

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

March 7, 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, Ralph Martin and Kevin Sutton

**EXCUSED ABESENCES:** Henry Liu, Stephanie Monk and Shaffer White

**STAFF PRESENT:** Carolyn Hope and Chris Weber, Redmond Cultural Arts and Scott Reynolds, 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 OF MINUTES**

**MOTION BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 3, 2019 MEETING MINUTES. MOTION SECONDED BY MS. ATVARIS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (A quorum of Board members who were at the January 3, 2019 meeting was met.)**

**BRIEFING**

**Topic:** Privately Developed Public Art Code Amendment

**Description:** The role of the Design Review Board in the development of the amendment and in the implementation of the future code

**Contact:** Carolyn Hope, 425-556-2313 or [cjhope@redmond.gov](mailto:cjhope@redmond.gov)

Ms. Hope, Park Planning and Cultural Arts Manager, introduced Chris Weber, Cultural Arts Administrator.

Mr. Weber stated that over the last several years, the City has encouraged the private sector to play a more significant role in placemaking and creating pedestrian amenities. In 2017, critical gaps were revealed in both policies and procedures. The issue is time-sensitive as Master Plan developments are beginning to provide public art through the public benefit provision of their agreements and as Marymoor Village begins to attract interest from developers who wish to incorporate art.

Currently, Redmond has no policy, code or resolution which addresses when and how the City should review public art in projects proposed by a developer. Staff members continue to research the approaches and processes of other cities. An inter-departmental effort will result in the adoption of code amendments to provide more clarity regarding the integration of public art in private development, including development incentives, design requirements and location in public space.

The purpose of amendments is to provide a process to follow for public art proposals from the private development community; developing a zoning code definition for public art; defining types of projects requiring review; identifying a City review body; establishing submittal requirements, rating criteria and a review process; and administrative procedures for project proponents using the zoning code public art in-lieu fund incentives.

The Design Review Board is asked to provide questions and input on the public engagement process, draft proposals and draft code amendments.

In 2017, Redmond adopted a definition for public art, but public art needs to be defined in the code as well as how to use the in-lieu fee. A tiered approach for using in-lieu funds could be; to fulfill the public art plan in the neighborhood of development; fulfill the public art plan in other neighborhoods; contribute to the Capital Fund for an Art Center; or to contribute into a public fund or Grant for other community support programs.

Public art comes in many forms and includes events and performances. An example of social practice was from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania in which a Conflict Kitchen pop-up restaurant served only food from areas of the world where there is conflict with the United States. This is paired with discussion, performance and outreach.

Benefits of policy is in making connections with different people and places, placemaking, inspiring creativity and promoting understanding. The Comprehensive Plan describes the benefits of public art.

Ms. Hope continued the presentation. The City has had a public art ordinance since 1991 for City Capital contributing public funds towards public art. Action is needed

regarding a definition for public art in the code; how to ensure that quality meets Policy goals; and to ensure that private developer owners maintain public art long-term with procedures and mechanisms in place so that the owners and not the City will remain liable in the future. Provisions for decommissioning are also needed.

To reiterate, the process moving forward will be to define the types of public projects which qualify for review; defining a review body; submittal requirements, clear weighting criteria; approval process and appeal process.

If a Developer does not wish to commission public art in a project, a contribution can be made toward the in-lieu fund. How the contributions are used needs to be established. Some cities break out the in-lieu fund so that percentages go toward maintenance, programming, a Capital facility and building out the public art plan.

A large project about to be reviewed by the Arts Commission is LMC Marymoor Village in which approximately \$750,000 will be spent on public art. The developer is versed in the process, but other developers may not have the experience to move forward. Tool kits should be in place.

Procedures, criteria and requirements from the City of Seattle are being reviewed as well as other cities and non-profit agencies in preparation for the formulation of the final proposal.

Ms. Hope stated that the project was hoped to be completed by the end of 2019. Outreach to stakeholders will occur within the next couple of months and another presentation will be given with the result of the outreach.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked for clarification regarding issues that arose during the 2017 adoption.

Ms. Hope replied that an issue was a blank wall requirement. The Mayor had asked the Arts Administrator to take this through the Arts & Culture Commission as the Design Review Board had limited experience and qualifications to review an art project. While there are criteria in place for public art, working with a developer presents specific permit requirements as well as other issues.

- Mr. Krueger did not recall the proposal before the Design Review Board.

Ms. Hope replied that the issue may have occurred at staff level.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked which project was being referred to.

Ms. Hope replied the project of Mr. Pantley

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the project in question had completed well.

Ms. Hope continued to reply that there had not been enough time to put procedures into place.

- Mr. Krueger asked if there was an incentive for Mr. Pantley to proceed through the Arts & Culture Commission.

Ms. Hope replied that this was the reason was the requirement in code.

- Mr. Krueger asked if the Arts & Culture Commission should be the natural group to designate as the review body.

Mr. Weber replied that the Arts & Culture Commission most likely would be the natural body, but there is nothing stating this. Clarifying this is part of the process being presented to the Design Review Board.

Ms. Hope replied that if the final recommendation is to designate the Arts & Culture Commission as the review board, the ordinance for the Arts & Culture Commission will also need to be updated to ensure that authority is outlined.

- Mr. Krueger asked for clarification regarding the need for a definition.

Ms. Hope replied that public art is defined with the word *art*, but exactly how art is defined is in question as well as if a definition could be too narrow; how a legal definition in the zoning code is written versus how an Arts Commission might define public art.

Ms. Hope stated that the Marymoor developer has been very progressive in working with the Arts Commission although not required to at this time. The current procedure has a one touch requirement but the size of the project may indicate two touches.

- Mr. Krueger stated that the Marymoor project had been brought in three stages to the Design Review Board.

- Mr. Krueger asked about the time limit for artists of 20 minutes for presentations to the Arts & Culture Commission including questions and answers.

Ms. Hope replied that the Commission has been lenient with the time limit.

Mr. Weber replied that artists have been given 40 minutes.

Ms. Hope replied that the subject may bring up even more for the Arts & Culture Commission to consider, such as if there should be a sub-committee reviewing in more depth or a group that meets more often.

- Mr. Krueger stated that if artists could also brief the Design Review Board for suggestions, this would be beneficial.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that while public art in the Marymoor project would be critical, the Design Review Board had not had a chance to see the art chosen before making a recommendation. Timing will not allow for this with the Marymoor project but once a process is in place, the whole picture should be reviewed before a recommendation is given.

Mr. Martin:

- [Inaudible]

Mr. Weber replied that the Marymoor developer has gone above and beyond, and the effort should continue.

Ms. Hope replied that while the Arts & Culture Commission makes sense as the review body, in other cities there is a selection committee with representatives from different Commissions or Boards, staff and others to review projects in a first touch. Possibly, the Arts & Culture Commission could be the final touch. The opportunity over the next months is to be able to decide what will make the most sense for Redmond. A good point was made by Mr. Sutton regarding seeing the whole picture with the art before making a recommendation.

Ms. Atvars:

- Agreed that seeing art should come before a final building sign-off.
- Ms. Atvars asked if the reviews of the Marymoor project are what are envisioned for the rest of Redmond.

Ms. Hope replied that Planning has been worked with closely on Marymoor. A public art definition would apply to the entire City and not specific to a neighborhood.

Mr. Krueger:

- Commented that the January 3, 2019 meeting included the presentation by Ms. Kim Dietz in regard to design guidelines for Marymoor Village, and asked if language should be inserted.

Ms. Hope replied that the next workshop with the consultant would be regarding the design guidelines topic.

### **PRE-APPLICATION**

#### **LAND-2019-00125, Avalon Redmond Campus**

**Neighborhood:** Overlake

**Description:** Proposal to redevelop the southwest portion of the existing site to include 214 new multi-family apartments

**Location:** 15606 Northeast 40<sup>th</sup> Street

**Applicant:** Scott Rasmussen *with* AvalonBay Communities, Inc.

**Staff Contact:** Scott Reynolds, 425-556-2409 or [sreynolds@redmond.gov](mailto:sreynolds@redmond.gov)

Mr. Reynolds stated that the presentation would be the first touch for the Design Review Board. The specific site is within the R-30 zone district, a high-density residential zone in the zoning code and the Comprehensive Plan. There is intentionality to make the area distinctive from Downtown, providing superior design build, and a focus on pedestrian connectivity within the neighborhood.

Staff has concerns regarding the site layout. First, adjustments should be made regarding pedestrian activity with light rail and Microsoft near by. Other concerns are regarding how the mid-rise building will interact with the two-story walk-ups, façade material, and power lines abutting on 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast and Northeast 40<sup>th</sup> which cannot be undergrounded. How the building will interact with not only the street frontage but also power lines are of concern. Some trees currently buffering existing buildings on the site would be removed with site development. Staff feels that parking needs to be screened particularly if trees are removed on 156<sup>th</sup>. Parking spaces could be moved within the underground parking garage on site, also.

Staff has two concerns regarding massing. There are three primary frontages being the south, west and east. Staff feels that the west façade reads flat and does not engage with the street. The underground parking garage façade would benefit from improvements.

Mr. Scott Rasmussen *with* AvalonBay stated that the building placement and design stays within the context of neighboring properties and the building takes advantage of the new Redmond Technology Light Rail Station. Staff raised points that AvalonBay agrees with, specifically regarding the west façade modulation and the pedestrian connection to the light rail station. The design team has worked hard to incorporate staff comments and is happy with the result.

The goal is to obtain from the Board approval of the site and building layout and ultimately input or approval on the massing.

Mr. Dave Maul *with* Rutledge Maul Architects (RMA) described slide renderings of the project. Calculating with City requirements, the site should have 316 parking stalls while King County suggests 232 stalls. There are 279 parking stalls designed for the garage. On the north side of the project, 18 existing stalls are being eliminated from surface parking currently serving existing apartment buildings which will remain in order to provide a fire truck turn around for better access. The 18 parking stalls are being relocated on 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast and need to be screened. The dog run will be moved as a result.

The placement of the building does a good job of transitioning from the Microsoft office buildings across the street. There are existing two- and three-story apartment buildings between this project and single-family buildings further to the west. As the neighborhood grows, this is a logical transition and good fit for more housing close to employment.

The project will be a cohesive, code-compliant, transit-oriented residential community that is integrated into the natural setting with a strong sense of entry, place and connection with adjacent Microsoft facilities and light rail. Site constraints include utility easements and power lines on 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast. The garage is two stories, one and one-half stories of which will be buried, and two different access points access either level. Further perspectives were displayed. Easy access to the leasing office and mail room have been developed as well as large courtyards with amenity activity space. A lobby and sidewalk connection will provide direct access to the transit center. Better access out of the east side and breaking the façade more with modulation is being examined. There is a small club and amenity space on the rooftop but height restrictions need confirmation.

Mr. Mark Brumbaugh *with* Brumbaugh & Associates, Landscape Architects, stated that the project includes streetscape improvements. Landscaping around the building will be a native Northwest plant palate consistent with the neighborhood. Vegetation will help with massing and screening. There are two podium level courtyards; the south intended as a more passive space with a yoga deck and private outdoor spaces. Both courtyards will have private patios separated with landscape planters. The north courtyard will be more active, adjacent to the club room with a wood deck, fire tables, seating with tables

and a hammock structure. The roof deck in the center of the structure faces west for solar exposure. Further amenities will be outdoor ping pong, a bocce court, a barbeque and sun deck surrounded by a green roof. The applicant had not brought the site plan to the meeting, and stated that this would be brought to the next presentation.

Previous staff concerns included connection to the transit center, which has been addressed by creating engagement at the corner. Surface parking screening and saving existing trees on the 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast frontage were also a staff concern; 68% of significant trees will be saved, however, not against the building. Isolated conifers are prone to failure due to, in example, excavation changing the water table and vibration from construction. Trees should be saved where they have a better chance of surviving. As the project moves from suburban to more urban, the character of the landscape will change.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

#### **Mr. Sutton:**

- Is curious how the lobby will integrate with the interior and circulation.
- Mr. Sutton stated not knowing what the big design idea was.
- Mr. Sutton stated that the connection to the corner was important and a step back could occur.
- Mr. Sutton stated that the building in relation to the rest of the property in regard to the number of stories surrounding should be considered, to create a transition down to the smaller area.

#### **Mr. Martin:**

- Agreed with Mr. Sutton about a step back on the west side.
- Mr. Martin stated that the lobby at the drop off could offer something to protect people or extend a welcome architecturally.
- Mr. Martin [inaudible].

Mr. Rasmussen replied very good water-proofing materials and pedestals.

#### **Ms. Atvars:**

- Asked if there was a reason that the building is angled.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that the angle began with an attempt to save trees, but as research progressed it was realized that many trees would be difficult to save regardless. The spaces created along the public realm were positive outcomes.

- Ms. Atvars asked that the streetscape be a purposeful point in the project.
- Ms. Atvars hoped that the dog run could still occur closer to the building.
- Ms. Atvars stated that there was an opportunity to bring an interesting natural element on the shorter streetscape side.
- Ms. Atvars liked the rear lobby area and wondered if the fitness amenity should be moved to that lobby to give more purpose and activity as seen from the street.
- Ms. Atvars stated that the general floorplan and outline is chaotic and could be toned down.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the design now has great activity internally for the residents, but the public realm needs more attention to become intentional and distinctive from Downtown. There will be a sense of existing community but the public will only see the backside.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the power lines will be exposed when trees are removed and wondered if there will be any buffering to the street and sun to the west.
- Mr. Krueger liked moving the pedestrian connection to the corner.
- Mr. Krueger referred to The Milehouse Apartments in regard to similar design with attention to streetscape.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that the comments had addressed questions in general. Mr. Maul stated that the orientation of the building was conscious of the primary resident entrance in relation to the intersection, and scale with a more large, imposing mass on the residential buildings could feel out of context with the rest of the community. The larger bulk to 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast would mesh better with the Microsoft buildings.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that adding courtyard along 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast could be added to soften the area.

Mr. Brumbaugh replied that the site was neither urban or suburban but a hybrid. Automobile speeds at a busy arterial aren't engaged in the same way as a Downtown street.

- Mr. Krueger stated not implying that entrances should be off the arterial but rather that entrances stay where they are but using an alley, in example, softening the west edge for an amenity towards the public realm and the remainder for the residential community.

Mr. Derek Bottles with AvalonBay Communities, Vice President of Development, stated that the comments of the Board were on point and between the staff report and Board comments, 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast can be designed better. In general, the massing will remain as is now and a more cohesive idea and experience can be developed on 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast. Mr. Bottles asked the Board if the thoughts were accurate and the Board replied yes.

Mr. Martin:

- Stated that there was tension between the urban activity side and suburban side.
- Mr. Martin [inaudible].

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the comments of Mr. Martin were great in regard to the interface change from one side to the other.
- Mr. Krueger described the new five-village project at Microsoft and stated that the Microsoft campus there will look very different than it does now.

Mr. Reynolds commented that the presentation at this meeting was a pre-application for general guidance and no decisions would be made at this meeting.

Mr. Bottles stated that the next presentation would address further issues raised. Mr. Reynolds stated that the project would return in a couple of months.

Mr. Reynolds stated that there was no report from staff.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTIONED BY MR. MARTIN TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:32 P.M.  
SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

April 18, 2019

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

Carolyn Garza

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