

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

August 6, 2020

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

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairperson Diana Atvars

Board members: Craig Krueger, Stephanie Monk and  
Shaffer White

**EXCUSED ABESENCES:** Henry Liu and Kevin Sutton

**STAFF PRESENT:** David Lee, Scott Reynolds and Benjamin Sticka,  
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.

Projects up for Approval have 10 minutes for a presentation, and Pre-Applications have 15 minutes for a presentation.

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Ms. Atvars at 7:00 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. White requested that the comment on page two of the May 28, 2020 Minutes, *Mr. White stated that images were inspirational*, should be changed to *Mr. White suggested that the applicant refer to reference images for inspiration*.

**MOTION by Ms. Monk to approve the amended Meeting Minutes for May 28, 2020. MOTION seconded by Mr. Krueger. The Motion passed unanimously.**

**MOTION by Mr. White to approve the Meeting Minutes for June 4, 2020. MOTION seconded by Ms. Monk. The Motion passed unanimously.**

**MOTION by Mr. Krueger to approve the Meeting Minutes for July 16, 2020. MOTION seconded by Mr. White. The Motion passed unanimously.**

## **APPROVAL**

### **LAND-2018-01187 Si-Five Homes (aka 166<sup>th</sup> Townhomes)**

**Neighborhood:** Education Hill

**Description:** Demolition of an existing single-family residence and construct (5) three-story townhome units

**Location:** 8921 – 166<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast

**Applicant:** Gaurav and Jessica Bora *with* Smart Build

**Prior Review Dates:** 10/17/19 and 11/21/19

**Staff Contact:** Benjamin Sticka, 425-556-2470 or [bsticka@redmond.gov](mailto:bsticka@redmond.gov)

Mr. Sticka introduced the project. Staff believes that the applicant has successfully incorporated all requests into the final design. No public comment has been received.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

### **Mr. Krueger:**

- Stated that the applicant had done a great job at addressing previous comments.
- Mr. Krueger stated that all four sides look good, much more balanced and appealing.

### **Mr. White:**

- Stated liking an option displayed onscreen but did not describe for the audio recording.

### **Mr. Krueger:**

- Agreed with Mr. White and stated being in favor of approval.

### **Ms. Atvars:**

- Clarified that option one in the video was preferred, page 31 of 38.

### **Ms. Monk:**

- Agreed with the comments of Mr. Krueger.
- Ms. Monk stated appreciating the back of the building.
- Ms. Monk stated that the front elevation was good.
- Ms. Monk preferred option one as well.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the applicant had done a fantastic job on a challenging site.

Ms. Atvars:

- Agreed with the other Board members.
- Ms. Atvars appreciated the solidifying of the stairs to the entry ways, more permanent and formal than metal.
- Ms. Atvars asked for clarification regarding the parking level north elevation, page 30 of 38, possible attempts to add shade or conceal parking.

Ms. Jen Kim *with* Medici Architects replied that changes were to add panels along the northwest corner concrete wall for air and ventilation and to become visually porous. On the north side of the driveway, the fence line is the property line with a five-foot landscape buffer.

- Ms. Atvars asked if spots between concrete columns are screening elements.

Ms. Kim replied metal mesh.

**MOTION by Mr. White to approve the design of Si-Five Townhomes (LAND-2018-01187) as shown in the Design Review Board Materials dated August 6, 2020 including Option One. This approval is subject to the standard conditions as drafted in the staff memo. MOTION seconded by Ms. Monk. The MOTION passed unanimously.**

**APPROVAL**

**LAND-2020-00360 Redmond Square Buildings A and B**

**Neighborhood:** Downtown

**Description:** Mixed-use development with approximately 613 residential units

**Location:** 16563 Redmond Way and 16425 Cleveland Street

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

**Prior Review Dates:** 07/05/18, 08/08/19, 02/20/20 and 05/28/20

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

Mr. Reynolds introduced the presentation and stated that while staff believes that significant progress has been made to address concerns, staff believes that the project needs an additional review for approval. No public comments have been received.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

### **Ms. Monk:**

- Stated that while Building B looks good, Building A requires further examination.
- Ms. Monk stated believing that an additional review is called for.
- Ms. Monk stated agreeing with the staff comment regarding scrim elements on the north facade, on the same plane with similar massing; current massing is more vertically than horizontally defined.
- Ms. Monk questioned if fiber cement board would be a superior material as light dependent materials will not be in sunlight for several months of the year in Redmond.

Mr. Scott Glazebrook *with* Tiscareno Associates replied that the northern façade had been revised to pull the northeast corner plane behind the scrim element, no longer in the same plane in the submittal. The industry name for the material does not indicate that the cladding is similar to terra cotta, lighter in weight for use on a wood framed building with more richness than typical fiber cement board. The material is relatively new to the market and United States.

Mr. Bob Tiscareno *with* Tiscareno Associates displayed the material sample in various light and exposed to moisture.

- Ms. Monk stated liking the material after seeing in different lighting and wet.
- Ms. Monk stated agreement with staff regarding Administrative Design Flexibility (ADF) number three on the southeast corner of Building A and asked for options.

Ms. Atvars asked Ms. Monk for clarification regarding which Building continues to be of concern.

- Ms. Monk replied almost exclusively with Building A and asked if only Building A could be brought back to the Board.

Ms. Atvars stated that some changes had been made to Building B.

### **Mr. Krueger:**

- Stated liking Building A including additions of color.
- Mr. Krueger stated that texture was hard to determine from renderings and clarification would be helpful.
- Mr. Krueger stated liking the west and north elevations.

- Mr. Krueger asked for clarification regarding staff comments toward the green screen.

Mr. Reynolds replied that the concern was regarding survivability of a long-term green screen wall due to solar access and a probable canyon effect when the Key Bank site redevelops.

- Mr. Krueger asked if an alternative has been provided that could be acceptable.

Mr. Reynolds stated that there is no concern from a City of Redmond standpoint.

- Mr. Krueger stated being okay with the west elevation and utility access.
- Mr. Krueger stated liking the Building A elevation along the woonerf pedestrian way.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the applicant has made many improvements, but some elements can be developed further.
- Mr. White stated that deleting green screens would redirect efforts to more visible areas.
- Mr. White stated that brick along the base is flat and suggested more textured, older brick such as the Matador building, contrasting with the sleek top.

Mr. Tiscareno replied that the rendering does not show that the base brick does have texture and roughness and displayed the material onscreen.

- Mr. White stated that photographs in different outdoor light would be helpful.
- Mr. White stated preferring the older inset version, page 0.10, but open.
- Mr. White stated that the mass may benefit from a more contrasting and dark color than the rest of the building.
- Mr. White stated being overwhelmed with the amount of beige on both buildings.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated agreeing with Mr. White.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the scrim element could carry more weight, and a slightly different scale could be helpful as joints line up too much.
- Mr. White stated appreciating further refinement on the top penthouse floor but would like to bring back balconies

- Mr. White asked how much the brow had been extended.

Mr. Glazebrook replied that Transportation had given permission to extend the brow two days prior to submittal, so the change was not made in renderings. There is a potential to extend the brow at this time.

- Mr. White stated that extending the brow will help.
- Mr. White stated that vent hoods should match surrounding fields.
- Mr. White asked Board members if the bump-out, brick red scrim was preferred.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated liking a unique element where Mr. White referred.

Mr. Tiscareno replied that there is a color variation in the mixed brick and recessed mortar, and a single color was chosen for the scrim for clarity.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked for clarification that the scrim is a brick material.

Mr. Tiscareno replied a similar color to brick; alternating color in the scrim would compete with the multi-colored brick at the base.

- Stated liking the comment of Mr. White regarding changing up texture of the paneling.
- Ms. Atvars stated preferring the same color but panel sizing changing to reflect Building B.
- Ms. Atvars stated not having a strong opinion regarding the new red scrim.
- Ms. Atvars stated preferring popping out rather than setting in, distinguishing the visual corner facing light rail as unique.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated preferring the brick red scrim versus previous, jumping out.
- Ms. Monk stated that a darker material than beige would be helpful to tie in with Building B.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated wondering if a window frame color change would help the plane in question.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the applicant should then keep the scrim as shown.

Mr. Glazebrook stated that the floor above the four-story scrim has been pulled back four feet from the face of the scrim to create a balcony appearance without privacy screens. Balconies were never above.

- Mr. White stated that columns could pop out more so that windows feel more inset and not in plane for more rhythm and character.

Mr. Glazebrook replied that the suggestion of Mr. White would violate the part of placing deeper recessed windows only in the scrim.

- Mr. White asked for the size of the added recesses.

Mr. Glazebrook replied approximately three inches.

- Mr. White understood limitations.
- Mr. White appreciated a corner going up an extra story.
- Mr. White stated hoping another corner at the north façade could extend brick to the top, page 0.14.
- Mr. White stated that a darker band along top and bottom and shifting a balcony to the corner would be more dynamic, activating the woonerf further.
- Mr. White stated that a window was not aligned with other windows in a rendering, page 0.15.
- Mr. White stated that anything to activate the woonerf is a huge win.
- Mr. White stated agreeing with staff that in general, the interior elevations of courtyards are good.
- Mr. White stated that the green screen is at a service corner and was okay with deleting.
- Mr. White stated that an elevation is flat but given the location on the building, energy should be focused elsewhere.
- Mr. White stated that the darker area on the north elevation gasket is better to further break up the mass left and right.
- Mr. White commented on bays, columns and recesses but did not identify a page or location for the audio recording.

- Mr. White suggested making a window bay larger but did not identify a page or location for the audio recording.
- Mr. White asked for a drawing for a clear sense of where textured and flat panels are located.
- Mr. White stated that the top floor at the woonerf needed reason.

Mr. Glazebrook replied that a rendering contained a modeling error.

- Mr. White stated being good with interior elevations for courtyards.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that requested changes will need to be clear from the Board. Issues identified to this point were further refinement of the Building A penthouse condition, deleting green walls, materiality and questioning of beige material and photographed examples outdoors.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that options for the beige plane should come back.

Mr. Tiscareno replied that darker colors in the beige plane were not complimentary to the other building and other colors were found to draw attention away from the linea.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked for clarification regarding the rendering error mentioned by Mr. Glazebrook.

Mr. Glazebrook replied that two different textured products are shown, but renderings are darker due to shadow lines in grooves of the linea. The page was not identified for the audio recording. The products are the same color, hessian or grayish beige.

- Ms. Atvars stated that the issue was not the color but the lack of contrast in the renderings and changing window frame material or adding dark coping could help.

Mr. Glazebrook replied understanding that color changes and the penthouse level are to be revisited, but that overall Building A form is generally acceptable.

- Ms. Atvars stated agreeing and that the team is getting close, that the project is exceptionally large and detailed, and thanked the team for working with comments.

Ms. Abigail DeWeese *with* Hillis Clark Martin & Peterson P.S. asked if the Board would consider minor changes conditioned to work with the Planner.

- Ms. Atvars stated that as the changes are appearance based, what is approved is the visual record of what the Board has agreed to which could lead to possible confusion. Approval could be conditioned between meetings, possibly through email communication.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated agreeing with Ms. Atvars, and that a concrete visual to sign off on is needed.

Mr. White:

- Stated not being comfortable voting for approval with conditions at this meeting, as suggestions made may in fact be in the wrong direction and need to be seen.
- Mr. White stated that if other colors and execution of details have been examined, even if rough, the applicant can present.
- Mr. White stated that email or another abbreviated Board meeting is needed.

Mr. Glazebrook asked if conditional approval could be given, with changes brought back to the next meeting, so that if changes are not adopted there would still be an approval.

Mr. Reynolds stated that staff can execute deliberate detail changes but not design direction. An option available is that the Board could choose to approve with a condition to return to address certain items during Coordinated Civil Review (CCR) or the Building Permit phase, allowing the project to proceed but also ensuring that the Board concerns are addressed.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the suggestion of Mr. Reynolds was good, conditional approval for staff to bring back alternatives on specific aspects.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that what is in packets at this meeting would not be approved as-is, but the condition would be that the applicant makes changes and the Board sees for

sign-off. Changes requested are minor and if returned to the Board in two weeks, the issues could be addressed quickly and possibly not requiring a formal meeting.

Ms. DeWeese stated that the conditions outlined could be accomplished, reviewed by Mr. Reynolds and back to the Board via email in a couple of weeks. The specific changes are extending brows, windows on the penthouse level, columns in between, color in specific areas and deleting green screen on the west façade.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the changes listed by Ms. DeWeese were a good starting list but another version of the scrim, full height brick at the northwest corner and a rendering of balconies at the corner from the northeast as an alternative were also needed.

Ms. Atvars stated that Building B would be discussed next and afterwards action can be discussed further.

Mr. Reynolds asked for clarification that materiality in renderings was needed per the comment of Mr. White.

Mr. White:

- Stated wanting to see physical photographs, either taken by the applicant or source images from manufacturers given the location and quantity.

Mr. Glazebrook asked for clarification that Mr. White referred to brick.

- Mr. White replied that if material represents as flat on the material board slide, knowing additional character that exists but not revealed would be helpful.

Ms. Atvars asked for Board comments regarding Building B.

Mr. White:

- Stated that Building B is more successful.
- Mr. White stated questioning the mustard color accent and imagined grey tones.
- Mr. White stated that in general the east elevation is successful.
- Mr. White stated liking glazing at the main showcase corner but suggested refining with a grid of opaqueness.

- Mr. White stated appreciating the gasket on the south elevation and that any moves to break the mass of the building is good.
- Mr. White stated liking a corner not identified for the audio recording.
- Mr. White stated that the northeast corner requires further work and asked the applicant to consider glass spandrel or a shadow box condition to read vertically as single glass panes and darker recess as asymmetrical play can add interest.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated agreeing with Mr. White regarding the northeast corner, very heavy.
- Mr. Krueger stated liking the alternative for the southeast corner.
- Mr. Krueger stated liking the mustard color.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated liking the mustard color for visual interest.
- Ms. Monk stated liking the southeast corner alternative.
- Ms. Monk stated that first-floor street level is confusing but may be a rendering issue.
- Ms. Monk stated liking pops of color and the evolution on page 0.26.
- Ms. Monk stated liking the number of windows in the alternative on page 0.26C.
- Ms. Monk stated that anchor retail looks good but a dark column with brown framed windows may need refinement unless the design was a response to a previous comment.
- Ms. Monk stated liking the improvements on page 0.28.
- Ms. Monk stated liking shape and massing but not liking lack of contrast at the northwest corner on page 0.30.
- Ms. Monk stated that the corner is massive on page 0.31, options should be explored and preferring the round three design.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that the northwest corner appears washed out and the darker color at other corners could help in general but likes how the corner has iterated.
- Ms. Atvars stated that the northeast corner needs to be lightened in color or mass; the top parapet mass could be reduced, and windows tied together.
- Ms. Atvars stated liking smaller windows or a combination of sizes at the main showcase corner; the corner is closest to the raised light rail station which will see into windows, and the solar gain of a south facing façade will make large windows a negative.
-

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that Ms. Atvars had a good point regarding the corner closest to the station and preferred the original design.
- Ms. Monk agreed with Ms. Atvars that while there would be air conditioning, large windows would be overwhelmingly bright inside.

Mr. White:

- Stated being okay with less windows at the main showcase corner, but that the corner should be differentiated from the rest of the building.

Mr. Glazebrook replied that the eroded portion of the prism is similar product elsewhere on Building A but different texture, highly polished with reflectivity and luminescence per a previous Board comment and stated that the change requested could be a simple condition of approval..

- Mr. White stated that more refinement and interest is good at the eroded parti, page 0.30, and that a color change or spandrel glass might boost design.

Mr. Glazebrook replied that the vertical expression is maintained.

Ms. Atvars stated that Mr. White was pointing the applicant in a good direction.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the corner needs something more dramatic.

Mr. White:

- Stated agreeing with Mr. Krueger and that the window condition is different than the rest of the building.
- Mr. White stated being okay with a conditional approval with certain items to return to the Board for further discussion, concerns being regarding the main corner and northeast corner.
- Mr. White stated acceptance of the mustard color.

Ms. Atvars asked for specific directions regarding the northeast corner.

Mr. Glazebrook stated that there is asymmetry that may not be obvious in the rendering at the northeast corner. Action items understood are to lower the parapet, lower the

stem wall at the second-floor balcony, return glass back to that point and change material banding between windows to better reflect a spandrel condition.

Ms. Atvars asked if the suggestions would resolve the corner.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that an issue was the straight connection between the walls with the deck and asked if there is a way to celebrate that there is not a 90-degree angle at the corner such as a deck.

Mr. White:

- Asked if the middle four balconies should recess back, in line with the transition of materials.
- The northwest corner dynamic should be looked to.

Mr. Glazebrook explained the design thought process for the northeast corner and stated that the team believes that the chamfer expression above the second floor and up was the appropriate way to celebrate the angle.

- Mr. White stated that the corner could have something extra.

Mr. Glazebrook replied that more of a distinctive vertical recess showing off angles can be designed.

- Mr. White stated that masses should be developed further and that corners should go beyond the same window, more interesting and helping with the weight of the corner.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated liking round three and pulling balconies back, but also the suggestion of Mr. White regarding window pattern.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated liking round three.
- Ms. Monk stated that the current iteration of the northeast corner is top heavy, and the suggestion of Mr. White is good

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that the Board had commented previously that the lower balcony needed to be solid.

Ms. Monk:

- Suggested a gradual change in the balconies moving up floors.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that the textured accent material on the plane of the doors and not angled items helps the mass to be differentiated.
- Ms. Atvars stated that accent material only on the back wall also could help the chamfer, or the windows could be brought back to lighten the balcony areas.

Mr. White:

- Asked the applicant for feedback regarding what should be adjusted.

Mr. Tiscareno replied that adjustments and refinements would be made to the proposed design and described possible expressions and materials. The parapet had been heightened as the result of a Board comment to vary the roofline but can be reduced again.

Ms. Atvars summarized that the applicant team would prefer to refine as one mass and not per individual comments and suggestions to achieve goals. The applicant team agreed and described further possible changes.

Mr. Alexis Chartouni *with* Legacy Partners stated that the project is contingent on receiving the Site Plan Requirements (SPE) for groundbreaking. The CCR permit includes a shoring permit. An approval with conditions would allow the project to submit for SPE and to receive the CCR, shoring permit approval and groundbreaking.

Ms. Atvars stated that approving only one building or the other would not help the applicant to move forward faster.

Mr. White:

- Stated being okay with a conditional approval route, while encouraging the applicant to continue working proactively with the Board to resolve the remaining elements so that there is not a late time crunch to resolve.

Mr. Lee asked if the Board considers the changes minor or large enough to bring back over email and suggested that approval be conditioned upon coming back to the Board before the issuance of the Building Permit.

- Mr. White suggested that adjustments being made per comments be brought back to the Board via email with one final meeting for final approval.

Mr. Reynolds stated that the application is finishing up Technical review. DRB has the option to condition approval on bringing updates back before CCRs and Permits to allow flexibility and ensure the comments are heard and addressed.

Mr. Chartouni replied that the applicant would be comfortable coming back one more time to the Board to present the final iteration as a condition of approval.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that focusing on top issues now and further details later would be fine.

Mr. Chartouni replied agreement and assured the Board that the team is incentivized to complete design.

Mr. Krueger asked Ms. Atvars if approval could wait for the next presentation as the applicant has agreed to. Ms. Atvars reiterated that the applicant requires a formal recommendation in order to move forward to CCR. Mr. Reynolds stated that Ms. Atvars is correct, the Board approval conditions would need to be built into entitlements in order to move forward to CCR. Mr. Glazebrook replied that the applicant is submitting tomorrow. Mr. Chartouni stated that the CCR permit is ready to submit as well, pending SPE approval.

Mr. White asked the Board for clarification regarding a corner volume design change as a condition, and the Board replied that there was not a concern. Mr. White stated that the corner would then not need to be a part of a condition.

**MOTION by Ms. Monk to approve LAND-2020-00360 Redmond Square Buildings A and B as shown in Design Review Board materials dated 8-6-20 with the conditions that the applicant bring back prior to building permits options for the following:**

**Building A:**

- 1. Refining the penthouse areas**
- 2. Removing the green wall on western façade**

- 3. Windows/contrast within “beige” plane**
- 4. Northwest corner brick extension**
- 5. Scale of white scrim material**

**Building B:**

- 1. Southeast corner window layout**
- 2. Northeast corner mass reduction refinements**

**Further recommend to the Technical Committee approval of the Administrative Design Flexibilities (ADF) detailed in the Staff Memo dated 8-6-20. Further, the Private Open Space design departure is approved reducing the number of required balconies from 613 to 492, provided the applicant pays the fee-in-lieu for each required balcony not provided as described in RZC 21.62.020.E.3. This approval is also subject to the standard conditions as drafted in the staff memo.**

Mr. Reynolds asked that the third ADF be clarified in the Motion.

**Another condition for approval is that the third ADF will be considered when the applicant returns with final southeast corner Building A design. MOTION seconded by Mr. White. The MOTION passed unanimously.**

Mr. Reynolds sought clarification if the motion had been made that the project be brought back prior to the Building Permits. Ms. Atvars replied that a presentation to the Board prior to the Building Permit was addressed and is the intent.

**OTHER ITEMS**

Mr. Sticka stated that during the May 21, 2020 meeting, the Board reviewed Redmond City Center Tower B and the applicant had been given the opportunity to send the Board different design options. The applicant submitted options on June 25, 2020 but has only received feedback from two Board members, Mr. Krueger and Mr. White. The applicant would like to know if additional feedback would be forthcoming from remaining members for a level of certainty prior to returning. Ms. Monk stated that a reply would be forthcoming. Ms. Atvars stated that comment from Ms. Atvars would not occur due to an association with the applicant team. Mr. White asked Mr. Sticka to contact Mr. Liu and Mr. Sutton for an opportunity to comment.

Mr. Lee stated that the Mayor of Redmond would give a brief presentation at the 8-20-20 meeting

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY MR. WHITE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:32 P.M. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**RECORDING SECRETARY**