

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

March 4, 2021

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

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Vice-Chairperson Stephanie Monk

Board Members: Ana Cisneros, Josiah Cline, Henry Liu and Shaffer White

**EXCUSED ABSENCES:** Diana Atvars

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

**MEETING MINUTES:** Carolyn Garza, LLC

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Ms. Monk 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 Mr. Liu to approve the January 7, 2021 Meeting Minutes. MOTION seconded by Ms. Monk. The MOTION passed unanimously by members who had been present.**

**APPROVAL**

**LAND-2020-00932 LMC Porch and Park**

**Neighborhood:** Downtown

**Description:** Modification to Site Plan Entitlement LAND 2019-00711 for an internal conversion of second floor from office use to residential use. The project is increasing the number of dwelling units from 86 to 104 by eliminating office space on the second floor.

**Location:** 16001 and 16005 Redmond Way

**Applicant:** Kim Faust *with* MainStreet Property Group

**Prior Review Dates:** 07/11/19, 11/07/19, 05/07/20 and 12/03/20

**Staff Contact:** Niomi Montes De Oca, 425-556-2499 or [nmontesdeoca@redmond.gov](mailto:nmontesdeoca@redmond.gov)

Mr. Lee stated that no public comment had been received.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

#### Mr. White:

- Stated that the revised design looks great, much more in keeping with the original commercial aesthetic.
- Mr. White stated being comfortable moving forward with approval.

#### Mr. Liu:

- Stated agreeing with Mr. White.
- Mr. Liu stated that being able to see improvements in the renderings was good.
- Mr. Liu stated being ready to approve.

Ms. Monk welcomed the two new Board Members, Ana Cisneros and Josiah Cline.

#### Ms. Cisneros:

- Stated liking how the project had developed.
- Ms. Cisneros stated agreeing with approval.

#### Mr. Cline:

- Asked the applicant regarding window size variation between floors.

Ms. Tiina Ritval with GGLO replied placement of the window in relation to the sill and operability. The second floor is a tall space and the casement operable is lower. The window above is a fixed portion. On the upper levels, the casement is the upper portion in relation to floor height and code requires handicapped accessible heights for the operability of windows.

- Mr. Cline stated being good to approve.

#### Ms. Monk:

- Stated agreeing with Board comments.
- Ms. Monk liked the revision.
- Ms. Monk stated that the Administrative Design Flexibility (ADF) for less balconies is okay considering the proximity to the park.

Mr. White, Mr. Liu, Mr. Cline and Ms. Cisneros were unanimously in favor of the ADF.

**MOTION by Mr. White to approve the design of the Porch and Park Administrative Modification (LAND-2020-00932) as shown in the Design Review Board materials presented on March 4, 2021. Further, the private open space Administrative Design Flexibility request is recommended for approval reducing the number of required balconies from 104 to 52, provided the applicant pays the fee-in-lieu for each required balcony not provided as described in RZC 21.62.020.e.3. This approval is subject to the standard conditions as drafted in the staff memo dated March 4, 2021. 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 meetings 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 presentation materials, the Design Review Board and the Redmond Planning staff will review and determine which design version will be followed for building permits. MOTION seconded by Mr. Liu. The MOTION passed unanimously.**

### **APPROVAL**

#### **LAND-2021-00117 TBN Industrial LN2 Tanks**

**Neighborhood:** Southeast Redmond

**Description:** Installation of three industrial LN2 tanks

**Location:** 18340 Northeast 76<sup>th</sup> Street

**Applicant:** Andy Paroline *with* Paroline and Associates

**Prior Review Date:** n/a

**Staff Contact:** Cameron Zapata, 425-556-2411 or [czapata@redmond.gov](mailto:czapata@redmond.gov)

Mr. Lee stated that no public comment had been received.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

Mr. Liu:

- Asked if there have been exterior modifications, pages four and five.

Ms. Amy Ward *with* Nelson replied that there are no exterior modifications involved with the project.

- Mr. Liu asked about verbiage on page five, *proposed view*.

Ms. Ward replied that the rendering shows how far back from the right-of-way the tanks will be only.

- Mr. Liu stated that compared to a photo, the rendering is different but liked the proposed rendering view.

Ms. Ward stated that the photo may have been taken from a lower eye level.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the difference appears to only be a rendering issue and that the applicant has asserted that no exterior modifications would be made.

Mr. Michael Townsend *with Seneca Group* clarified that there is no proposed change to the exterior of the building.

Ms. Ward stated being able to see where the confusion has come from.

Mr. Liu:

- Stated having no issues with the project.

Mr. White:

- Stated having no issues with the project.
- Mr. White stated that slats should be left to the applicant and designer.

Ms. Ward stated that there is other equipment screening on site, all the same in finish and height, and the consistency would be continued.

Mr. Cline:

- Stated being good with the project.

Ms. Cisneros:

- Asked if the proposed screening will only cover the three tanks, or more.

Ms. Ward replied that the new concrete pad to be installed for the tanks is 30' x 52' and the fence size was determined to allow clearances required by the manufacturer around tanks for maintenance. Chiller equipment is also screened. A second fence is under separate permit and the only fence being proposed for this scope of work is around the three tanks.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that screening is well integrated into design.

**MOTION by Mr. Liu to approve the TBN Industrial LN2 Tanks (LAND-2021-00117) as shown in the Design Review Board Materials dated February 18, 2021. If any additional changes are made in the field or are found inconsistent with the approved Design Review Board Materials at this meeting, and over which the Design Review Board has authority, the elevations approved by the Design Review Board at this meeting will prevail. MOTION seconded by Mr. Cline. The MOTION passed unanimously.**

### **PRE-APPLICATION**

#### **LAND-2020-00891 Nelson Legacy Project One**

**Neighborhood:** Downtown

**Description:** Eight story mixed-use residential building

**Location:** 8005 and 8075 161<sup>st</sup> Avenue Northeast

**Applicant:** W. Scott Clark *with* Clark Barnes

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

**Prior Review Dates:** 10/15/20 and 12/03/20

Mr. Lee stated that no public comment had been received.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

Mr. White:

- Stated that the project is moving in the correct direction.
- Mr. White stated appreciating detail for the metal screen vent.
- Mr. White stated that the change to the previous design of accent metal panels almost to the top was good, but may be not high enough on higher parapet masses, making the top mass feel top heavy
- Mr. White asked if the panels terminating at a halfway point between the window and parapet would present an execution issue.

W. Scott Clark *with* Clark Barnes replied that the designer likes how the corner has evolved in overall scale. The metal panel height can be raised without a problem.

- Mr. White asked if there are balconies in the interior courtyard.

Mr. Clark replied no.

- Mr. White asked if adding activation in the interior courtyard would be possible.

Mr. Clark replied that there are balconies at the corners of the spaces. The number of balconies required has already been exceeded per code. From an acoustic and privacy standpoint, the designer decided to move away from courtyard balconies relying instead on the creation of the podium level outdoor space. The sky lounge looks down into the courtyard as well.

- Mr. White stated that there is a corporate commercial feel without outdoor spaces tying residences to the courtyard.
- Mr. White asked if there could still be an opportunity for some balconies.

Mr. Clark replied that the designer is not willing to re-design as the program of the building is clear and the budget is being managed.

- Mr. White stated that as the designer as met code, the ability to impress changes is limited.
- Mr. White stated being okay moving forward.

Mr. Liu:

- Stated liking the accent metal panels in the newest presentation, particularly the reference images on page 32, a clean treatment.
- Mr. Liu stated agreeing with Mr. White regarding the office building look from the courtyard, but okay if the applicant is okay with the look.
- Mr. Liu asked Mr. Lee if there is a code requirement or City guideline regarding a necessary percentage of residential units needing balconies on certain facades.
- Mr. Liu stated understanding that the absence of courtyard balconies is both a design and cost issue but that there are various ways to approach balconies such as cantilevered, recessed or Juliet, and people appreciate even only a Juliet balcony for fresh air particularly during the pandemic.

Mr. Lee replied that there is a minimum amount of open space that can be achieved through balconies. Further articulation can be addressed. Mr. Sticka asked for a moment to find exact verbiage within the code.

- Mr. Liu asked if staff would verify the percentage of balconies required so that the issue would not need to be guessed.

Mr. Clark replied that the project exceeds the minimum requirement for balconies per code.

Mr. Sticka replied that any aspect not in compliance would come to the Design Review Board with an ADF request.

Mr. Cline:

- Stated that the middle massing of the west façade on page 5 looks flat and there is opportunity for more expression.

Mr. White:

- Asked if there is a darker metal panel applied to the west center elevation.

Ms. Lauren Garkel *with* Clark Barnes replied yes, and that more texture is provided in the fly-around presentation than stills.

Mr. Cline:

- Asked if at the southwest corner, there is language that can play between the eyebrow canopies.

Mr. Clark replied that the designers have examined several options and that after all analysis are pleased with the extended eave terminating into the southwest vertical element and the read of the element below the eaves, as well as the overall language of the building as rotating around. The idea of raising metal elements on the south and west elevation for the southwest corner is possible, but the eave on three sides is functioning and connected.

Mr. Cline:

- Stated appreciating the material boards.

Mr. Clark stated that the panel is applied on the Clark Barnes office building and that the four photographs had been taken on the same day over an approximate 45 minutes period in the afternoon in relation to the sun. The panel will change seasonally, through the course of a day, and when dry or wet.

Mr. White:

- Stated appreciating the physical sample.

Mr. Clark stated that the material picks up the red tones of incandescent lighting and will vary dramatically depending on light conditions.

Mr. Sticka stated that having consulted code, the answer to the balcony question by Mr. Liu was that 50% of units are required to have balconies, Section 21.62.020 of Downtown Design Standards under Open Space Requirements.

Mr. White:

- Stated that questions from Board members regarding overall density and code requirements may be the result of how well the designer has executed the outer envelope without crowding.

Ms. Cisneros experienced an issue with the virtual meeting and could not be reached for comment. Ms. Monk proceeded with comments while the issue was resolved.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated agreement with Mr. White and Mr. Liu regarding balconies but opinion will not have bearing on an approval.
- Ms. Monk stated that the space will be good for residents and neighbors.
- Ms. Monk stated looking forward to seeing the panel material when on the building.
- Ms. Monk asked what next steps should be.

Mr. Sticka replied that the decision was up to the Board whether the applicant can come back next for approval.

Ms. Cisneros rejoined the virtual meeting.

Ms. Cisneros:

- Asked if there is sunlight in the courtyard area and referred to page 26; the rendering shows that there will be shadows due to the building height throughout the day considering the plants and trees proposed.
- Ms. Cisneros asked if the project will also take care of landscaping, referring to page 34.



Peter Nelson *with Weisman Design Group* replied no, that regarding landscaping, the area referred to is the adjacent property.

Mr. White:

- Clarified the question of Ms. Cisneros, asking if there had been a solar study of the courtyard.

Mr. Clark replied that the courtyard faces due south and there is good light from the opening in the corner as well as sunlight mid-day and setting sun on the opposite face. Studies have been done.

Ms. Karla Gonzales *with Clark Barnes* replied that diagrams can be sent to Mr. Sticka after the meeting for review. The building orientation is good and most if not all units through the day will have sun.

Mr. White:

- Asked if landscaping can be supported with sufficient lighting.

Mr. Clark replied that designers are confident in landscaping and the landscaping section of the application can be examined.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the project may be ready for approval at the next presentation but that the remaining question is how high to take the metal panels on the higher parapet sections. Additional options could be presented or a better of understanding of why the current design is preferred.

Mr. Clark asked if the direction was to come back for a fourth presentation. Mr. White replied no, for final approval. Mr. Sticka stated that the direction from the Board is to come back, address remaining comments and concerns, and for approval pending review of materials and final recommendation.

Mr. Clark stated understanding that the Board is comfortable to approve except for the height of metal panels on the southwest corner, although Board members had acknowledged opinions were personal and subjective. The designer stated being happy to examine further, however. Mr. White replied that the issue is at all higher parapets and not only the southwest corner, one condition for all but only one rendering needed. Mr. Clark stated that the proportion of the parapet elements varies and is highest at the southwest corner. Mr. White stated having been mistaken in believing the same condition existed around the building so the issue was in fact only regarding the

southwest corner. Mr. Clark stated that the condition at the southwest corner exists because of how the eve of the sky lounge is terminated.

Mr. Clark asked Mr. Sticka when the next meeting could occur, and Mr. Sticka replied that the expectation is three weeks.

Mr. Sticka suggested that the lighting study be incorporated for review.

### **OTHER ITEMS**

Mr. Lee stated that new Policy and Procedure should be formally adopted for the Design Review Board and Board members should begin thinking about what should be included. A draft will be created by Mr. Lee and discussion can occur at meetings with short agendas. Ms. Monk asked if the focus would be timelines, and Mr. Lee replied that project presentations have been done offline during the last year saving time. A provision could be that video presentations be submitted prior to the Board meeting and that the Board is expected to review the videos online prior. Ms. Monk asked if the limit for video presentations is five minutes, and Mr. Lee replied that the limit is seven minutes. Other issues to address could be defining the time a large project will be allowed to present versus a super project, by acres or density, and procedures regarding last minute presentations by an applicant.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY MR. WHITE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:19 P.M. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. LIU. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**April 15, 2021**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

**Carolyn Garza**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**RECORDING SECRETARY**