

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

May 16, 2019

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. If you would like to listen to the recorded meeting, please submit a public records request for a copy of the audio tape at <https://www.redmond.gov/777/Public-Records-Requests>

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice Chairman Kevin Sutton

Board members: Diana Atvars, Ralph Martin,
Stephanie Monk and Shaffer White

EXCUSED ABESENCES: Craig Krueger and Henry Liu

STAFF PRESENT: Steven Fischer, Carol Helland, David Lee and Gary Lee, 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. Sutton at 7:00 p.m.

APPROVAL

LAND-2018-00869 LMC Marymoor

Neighborhood: Southeast Redmond

Description: Proposal to construct (1) six-story and (2) five-story multi-family residential buildings with commercial space

Location: 17611 Northeast 70th Street

Applicant: Rocky Flores *with* Encore Architects

Prior Review Date: 09/20/18, 11/15/18, 12/06/18, 12/20/18, 01/17/19 and 02/21/19

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

Mr. Lee introduced the Board to Ms. Carol Helland, Deputy Planning Director. Ms. Helland stated having been with City of Redmond since the beginning of March, working

previously with the City of Bellevue for 23 years, and thanked the Design Review Board for their work.

Mr. Lee continued. At the time of the previous approval for LAND-2018-00868/00869 on February 21, 2019, the Design Review Board had asked that the southeast corner of the site be redesigned and sent for review through email. The result is a request for formal approval of the revision to the southeast corner as part of the Board recommendation to the Technical Committee.

MOTION BY MS. MONK TO APPROVE LAND-2018-00869 LMC MARYMOOR, AMENDING THE FEBRUARY 21, 2019 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION OF DESIGN APPROVAL TO THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE. THE AMENDMENT TO THE RECOMMENDATION IS IN REGARD TO ONLY THE REDESIGN AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE SITE. THE FEBRUARY 21, 2019 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION SHALL INCLUDE THE CONTENTS OF THE MAY 16, 2018 MEMO AND CONDITIONS SET FORTH IN THIS MEMO. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WHITE. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL

LAND-2015-01974 Archer Hotel

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: Seven-story building on the single lot, five-stories for hotel and multi-functional use and two-stories for a 170-car parking garage

Location: 7210 – 164th Avenue Northeast

Applicant: Bob Mannon *with* LodgeWorks Partners, LP

Prior Review Dates: 08/06/15, 01/21/16, 05/05/16 and 04/18/19

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

Mr. Lee stated that three items remained outstanding. Staff finds that concerns have been addressed and the project is ready for approval with the condition that the planting specifications for proposed trees not damage sidewalks and the recommendation that the use of **root berries** is strongly recommended.

Mr. Howie Beauchamp *with* LK Architecture began the presentation. Two options are being presented regarding planting. The first and preferred option is 10 to 12-foot tall trees with an immediate impact as opposed to a green screen which would require seasons for vines to cover. Renderings were displayed.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked what the material of the green screen would be.

Mr. Beauchamp replied that the product name is Greenscreen, a steel with epoxy type of coating over it attached to structural steel columns.

Mr. White:

- Stated leaning toward green screen as this matches better with the rest of the building, but not being completely opposed to trees.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked if any plantings would be removed in order to install the proposed plantings.

Mr. Beauchamp replied yes, there are three evergreen style trees on each side. Which option is chosen will determine how many and which trees would be removed.

- Mr. Sutton asked if the trees to be removed would be planted somewhere else.

Mr. Beauchamp replied not knowing if the trees would go back to a nursery, but that there is no intention of planting elsewhere on the site.

Ms. Monk:

- Asked if any material other than ivy had been explored for climbing on the metal trellis, citing that ivy is very invasive and can spread easily around the city through birds and seeds.

Mr. Beauchamp replied that the landscaper had recommended that two species of vines be planted, neither considered an ivy varietal. Both species flower white seasonally. Using the green screen option will require more trades working onsite, more in-depth than having a landscaper install three trees. Again, the trees would provide an immediate impact.

Ms. Atvars:

- Liked the green screen better but the proportion of the green screen seems long for the façade. Pulling up higher would make more sense.

Mr. Beauchamp replied that anchoring back to the building façade was not desired, and supporting from the ground was preferable for water proofing. The limitation is 14 feet.

- Ms. Atvars liked that trees could have a more dynamic height change and trees would be voted for.

Mr. Martin:

- Asked if a planted green wall had been considered.

Mr. Beauchamp replied that only the two options presented had been considered.

- Mr. Martin stated preferring a green screen.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated preferring the green screen, not with ivy but with a flowering vine. Evergreen shrubs would not work well in the location.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated preferring green screen.

Mr. Beauchamp continued to display renderings. Aluminum tube trellis brackets are 3 x 8, previously listed as 3 x 6. Top outriggers are 3 x 10. The fabricator from Wichita, Kansas will be installing onsite.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the new rendering was a much better design and liked the proportions.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked if plates are welded together.

Mr. Beauchamp replied there are male and female receiver plates. An anchor should work here. A rendering was described but without detail for the audio recording.

- Mr. Sutton stated that given the height of the building, this is not that noticeable.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that the design was an improvement.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that the design looks good.

Mr. Martin:

- Stated that the design was sufficient.
- Mr. Martin asked about a recessed box [inaudible].

Mr. Beauchamp replied that the intention was that the plate would be somewhat flush with the stone but not recessed.

- Mr. Martin asked if the area was sealed.

Mr. Beauchamp replied yes.

- Mr. Martin stated that the current presentation looked better than the previous presentation.

Mr. Lee stated that the façade item, relief of modulation on the east and west facades, needed to be addressed. Mr. Beauchamp stated only having the items presented as issues. Mr. Lee replied by listing the first two items, 1) blank wall mitigation for the southwest and southeast corners and 2) decorative brackets connecting the garage trellis to masonry columns of the south façade, but then realized that the east and west elevation façade treatment had been accepted as constructed; the Design Review Board would not make a decision on the issue.

MOTION BY MR. WHITE TO APPROVE MODIFICATIONS OF LAND-2015-01974 ARCHER HOTEL, BUILDING 2016-05548, GREEN SCREEN OPTION CHOSEN AND REVISED BRACKET AT TRELLIS APPROVED, EAST AND WEST ELEVATION MODIFICATIONS TO BE MADE AS DISCUSSED BY STAFF, WITH STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR INCONSISTENCIES. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. MARTIN. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5 Minute Break

APPROVAL

LAND-2019-00369 Microsoft Refresh – Washington Village

Neighborhood: Overlake

Description: Construction of five (5) five-story office buildings

Location: Microsoft Main Campus, south of Northeast 36th Street and west of 156th Avenue Northeast

Applicant: Aaron Dundson *with* Microsoft

Prior Review Date: 02/21/19

Staff Contact: Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or glee@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee stated that the request before the Board was for an approval of site plans, building elevations, color and materials. The package has been updated and refined since the last presentation. Staff had four areas of concern, resulting in a recommendation not to approve the package until additional information would be provided.

The concerns had been 1) lack of detail information for the bridge structure within the village; 2) a need for additional information justifying a request for Administrative Design Flexibility (ADF) for front set-back deviation; 3) an additional ADF request for the roof line modulation along 156th Avenue Northeast and 4) lack of clarity regarding use of exterior finishes.

Staff has met twice with the designers. A revised package was uploaded for Board review earlier this week that better addresses the original concerns of staff. The design team has further updated explanations to the point that staff now supports approval for the requests of the site plan, building elevations, colors and materials as to be presented at this meeting.

As there is still a lack of design detail for the bridge in the village, staff recommends that the bridge portion be continued for review later. Staff recommends that the updated package be approved with standard conditions for inconsistencies and with review of the bridge in the village to be continued.

Mr. Eric Ragde, Development Manager *with* Microsoft, stated believing that information from the Board and City has been implemented into the design of the village.

Mr. Dan Simpson and Mr. Allyn Stellmacher *with* ZGF began the presentation. The geode concept and five buildings of the village have grouped into two neighborhood clusters with Whatcom Village to the east and Sammamish Village to the south. The geode concept is to harness the internal energy of the buildings and common space, from inside outward. Renderings were described. The ground plain is brought to life with

meeting spaces and amenities. Being located at the center of the villages has made architecture stronger and nuanced.

Extra boards and material samples were displayed in addition to renderings. In the interface, material that clads the interface zone is a blend of cementitious panels. Glazing is the same used for the rest of the building with the exception of some areas set back. Exposed wood structure inside will reflect natural landscape outside. Components which make up levels two, three and four as well as set back pieces on level five are punctuated by simple Sine-wave profile modal inserts in the glazed system. A horizontal ribbon of metal connects all buildings. Simple textures, shapes and forms play with the light quality variety of Seattle. Materials were pointed out on renderings but locations not described for the audio recording. Poppies draw light through the mid-section of the building. The sheen separates activities at the center of the interface from outer layers, creating lower scale elements. Subtle articulation and reflection helps set up the internal action of the building in a powerful way. Demure plazas calm architectures.

At ground level, parts bump out to reclaim the understory creating modulation and pedestrian scale. Some tonation is taken from Whatcom Village to create a relationship in a sophisticated way. At the ground floors, all glazing is a higher clarity glass for better visibility in and out.

Mr. Stellmacher asked if there were questions to this point, and Mr. Sutton replied that the materials made sense.

A building C and D bridge connection involves budget and security concerns. Two options are being considered; one is a bridge and the other is not a bridge. Material options would not be significantly different. The preference of Microsoft is to provide a universality of access.

The first ADF is requested along the frontage of 156th Avenue Northeast. A defined setback maximum of 45 feet is asked to be raised to 111 feet as an overall strategy, an accommodation for modulation for an urban focal point as well as safety. Microsoft is working with arborists to preserve current trees if possible.

The second ADF is regarding a 100-foot maximum limit for roofline extension. An alternative strategy is proposed on buildings B and E. The top floor has been set back ten feet at the north edge reducing the sense of scale. A driver for modulation is the pedestrian experience.

Approval of the campus architecture is requested with the caveat that the bridge landing or promenade would be on hold for four to six weeks to allow review of all design issues. Mr. Sutton asked for a quick overview of the promenade.

Mr. Stellmacher replied that further details would be forthcoming regarding the elevated bridge structure and design coming across 156th Avenue Northeast. The connector is between the end of the public bridge and the promenade. Renderings were displayed. A bike café and storage are still planned. Extending the forest thread through is important. As the transition begins from pier nine toward campus, there is a sense of inflection; the bridge narrows and swerves gently to the right. The idea is to balance the amount of territory given to the upper pathway with open, generous space at the lower level as well. Landscape can then take a prominent role in the transition zone where there will be a mix of activities. The arrival is a gentle welcome into the campus, framed between the wings of buildings A and B but the arrival moment is the central plaza, not the touchdown point of the bridge.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked if all surfaces will be addressed.

Mr. Stellmacher replied being responsible for architecture of the Washington Village; the totality of the landscape surface will be handled by the landscape team.

- Mr. Sutton asked if the walking surface would be completely open or if there is freedom to use landscaping.

Mr. Stellmacher replied that the team would come back to the Board with detail.

Mr. Keith Donovan *with* Microsoft asked if Mr. Sutton was referring to the surface of the bridge over 156th Avenue Northeast meeting the campus. Mr. Sutton replied from pier nine to the left into campus. Mr. Donovan replied that this would be a part of the landscape package from the bridge design team, governed by the Redmond Public Works department. Mr. Stellmacher stated that the element would not be for this team to design but rather to integrate the structure, a supporting role.

Mr. Sutton asked if there were comments from the audience, and there were none.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that the ADFs were fine and what is proposed satisfies.
- Ms. Atvars stated preferring a bridge but budget constraints were understood.
- Ms. Atvars stated that the exterior stair could be a nice texture in the space and in nicer weather, people may choose to use a stair.
- Ms. Atvars asked about new and existing trees.

Mr. Guy Michaelson, Landscape Architect *with* Berger Partnership, replied that there are significant stands of existing trees that will remain in pockets around the campus particularly on the east side. On 156th Avenue Northeast, trees on the corners and mid-block are hoped to be saved.

- Ms. Atvars stated that renderings show a mix of new and mature trees and hoped the trees were portrayed as accurately as possible.
- Ms. Atvars stated that there was a strong design behind the foliage.
- Ms. Atvars asked if renderings at evening for nighttime looks could be made as the current renderings only show sun reflections. A lighting plan was included in the Board packet.

Mr. Stellmacher replied that nighttime renderings have not been done. There will be illumination for pedestrian safety and particularly around the amenity zones and work space commons.

- Ms. Atvars stated that the illumination will add a horizontal striping to the buildings but this was fine.

Mr. Stellmacher replied that design was toward variety to fit all hours of the day.

- Ms. Atvars stated that on the promenade bridge, there may be an opportunity for a covering structure.
- Ms. Atvars stated that the geode concept could be cracked at the bridge.
- Ms. Atvars stated that landscape features on the bridge could spill over the edges.

Ms. Monk:

- Asked if locating a less busy street for the ADF had been investigated due to heavy traffic.

Mr. Stellmacher stated that the master plan provided a location for each major drop off facility in the campus organization, established in the phase of work prior to the design of the village.

- Ms. Monk stated interest in more information regarding the promenade gateway to uncover more opportunities in design.
- Ms. Monk stated that the texture of the walkway could slow bikes down, slightly bumpy.
- Ms. Monk stated agreeing with Ms. Atvars regarding preferring a bridge, a good escape from team-based rooms and also away from pedestrian traffic.

- Ms. Monk stated agreeing with Ms. Atvars that nighttime renderings would be great to see.

Mr. Martin:

- Stated that the book was very informative and well put together.
- Mr. Martin agreed with Ms. Atvars' and Ms. Monk's comments.
- Mr. Martin stated that the bike café could be more transparent, and facades could pick up a bicycle theme.
- Mr. Martin asked how bicyclist would be directed to the bike café.

Mr. Stellmacher replied that there will be a large bike repository with maintenance and refreshments, part of the overall campus amenity set. Mr. Stellmacher replied that the plan is for employee bike locations to be consolidated into three or four facilities around the campus. Employees will learn quickly where to go. Visitor bike storage and racks will be provided at other surface locations for convenience. Regular cyclists will be aware.

- Mr. Martin stated the roof modulation with setback is perfectly fine.
- [Inaudible]
- Mr. Martin asked how reflective the glass will be.

Mr. Simpson replied that standard reflectivity is 19%, and at vertical accent elements between 36% and 40%, providing dapple with bright sunlight and modulation on darker days.

Mr. Simpson replied that the goal is to create a sheen that shows the difference between glass.

Mr. Simpson replied that the crackle texture has more animation capturing light with fins. The light and sky color are captured by the different reflectivity that offers variety both nocturnally and in daylight, in terms of continual modulation during light and weather changes.

- Mr. Martin liked the geode concept.
- Mr. Martin suggested an element of surprise would be good.
- Mr. Martin stated the start was very strong.

Mr. White:

- Asked about the bridge option in the courtyard.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that the bridge should be there.

Ms. Monk:

- Asked if the end of the building could be broken up more.

Mr. White:

- Asked for clarification that permission is being requested to set further back

Mr. Stellmacher replied yes, for building C the requirement is five feet back, and design is at 111 feet back. The building would be moved back to create more porous space and to accommodate functional needs.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated liking the new design more.

Mr. Stellmacher asked Ms. Monk for clarification that the bridge should be kept and Ms. Monk replied yes.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that the plaza would be better without the bridge. The stair should be enclosed as there is a lot of activity and would become cleaner and simpler. The rest of the Board seems to be in favor of the bridge, however.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked for clarification that as the request is for flexibility as design progresses and that the Board, though of mixed opinions, would be okay approving the ADFs.

The Board agreed.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated overall the design was nice and complimented the presentation.

MOTION BY MS. ATVARIS TO APPROVE THE TWO ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGN FLEXIBILITY REQUESTS SUBMITTED, SITE PLAN, COLORS, MATERIALS AND BUILDING ELEVATIONS AS PROPOSED WITH STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR INCONSISTENCIES. THE PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE WILL CONTINUE TO BE REVIEWED AT A LATER DATE. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. MARTIN. MOTION PASSED 4-0 WITH ONE RECUSAL.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY MS. ATVARIS TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:39 P.M. MOTION SECONDED BY MS. MONK. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**June 20, 2019
MINUTES APPROVED ON**

**Carolyn Garza
RECORDING SECRETARY**