

Due to technicalities with the recording equipment the  
official minutes for the  
July 11, 2019 are not available

Below are summaries provided by the planners

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

July 11, 2019

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Craig Krueger

Board members: Craig Krueger, Henry Liu,  
Diana Atvars, Ralph Martin and Shaffer White

**EXCUSED ABESENCES:** Kevin Sutton and Stephanie Monk

**STAFF PRESENT:** Gary Lee, Scott Reynolds, Benjamin Sticka, David  
Lee and Elise Keim

**MEETING MINUTES:** Planner Summaries – Fail in Recording Equipment

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Mr. Krueger.

Mr. Lee introduced new Planning staff in attendance.

**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 NE 36<sup>th</sup> Street  
and west of 156<sup>th</sup> Ave NE

**Applicant:** Aaron Dunsdon with Microsoft

**Prior Review Date:** 02/21/19 & 05/16/19

**Staff Contact:** Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or [glee@redmond.gov](mailto:glee@redmond.gov)

Gary Lee, Senior Planner, summarized that the application before the Board was the review and approval of the Promenade portion (bridge landing) of this project, as the rest of the project details including the buildings, site plan, and conceptual landscape plan for the Washington Village was previously approved by the Board May 16, 2019. Mr. Lee explained that the Promenade is the eastern end of the pedestrian bridge crossing over the 520 freeway, and the bridge is designed by another team, and the bridge designed was previously presented to the Board at an earlier date. Shaffer White recused himself from this review as he works for ZGF, the architectural team.

### **Presentation by Dan Simpson (ZGF)**

- Discussed how the promenade bridge design relates to the campus as a whole
- Design addresses continuity of the Transit Bridge across 156<sup>th</sup> and creates a “soft” landing in the campus
- Integration with landscape and the forest thread concept
- Design tries to make our bridge connection as seamless as possible with the Transit Bridge providing continuity
- We have upgraded the materials where there is human experience
- We have upgraded the quality of design for the column (Pier 9) but kept the scale down
- Material for Pier 9 cover– perforated stainless steel to make it graffiti resistant
- Bike area is an active feature in this area

### **Comments and Questions from the Board**

- Ralph Martin
  - Again noted incredible book ... those who worked on it deserve a raise!
  - With 190-foot ramp at 5% slope, why not have intermediate landings? (Dan Simpson-ZGF Response: Attempted to maintain the shallowest slope possible which is currently a little under 5%.
  - Pier 9 Design – like the expression. Could be repeated between the bike area opening to below between the bike club and Pier 9. Consider adding a glass cylinder or round belvedere.
  - Like the bike club. Consider minimizing the glass exterior by possibly detailing spider mounts instead of frames.
- Diana Atvars
  - How did we derive at the railing design? (Dan Simpson-ZGF Response: We want to match the RTS Bridge Design which is cable railing. Want to be as transparent as possible to minimize the vertical elevation mass.
  - Consider vertical railing to be “kid-proof”.

- Henry Liu
  - A lot of effort and design solutions have been considered; appreciate where the design has landed.
  - Like the railing break to the right bringing the landscape to the upper promenade
  - Have you considered a connection to Level 2, Building A from the promenade bridge? (Dan Simpson- ZGF Response: We considered that idea at one point but the area started to feel pinched. We feel it is better to leave it as open-air allowing the lower promenade to have better natural light.
  - Bike Storage Area – liked the “lounge” concept.
  
- Craig Kruger
  - Pedestrian Safety – How can we manage the flow of bikes and user experience? (Dan Simpson-ZGF and Guy Michaelson-Berger Response: We took deliberate steps to calm the flow in the mixing zone. There will be visual queues in the pavement markings and materiality as well as signage to address when the dedicated “speedy” bike path transitions to a shareable mixed zone. These will be defined when the Campus Landscape Design is reviewed.

Motion to approve as presented by Diana Atvars, with a comment that the review of final materials shall be reviewed by Planning Staff during Construction Plan review.

Second by Ralph Martin,  
Unanimous decision to approve

### **APPROVAL**

#### **LAND-2019-00573, Pump Station 13**

**Neighborhood:** Southeast Redmond

**Description:** Relocation of pump station 13 to be on Redmond Community Center site, station to have approximately 20X30' building.

**Location:** 6505 176<sup>th</sup> Ave NE

**Applicant:** Noah Allen with BHC Consultants, LLC

**Staff Contact:** Scott Reynolds, 425-556-2409, [sreynolds@redmond.gov](mailto:sreynolds@redmond.gov)

Applicant Introduction:

- Applicant described that the structure is for an upsized, relocated wastewater pump station serving the Marymoor community.
- Applicant explained that there are three options regarding design within the DRB packet with option #3 being preferred by the City.

- Applicant stated that option #3 has the potential to host future Art but is not under review at this time.
- Applicant stated that the current signage on the property will be relocated with the proposed work.

#### Staff Comment from Memo

- City recommend approval with any option and standard approval conditions.

#### Specific Notes from DRB members

- Diana: Question was posed to the applicant regarding the slope of the roof compared to the slope of the community center roof. Applicant stated that the slope is establish by the Vactor Truck access to the wet vault, but the slopes are similar. Additional question was posed to the applicant regarding the landscaping plan. Applicant provided paper copies to the Board. Diana like the possibility of Art on the east and south building elevations.
- Ralph: Liked the idea of carrying the radius curve of the wet well up on the building and future Art idea. Question was posed to the applicant regarding the thought of symmetrical window duplication on the west facade. Applicant stated that it was not possible due to use behind the wall.
- Shaffer: Liked the radius idea without the Art element. Question was posed to the applicant regarding how the back of the building is going to be treated concerning a blank wall. Applicant stated that a green screening is proposed.
- Henry: Felt that design option #2 was better for the location without the radius arch and Art.
- Craig: Question was posed if the vent between the wet well and exterior wall can be relocated to another area more suitable. Applicant stated that they can investigate the idea from a technical standpoint. Craig like the idea that other members mention regarding carrying the radius curve of the wet well on the wall and the future Art possibility.

#### Motion: Motion by Diana with the following condition

1. Presentation Materials Inconsistencies
  - a. Where inconsistencies between the floor plans and elevations are found after the Design Review Board has approved this project, the elevations approved by the Design Review Board at this meeting will prevail.
  - b. If, after this Design Review Board approval, there are any inconsistencies found in the information provided for the elevations, floor plans, materials and color between the presentation drawings, the Design Review Board and the Redmond Planning Staff will review and determine which design version will be followed for Site Plan Entitlement and Building Permits.

- c. Approval of design option #3 as outlined in the Design Review Material with the applicant to work with staff regarding relocation of the vent in front of the western façade.

Second by Schaffer White

Vote: 4 – 1 with Henry Liu casting the dissenting vote.

## **APPROVAL**

### **LAND-2019-00504, Redmond City Center**

**Neighborhood:** Downtown

**Description:** Administrative Modification to existing Site Plan Entitlement (LAND-2016-03100), project is one mixed-use building and consists of a residential tower to the north and an office/residential tower to the south

**Location:** 16135 NE 85<sup>th</sup> Street

**Applicant:** Katernia Prochaska with Jackson Main Architecture

**Staff Contact:** Benjamin Sticka, 425-556-24, [bsticka@redmond.gov](mailto:bsticka@redmond.gov)

- Ben Sticka introduced the Redmond City Center Administrative Modification, LAND-2019-00504, which amends the approved Site Plan Entitlement (LAND-2016-02100). It was indicated that the proposal is located at 16135 NE 85<sup>th</sup> Street within Downtown Redmond and zoned Town Square. The proposal was approved by the DRB at its June 2017 meeting and included two nine-story towers, located on the former post office site. The site is approximately 2.3 acres in area. The building will have ground floor retail fronting on 85<sup>th</sup> Street with two 8-story towers above.
- The applicant Katerina Procheska introduced the proposed changes as follows:
  - Brick along the 85<sup>th</sup> street façade is more prominent.
  - Garage entrance has been further strengthened.
  - Eyebrow projection is one level higher on building. Continues to provide balance across the north façade with façade with respect to opposing corners of façade.
  - Upper most portion of NE corner has been strengthened by incorporating the element into a continuous roof overhang. Ties the corner of the north and east façades into a clearer concept.
  - Cascading roof lines at NE Corner preserved with eyebrow projections.
  - Inset corner from the street, which clears the site lines from the drive aisle and greatly simplifies the brick structure supporting the upper floors at the NE corner.

- Chair Kruger and member Liu generally supported the project, but asked about the proposed changes to the building from its initial 2017 approval, as both were on the Board during its approval.
- Members White and Martin questioned the proposed building modulation, massing and the corner treatment. Questions were also asked about how the building relates to the other tower, which was indicated that it would come back before the Board at a later date. Member White indicated that he would like to see how the building evolved into its current design and asked for a graphic from the applicant to better understand that.
- Chair Kruger asked for a motion, which was made by member Liu and supported Chair Kruger, but and was not seconded. Both members Martin and White ultimately voted against the proposal, which required it to come back.

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**LAND-2019-00136, Building X**

**Neighborhood:** Willows / Rose Hill

**Description:** New building, 3 stories of office constructed above a tiered parking structure

**Location:** 10301 Willows Road NE

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

**Prior Review Date:** 03/21/19

**Staff Contact:** David Lee, 425-556-2462 or [dlee@redmond.gov](mailto:dlee@redmond.gov)

- Unavailable

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**LAND-2019-00469, Porch and Park**

**Neighborhood:** Downtown

**Description:** 107 unit mixed used building with approximately 11,000 SF of commercial space

**Location:** 16001 Redmond Way

**Applicant:** George John with Main Street Property Group

**Staff Contacts:** Elise Keim, 425-556-2480 or [ekeim@redmond.gov](mailto:ekeim@redmond.gov) and David Lee, 425-556-2462 or [dlee@redmond.gov](mailto:dlee@redmond.gov)

Applicant Introduction:

- Applicant described they got the project as a competitive bid process and are working in partnership with the city through a purchase and sale agreement
- Applicant described the structure as the city's "front porch"

#### Staff Comment from Memo

- City had requested applicant explore upper-story courtyard facing the park. DRB members liked south-facing courtyard and its symmetry across Cleveland St with an existing multifamily building.

#### Specific Notes from DRB members

- Ralph: sees the building as a sculpture which will need 360° consideration. Focus on the pointed “prow” as the more aggressive element, consider making the tip of the building all glass. Keep working on the more passive, park facing element. Perhaps a “picture window” concept or “anchors” at the corners.
- Diana: More resident space up a few stories that faces the park. Interested in the angled balconies above the courtyard. The inspiration images are distinctive, but the rendering doesn’t seem to relate to the inspiration images.
- Henry: The rectangle box in the center of the park facing side is too simple
- Craig: Simplify the park facing side, can the corners on 161<sup>st</sup> protrude more?
  - Note: Staff and the applicant are in discussion about what, if anything can extend into setback areas and right of way.
- Shaffer: the façade facing the park needs to “earn the honor”