

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

May 2, 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 and Kevin Sutton

EXCUSED ABESENCES: Ralph Martin, Stephanie Monk and Shaffer White

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Fischer, Aaron Ruffin 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 MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE THE APRIL 4, 2019 MEETING MINUTES. MOTION SECONDED BY MS. ATVARS. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY (Mr. Liu had not been in attendance and did not vote regarding the Minutes).

APPROVAL

LAND-2019-00228 Microsoft Refresh – Whatcom Village

Neighborhood: Overlake

Description: Construction of four mixed-use four and five-story office buildings

Location: South of Northeast 36th Street and east of 156th Avenue Northeast

Applicant: Michael Huey *with* CBRE

Prior Review Date: 02/21/19

Staff Contact: Aaron Ruffin, 425-556-2925 or aruffin@redmond.gov

Mr. Ruffin explained that this application was a part of the larger Microsoft redevelopment project. Staff has reviewed the development checklist and finds that the product is consistent with the goals and policies set forth in Redmond Zoning Code. Staff recommends approval of the project. The project came to the Design Review Board as a pre-application on February 21, 2019.

Mr. Gid Palmer, Development Manager for the project *with* Microsoft, stated that Microsoft respects the high standards of the community. Questions and comments had been taken from the pre-application presentation on February 21, 2019 and further detail would be presented at this meeting.

Mr. Palmer continued that the project represents what Microsoft hopes to create in the employee environment; daylight, sustainability, adaptive and flexible space, multiple amenity spaces and outdoor areas both on-site and in the terrace area.

Mr. John Chau *with* LMN Architects stated that the package submitted at this meeting is the same package submitted at the pre-application meeting with some evolution. Approval of the building design only is requested at this meeting, and landscape design will be presented at a later date. Renderings were displayed and details described regarding exterior articulation and views, but locations not explained for the audio recording. Buildings R and K are meant to be showcase buildings. Materiality and shading devices are subtle differences on each façade. All four buildings have different characteristics but will be visually connected. Terracotta and Charcoal colors are seen throughout the exteriors. Elevations were displayed and Mr. Chau explained again that further landscaping design would be presented in detail at a future meeting.

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

Mr. Ruffin asked for clarification regarding the durability of concrete panel. Mr. Chau replied TAKTL, lightweight and high strength concrete panel which comes in various colors and textures. The proposed material is extremely durable, higher end pre-cast in terracotta but thinner; returns are proposed metallic metal etching, wood soffits, and glass which is the equivalent of Viracon. The intention is for more transparent glass at the base where retail and restaurants occur and a durable look without heaviness.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Sutton

- Stated the project continues to be nice and materials make sense.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked if colors would be a random mix on the buildings.

Mr. Chau replied that there would be some variation in panels, and not so engineered to appear as a flat color.

- Ms. Atvars asked if the metal accent panels inside frames would be flat or textured.

Mr. Chau replied that the idea now was flat panel with metallic finish.

- Ms. Atvars advised caution regarding the panel seams as smoother is better, and to stay true to the renderings.
- Ms. Atvars asked how thick the frame feature would be on the thinnest edge.

Mr. Chau replied one foot.

- Ms. Atvars stated that one foot would feel okay, and did not want the feature to become lost with the sun shades.
- Ms. Atvars liked the variety of Building N.

Mr. Liu:

- Liked the roof terrace and appreciated the analysis of outdoor space.
- Mr. Liu stated that panels sing without the heaviness or mass of concrete.
- Mr. Liu asked how reveals and corners would be addressed.
- Mr. Liu stated that warmer tones may match better with terracotta.
- Mr. Liu stated that the project is nicely done.
- Mr. Liu hoped that the corner should be developed more in the next stage.

Mr. Krueger asked Mr. Liu if a response was needed regarding reveals and corners as final approval was being asked for. Mr. Liu replied that the lower mass should appear heavier and detail is modern. The building should not feel like masonry or heavier than the building actually is.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked for the thickness of the panel.

Mr. Chau replied that the panel is 5/8", a thin material.

- Mr. Krueger asked if the canopies are the same color, charcoal.

Mr. Chau replied yes; the same colors would be used for the column cover, canopy cover, shading devices with one exception; and terracotta metal accents on the charcoal building. Rooftop screening should be lighter grey as to disappear.

- Mr. Krueger asked if the shading devices matched the terracotta color.

Mr. Chau replied no. The components are the same with the exception of the frame and condition.

- Mr. Krueger asked if the horizontal shading devices are charcoal.

Mr. Chau replied yes.

- Mr. Krueger commented that how the presentation was done was helpful.
- Mr. Krueger commented that normally a project would experience one more presentation to the Design Review Board before final approval but plans had moved to the final point and this was good.
- Mr. Krueger asked about mechanical screening on the roof.

Mr. Chau described a rendering and explained that more than only a flat panel was planned.

- Mr. Krueger liked the rendering of the street edge along Northeast 36th Street.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the project looked good with only certain details to be refined.

MOTION TO APPROVE LAND-2019-00228, MICROSOFT REFRESH – WHATCOM VILLAGE BY MR. LIU BASED ON STANDARD CONDITION, STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD COMMENTS. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

PRE-APPROVAL REVIEW

Proctor Willows – Consolidated Review

- **LAND-2019-00349 Master Planned Development**
- **LAND-2019-00351 Development Agreement**

Neighborhood: Willows/Rose Hill

Description: Master Plan for mixed-use/residential with 22,000 square feet commercial in 15.38 acres

Location: Southwest corner of Northeast 124th Street and Willows Road Northeast

Applicant: Erik Enstrom *with* Quadrant Homes

Staff Contact: Amy Tarce, 425-556-2938 or atarce@redmond.gov

Ms. Tarce stated that the presentation would be a first introduction to the Proctor Willows Master Plan, which has been submitted to the City as a formal application and has an associated Development Agreement. The permit will be type-five which requires the City Council to be the decision-making body. The Design Review Board will be recommending actions. No recommendations need to be given at this presentation, as large elements of the Master Plan will be identified. Only feedback regarding the general layout of the site particularly around the relationship of open spaces to the buildings, linkages for pedestrians and transportation, and the overall treatment of the site is needed at this time.

The applicant is required to provide some public benefit and there are four items proposed. The degree of benefit to the City is conditioned on Design Review Board feedback regarding the type of enhancements or amenities that should be included. The elements are:

- The entry at Northeast 174th Street, being called a boulevard entry
- The Willows Road entrance for which there are not yet details but which can be examined in the next presentation
- The soft surface perimeter trail
- Wetland buffer enhancement; a significant section of the property is wetland and stream buffer, approximately 2.5 acres. Fifty percent of this area will include voluntary enhancements and the remainder is required due to regulation and environmental standards

Ten items are recommended for consideration by staff based on an analysis of Comprehensive Plan Policies which apply to the property. Some are recommendations and some are requirements.

- The street grid, organized in regard to site contour and elevations
- Take advantage of natural site features such as trees, wetlands and stream buffers
- Improved pedestrian connectivity to the property
- Bicycle lanes inside the property
- The soft surface trail should be continuous and not force trail users into roadways to continue to the western leg of the trail
- The soft surface trail should adequately serve a multi-generational community with seating, pet waste pick-up stations, interpretive signage and trailheads.
- Replacement tree locations
- More distinction to the metropolitan modern architectural style
- More green buildings and site features
- General idea regarding quantity and location of on-street parking

The applicant intends to come back for a site plan entitlement and a subdivision plat after approval of this phase. The Board will have another opportunity to review the project at a greater level of detail at that time. After this presentation, staff would like to be able to give the applicant clear directions regarding the overall site plan. Street edge treatment in regard to consistency to the Willows/Rose Hill vision for community character should also be determined.

Mr. Krueger stated having done work with Quadrant including feasibility studies on the property several years ago, but would not recuse at this level.

Ms. Bonnie Geers *with* Quadrant Homes, stated having began work on the project in 2016, a business park zone which has been rezoned as a Northwest Design District because of site constraints such as topography. A deep green commitment was made at the zoning level, meaning that all structures on the site must be green certified meeting either Built Green four-star or LEED Silver as a minimum. A menu of green building items needs to be selected from such as electric vehicle ready facilities and solar programs.

Mr. Keith McCloskey *with* KTG Group continued. The overall project consists of just under 380 dwelling units. The mixed-use building will be composed of just under 200 stacked flat apartments over a variety of uses on the ground floor, 22,000 square feet of commercial or non-residential space. There will be 174 townhomes in three to seven-unit buildings distributed throughout the project adjusting for topography. Willows Road is to the east and Northeast 124th Street is to the north, zoned commercial and industrial. There are good views and farmland towards the east side of the property.

In architecture, each phase will have similar character but variation including multiple color schemes from building to building. The overall vision is for the site to use the same architectural styles while adapting to a variety of scales. Renderings were displayed. Different scales of open spaces are also planned. A serpentine road provides maximum percentage slope for fire trucks as well as a spine that mirrors the natural ravine.

Vehicular access arrives at a central open space with commercial presence. Shadow studies have been done. Further renderings were displayed including paseos and connections.

Mr. Nick Hagan *with* Weisman Design Group presented basic landscape design. Opportunities for visitors to view green space through the project with more developed spaces at entry points is an organizing element. Natural features will be taken advantage of with small play and picnic areas. A pedestrian street grid has been developed but further opportunities will continue to be explored. The trail should be an

active place that encourages people to engage. Replacement trees will include native plant material to tie in naturally to the site. Rural agricultural elements to the east and more commercial, technological elements to the west are being considered. A large informal lawn area will include storm detention. Bike repair and bike wash stations for the public, dog parks and child play areas are potential amenities.

Spaces are subdivided between moments for gathering between buildings and entry points. The northwest open space may be more urban in nature due to dense development.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked about guest parking throughout the site.

Mr. McCloskey stated that there would be an exhibit to come, but pointed out areas on a rendering.

- Ms. Atvars asked if each unit would have parking space or a driveway.

Mr. McCloskey replied that there are primarily two side-by-side parking spaces in a garage but there are some tandem spaces as well, with 20% guest parking.

- Ms. Atvars asked how traffic coming in and out of the site would be managed.

Mr. Jeremy Febus, civil engineer with KPFF Consulting Engineers, replied that there would be a new traffic signal at Northeast 124th Street, the City of Kirkland right-of-way. At the request of City of Redmond transportation engineers, the entrance off Willows Road will be restricted movements, right- in and right-out only.

- Ms. Atvars asked why the graphic of the lower amenity off of Willows Road included contour lines when the amenity had been described as flat.

Mr. Hagan replied that shown were the existing contour lines.

- Ms. Atvars suggested that roof deck amenities could be developed so that views don't consist of roof utility spaces.

Mr. Liu:

- Asked if the ravine is wetland or accessible to residents.

Mr. McCloskey replied that a soft surface trail is proposed in the outer portions of the buffer, but the bulk of the buffer will be 100% protected. Residents will be able to view the edges.

- Mr. Liu asked if the multi-use building would be used as a club house for the community.

Mr. McCloskey replied that there is an elevated podium deck and that a main lobby entry would be on the south side. The second floor would include amenities such as fitness, a club room and outdoor amenities. The building will be for the apartment rental community; townhome residents will use shared or private open spaces.

- Mr. Liu asked why the boulevard entrance stops mid-way through.

Mr. Febus replied that there was no technical reason, but that City standard has guided design.

- Mr. Liu stated liking the boulevard entry, but that the road should continue if there is space width-wise.

Mr. McCloskey replied that making the road wider may encroach on some retaining wall resulting in less room for landscaping.

- Mr. Liu asked if the metropolitan modern design would be carried from the townhomes to the mixed-use development

Mr. McCloskey replied that the design would be interpreted differently due to the scale of buildings, but the buildings would be compatible with each other.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked how much grading would be done on the recreation space.

Mr. McCloskey replied that there are one-foot contours with an average grade of eight to 10 percent currently. When complete, the space will be four to five percent, flat relative to the rest of the site; more usable but not flat in the sense of a soccer field.

- Mr. Sutton asked how the grade would be achieved.

Mr. McCloskey replied that building would move up from Willows Road. More detail will be available at future presentations. The vault will have an exposed face on a portion of

the side facing Northeast 124th Street and Willows Road with screening into the Willows buffer. A mix of landscape walls and street edge can be used to take up grade.

- Mr. Sutton was curious how much density could occur in regard to landscaping as the proposal is a significant change.
- Mr. Sutton asked if there would be a uniform treatment at the street.

Mr. McCloskey stated working with staff and that the wall on the edge of Northeast 124th Street currently is approximately 16-20 feet tall. Based on preliminary grading, a maximum wall height of 10 feet is possible. Materials, wall types and treatments are being discussed.

- Mr. Sutton asked if the walls would then be reconstructed.

Mr. McCloskey replied yes. City of Kirkland prefers arterials to include a buffered bike lane while City of Redmond prefers multi-modal trails. The compromise with the two municipalities is to include both. A project traffic engineer is working with both municipalities to install a longer queuing right-turn lane.

- Mr. Sutton stated that between the height of town homes and the grade, the elevation will be very high and asked what the pedestrian experience may be.
- Mr. Sutton stated that the trail on the southwest corner could be on the other side due to cars coming in and out of driveways, in the interest of a continuous trail.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that a change in personality from the west side to the east side could be achieved; materiality could be different along the east edge for a rural feel transitioning to urban feel to the west.
- Mr. Krueger liked the urban entry of Northeast 124th Street and the serpentine access off of Willows Road.
- Mr. Krueger stated that many buildings will be visible both from outside public space and internally, and wrap-around architecture would be good.

Mr. McCloskey replied that there are very nice view opportunities.

- Mr. Krueger stated that cluster buildings in the northeast corner were rigid and separation could occur for differentiation in edges.
- Mr. Krueger stated that there are ways to get through the site on a continuous trail.
- Mr. Krueger stated that an east and west visual connection could be made.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the public trail with connections to the Cross Kirkland Corridor and Redmond Connector was a public benefit.

- Mr. Krueger stated that the mixed-use building will need to be addressed regarding the exposure along Northeast 124th Street and internally.
- Mr. Krueger liked the boulevard entry.
- Mr. Krueger asked how many levels of parking were anticipated.

Mr. McCloskey replied one on grade level and likely two subterranean. A few feet of the upper garage will be exposed, but most will be covered by fill with a natural landscape berm. All that will be visible is the drive entry and an approximate 20 x 20-foot opening. Spaces will consider future residents visiting the leasing office, onsite staff, retail or commercial parking and resident parking below.

Ms. Tarce asked if the Board has any guidance for the gateway element to reinforce community character. Mr. Krueger asked for clarification that the gateway was at the northeast corner, and Ms. Tarce replied yes.

Ms. Tarce stated that staff would like to see a detailed section showing how tuck under mignonettes will appear on townhouses, as the grade may provide an opportunity for unique or distinctive architecture. At the Master Plan level detail is not being discussed, but Ms. Tarce asked the Board if conceptually a detailed section would be valuable at this point. Mr. McCloskey gave more detail regarding these areas.

- Mr. Krueger asked if the backsides of the townhomes would be three stories.

Mr. McCloskey replied yes.

Ms. Tarce asked if the tuck under section should be a part of the Master Plan review or site plan entitlement, and Mr. Krueger replied site plan entitlement.

Ms. Atvars:

- Recommended that a site section would be useful.

Ms. Tarce replied that for the sake of clarity, the applicant should provide the section.

Ms. Tarce asked for clarification that the way the project has been presented is okay with the Board, and Mr. Krueger replied yes.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked if thoughts could be brought back regarding a shared lane.

Ms. Tarce replied that the road may not need to be striped for a bicycle lane per traffic engineers. Bike amenities such as parking are required.

- Mr. Krueger stated that landscaping would be important, possibly reminiscent of the agricultural land being left while driving; however, drivers will need to focus on driving and not the gateway.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated being skeptical that the gateway will be a public benefit because of fast moving traffic.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated not indicating benches but rather architecture to enhance the edge along with landscaping.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that an integrated landscape feature stair could be interesting.

Mr. Krueger stated that the project would be brought back for approval of the Master Plan.

Ms. Tarce announced having submitted resignation today, and this meeting would be the last meeting attended. Ms. Tarce stated having enjoyed interacting with the Board and learning from comments.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTIONED BY MR. SUTTON TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:16 P.M.
SECONDED BY MS. ATVARIS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**June 20, 2019
MINUTES APPROVED ON**

**Carolyn Garza
RECORDING SECRETARY**