

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

March 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, Ralph Martin,
Stephanie Monk, Kevin Sutton and Schaffer White

EXCUSED ABESNCES: Henry Liu

STAFF PRESENT: David 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 OF MINUTES

MOTION BY MS. MONK TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 17, 2019 AND FEBRUARY 7, 2019 MEETING MINUTES. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WHITE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Mr. White stated not having been present at the February 7, 2019 meeting.)

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2019-00136, Building X

Neighborhood: Willows/Rose Hill

Description: New building, three stories of office constructed above a tiered parking structure

Location: 10301 Willows Road Northeast

Presenters: Craig Webb *with* Gehry Partners and Shannon Nichol *with* GGN

Staff Contact: David Lee, 425-556-2462 or dlee@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee stated that the project is located on parcel 3426059037. The proposal is for a 355,686 square foot building facility with offices and meeting spaces. The hope of the project is to integrate into the site topography and natural features which currently exist.

Mr. Craig Webb *with* Gehry Partners, based in Los Angeles, stated that Shannon Nichol *with* GGN would present landscape design and that several team members were in the audience. A great aspect of the project is the beauty of the site. A good relationship is being developed with staff and feedback is desired from the Design Review Board.

Gehry Partners has been asked by Facebook to create a building which creates collaboration. When Facebook lab groups were asked which building would most epitomize what was desired, the lab building was chosen for functionality and simplicity. There are great communal spaces internally. Slides were shown of other buildings designed for Facebook elsewhere to demonstrate the industrial aesthetic. Facebook has requested that buildings be anonymous and not iconic in architecture. Areas such as egress stairs articulate the façade, however. Interiors are unfinished and Facebook has requested that the building moves and is flexible, with the idea that everything is always a work in progress in mind.

Mr. Webb displayed slides of the location and perspectives from different angles. A model of the building was brought to the meeting. Industrial aesthetics, simplicity of design and integration of the building into the site are what drives the design. There are Douglas Fir and Western Red Cedar trees on the site, up to 150 feet tall. Drone footage with 3D computer modeling was displayed.

An existing driveway off of Willows Road will be used. A canopy is over the front door and outdoor spaces will exist. On the west side, there will be a shuttle bus drop-off and traffic mitigation measures will attempt to bring people to the site in modes other than single passenger cars. A trail system moves up the slope and the required fire lane will share trail space. A roof terrace will provide a great view across the valley and native, rustic material will be brought up. The site plan and further diagrams were displayed. Attention is being paid to both groundwater movement from the top as well as at sub-surface.

As a result of a comment from the City, stainless steel mesh screening is being added to the parking garage which was not on the original submission. Stacking conference rooms within atriums will create architectural towers, an interior City scape within the building.

Ms. Nichol continued with overall landscaping goals, which include augmenting as well as retaining the existing natural presence such as mosses. The site is visible from the valley and community from either end. The evergreen canopy holds the wall of the

valley. Deciduous forest dominated by big leaf maple and alder as well as remnants of mature generation conifers are existing. Restoring the understory and removing invasive species are the planting strategies. The deciduous young forest will expand over the disturbed spaces, providing shade and bird habitats. Preserving the moisture in the site sustains existing trees. Paved areas will zig zag, creating depressions which will slow water in order to allow absorption into the ground for plant life. The location of the building will preserve a moist, low ravine that has been disturbed over time. People will experience the site with prospect and refuge, with the contrast of views of the valley. There are a number of intimate spaces for seating, vegetation and texture to the rear and open toward the low, wet areas. The character of materials will be informal so that attention is focused on the natural landscape as well as with an ability to give friction and absorption to slow water flow. Roof area renderings were displayed.

Ms. Nichols offered to talk further about the planting plan if there were questions.

Mr. Webb explained that sustainability strategies have been included in the submission. Staff has asked the team to address some specific design issues. The applicant proposes not complying strictly with two parts of the code regarding façade and roofline articulations. Diagrams showed proposed designs side-by-side to what would be required to the text of the code. The design team believes that regarding the requirement to offset the façade at a specific increment, the façade should have a very abstract appearance, simple and floating in the trees. Articulating the façade would detract rather than add to the design. The articulation of the roofline was the next issue; because design is attempting to make the building recede and appear lower, the proposed design is believed to be a better option.

The future Willows Road widening is an issue, a part of City long-term planning and not currently underway. The current proposal is for an in-lieu fee in order to not rush the widening, as the widening project will be removing a number of large trees across the façade that cannot be replanted at the current scale.

Mr. Krueger asked if anyone in the audience had questions or comments and there were none.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Martin

- [Inaudible]
- Mr. Martin asked about bringing daylight in.

Mr. Webb replied that there are skylights over the top of the atrium, pushing daylight down into the space. Bouncing the light to these types of spaces versus direct sunlight

has worked well in the past. Tower pieces will provide mass for light to diffuse and bounce off of. Design is limited in the scale of skylights but design continues.

- Mr. Martin [inaudible].

Ms. Monk:

- Asked if there is a current use of the site.

Mr. Webb replied that there is a building on the site currently. Two parcels are adjacent to each other. The laboratory is a company named Crane.

- Ms. Monk asked what is in the adjacent building to the south, and how this site may interact with traffic and other uses.

Mr. Webb replied that the original intent was to develop both parcels simultaneously. Because of business planning and commercial strategies, Facebook decided that a full build-out of the site was not necessary. Both of the existing buildings will be vacated shortly.

- Ms. Monk stated liking the landscape plans and trails behind the building.
- Ms. Monk asked how many employees would work here and how transportation would occur.

Mr. Steve Ciroca, Design Manager, replied that there is a transportation program being developed and 60 to 70 percent participation is hoped for. There will be three-per-thousand parking for the building; the submission shows 800 cars and the plan is to increase that level. Design is still evolving.

- Ms. Monk stated liking the green roof terrace with a Pacific Northwest vibe.
- Ms. Monk stated that the finalized plans for road widening will play with thoughts regarding decisions for articulation for the façade.
- Ms. Monk stated that renderings of the building stepping back more in order to retain trees would be helpful as an option.

Mr. Webb replied that the City has indicated that road widening may be as much as ten years into the future. Trees are being planted in the space between where the road widening will occur and the building. In ten years, the trees should have height. A fast-growing tree species would be chosen as a screen.

- Ms. Monk stated the project looked great and was a good use of the parcel.

Mr. White:

- Asked about the location of the truck dock.

Mr. Webb replied that the site is very steep prohibiting full semi-trucks. Other loading dock positions had been studied but the location shown is the one which functionally works the most easily. Ways to screen the truck dock are being examined, possibly with stainless steel mesh.

- Mr. White asked about the docks and turnaround.

Mr. Webb replied that the dock as well as the full truck bay are under the building. Parked trucks will be completely underneath the building.

- Mr. White asked if the doors face to the east.

Mr. Webb replied yes.

- Mr. White wondered if the doors could be moved so as to not face the principle street.

Mr. Webb replied that the door location would be examined.

- Mr. White was okay with the façade modulation, but wondered if a cantilever or recess could occur mimicking the atrium inside.

Mr. Webb replied that many façade options had been examined. Decisions and reasoning through the design process could be brought to the Board if helpful.

- Mr. White hoped to see more [inaudible], elegant and beyond office park design.
- Mr. White stated liking the tree canopy on the third floor, breaking up the line.
- Mr. White [inaudible].
- Mr. White stated hoping to see renderings of the ten-year study with options.
- Mr. White stated that at 4:00 p.m., people will experience the building from the road in the dark and was interested in the night lighting and visible site lines.
- Mr. White stated that the egress stairs may not do as much for the design because of the scale of the building.
- Mr. White stated that the project was exciting.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated hoping that blending in with the surroundings will work, but that until further development occurs on the road the project will stand out no matter what.

- Ms. Atvars stated that if the road widening is inevitable, the buildings will need to look good even without trees, and hoped this would be focused on more at the next presentation.

Mr. Webb asked if what should be brought back is renderings of the street widening with ten years of growth on the replacement trees, and Ms. Atvars replied yes.

- Ms. Atvars stated that the intent of the design appeared to imply that the building had always been there, integrated with the landscape, and further detailed versions of landscape design would be helpful.
- Ms. Atvars asked if plantings might occur on vertical surfaces of the building, or plants on the top terrace spilling over the edge to help with blending.
- Ms. Atvars stated that road widening before traffic becomes an issue would be a good idea.
- Ms. Atvars asked if lights and traffic mitigation was planned.

Mr. Webb replied that as part of the SPE process, a full traffic study is being conducted. The applicant is proposing to signalize the front entry point at the center driveway and other traffic mitigations are possible up and down Willows Road.

- Ms. Atvars asked if there could be a way for transparency to change; vision glass versus solid walls versus perforated mesh for variation of the façade to help with staff concerns.

Mr. Sutton:

- Supported the modulation request.
- Mr. Sutton asked if there would be a grass volume or mass sticking out, or more of a plain.
- Mr. Sutton commented that a parapet is shown on the east side but not on the north or south.

Mr. Webb replied that the intention was articulated volume or bumper, linear volume supporting the roof terrace.

- Mr. Sutton was okay with the roof element and the roof landscaping should create the modulation desired.
- Mr. Sutton was concerned about the garage façade and inevitable disappearance of trees, and renderings without the trees are needed.
- Mr. Sutton stated that bringing green elements up the façade is interesting but may be a challenge around the native plant scheme.
- Mr. Sutton stated that the stairs were a distraction given the massing.

Mr. Krueger

- Liked the bold moves in elevation modulation proposed.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the interface between the street and glass bumper will be key.
- Mr. Krueger stated that widening in front of this site will not help with narrowed traffic lanes to the north and south.

Mr. Webb replied that the number of trees that will be removed when the widening is done will be huge, 75 on the side of the site alone.

- Mr. Krueger liked the idea of planting behind existing trees so that when widening does occur there will be some growth.
- Mr. Krueger liked the night lighting study.
- Mr. Krueger liked the term *moisture level plants*.
- Mr. Krueger hoped that fees in lieu of from Facebook could possibly go towards the State Route 520 and 405 interchange.

Mr. Webb stated that the next scheduled presentation would follow SPE presentations, June 6, 2019.

10 Minute Break

BRIEFING

Topic: Redmond Technology Station Bridge

Description: Information only – briefing on the status of the Redmond Technology Station Bridge

Presenter: Allen Nichols *with* Microsoft

Staff Contact: Patty Criddle, 425-556-2736 or pcriddle@redmond.gov and David Lee, 425-556-2462 or dlee@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee stated that the last time the Design Review Board had been briefed on the Redmond Technology Station Bridge was December 21, 2017, then called the Overlake Transit Center. The Station is currently under construction. At the last briefing, the project consisted of a park-and-ride, a transit station, light rail and associated uses. The briefing at this meeting would be about the bridge, so that the Design Review Board can use the visual for context when reviewing other related projects at a future date.

Mr. Allen Nichols *with* Microsoft stated that the presentation of design progress of the bridge was a courtesy to the Design Review Board. Images to be shown are in-progress with design at 65%. Structural design is scheduled to be completed in summer 2019 and architectural design will finish in fall 2019.

Renderings were described. How to better connect the east and west sides of the Microsoft campus was the initial challenge, as well as how to increase efficiency of movement, provide a people-first approach and increase safety for pedestrians. Currently, employees must cross three major intersections to move from the west campus to the east campus. Creating a bridge that does not mix cars and people is a safe way to transition between campus elements.

Microsoft has held weekly meetings with Redmond staff, Sound Transit and WSDOT on design collaboration. The bridge is wider over the State Route 520 portion with landscaping. The bridge then narrows to a 30' section crossing 156th Street Northeast. The bicycle lane is on the south side of the bridge and the pedestrian lane is on the north side.

How to capture rainwater for landscaping and carbon reduction as a result of eliminating the need to drive and park are examples of sustainability moments being explored. The design intent is to extend the current campus pathways with native plants and grasses along the bridge. Landscaping elements and the canopy help to reduce noise from the road. Maintenance vehicles from Redmond will be able to utilize the bridge.

Lighting should not be a distraction for drivers under the bridge and WSDOT is being worked with to ensure the correct level of natural, soft lighting.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Monk:

- Asked what the canopy material will be and how the canopy will be maintained.

Mr. Nichols replied that fireproof Teflon fiberglass had been selected, and that the material has a 25 to 30-year warranty although the lifespan has proven to be longer, some currently at 40 years plus.

- Ms. Monk stated that the bridge would provide a much safer way to cross State Route 520.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked what the width of the bridge would be over State Route 520.

Mr. Nichols replied 50' across State Route 520, which then tapers down to 30 feet.

Mr. White:

- Asked if canopy design could be drawn down into the transit center.

Mr. Nichols replied not at this time, as appropriate resources need to be in place.

- Mr. White stated that a transition from elements of the bridge between the bridge and transit center would be good.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked if there is a ramp to the station.

Mr. Lee replied that there is a direct access ramp that leads from the bridge to the State Route 520 side of the station.

Mr. Krueger asked there were questions from the audience and there were none.

Mr. Martin:

- [Inaudible] and stated the canopy was beautiful.
- Mr. Martin [Inaudible].

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated liking the width and plantings that make the project more than a utility bridge.

Mr. Krueger asked Mr. Lee if there was a report from staff and Mr. Lee replied no.

Ms. Tarce commented that at the last meeting, the review for Avalon Redmond Campus in Overlake included a list of poll questions for comments from the board as well as to establish a record of decisions. Ms. Tarce asked the Board if the new poll questions were productive, as the best way to formalize Design Review Board comments is being examined.

Mr. Sutton replied that as the Board spontaneously expresses opinion and comment, commenting by a list of questions would take getting used to. Follow up questions from staff may be needed for further detail.

Ms. Tarce commented that the questions had been included in the staff memo as well as in front of the Board during the meeting. The purpose of the questions is to ensure that comments are tied into actual development code and design standards.

Mr. White stated not having been at the last meeting and asked how many questions there were.

Ms. Atvars replied that there were just a few questions, and commented that if required to answer questions in order, natural thoughts may be missed and follow up for further feedback by staff may be needed. Specific questions may limit comments. Ms. Atvars commented that knowing specifically what staff would like to hear as far as feedback was good.

Ms. Monk stated not having been at the last meeting, but had seen the email regarding questions and believed it would be a good idea if the poll questions help staff.

Ms. Tarce replied that the last meeting was a test of the poll questions, and the questions would be implemented slowly with the rest of staff. At this time, poll questions will not come from other staff members.

Mr. Krueger stated that Mr. **Reynolds** had done a good job. Comments should not become structured as, in example, all Board members answering question number one and not commenting with a natural flow, however.

Ms. Tarce stated having great confidence in the Design Review Board process to provide detailed comments that the poll questions will not capture. Poll answers are used to remind the Applicant of the strength of the project. Staff must translate comments into code so that at final approval, comments are incorporated into the design checklist. The City attorney has recommended using the design checklist as a record of decision. Meeting Minutes and comments will establish a clear rationale for why a project was approved.

Mr. Krueger replied that a reminder of what portions of code must be addressed is good. Ms. Tarce stated that there have been times when a Board member has commented that, in example, an element would not have to be used, when in fact the code states that the element is required. All comments are helpful.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTIONED BY MR. WHITE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:30 P.M.
SECONDED BY MS. ATVARS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

April 18, 2019

MINUTES APPROVED ON

Carolyn Garza

RECORDING SECRETARY