



CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

March 23, 2023

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Shaffer White, Vice-Chairperson Josiah Cline, Board Members Ana Cisneros and Wanqin Su

ABSENCES: Board Member Henry Liu

STAFF PRESENT: David Lee, Redmond Planning

MEETING MINUTES: Carolyn Garza, LLC

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Mr. White 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.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

MOTION by Ms. Wanqin to approve the February 23, 2023 minutes. **MOTION** seconded by Ms. Cisneros. The minutes passed unanimously.

STUDY SESSION - MGP XII-Overlake East

LAND-2022-00206, Master Plan Development

LAND-2022-00207, Phase 1

LAND-2022-00208, Phase 2

Neighborhood: Overlake

Description: Four building development of residential multi-family and commercial

Location: 15340 Northeast 24th Street

Applicant: Joe Tucker *with* Ankrom Moisan Architects

Prior Review Dates: 10/20/22 and 11/03/22

Staff Contact: Tim McHarg, 425-556-2414 or tmcharg@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee presented the project due to the excused absence of Mr. McHarg. There had been no public comment received.

Mr. Scott Bevin with Trammell Crow introduced himself..

PHASE 1

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Cline:

- Stated hoping to see the multi-family option.
- Mr. Cline stated appreciating the overall parti, playful inside and sleek outside skin.
- Mr. Cline stated that the site feels cohesive.
- Mr. Cline stated that in Phase I, the thoughtfulness of landscaping works.
- Mr. Cline stated that along 152nd Avenue Northeast, modulation and sidewalk areas are great to see.
- Mr. Cline asked if what commercial will be present at Building A, 152nd Avenue Northeast frontage, is known at this time, and if there will be seating.

Mr. Mark Hoyt *with* Trammell Crow replied that a tenant has not been identified but that the intention is for neighborhood commercial retail, such as a coffee shop or sandwich shop. Access is a design feature.

- Mr. Cline suggested a focus on the feel from a pedestrian level, constricting into a dark garage.
- Mr. Cline stated liking the bike amenities.

Mr. Joe Tucker *with* Ankrom Moisan Architects stated that the area between the public right-of-way and retail space is intended to have space for seating, spilling onto the sidewalk.

- Mr. Cline asked if benches and points of interest for pedestrians through the length of the building and not only at corners is being considered.

Ms. Kristen Lundquist *with* Brumbaugh & Associates replied that double-sided benches and other opportunities will serve places other than retail entry spaces.

- Mr. Cline stated that breaking up massing into three commercial spaces instead of a single façade brings the building to the pedestrian level.
- Mr. Cline stated that the east façade facing the King County Metro area is the weakest, a flat plane, and that the design team should examine more fun on the façade.
- Mr. Cline asked, regarding the courtyard Administrative Design Flexibility (ADF), if there is a rhythm for which units will or will not have balconies.

Ms. Jenny Chapman *with* Ankrom Moisan Architects replied that texture and opportunities to view the courtyard are offset to provide privacy, as well as to present a more playful, random appearance. Balconies are mixed between unit types.

- Mr. Cline stated appreciating the break up of unit siding with wood up to the rooftop terrace.

Ms. Cisneros:

- Stated seeing improvement to the Master Plan.
- Ms. Cisneros stated that while the façade facing the King County Metro Station is flat, this will eliminate traffic noise for the units, locating balconies on inner protected streets.
- Ms. Cisneros stated that materials and textures can improve the flat façade, page 22.

Mr. White asked staff for clarification that the eastern elevation of Phase I requires the same level of treatment by the Design Review Board for a primary façade, or if considered a secondary façade. Mr. Lee replied that facades are not exempted in terms of treatment in design, but there is language in code addressing types of uses on a first floor.

- Ms. Cisneros asked if overhead weather protection is specifically for retail entries or pedestrians, page 26 of the Master Plan.
- Ms. Cisneros stated liking different heights and asked if the canopies will occur at both buildings.

Ms. Chapman replied that the intent for weather protection is to activate spaces and not only for private retail space such as outdoor restaurant seating.

Ms. Wanqin:

- Stated liking the revisions made, particularly public and private space distinctions.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that pedestrian circulation is better.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that the outer shell of a balcony works better, and building material is more thoughtful compared to the last package.
- Ms. Wanqin stated hoping to see how people fill the space, a realistic eye level view, rather than a birds eye view.
- Ms. Wanqin asked if there is more distinction between pathways and open space, more materials not presented yet.

Ms. Chapman replied yes, there will be more distinction made between main pathways outside of the sidewalks and open spaces, a finer level of texture or scoring, primarily concrete but with contrast and accent.

- Ms. Wanqin stated that there can be more distinction between the residential lobby versus the commercial.
- Ms. Wanqin asked if, regarding the lighting ADF request, the intention of code is to ensure that all units have sunlight.

Mr. Lee stated that the square footage area of the open space is a code requirement based on the amount of units and only needs to be accessible by the tenants; however the design and layout of the open space, including sunlight, can be commented on by the Design Review Board.

- Ms. Wanqin asked if the building six levels above the courtyard can be approved.

Mr. Lee replied yes.

- Ms. Wanqin stated being comfortable with the small difference in levels.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that how the intent of code is being met should be explained for the Board to understand.

Mr. White:

- Asked what time of the year that the study reflects, such as middle of June.

Ms. Chapman replied correct.

- Mr. White asked if the difference between meeting code or not is what was being shown in the package.

Ms. Chapman replied correct. There is reflective light with light materials being used and there will not be dark shade unless a shade structure is provided.

- Mr. White stated being open to the ADF but asked to see a study on a darker winter day.
- Mr. White stated that the project is a tremendous improvement, being strong to begin with.
- Mr. White stated that two balconies on a darker mass to the rear could be glass to match with volume.
- Mr. White stated appreciating a vertical mass with wood and the façade material could be carried all the way up with a parapet wall or a different material rather than wood on wood.
- Mr. White stated hoping to have an opportunity to further discuss Building D.

Mr. Tucker replied that there will be another SPE for Building D when moving to the design phase and outside of Master Plan phase.

- Mr. White stated that the hardscape and landscape have been refined successfully.
- Mr. White stated that the flat façade, Phase I east elevation, needs more treatment, the only elevation with issues.
- Mr. White stated that the changes to ground floor are great, and while code requirements regarding height are not met, the proposal looks good.
- Mr. White stated being in support of the ADFs.
- Mr. White stated that an amenity space will be fun for residents.
- Mr. White stated that weather proofing is great, and that height makes sense, but height should be dialed in in terms of waterproofing for different tenants.
- Mr. White stated that an added gesture along the commercial space and access to parking is great.

Mr. Mark Hoyt *with* Trammell Crow stated hearing that Phase I, upon improving the east façade, may be ready for approval. Mr. White replied yes. Ms. Wanqin replied that if comments are addressed, yes.

Ms. O'Neill:

- Asked where an E4 light would be located, page 14.

Mr. Tucker replied at doorways without canopies, and that the renderings will be refined.

- Ms. O'Neill stated preferring shared seating back-to-back.
- Ms. O'Neill stated agreement with the comments of Ms. Wanqin.

PHASE II

Ms. O'Neill:

- Stated that lighting will be important.

Ms. Wanqin:

- Stated that comments given for Phase I apply also to Phase II.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that a lighting study will be helpful.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that how the east façade of Building C will eventually interact with Building D will be helpful.
- Ms. Wanqin stated liking the playful design of the urban pathway and asked for a more immersive view.
- Ms. Wanqin asked for the outdoor hardscape material palette.

Ms. Cisneros:

- Stated liking the pedestrian path moving north, page 18 of the Master Plan, and that landscape can guide pedestrians, cover storage, and mark parking entry.

Mr. Cline:

- Stated agreement with Ms. Wanqin and Ms. Cisneros.
- Mr. Cline stated liking the width and seating opportunities of the pathway.
- Mr. Cline stated liking the overlooking balconies providing security to the public space.
- Mr. Cline stated that light between both buildings creates an open and inviting space.
- Mr. Cline stated that the introduction of the vertical element on Building C, south elevation page 19, breaks up the mass and speaks to the skin of the other two buildings.
- Mr. Cline stated appreciating all facades on Building B, emphasizing the corner.

- Mr. Cline stated that there are nice revisions to the pedestrian experience at the retail core along 152nd Avenue Northeast.
- Mr. Cline stated appreciating the two rooftop terraces, page 13, that will be very successful amenity spaces for residents.
- Mr. Cline stated agreement with Ms. Cisneros that the pedestrian path moving north is great, and that ways to accent where pedestrians can cross ensuring safety can be provided.

Mr. White:

- Stated agreement with Board comments, very strong.
- Mr. White stated that the pedestrian thoroughfare looks great and an image from within will be helpful.

Mr. White asked the Board if there were any further comments regarding ADFs in terms of concerns in both Phases and there were none.

Ms. Wanqin:

- Asked if the project is connected to the Transit Center.

Mr. Tucker replied that a connection had been discussed but challenges were that the land does not belong to Trammel Crow, and that there is grade change at the corner that would require significant tree removal. Mr. Hoyt replied that another challenge was that ADA access would not be possible. The pedestrian access was moved to the north end of the vehicle path, connected to the existing pedestrian connection. The connection will be enhanced with ADA access into the transit center from there.

- Ms. Wanqin stated that a small portion of pavement connecting the pathway to the transit center was confusing.

Ms. Lundquist replied that the section indicated the hope to connect, but after studying was no longer viable.

Mr. White:

- Asked if a blue line marks an intention for a sidewalk on the north side of the road.

Mr. Tucker replied yes, and that stair areas will be enhanced for ADA accessibility and clearly identified.

Mr. Hoyt stated appreciating the feedback and recognition of progress. The traffic circle on the right side of Building C will be calming and pedestrian friendly. Aside from the east façade of Building A, Mr. Hoyt stated not hearing feedback for changes to Building B and C Phase II. Mr. White replied that the Board had a short wish list of supplemental materials and images for understanding, but not design changes. Ms. Wanqin stated needing a lighting study for Phase II, and Mr. Cline requested that the east façade of Building C be designed to mimic Building D, page 35. Ms. Su stated that the landscape can be strengthened.

Mr. Tucker stated that page 15 of the package shows a rendered lighting plan for Phase II.

Mr. White:

- Asked for clarification regarding a pedestrian thoroughfare between Buildings C and D.

Ms. Lundquist replied that pedestrians will use a crosswalk at Northeast 24th Street, and that there is a plan for Building D safe pedestrian access.

- Mr. White asked if the first floors on the east side of Building C are parking.

Mr. Tucker replied no, residential units.

- Mr. White stated that there could be more attention on the ground floor, or an understanding of how Phase III will interact when known.

Ms. Wanqin

- Asked if larger shrubs could be added, speaking to the rhythm of the building.

Ms. Lundquist replied that planting specifics will be explained.

Mr. White:

- Stated that on the east elevation of Phase I there is no pedestrian interaction, and that Building C ground floor will need more activation.
- Mr. White asked if live-work is a part of the project.

Ms. Chapman replied that there is no live-work currently on the project. There are ground facing units on the through block.

- Mr. White stated that the project is getting close.

Mr. Hoyt asked staff what is required by code at this point regarding the future Phase III and design. Mr. Lee replied that the look and feel of Phase III should be captured. Concepts should be future-proofed.

Mr. Tucker stated hearing that the overall comments are to give attention to the east side of Building C and the pedestrian experience, not designing for Phase III but something to respond to in the future. Ms. Wanqin replied that Buildings B and C are very well connected because of the pathway, but that something more is needed to bring the experience together.

OTHER ITEMS

Mr. Lee stated that the April 6, 2023 meeting is cancelled due to no quorum, and the Board members were polled regarding availability on April 13, 2023. There are four projects that need attention. Mr. Hoyt requested a return to the Board on April 20, 2023, and Mr. Lee replied that the date would be considered.

	04/06/23	04/13/23
Mr. White	No	No
Ms. O'Neill	Yes	Yes
Ms. Wanqin	Yes	Yes
Ms. Cisneros		Yes
Mr. Cline	No	Yes

Mr. Lee stated that the next meeting would be April 13, 2023, and that an April 20, 2023 meeting will be considered for MGP XII-Overlake East to return.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Ms. Wanqin to adjourn the meeting at 8:12 p.m. MOTION seconded by Ms. Cisneros. MOTION passed unanimously.

April 20, 2023

MINUTES APPROVED ON

Carolyn Garza

RECORDING SECRETARY