

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

August 1, 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: Chairman Craig Krueger

Board members: Diana Atvars, Stephanie Monk,
Kevin Sutton and Shaffer White

EXCUSED ABSENCES: Henry Liu and Ralph Martin

STAFF PRESENT: Andrea Kares, Elise Keim, David Lee, Tom Mauriss,
Scott Reynolds and Jeff G. Taylor, 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 7:35 p.m. following a Cultural Resource Management Plan Briefing.

Mr. Lee introduced new Planning staff in attendance.

APPROVAL

LAND-2016-00485/BLDG-2016-10223 The Bond (East Lake Sammamish Apartments)

Neighborhood: Southeast Redmond

Description: 64-unit multi-family building along East Lake Sammamish

Location: 6038 East Lake Sammamish Parkway

Applicant: Kim Faust and Marc Boettcher *with* Main Street Property Group, LLC

Staff Contact: Elise Keim, 425-556-2480 or ekeim@redmond.gov and Tom Mauriss, 425-556-2499 or tmauriss@redmond.gov

Ms. Keim stated that on July 11, 2019 the applicant called staff for a temporary Certificate of Occupancy for building B. During the staff inspection a number of discrepancies between the approved plans and what has been built were discovered. Issues include changes in materials and architectural features. Staff is requesting a decision from the Design Review Board in regard to the field changes.

Mr. Marc Boettcher *with* Main Street Property Group, LLC stated that the first issue was the composite wood panel; a darker color and texture ties into the urban forest to the south better than the original choice. The second issue was board formed concrete; attaching the material structurally was a challenge and an alternative product was used, accomplishing a high-level look. The third issue was an eave that had been shortened; buildings were initially designed schematically but structural design necessitated the change.

Mr. Krueger stated that the staff memo included many more items than addressed by Mr. Boettcher including administrative issues. Mr. Boettcher replied not being aware that the meeting tonight was the venue to address these but was available to discuss.

Mr. Boettcher continued. The color for wood braces in the original concept elevations were lighter, but a darker tone was decided on which ties in to the building base. Modulations or pop-outs were modified after additional challenges were discovered. Bicycle parking had originally been conceived on the southeast corner but more bicycles were brought inside the garage and between two buildings for better security and safety.

Mr. Krueger asked for clarification regarding the six field changes not included in the approved Plans. Ms. Keim replied that Design Review Board plans would prevail and approved construction plans would need to be updated. Mr. Lee asked if a Design Review Board approval at this meeting would be attached to construction permits and a part of the record. Mr. Krueger stated that significant changes need to be brought to the attention of staff before occupancy. Mr. Lee replied that staff is exploring adding an in-between step before final planning inspections.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that the changes are minor enough in nature that communication with staff may have avoided the agenda item.
- Ms. Atvars asked why colors had been changed to bold and if the changes were due to availability of product.

Mr. Boettcher replied that tones printed from a computer vary and actual lighting and the environment had been examined. Several colors were experimentally applied to the building and the consensus was to use the current color.

- Ms. Atvars stated that whenever the material palette will be deviated from, an email should be sent to the Planner with the decision to avoid problems with occupancy later.

Mr. White:

- Agreed with staff recommendations for approval.

Ms. Monk:

- Asked if staff monitors the processes as agreed upon.
- Ms. Monk stated that the recommendations looked good.

Mr. Sutton:

- Agreed with recommendations.
- Mr. Sutton asked if color renderings are required in the pre-construction set.

Mr. Lee replied yes, a color and materials board is required.

**MOTION TO APPROVE FIELD CHANGES TO LAND-2016-00485/BLDG-2016-10223
The Bond (East Lake Sammamish Apartments) BY MR. WHITE. MOTION
SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2018-01089 Redmond Square

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: Mixed-use development with approximately 580 residential units

Location: 16563 Redmond Way and 16425 Cleveland Street

Applicant: Mark McKallor and Jay Liu *with* MGRM, Inc.

Prior Review: July 5, 2018

Staff Contact: Scott Reynolds, 425-556-2409 or sreynolds@redmond.gov

Mr. Reynolds stated that the project had been seen by the Design Review Board in pre-application in July 2018. Staff believes that improvements could be made to treatments, as well as clarification on materiality. The applicant is proposing façade modulation and staff would like direction and input.

Mr. Bob Tiscareno *with* Tiscareno Associates was accompanied by the MGRM development team who has partnered with Legacy Partners Residential. Also present were Ms. Kate Miller and Mr. Mark Stine *with* Tiscareno, and Mr. Dave Bramer, landscape architect *with* Hewitt.

The project is located across the street from the Redmond Central Connector Park and the site of the future elevated light rail station. The vision is for a significant pedestrian thorough-way and gathering place and a transit-oriented development. A series of shops and restaurants will create vitality and excitement.

Each building has a large courtyard which opens to a pedestrian plaza. Common design elements will be used at street-level while distinct articulation will occur at upper levels. Renderings of massing and design articulation were displayed. The project will comply with Anderson Park design standards. The high-water table is addressed with a higher subterranean parking level under courtyards. Renderings of architectural details and materials were displayed and described. Creating the required Type Seven Pedestrian System was the most important decision for the project. The development has the potential to be an urban community gathering space unrivaled in Redmond.

Three modulation deviations are being requested; at the southwest corner, along Redmond Way and the southeast corner across from the light rail station.

Mr. Bramer continued with landscape architecture. All streetscapes are influenced by the surrounding neighborhood. Courtyard areas will have the feel of being in the landscape at grade rather than surrounded by planters.

Mr. Krueger asked that upper floor materials be addressed. Mr. Tiscareno replied that the material palette proposed is similar to other projects such as The Triangle and Modera, a European aesthetic downtown. Mr. Reynolds clarified that there are specific requirements in Code for gateway treatments and staff comments were regarding top aspects, concerns with the rectangular form. Improvements to corners could add emphasis to the top. Mr. Krueger asked if staff had concerns regarding the west end elevation and Mr. Reynolds replied not at this time. Mr. Tiscareno continued to describe corner expressions.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that the area looking in from Cleveland Street could be lightened to be more inviting on a darker day.

Mr. Tiscareno stated that the area had been widened more than Code requires, and offset openings will allow additional daylight onto the pedestrian path.

- Ms. Monk suggested that shapes and sizes could be explored at Northeast 66th Street and Cleveland Street as the top appears very heavy.
- Ms. Monk stated that building A appears flat.

Mr. Tiscareno replied that windows on the building are at different plains and shadows may not show on the renderings.

- Ms. Monk stated that the colors on Building A appear very similar.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that there seemed to be simply replication of forms and a bigger gesture was suggested.

Mr. White:

- Liked the interest at the edge of courtyards.
- Mr. White stated that later in the approval process all elevations will need to be shown, and in particular the southwest corner coming down Cleveland Street.
- Mr. White asked to see the material boards between Buildings A and B and asked if these were similar palettes

Mr. Tiscareno replied that there are minor nuance changes between the two buildings. There is more contrast than seen in the rendering.

- Mr. White stated that seeing different materials on flat elevations would help.

Mr. Tiscareno replied that the Planner had suggested removing elevations from this presentation in the interest of time.

- Mr. White suggested that physical comprehensive packets aside from information on the website be brought to the next presentation.
- Mr. White stated that the southeast corner gesture does not appear successful and the recess could include more depth.
- Mr. White stated that all corners should have something interesting to say.
- Mr. White asked at what stage the project was.

Mr. Reynolds replied that this presentation was PREP round two, and a PREP round three meeting would be next with a material board. A formal review would occur afterward.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked if construction would be phased.

Mr. Tiscareno replied yes.

- Ms. Atvars asked what the site would look like during the construction process.
- Ms. Atvars asked about timing around the light rail station being built.

Mr. Tiscareno replied that light rail would be completed after this project opens.

- Ms. Atvars stated that the west side façade acts as a larger gateway into Redmond and a first impression. Building A needs more attention.
- Ms. Atvars suggested that cues could be taken from historical buildings a block away.
- Ms. Atvars stated wanting to see more modulation language developed on Building B.
- Ms. Atvars stated that the modulation appears horizontal rather than vertical.

Mr. Tiscareno replied that corners have increased height and units with higher ceilings.

- Ms. Atvars hoped to see this accentuated more, broken into a smaller neighborhood together rather than one building with decorations.
- Ms. Atvars asked to see renderings of inside the courtyards particularly if open to the Public.

Mr. Tiscareno replied that courtyards would be for residents only.

- Ms. Atvars asked that if the courtyards will be gated or separated, fence details would be appreciated.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the spaces are great for both residents and the public but was concerned about excessive modulation.
- Mr. Krueger was not convinced regarding the southeast corner.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the buildings need broken up more, with more variety at corners.
- Mr. Krueger stated that there is a striking difference between the east and west sides.

- Mr. Krueger suggested that some floors could be six stories and others five for vertical modulation.

Mr. Reynolds replied that the project went through pre-application prior to PREP a year ago. Staff was working on technical compliance during the PREP round 1 presentation so this is the first presentation under the PREP process.

Mr. Lee asked if review of the buildings should be broken into two meetings, bringing both buildings into one meeting afterwards. Ms. Atvars replied that both buildings should be presented at the same time but with half of the project to stand alone in approval. Building B stands alone at this time but Building A needs more attention. Ms. Monk agreed with Ms. Atvars and was concerned about breaking the project up in presentations. Mr. Lee suggested that two slots be scheduled for each building, and at the end of the Building B presentation a discussion can be held regarding how both buildings work together.

Mr. White:

- Asked about the location of the garage entrance off of the roof.

Mr. Reynolds replied that the garage entrance was dictated by Transportation staff.

- Mr. White hoped to keep vehicular circulation away from pedestrian circulation if possible.

Ms. Monk:

- Agreed that pedestrians may not expect vehicular traffic.

Mr. Reynolds replied based on street hierarchy, the access should be taken from the lowest classification. Technical Staff is currently working out access points to the site including Building A. Design Review Board comment would be shared with Technical staff going forward.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2019-00467 Cascadia Montessori School Expansion

Neighborhood: Overlake

Description: Addition and remodel to existing east building to serve as upper elementary; work affects one building, one lot, minimal site work, adding two parking stalls

Location: 4239 – 162nd Avenue Northeast

Applicant: Kevin Flanagan *with* NAC Architecture

Staff Contact: Jeff G. Taylor, 425-556-2437 or jgtaylor@redmond.gov

Mr. Taylor stated that the expansion would be approximately 600 square feet on the eastern building only. There are two buildings on a 2.83-acre site. Including the interior remodel with the expansion, there are 3,200 square feet touched. An outdoor mural has been suggested.

Staff discovered that the southeast corner has an existing patio deck structure with no linkage to street, and design guidance is requested as well as input regarding pedestrian connectivity.

Mr. Flanagan continued the presentation. Landscaping will be preserved as-is. Other existing buildings will only be re-painted a light grey color. Renderings were shown. The proposed mural would not be visible from the public right-of-way, and only a small area of the expansion may be visible to public in the distance.

Mr. Krueger asked Mr. Flanagan to respond to staff comments regarding pedestrian access. Mr. Flanagan explained a rendering.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked about the staff question regarding decking.

Mr. Taylor replied that staff had two main concerns; the sidewalk at vehicular access has no crosswalk provided, and the patio could be an opportunity to link into a crosswalk, sidewalk or street.

- Mr. Sutton stated the building design was great.
- Mr. Sutton asked if the color passes interior and exterior.

Mr. Flanagan replied yes.

Ms. Monk:

- Agreed with Mr. Sutton
- Ms. Monk liked the pops of color.
- Ms. Monk stated that the additions will bring more light for the classrooms.
- Ms. Monk stated that sidewalk or striping was not critical but could be considered.

Ms. Atvars:

- Had no complaints or questions.

Mr. White:

- Suggested striping on the street

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked how parking functions.

Mr. Flanagan replied that a traffic study has been done as part of the Technical pre-application. School hours are staggered and the amount of traffic is controlled at any particular time. Street parking does occur.

- Mr. Krueger agreed with the Board that striping should be considered.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2019-00636 Maplewood Condominiums

Neighborhood: Education Hill

Description: Eleven-unit condominium building, (2) three bedroom, (6) two bedroom and (3) one-bedroom units including one affordable unit and parking for 20 vehicles

Location: 8420 – 167th Avenue Northeast

Applicant: Jeff Moffatt *with* Moffatt Architects, LLC

Prior Review Date: April 21, 2016

Staff Contact: Andrea Kares, 425-556-2440 or akares@redmond.gov

Mr. Krueger stated having worked with the client on the property in the past and recused from the discussion. Mr. Sutton would lead the presentation.

Ms. Kares stated that the property is currently undeveloped and approximately 2.31 acres, and .65 acres is located outside of a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) zone. The project was originally approved by the Design Review Board on April 21, 2016 as two separate townhomes consisting of four units. Since that time, the project has changed substantially. The building will consist of three stories of residential over one story of at-grade parking. Early design guidance is requested.

Mr. Barry Margolese *with* Amalani, LLC continued. The reality of the site caused the original concept to become uneconomic. There is a fair amount of topography and in order to short plat, an integral part of the townhouse project, retaining walls would be required around the corners of the site. The work would have needed to be complete

before a building permit would be issued. Now, the foundations walls can be a part of the retaining walls. The new project is the correct kind of development for the property.

Mr. Moffatt described renderings.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. White:

- Asked for clarification regarding the parking area.

Mr. Moffatt described renderings.

- Mr. White stated that the parking area was a bulky element for the design and wondered how the area would be detailed and resolved.
- Mr. White stated that knowing how the retaining wall will be executed would be helpful.

Mr. Moffatt replied that the northeast corner will require a 20' plus retaining wall at this time but adjustments may allow the wall to come down to 10' in height.

- Mr. White stated that adjustments would be worth exploring as the area is a focal point along 167th Avenue Northeast.
- Mr. White stated not having other concerns at this time.

Ms. Monk:

- Liked the design for a rough sketch.
- Ms. Monk liked the integration with the forest and focus on decks.
- Ms. Monk liked the stacked box concept.
- Ms. Monk asked if the tower contained stairs and an elevator.

Mr. Moffatt replied yes.

- Ms. Monk looked forward to seeing more details in landscaping and materials.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked if there is an accessible sidewalk connection.

Mr. Moffatt replied up the driveway to the path.

- Ms. Atvars suggested that a path could meander through landscaping rather than on the driveway.
- Ms. Atvars looked forward to seeing how the landscaping will work in front of the building.
- Ms. Atvars was curious about any landscape screening facing the adjacent property.

Mr. Moffatt replied that window placement will be examined. Above the first level, height will be an issue for vertical landscaping.

- Ms. Atvars asked if there would be an opportunity to connect the project to a trail.

Mr. Moffatt replied that a linkage from the circulation path can be designed, but security will be important.

Mr. White:

- Asked if the corridor is interior or exterior.

Mr. Moffatt replied interior.

- Mr. White stated hoping the corridor would be interior as exterior corridors deteriorate and value would be affected.
- Mr. White suggested that heights be varied.
- Mr. White asked if the ground floor corridor was open.

Mr. Moffatt replied yes, the corridor connects to the garage.

Mr. Margolese asked if the City would be open to a variance or deviation for one less parking stall than Code requires which would solve the north corner issue. The affordable unit may not need a parking stall. Mr. David Lee replied that the Technical Committee would require a parking study and the deviation may be possible. Affordable housing residents do own cars. The Design Review Board cannot make the decision, however.

Mr. Margolese stated that a connection could be made from the condominium to the trail for residents, while discouraging the public from walking through the property to arrive at the street.

Ms. Atvars:

- Agreed that the connection should not be a public walk way but only a private connection for the residents.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that a trail connection could be a selling point.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY MR. WHITE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:46 P.M. MOTION
SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

September 19, 2019
MINUTES APPROVED ON

Carolyn Garza
RECORDING SECRETARY