prior Review Date: 01/03/19

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

Mr. Lee stated that an overview of all Villages will be presented by the different architectural teams.

Mr. Krueger asked if comments should be made after each Village rather than waiting for the end of the presentations and Mr. Keith Donovan *with* Microsoft replied yes.

Mr. Donavan displayed the schematic design presentation for internal Microsoft leadership.

Ms. Rula Patil *with* Microsoft stated that two different design concepts had been considered; designing inside-out to optimize how employees work and specific function needs, and how architecturally the design fits with the broader context. Ms. Patil would present the inside-out approach and the architect teams would address the design expressions.

Team-based space or neighborhoods for eight to 16 team members have been designed. Windows with access to daylight and views and other positive amenities were always considered toward individual needs. There are support spaces for focus work, conferencing, kitchenettes and other communal uses. Tools for teams to expand from one team base to another exist in adjacent neighborhoods. Each floor has multiple neighborhoods. Connecting social spaces for a strong sense of community emphasizes inclusion in a larger team. These principles were given to all architects to incorporate. While the Villages belong to one larger campus, variety is critical.

Mr. Donavan stated that the four architects for four Villages were designing for unique character while still within the One Microsoft campus and the fabric of Redmond. A rendering of the forest thread connecting the urban part of the campus with the landscape and recreational part of the campus was shown. A variety of ground floor amenities are grouped around the main plaza, activating the plaza, tying in with the forest thread, and connecting urban transit with the landscape. The parking structure is in the center of the campus, allowing the center of the campus to be car free and walkable.

Mr. Donavan continued that connecting to existing buildings across 156th Avenue Northeast as well as facilities north of Northeast 36th Street and south of Northeast 31st Street, and the other 500 acres, was a big driver in planning principles. Whatcom, Washington, Sammamish and Chelan are the Village names.

Mr. John Chau *with* LMN continued with a presentation on Whatcom Village. The Village is composed of four buildings; two buildings have amenities such as food service, shared bikes and multi-purpose rooms on the ground floor. The second and third floors allow for more massing articulation. A slide rendering was described. The notion of weaving all together is within the design. The Whatcom commons and pedestrian connectivity across the central plaza are considered. To further articulate the

masses, slots or insets break up the longer façade. Articulation lifts the building at the ground level for amenity spaces.

The color sketch is concept only at this point. Integration between upper and lower masses is celebrated by glazing. Canopies and other activity will be created on the ground plane. Areas on the rendering were described by color codes, and different views were displayed. Sketches intentionally did not include color so that articulation, massing and materiality could be understood.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Martin:

- [Inaudible]
- Mr. Martin suggested that cubes at the end should come out farther, walls slanting out at the ends.
- Mr. Martin stated that the design was very strong.

Mr. Sutton:

- Agreed with Mr. Martin that a larger cantilever to be more dramatic is needed.
- Mr. Sutton stated that landscape does some of the weaving on horizontal planes on roofs.
- Mr. Sutton stated the design was a great start.

Mr. Liu:

- Asked if the campus was enclosed or open.

Mr. Donovan replied open. The buildings are secure and the scale of openness and transparency are being examined. The campus will be open for driving into and walking through as at the west campus on the other side of State Route 520.

- Mr. Liu asked if the open space would be open not only to employees but to the community or visitors.

Mr. Donovan replied that the answer would need to be brought to the next meeting, but generally, yes. Prioritizing use for employees would occur but there is no gate or barrier to stop people from coming in to enjoy the trails and retail amenities. Food amenities will be for employees only.

- Mr. Liu stated that creating open, green spaces is very successful. The large technology companies all have a different ideology, some enclosed and some playful with forms.
- Mr. Liu stated that there was a lot of opportunity at the rooftop.
- Mr. Liu stated looking forward to the next presentation.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that most comments would be made at the end of the presentation in regard to how all of the Villages will relate to each other.
- Ms. Atvars liked unoccupied green spaces mixed between levels and wondered if these would have an opportunity to have a vertical plane as well. Greenery spilling over the sides could be a nice addition.
- Ms. Atvars agreed with other Board members that the pop out move is important and should be developed but not every building should be similar to each other. Inverting colors or scaling down the pop would ensure that each building has a unique identify.

Ms. Monk:

- Agreed with Ms. Atvars regarding bringing the ground level and roof together with green above, providing interest about the roof.
- Ms. Monk liked the push-pull and form.
- Ms. Monk commented on a particular view being displayed but did not identify the location for the audio recording.
- Ms. Monk commented that the design was looking good.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that transparency, openness and light was good to see.
- Mr. Krueger would add comments at the end of the presentation regarding the relation of Villages to each other and the public.
- Mr. Krueger appreciated the massing and believed this was a great start.

Mr. Donovan stated that feedback regarding ways to better bring the Design Review Board through the official process would be appreciated.

Mr. Dan Simpson *with* ZGF Architects began the presentation for Washington Village. There will be a high public profile as the location is along 156th Avenue Northeast. The Village will help form the central campus plaza. An overhead bridge was shown in a slide which crosses State Route 520 from the transit center.

The five buildings in this Village respond to unique circumstances; geometry and vicinity of the site, the creation of something which will embrace the promenade or overhead bridge, and the creation of something different along the plaza and central courtyard space.

The ground floor will incorporate energy elements, an urban market hall environment with food service, retail and multi-purpose areas. There is only a small amount of workplace neighborhoods. Energizing this campus is paramount in creating transparency and accessibility.

Upstairs, the building forms and the idea of the building responds to the idea of the workplace as well. Neighborhood flexible team spaces with daylight access and views are gathered around central atrium core elements connecting the buildings vertically on the inside as well as connecting community spaces to the exterior. Interesting internal elements or geodes can be recognized as being connected to the outside and differentiated so that the idea of the building is not the same on all sides. The four to five story interconnected atrium space will be where employees gather for collaborative work. There are also kitchenettes and closed collaborative spaces.

The promenade is an elevated bridge crossing the freeway landing at the central plaza and a sense of welcome and arrival at both the bridge and street level is created with a threshold or gateway between buildings A and B. The bridge is approximately 25' wide, with landscaping on top and underneath. The elevation gain is 15'. Bike storage lockers, employee showers and a coffee shop will be located here.

The three buildings to the south form frontage and also have the opportunity to create a contrasting space, distinct from the central plaza. While the plaza presented in the images of Mr. Chau is large with a hardscape and urban quality, a more landscaped opportunity is being created in the center of these three buildings. Zones where atriums break out take on a more scaled down character with a strong indoor-outdoor quality.

The frontage along 156th Avenue Northeast from corner to corner is 1,500' long, the equivalent of four to five blocks. There is an existing vehicle access under the building across the street and a proposed new vehicle access on the side of the street of this project. There is a vehicular shuttle access planned and visual connectivity between a café and garden zone. A set back to enclose the drop-off and shuttle zone into a forecourt creates a sense of relief in the scale of the firmly defined street wall.

The buildings were displayed in renderings in black and white to show a range of expressions on the exterior. External terrace opportunities connect nature and the workplace. There is a base-middle-top overall massing strategy. Articulation will be detailed at a later presentation. The interface zone will have a great deal of depth; rooms which project out beyond the typical facades, the second-floor terrace and a series of operable openings at the upper levels to create a difference between

neighborhood and community zones within the building. There are two versions of exterior cladding, one with solidity and rhythm, and one with a glassier sense of daylight and sky.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that the café use of the space under the pedestrian bridge sounds great.
- Ms. Monk stated that the two concepts of curtain walls shown looked very interesting and natural light will be appreciated.
- Ms. Monk liked the geode concept.

Mr. Liu:

- Asked if the pedestrian bridge is part of the campus project.

Mr. Donovan replied that WSDOT and Sound Transit are being worked directly with. The entire bridge is ultimately a WSDOT project.

- Mr. Liu asked if the design team is working on the extension of the bridge as well as how the bridge ends.

Mr. Donovan replied yes.

- Mr. Liu stated that there may be more opportunity at the pedestrian arrival space.
- Mr. Liu stated that there are great things going on in many spaces and scales.
- Mr. Liu stated that the shuttle drop-off might be moved toward the south side, enhancing the arrival experience.
- Mr. Liu liked the extra wall design, simple but interchangeable and inviting light and natural materials to the view.

Mr. Krueger:

- Liked forms within the internal courtyard.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated the presentation looks very good so far.
- Ms. Atvars suggested exploring ways to extend the geode theme; that how the rocks break and materials used will be opportunities.

- Ms. Atvars asked if the landscaped courtyard blends into spaces inside, and if there will be greenery planned within the buildings.

Mr. Simpson replied that the greenery was to be determined, but blurring the distinction between courtyard space and interior space as well as extending ground plane sensibility was being examined.

- Ms. Atvars was curious to see more.

Mr. Martin:

- [Inaudible] the bridge is a front door to the campus [inaudible].

Mr. Simpson replied not having an answer to resolve the concern, especially between the landing and forest thread, but the topic is being worked on. The resolution of the forest thread, creeping from the southeast, is being examined and the definitiveness of the arrival and integration of forest thread within urban infrastructure is part of what is being worked on.

- [Inaudible]

Mr. Simpson replied that the number of non-rectilinear and non-Cartesian orientations is the reality of the Site Plan. Orientations range from due-west to southwest and southeast, as well as northeast and northwest, omni-directional. Discussions are around maintaining healthy and productive work environments with no glare and also the energy impacts of solar gain. Using technology to control operable blinds either inside or outside will involve maintenance cost as well as design but the idea is in play at this time. A fixed shading system for the various orientations is difficult and smart glare control would be good.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that the next presentation would be more telling in how materials will be pulled together.
- Mr. Sutton stated that while the concept was not as concrete on this Village, the materiality will play a large role.

Mr. Dale Alberda *with* NBBJ Architects continued with the Sammamish Village. What makes this Village unique from the others is that the location is the most embedded in the forest thread. A transition from pastoral landscape to a more urban structured part of the campus is desired. Being in the trees was leveraged. Amenities can be embedded in the forest edge and also adjacent to the activity fields to the north and east. The circulation and view axis into the site and on the site through spaces, and how

the street is connected to the center of the campus visually and physically for pedestrians is being considered. Working with how the Sammamish Spine will connect each building but also into the Washington Village and to Northeast 31st Street is another consideration.

An adjustment since the Master Plan was completed was to move Building G slightly to allow a direct visual connection from the corner of 156th Avenue Northeast and Northeast 31st Street. People arriving at that point will be able to look between the buildings and see all the way to the center of the campus. An overlay of the original Master Plan was displayed.

The ground plane is layered from the forest thread toward the street at Northeast 31st Street. Building G creates an urban edge and is rotated in such a way to allow an auto court to come into the site. Central gathering spaces, being called living rooms and dens, look toward landscape and outdoor amenities. The atrium has been staggered to create two story living rooms. Connectivity between living rooms does not diminish an ability to be in individual spaces but connects well enough for people to intuitively move from one living room to the next, in the spirit of the Microsoft term *Walk-up Culture*. Further views were displayed.

Each building has two heads and a link in the massing; heads are articulated with a particular sun control and links are where living rooms are expressed. Where shading will be needed is being explored. The correct dimension of space between buildings is being considered. An existing stand of trees at Northeast 31st Street and 156th Avenue Northeast has been preserved. The experience of indoor and outdoor merge together.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked for clarification regarding what resembled treehouses beyond living rooms.

Mr. Alberda replied that elevated outdoor rooms out of the living rooms was an idea being explored. The living rooms are a graduation from an interior space, to semi-interior space, to balconies or outlooks; independent structures bridged to.

- Mr. Sutton liked the conceptual idea, but aesthetically the design was a strong contrast to the rest of the building.
- Mr. Sutton asked if the first floor would be substantially taller than floors above.

Mr. Alberda replied that the first floor would be three feet taller than the typical office floor.

- Mr. Sutton commented that the bike commuter forum feels that the space wants taller volume.

Mr. Alberda commented that the bike storage would be a largely glass structure to celebrate bike commuting.

Mr. Martin:

- Felt the concepts were very strong.
- Mr. Martin commented [inaudible].

Mr. Liu

- Stated that when rotating the living rooms, the building seems cut in half and asked if building depth versus building height was considered.
- Mr. Liu stated that the vehicular access point appeared crowded and asked if a traffic study has been completed.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that the real effect of vertical sun shading was hard to see in the rendering and looked forward to seeing materiality. The fins should not be overly repetitive.
- Ms. Atvars wondered about the placement if the cafeteria amenity had been dictated by the Microsoft Master Plan.

Mr. Alberda replied yes.

- Ms. Atvars commented that the cafeteria appeared to be in the furthest corner from the other amenities and a mini-version of the cafeteria might be brought down so that employees do not necessarily have to walk so far in the middle of the day.
- Ms. Atvars asked if all cafeterias were required to be central and if so, why.

Mr. Donovan replied that in the Plan, Building 37 has café amenities and the employees in the village are not disadvantaged in this respect. The building without amenity space is a short walk from a building that does have a café. Adjacent buildings help to support the lunchtime rush.

- Ms. Atvars stated that knowing how amenities are distributed throughout the entire project would be helpful in order to understand how the buildings work together.

Ms. Monk:

- Liked the forest concept with water and nature.
- Ms. Monk liked the inside-outside links. Fresh air and the ability to step outside is valuable.
- Ms. Monk liked the treehouse concept.
- Ms. Monk appreciated that the stand of trees was being kept.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the interface of materiality through the forest thread was great.
- Mr. Krueger liked the staggered atrium.
- Mr. Krueger stated looking forward to the next iteration.

Mr. Rus Sheiman *with* WRNS Studio began the Chelan Village presentation. There are only two buildings making the Village the smallest. Building J is the executive office building and Building K is the Guest Engagement Center (GEC) for customers from all around the world to engage with Microsoft. There is no street frontage and a bridge between the urban campus and existing forest is provided. The architect calls the Village the civic portal. A great deal of effort is being made to save as many of the existing trees as possible and in particular, the trees that stand between Buildings J and K.

Views of elevations were shown and described. The trees can be seen through a bridge element connecting to Whatcom Village and playing fields are to the southeast. The lobby space of Building J is a blow-through lobby with glass on both sides, providing a view through to the plaza space and trees beyond. The lower two floors are seen as being underground. The upper two floors are of the air or trees. The upper two floors of Building K are light and transparent.

The massing strategies are different in both buildings because of different programmatic elements. Building J is seen as weaving between the plaza space and playing fields, pulling garden spaces. Each of the hub spaces continually view different sides. There is one amenity space in the southeast corner of the project engaging both the playing fields and legacy forest. Hub spaces where the building inflects public spaces engaging the garden side are connected between an open stair that weaves up through the building.

The ground plain responds to tree locations and the upper volume is cantilevered over with very heavy supports in the middle of the building. There is a connection across between both buildings. Building K (GEC) is where the hospitality and social spaces will be including a huge dining space as a part of the trees. There is a void space down the middle of the building where planting will engage people in the experience of the Pacific Northwest. Programmatically, level one has all exhibit spaces and a briefing center. Level two is dining terraces which open to the forest. Levels three and four are briefing suites. More renderings were displayed.

People from all over the world will come to the Visitor Center and the experience will not be generic but express the character of this area and the hometown of Microsoft.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Martin:

- [Inaudible]

Ms. Monk:

- Appreciated the preservation of trees and giving people a sense of place.
- Ms. Monk asked if the street would be a drop-off area or a connection to parking.

Mr. Sheiman replied that there is no connection to parking; the entry drive has existing parking and trees are planted in between parking or are existing. The path that exists is being reused.

Mr. Rafael Viñoly-Menendez *with* LMN Architects proceeded with the last presentation. As the campus is committed to be pedestrian and bicycle only, every vehicle whether bringing employees, visitors, services or goods must disappear. The strategy for arriving on the campus must be the same level of quality as experienced within the campus.

Views of the underground or below-grade spaces and particularly the garage portals, gateways into the Villages, were displayed. The loading dock is to the southeast. All visitors and employees will arrive below grade. Equitable access in terms of distance between points of surfacing onto the campus will be provided, and close walking distance to all main entry lobbies have been designed. The level two below-grade is the actual service loop incorporating all back of house loading, the catering kitchen for the entire campus, back of house spaces such as data, mail sorting and storage, and a service tunnel that brings in all goods brought by truck into a network of electric vehicles which then service basements of each of the building. None of the buildings have a back door at grade at the streetscape.

The garage has an extremely large footprint, and intuitive wayfinding not heavily reliant on signage is needed. Penetration of daylight, ventilation and views are important from every level of the garage space as well as the idea of landscape from the surface deeper into below-grade spaces and continuing the materiality of outdoor pavilions. A sense of individual Village identity but also commonality for easy navigation into and out of the campus is a guiding design principle. Further images were displayed. Openings in each of the floor plates, vertical circulation or the combination of elevators and stairs, and pavilions which are both weather protection and a gathering space to public plazas were shown.

At Whatcom Village, playing against the rigid geometry of buildings creates whimsy. Portals are not sealed boxes but rather preserve light, fresh air and views. The plaza portal is located at the end of the transition from the pedestrian bridge connecting from the light rail station and the west campus. This particular portal has an omni-directional quality in terms of the buildings which surround. The portals have glass in the covers to create variety of light, and at night and in winter will be lit from below to create a visually interesting piece of the building.

At Sammamish Village and Chelan Villages, the portal takes cues from engagement with landscape.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Martin:

- [inaudible]

Mr. Liu:

- Asked what the colors at the beginning of a diagram that had been shown indicated.

Mr. Viñoly-Menendez replied that the colors were meant to indicate that there is a difference between each. When looking at the elevator shaft elements, in example, each portal shaft would be clad with materials that reflect the character of the buildings in that Village. The timber structure is a common element to all, but the elevator shafts would have slight variations in terms of materiality that will reflect the character of each building. The colors do not indicate a color but rather a strategy.

- Mr. Liu liked the daylight terraces in the parking structure and asked if there would also be programmed space or if all four levels would be parking only.

Mr. Viñoly-Menendez replied that no programmed space was planned, but some informal spaces below grade could occur. No programmed spaces occur under the amenity level.

- Mr. Liu asked if the portal spaces are connected to atrium spaces or programmed space in the building.

Mr. Viñoly-Menendez replied no, that travel would be from below grade to the surface level and visually connect to individual amenities from there.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that this is a favorite part of the campus and tying everything together allows for creativity and unique forms.
- Ms. Atvars agreed with Mr. Martin that there is an opportunity to work with other team members at the bridge.
- Ms. Atvars asked if there would be a subtle, tasteful way to light, in colors, for pedestrian use to identify where parked.
- Ms. Atvars was interested in seeing how far landscape can be brought down to the parking areas.

Ms. Monk:

- Agreed with the other Board members
- Ms. Monk appreciated the concept of being at garage level four underground and seeing daylight.
- Ms. Monk asked about the buildings being vacated and the number of parking spots effected.

Mr. Viñoly-Menendez replied not having exact numbers for the current campus but approximately 6,000 seats are being vacated while approximately 13,000 seats are being put back in. The parking for the 13,000 seats is 50% Single Occupancy Vehicle (S.O.V.) down from the current percentage of 59%. Continued improvements in ride share, light rail and the shuttle system will be how the S.O.V. percentage will continue to move lower.

Mr. Donavan thanked the Board for comments.

APPROVAL

LAND-2018-00869, LMC Marymoor

Neighborhood: Southeast Redmond

Description: Proposal to construct (1) six story and (2) five story multi-family residential buildings with commercial space.

Location: 17611 Northeast 70th Street

Applicant: Rocky Flores *with* Encore Architects

Prior Review Dates: 09/12/18, 12/06/18, 12/20/18 and 01/17/19

Mr. David Lee stated that Encore Architects had returned to present changes asked for by the Design Review Board at the last meeting. Mr. Shaffer White, Board member, was not present but had provided comments which were given the Board Members for discussion as well.

Mr. Brian Bellissimo *with* Encore Architects recapped that the buildings had been presented separately at previous meetings, and that the changes from the last round of each meeting would now be brought together. The presentation would focus on the last comments received and another full package will go to Council. The goals have remained the same throughout the project. Eclecticism has been a driving force in each building in material, form and use of art. Materials have been chosen; Z profile metal in blue-gray had been decided on at the last meeting to move away from curved corrugations. Painted fiber cement panels will be the canvas for art. A Redondo gray brick forms the base, and stack bond with darker grout is proposed. Specific art proposals are still moving through the Art commission.

At the last meeting the Board members were had agreed with the massing changes made and articulation of curved forms in elevation. A main comment was that art should be more distinct and prominent, potentially penetrating the rim of the top of the roof. Another comment had been regarding the courtyard pool area, that the termination of the art should actually drop down to the ground. Future maintenance is being examined. Another comment was that at the north façade, parapets should be more differentiated. Updated renderings of views were displayed and described.

A mural location may need to become glass to alleviate visibility from a garage. A color palette which brings more contrast and modulation to the courtyard would be used. Art balconies have been brought to the southern facades for pop, staggered at the corner for added effect.

The east building uses a simpler material palette. A comment regarding board form concrete has been incorporated. More views with descriptions of colors and materials were presented. A stack of balconies appeared lonely to the Board at the last meeting and these have been increased in size, now more usable and prominent as well as

holding a corner. The western building roofline has been articulated to capture a glass canopy and maintain the ribbon around the top.

Mr. Peter Nelson *with* Weisman Design Group addressed landscaping. The landscape plan had been well received at the last meeting so updates have been made as the buildings have changed, but the concept remains the same. The renderings were displayed including the minor shifts due to building changes. Since the last meeting, one element has been added; green roof has been added to provide more greenery to a building.

Bryan Bellissimo stated that there had been a request to pull back to view how the project will look for the community and a rendering was displayed. A desire to end cap the sixth floor of the west building has resulted in a unit brought down and around. The far west portion is a part of a 30-foot setback. Massing terminates at the stair tower acting as a gasket and transitions down to the five-story element.

Mr. Krueger asked if comments of Mr. White had been given to the applicant and David Lee replied no.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. White was not present at the meeting but provided written comments based on the materials online for consideration. Below is the text of the email to the Board from Mr. White.

...Overall, I think they are steps in the right direction.

These are comments based on their Design Change PDF.

Page 2: I could go either way on the mural touching the ground. I would have liked to see the inverse color facade idea for the inner court at least tried, but trust that the designers tried it and it just didn't work.

Page 3: I like the added verticality of the mural. One thing we have discussed is lighting. It would be great if lighting ensured the art pieces were nice and bright during the evenings. Serve as a beacon to the building.

Page 4: Good

Page 5: Good, though which we could get more of an inset at the mural base level.

Page 6:

1 - Kind of mixed on this one. I do want there to be something special about this corner, not sure if the wood siding is quite right, but could be on board as it looks like ties into the other wood elements.

2 - Works for me, though I would suggest the balcony panels perhaps have a different quality/version of panel than the other dark clad facades, but really just a thought.

3 - I actually prefer the previous white version. I feel like it sets up a nice rhythm with the other white verticals on this facade.

I also liked the idea of possibly using this white space as a frame for another mural/art piece. Perhaps something that ties into whatever is being done at the balconies. If that's not feasible, or overkill, then I see no harm in putting in the additional windows we see in the "current design".

Page 7: This is the big one for me. I mentioned this in the last meeting on this project, not sure if it was missed, or the designers don't agree. If they don't agree, I guess I can live with it, but want to make sure they tried it.

When we went to the thicker blades of the seesaw building on the right, it went from horizontal lap siding to more of the fiber cement board we see everywhere else.

I definitely like the thicker wall expression. However, I think there's plenty of fiber board on the industrial building across the way. I also think the horizontal lap siding has a more natural and delicate feel that supports the basic part of the building. Please do ask about this item with the designers. I'm concerned it just got missed.

Page 8:

1 - Not sure how I feel about this one. Maybe the material board will help. Seems a little too silvery in the rendering, but I do like the contrast with the other elements. Leave it up to the board.

2 - Good

3 - Good, though I wonder if there's not a chance for a bit more vibrancy in the color palette on the inside. So much color on the other facades, but this facade and courtyards feels like it takes more of its cues from the other buildings. Overall visually though I'm ok with it.

4 - Reads a little flat in the render, but I like the change up and the tie to the other facades.

Page 9:

1 - I prefer the previous. Feels a little stubby without it.

2 - Good

Mr. Krueger emphasized the comments in bold regarding page 7 of the email from Mr. White; Changing from lap siding to flat panel. Bryan Bellissimo replied that a simple white gasket was chosen. Wood tone does not show on the building any longer and the simpler white offered more of a pop.

Mr. Bellissimo stated that at a couple of previous meetings, there had been a desire expressed to thicken up and the proportion is better now. This is unchanged from the previous meeting.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked if the north building is blue.

Mr. Bellissimo replied the building reads bluer. Due to the renderings reflecting sunlight. The materials used are dark gray.

- Ms. Atvars commented liking the building on page 24 as it was before compared to now. The feel is too much wood product on the corner.

Mr. Bellissimo replied that the comment that changed the corner was to set the southwest corner off from the rest of the building.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated having made the comment in question regarding the corner and had hoped that metal or another more eclectic material would be used.
- Mr. Krueger agreed with Ms. Atvars that the previous iteration was better specific to the corner element.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that at the corner in question, the tall vertical wood in the middle felt more defined in the previous scheme and liked the gap with white corner next to it.

Mr. Krueger asked Ms. Atvars if the southeast corner towards the bike path was good, as the area had been a focus for Ms. Atvars, and Ms. Atvars replied yes.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked what would occur in the soffits in the north building.

Mr. Bellissimo replied that a gasket is created with hardy panel.

- Mr. Sutton asked if siding is treated like a plane that wraps and folds.

Mr. Bellissimo replied that this extends. There will be instances of mural on a return wall which will then transition to the soffit, particularly where a mural is horizontal. The soffit may receive the mural where elevated to be seen from the street. A rendering was described but without locations for the audio recording.

- Mr. Sutton asked if the southwest corner would not be as deep.

Mr. Bellissimo replied that there would be a change in plane of the metal of eight inches.

- Mr. Sutton stated liking a corner unidentified for the audio recording.

Mr. Bellissimo replied that a breaking point for the applicant was bringing art down to the pedestrian realm allowing this to break the base, breaking the plane and creating a gateway.

- Mr. Sutton stated that the mural on the left and the portion above windows on the slide being displayed became skinny and the mural should extend to the soffit.
- Mr. Sutton was very happy with how the project had progressed.
- Mr. Sutton preferred the older version of the corner discussed by Ms. Atvars and Mr. Krueger but staff can be worked with.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that the project had come a long way.
- Ms. Monk believed art on the side by the pool coming into the ground ties this into the building better.
- Ms. Monk believed the rounded corner worked out well.
- Ms. Monk agreed that the previous iteration of the southwest corner was preferred, too muted now with the extra wood color. Going back to the previous iteration or working with staff for a more colorful or interestingly textured element would be fine.

Mr. Martin:

- Stated that the soffits above the mural [inaudible].
- Mr. Martin asked about [inaudible].

Mr. Krueger replied recalling that the Board commented that the aspect was okay despite probably splashing from the pool.

- Mr. Martin commented [inaudible].

Mr. Liu:

- Stated that the project was coming together just fine.
- Mr. Liu stated not liking white with black or dark accent.

MOTIONED BY MS. MONK TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION OF DESIGN APPROVAL TO THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE AND TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH ALL STANDARD CONDITIONS. MS. MONK FURTHER MOVED THAT ALL ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGN FLEXIBILITIES CONTAINED WITHIN THE STAFF

MEMO MEET THE DECISION CRITERIA OF RZC 21.76.070.C.8.A AND IS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL BY THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE AND CITY COUNCIL. SECONDED BY MS. ATVARIS.

MR KRUEGER ADDED THAT THE APPLICANT SHOULD VISIT WITH STAFF REGARDING THE SOUTHWEST CORNER AND ECLECTICISM.

Mr. Lee stated that prior to the Technical Committee forwarding a recommendation to City Council, the southwest corner should be brought back to the Design Review Board to recommend a more concrete idea. Ms. Atvars asked if this could be accomplished via email and Mr. Lee replied yes, as the recommendation has already been made.

Mr. Bellissimo asked if introducing art balconies on the southwest corner would accomplish eclecticism as artists are creating interesting art. The Arts Commission approval will not be immediate and the project should not be held up in the chance that the art will accomplish what is desired by the Board.

Mr. Sutton believed that the building should stand alone without the art.

Mr. Krueger replied that options will be worked on through Mr. Lee.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTIONED BY MR. SUTTON TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:04 P.M. SECONDED BY MS. ATVARIS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**April 4, 2019
MINUTES APPROVED ON**

**Carolyn Garza
RECORDING SECRETARY**