



**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

May 18, 2023, 7:00 p.m.

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

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairperson Shaffer White, Vice-Chairperson Josiah Cline, Board Member Ana Cisneros, Kaitlyn O’Neill, and Wanqin Su

**ABSENCES:** Board member Henry Liu

**STAFF PRESENT:** Lauren Anderson, David Lee, and Tim McHarg, 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 Mr. Cline to approve the April 13, 2023 Meeting Minutes. **MOTION** seconded by Ms. Cisneros. The **MOTION** passed unanimously.

**MOTION** by Mr. Cline to approve the April 20, 2023 Meeting Minutes. **MOTION** seconded by Ms. Cisneros. The **MOTION** passed unanimously.

APPROVAL

LAND-2022-00151, Anderson Park Apartments

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: Multi-family residential building with five-stories and a mezzanine

Location: 16912 Northeast 129<sup>th</sup> Street

Applicant: Eric Murphy *with* Jackson Main Architecture

Staff Contact: Tim McHarg, 425-556-2414 or [tmcharg@redmond.gov](mailto:tmcharg@redmond.gov)

Mr. McHarg presented the project. No public comments were received.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. O'Neill:

- Stated being satisfied with the project.

Mr. Cline:

- Stated that questions had been answered.

Ms. Wanqin:

- Stated appreciation of more analysis provided based on previous comments.

Ms. Cisneros:

- Stated being ready to approve.

Mr. White:

- Stated having no issues with the project.

MOTION by Mr. Cline to approve LAND-2022-00151 Anderson Park Apartments Site Plan Entitlement as represented in the submittal materials presented at the April 13, 2023 Design Review Board meeting. This approval is subject to the standard conditions. The Design Review Board finds that the Administrative Design Flexibility (ADF) for the Site Plan Entitlement meets the criteria of RZC 21.58.020. The Design Review Board moves to forward the recommendation of approval of the ADF as outlined in the May 18, 2023 DRB Memorandum. MOTION seconded by Ms. Cisneros. MOTION passed unanimously.

## PRE-APPLICATION

### LAND-2023-0046, 16310 Northeast 80<sup>th</sup> Street

**Neighborhood:** Downtown

**Description:** Eight-story mixed-use residential building with open space and Type IX pedestrian system

**Location:** 16310 Northeast 80<sup>th</sup> Street

**Applicant:** Nolan Sit *with* Solomon Cordwell Buenz (SCB)

**Staff Contact:** Lauren Anderson, 425-556-2401 or [landerson@redmond.gov](mailto:landerson@redmond.gov)

Ms. Anderson presented the project. No public comments were received.

## COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Wanqin:

- Stated that the building massing concept is unique.
- Ms. Wanqin stated liking the east wing of the building, very modern, and texture brings warmth to the streetscape.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that there is an industrial feel.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that the tunnel is a unique feature, and the contrast between concrete and glass in the rendering is very successful.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that ground floor units do not look residential and recommended adding more transition buffer between the units and street without sacrificing light.
- Ms. Wanqin stated not being clear about the street-level open space, open to the public or serving commercial use.

Mr. Nolan Sit *with* SCB replied that the entire west end is intended to be open space. A daycare is being looked at, and most operators require approximately 10,000 square feet of indoor space. An outdoor space is associated with a playground. The area is a placeholder for now. Code reads that if a daycare occupies 20% of site area, open space is counted.

- Ms. Wanqin stated it was still not clear on if the open space will be available to the public.

Mr. Sit replied yes.

- Ms. Wanqin asked for more detail on how the ground level interacts with the surroundings and street, and of the pedestrian experience.

- Ms. Wanqin stated liking texture and variety of plants and would like to see more seasonal interest.
- Ms. Wanqin asked for more detail regarding how programs and functions will work on the ground-floor, connecting to surroundings.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that the color palette is a good start and liking the wood and steel contrast. Textures sound very interesting.
- Ms. Wanqin asked for clarification that a more attractive façade for the private open space is the reason for the Administrative Design Flexibility (ADF) request and stated that the wood is successful but the remainder lacks interest.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that regarding privacy, the impact of the deviation from the plan level is difficult to understand and asked the applicant to render a section regarding views and adjacent buildings, looking at each other.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that a justification that more sunlight will be available should be rendered to help in evaluating the ADF.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that regarding modulation, top and middle appear very similar, not translating well.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that wood is a unique feature of the site, but there can be more interest and detail elsewhere.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that regarding roofline, a street-level, pedestrian view will be helpful.
- Ms. Wanqin stated that an adjacent building has an interesting mural.
- Ms. Wanqin asked if the west alley is accessible by pedestrians from open space or street.

Mr. Sit replied that the west alley is an easement and not publicly available.

- Ms. Wanqin stated that the blank wall will be seen by people walking past and a rendering to show the pedestrian experience will be helpful.

Ms. Cisneros:

- Stated that the project is a great start.
- Ms. Cisneros stated concern regarding page 15, a volume different from the rest.
- Ms. Cisneros stated that looking at the south façade, similar materials could be used on the ground floor.

Ms. O'Neill:

- Stated also having been confused regarding residential and not commercial space appearance.
- Ms. O'Neill stated that a daycare will be positive.
- Ms. O'Neill stated that a corner setback is fine.
- Ms. O'Neill asked for the reason for parking reduction aside from the proximity of light rail.

Mr. Sit replied that 272 garage spaces for 272 units was a good fit considering surrounding developments.

- Ms. O'Neill asked if there will be other landscape features added for protection for the daycare, for example, a child kicking a ball further than anticipated.
- Ms. O'Neill stated agreement that the parking garage should be at grade level, and asked if the garage would be open to pedestrians.

Mr. Sit replied that specifics have not been finalized, but that level one could be guests and daycare with a security gate for the next level resident parking. There is street parking, and the pedestrian-vehicular connection is extra wide.

Mr. Cline:

- Stated that the project is a strong concept for overall massing.
- Mr. Cline stated that the wooded jewel box is a nice feature.
- Mr. Cline stated that the western mass is not as articulated, and more refinement is needed.
- Mr. Cline stated liking the differentiation from the base and top of the jewel box, and that the base, middle, and top of the western mass can be similarly differentiated.
- Mr. Cline stated that the middle and top portion of **white ? wide ?** mass need more refinement in materiality or shadow lines, to draw the memory of the other facades.
- Mr. Cline stated that the residential ground-level needs something to break the public and private space.
- Mr. Cline stated that the second story parking on the north façade reads as a single white band across the project but stated not having a suggestion for improvement.
- Mr. Cline stated that more stark contrast could be helpful, another color or material to make the whole building feel more cohesive.
- Mr. Cline asked if level three is residential or amenity space.

Mr. Sit replied amenity space, the first level of the box.

- Mr. Cline stated that accentuating the amenity space from the outside with visual acuity between the courtyards would be a good refinement.
- Mr. Cline stated liking the enlarged balconies on the jewel box.
- Mr. Cline stated that the site is traffic heavy and more opportunities for pedestrians to sit, gather, take a break under cover will be helpful.
- Mr. Cline asked if there are plans for landscaping at the six-foot space on the east side, a two-story concrete alley.

Mr. Sit replied that the intent was to minimize interest in the space, but the idea can be examined.

- Mr. Cline stated that the space could become unsafe.
- Mr. Cline stated that the western and northern blank wall treatments can be enhanced.
- Mr. Cline suggested that greenness be brought into the woonerf, inviting pedestrians.
- Mr. Cline stated that masses on the northwest and south facades should have more articulation.

Mr. White:

- Stated the project is a strong start.
- Mr. White stated that photos showing what the western elevation blank wall faces will be helpful.
- Mr. White stated agreement with Mr. Cline that a gate or security feature would be helpful at the east six-foot space.
- Mr. White stated that the woonerf feels amply wide for one-way traffic.

Mr. Sit replied correct, one-way traveling north. The other west woonerf is one-way traveling south.

- Mr. White stated that narrowing the traffic width, encouraging slower travel, could open opportunities for inhabited space or additional parking.
- Mr. White asked if the northwest corner will be parking available to non-residents.

Mr. Sit replied yes.

- Mr. White stated that Mr. Cline had an interesting comment regarding the façade of the amenity space and suggested a recessed balcony for fun interest.
- Mr. White stated that more street perspectives, particularly south, will be helpful.
- Mr. White stated that ground floor residential space feels very commercial with foot traffic, and commercial could possibly be considered instead.
- Mr. White stated that if the ground floor does remain residential, the character of entries needs to be addressed, and suggested a wrap around patio area with gated access.
- Mr. White stated that the color palette feels bland, particularly at the north elevation, but the jewel box is great.
- Mr. White asked if cement panels will have a stone quality.

Mr. Sit replied correct.

- Mr. White stated that images for reference from applications already built will be helpful.
- Mr. White asked if varied size panels and random joints are the intent.

Mr. Sit replied that design is in the early stages, but the intent is for variation without stark contrast.

- Mr. White stated liking the intent, more character and texture, and that more detail in future renderings will be helpful.
- Mr. White asked if the intent is for framed openings.

Mr. Site replied yes.

- Mr. White stated that more shadow lines could give more interest to a left volume not identified.
- Mr. White stated that fins could be incorporated at the north elevations, in example, feeling underdeveloped.
- Mr. White stated that a street-level view from across the street would be helpful.
- Mr. White stated that wood style siding can be further developed.
- Mr. White asked if variety in wood material planks is intentional.

Mr. Sit replied yes, a stark contrast between the rest of the building and the jewel box.

- Mr. White asked staff for clarification regarding material requirements at the site.

Ms. Anderson replied that the code will be examined, and an answer brought back.

Mr. Lee replied that the code specifically states that an ADF is needed to use cement fiber boards as the predominant material. Higher end materials are to be used across the city. Code was written years ago, however, when fiber cement board had not evolved.

- Mr. White stated that photos of actual products to be used will help understanding the details.
- Mr. White asked staff for clarification that the adjacent property had a variance to be closer to the property line.

Mr. Lee replied that setback requirements do not change, and the property was confined with easements and property lines.

- Mr. White stated not having an issue with an ADF if the adjacent property was not held to a different standard.
- Mr. White stated that regarding modulation, being flexible if design comes together, but more work is needed on north and west elevations.
- Mr. White stated that weather protection requirements will be addressed in the next meetings.
- Mr. White stated that there could be an opportunity to make the top and middle stronger, such as accentuating framing,

## OTHER ITEMS

Mr. Lee stated that the June 1, 2023 meeting will be cancelled with no submittals. The June 15, 2023 may be cancelled, but materials can still be submitted. Mr. Lee asked for the availability of Ms. O'Neill for a June 15, 2023 meeting and Ms. O'Neill replied available.

## ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Ms. Wanqin to adjourn the meeting at 8:05 p.m. MOTION seconded by Mr. Cline. MOTION passed unanimously.

July 5, 2023

---

Carolyn Garza

---



MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY