

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

August 15, 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, Ralph Martin,
Stephani Monk and Kevin Sutton

EXCUSED ABESENCES: Henry Liu and Shaffer White

STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Churchill, Elise Keim, David Lee, Scott Reynolds,
Aaron Ruffin 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.

CALL TO ORDER

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

Mr. Lee announced that Ms. Elise Keim would be the Design Review Board liaison in the absence of Mr. Lee.

Mr. Lee announced that the City Attorney would remain until a replacement is found which is allowed under code RMC-4.10.050B.

Mr. Lee asked the Board if a new Chairman should be elected at this meeting or if an election should wait until more Board members are available. Ms. Monk replied that an upcoming meeting with more members in attendance would be preferred. Feedback could also be collected off-line. The Board agreed. Mr. Krueger stated that the election should occur at the first meeting in September to avoid any issues regarding remaining in a position past the end of a term.

BRIEFING

Sound Transit

Neighborhood: City-wide

Description: 3.4-mile light rail extension from Overlake to Downtown Redmond

Location: City-wide

Applicant: Sound Transit

Staff Contact: David Lee, 425-556-2462 or dlee@redmond.gov and Jeff Churchill, 425-556-2492 or jchurchill@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee introduced Ms. Surpriya Kelkar *with* Sound Transit. Ms. Kelkar began by explaining station locations and describing renderings for context.

Mr. Churchill continued. The role of Mr. Churchill was to work on the development of the project requests for proposals, which Sound Transit published in November 2018, as well as to work on a number of interlocal agreements with Sound Transit. One is particularly relevant to the Design Review Board: the Project Administration Agreement which was executed in January 2019. The agreement includes the project Permitting Framework to help with efficiency and clarity regarding expectations.

Project-specific tools have been developed for reviews such as a project-specific design standards checklists and graphics defining where Site Plan Entitlement review applies. The entire set of design standards in the code was reviewed to determine what would apply to the Sound Transit project. The checklist has also been given to the design builder so that expectations are known.

Design Review Board input is requested regarding screening the garage façade and the plaza area that is not a part of the station platform. Fixed standards (i.e. platform canopies, foundation pillars, guideways, etc.) are part of the transportation system rather than typical vertical development, and are not subject to design review. An ending architectural piece at the end of the track will be a part of the Design Review Board review at the downtown station. A diagram of the site has been provided as an attachment to the staff memo that shows the areas of DRB's review.

When the Sound Transit 3 Plan was being developed before the November 2016 election, the original delivery date for this project was 2028. Because Puget Sound voters preferred a faster delivery, the schedule was accelerated to 2024. To accommodate the new aggressive schedule, the Board will need to thoroughly review materials prior to meetings, be ready with questions and comments, focusing only on the areas which will require Design Review Board review. Clear direction will be needed for designers. The design builders and Sound Transit are expected to provide high-quality, clear code compliant materials; to listen intently to Board questions and

comments, and to give comprehensive responses to questions and comments. Clear and timely staff reports will be provided.

APPROVAL

LAND-2019-00730 Microsoft Refresh – Sammamish Village

Neighborhood: Overlake

Description: One of four new villages planned for the Microsoft Redmond Campus

Location: East side of 156th Avenue Northeast between Northeast 31st Street and Northeast 36th Street

Applicant: Michael Huey *with* CBRE

Prior Review: February 21, 2019

Staff Contact: Aaron Ruffin, 425-556-2925 or aruffin@redmond.gov

Mr. Ruffin reviewed that the project consists of four buildings and a central utility plant. Staff has reviewed materials and find that these meet the intent, goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and code. The recommendation is for approval.

Mr. Jeff Rovegno *with* Microsoft introduced colleague Mr. Adam Gretz (not on sign-in sheet).

Mr. Dale Alberda *with* NBBJ Architects provided a refresh on the overall concept of the village and changes to the Plan. The MLUE was approved on August 2, 2019. What is being called the Sammamish Spine connects all three buildings, a strong connection to the portal or the link to all parking, and Building 212. Human scale connected to the forested area and unique amenities have been focused on in design.

The first comment from the Board at the February 21, 2019 meeting was regarding how building materiality ties in with the Village concept. The exterior material palette and shading were reviewed. Inspiration is drawn from not leaves but bark; photographs were digitized and pixelized to create a rationale for color and texture of each of the four native trees on-site for sun shades. Rather than each of the four buildings representing one tree, the mixture found in a forest was desired although a predominant color is on each building.

Another comment had been to be careful to avoid façade repetitions. The comment resulted in thoughtfulness in the design. Further comment had been around the two-story rooms being differentiated more at roof-level. A roof terrace has been created with a unique architectural expression. A concern had been that rotating the atriums might cause these to become dark so lighting conditions have been improved. Detail on renderings continued to be described.

The Bike Rotunda on Northeast 31st Street is shaped intentionally differently to emphasize that Microsoft puts a high-priority on bicycle commuting. Materiality is glass around the perimeter and wood salvaged from the site.

Building 216 is the Central Utility Plant (CUP) which will provide all energy for the Campus Refresh, seventeen new buildings, and sits at the end of Sammamish Village. A viewing porch will allow visitors to see into CUP operations through a large window. All equipment will be painted a single color.

Physical samples of materials were displayed.

A question regarding how the amenity space location was decided on had been asked. There is a grand amenity plan across the campus for balance in both energy centers and other centers, the intention being that employees will explore other areas of the campus rather than staying in one building for lunch, in example.

Renderings were further described. Green roofs are at lower levels to be seen from above.

A question had been if amenities could be more organic in geometry. The forest connection has been achieved and there is also harmony with the architecture above.

Mr. Krueger thanked Mr. Alberda for the detail and material breakdown.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Atvars:

- Appreciated that Board comments had been addressed.
- Ms. Atvars asked if pixilation of perforated metal panel on the CUP was derived from the bark study.

Mr. Alberda replied that the intention is for variation in pattern on the wall, possibly a larger scale abstraction of the same pattern.

- Ms. Atvars asked if there is repetition in materiality on other buildings.

Mr. Alberda replied that the CUP building is a very different and unique function than the other buildings, not an office building. Form is consistent with the surroundings but material distinguishes the function intentionally.

Mr. Martin:

- Stated that all questions had been answered by the presentation.
- [Inaudible]
- Mr. Martin appreciated the physical samples and the idea of bark textures.
- Mr. Martin asked how walkways would be articulated.

Mr. Alberda deferred a reply to the next presentation when landscape would be presented. The intent will be to clearly distinguish the spine.

- Mr. Martin stated that the project looked great, very distinct, powerful and clear in design intent.

Ms. Monk:

- Appreciated that Board comments had been incorporated and concerns addressed.
- Ms. Monk liked the roof terrace.
- Ms. Monk agreed that seeing through to other Living Rooms helps bring interest to passers-by.
- Ms. Monk appreciated the use of trees from the original site.
- Ms. Monk liked tying colors in on the CUP building.
- Ms. Monk stated that the presentation was great.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that while the CUP building was presented for approval at this meeting, the building had not been seen before.
- Mr. Sutton did not believe elements of the CUP had been fully resolved.
- Mr. Sutton stated that massing and form were fine but details should have been addressed before this presentation.
- Mr. Sutton stated that some element could speak to the rest of the campus, even though the function is different.
- Mr. Sutton stated seeing more on the CUP building would be desired before approval.

Mr. Krueger asked staff if the approval motion could include four buildings, holding CUP final approval until the next presentation with more detail. Ms. Keim replied yes, that the conditions need to be very clear in the Motion.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the presentation was great.
- Mr. Krueger agreed with Mr. Sutton that the CUP building needs to come back with more detail for final approval.
- Mr. Krueger had questions regarding the perforation sheet on the building.
- Mr. Krueger asked what material would be exposed at a jog-out on Building 212.

Mr. Alberda replied metal panel and pointed the material out on the physical material panel.

Mr. Martin:

- Stated that as the CUP building would be presented again, further screening and landscaping details were desired.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked to know if there would be noise concerns and mitigation strategies around the CUP building given the utility structure in the next presentation.

MOTION BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE LAND-2019-00730 Microsoft Refresh – Sammamish Village WITH STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR INCONSISTENCIES IN DOCUMENTS AND WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE CUP BUILDING COME BACK TO THE BOARD FOR REVIEW AGAIN WITH MORE DETAIL ON SCREENING, LANDSCAPING AND NOISE CONCERNS. MOTION SECONDED BY MS. MONK. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL

LAND-2018-01083, Modera Overlake

Neighborhood: Overlake

Description: New multi-family residential building with 246 units and associated leasing office, resident amenity areas, parking and exterior courtyard.

Location: 15260 and 15248 Bel-Red Road

Applicant: Darrell Turner *with* GGLO Designs

Prior Review: 03/15/18, 11/01/18, 02/07/19 and 06/20/19

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

Mr. Reynolds stated that the Applicant is asking for Design Review Board support and recommendation for Administrative Design Flexibility (ADF) regarding weather protection on Northeast 21st Street and Bel-Red Road. Staff recommends approval for both the project and ADF.

Mr. Steve Yu *with* Mill Creek Residential stated that comments from the last presentation had been incorporated.

Mr. James Bradley, Principal *with* GGLO Designs and Mr. PJ Benenati, Landscape Architect *with* GGLO Designs stated their presence. Mr. Bradley stated appreciation for City staff for the support in design refinements made to date. A general overview was displayed in renderings.

Refinements include work on the corner massing expression. More consistency and refinement had been desired and more expression in the roof and soffit from street-level have been designed. Reformatting of modulation on lower levels creates more simplicity, consistency and symmetry. A column was removed and a stronger interaction was created with retail space and the pedestrian environment outside.

The deviation request that the colonnade have a higher ceiling than 15 feet will give greater visual access to the retail space and invite people to move through. Materials, finishes and design will create a stronger pedestrian experience. The next refinement commented on was a reconsideration of material transitions and the comment has been incorporated.

At the residential entry and south building return there is now a full height expression of dark metal. The in-plane transition was displayed. A comment regarding consistency and clarity on a return element was incorporated.

Mr. Benenati continued with the need for an urban presence in the neighborhood. A decision was made to hold the grade at the intersection of Bel-Red Road and Northeast 21st Street for commercial space and the weather protected terrace, slightly raised from the busy streets. Concrete, lighting and movable furniture are being considered. A space for art will exist and local artists are being contacted for a Redmond focused art element.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked if there is a change of plain up a vertical outside corner.

Mr. Benenati replied that the corner is consistent to the roof deck.

- Mr. Sutton agreed with the changes proposed.

Ms. Atvars:

- Agreed with the changes.
- Ms. Atvars liked the additional plaza development.
- Ms. Atvars asked about the continuousness of canopy coverage along sidewalks.

Mr. Benenati replied the path is direct access to the plaza but not the streetscape.

- Ms. Atvars was okay with the path if staff has no concerns.

Mr. Martin:

- Asked how people will be able to move through the walkway.

Mr. Benenati replied there is 14 feet of covered walkway, wide enough for movable furniture and pedestrian traffic.

- Mr. Martin asked about an accessible path to the courtyard.

Mr. Benenati replied that there is not an accessible route of travel directly to the courtyard but rather vertical circulation within the building structure is required for access. A stair is for convenience and not a primary means of circulation for the building. The plaza space is an amenity for retail.

- Mr. Martin asked about security for the residents.

Mr. Benenati replied that there will be a fence and gate at the top of the stairs, electronically controlled for entry.

Mr. Reynolds clarified that the project was under a Site Plan Entitlement review and that ADA review would occur during the Building Permit review.

- Mr. Martin stated that those were the only questions.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked if the art will be reviewed by the Arts Commission or privately developed.

Mr. Reynolds replied privately developed, and an option as a condition is an art component.

Mr. Krueger commented that art would be an enhancement of the plaza and not a stand-alone requirement.

Ms. Monk:

- Agreed with all Board comments and appreciated changes made.
- Ms. Monk liked that the column had been removed to open the area.
- Ms. Monk liked the dramatic roof jetting out and contrasting colors for the façade.

Mr. Krueger:

- Agreed and stated the project had come along way.
- Mr. Krueger appreciated the change in the corner.
- Mr. Krueger asked for clarification regarding the three different brick colors.

Mr. Benenati replied that three different colors were to create a modulated look and blend versus a flat color, building texture into the color of the brick.

- Mr. Krueger stated that a rendering with more of the wall would have been helpful but understood the intent of framing.

MOTION BY MS. MONK TO APPROVE THE ADF LISTED IN THE MEMO PROVIDED BY STAFF FOR LAND-2018-01083, MODERA OVERLAKE, WITH STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR INCONSISTENCIES. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2019-00585, Proctor Willows

Neighborhood: Willows/Rose Hill

Description: Development of townhouse and mixed-use residential building construction with associated open space, recreation space, roads, trails and utilities.

Location: Southwest corner of Northeast 124th Street and Willows Road Northeast

Applicant: Bonnie Geers *with* Quadrant Homes

Prior Review: 06/20/19

Staff Contact: Benjamin Sticka, 425-556-2470 or bsticka@redmond.gov

Mr. Sticka stated that the project had been before the Board previously in respect to a Development Agreement and Master Plan which was approved; approximately 174 townhomes located in 32 buildings on approximately 9.1 acres of the approximately 15-acre site. Staff and the Applicant request guidance from the Board regarding variety in materiality, color palette, LEED building techniques and green space opportunities.

Mr. Keith McClosky *with* KTG Y described renderings in detail. Topography drives the design. Three architectural styles within the project include Metropolitan Modern, Modern Agrarian and Transitional.

Mr. Nick Hagan *with* Weisman Design Group continued with open space and described renderings. A sports court has been added at the request of the Parks department and other amenities are being considered for the lawn area. There is ADA access to Northeast 124th Street. Pathways were described. Topography allows more garden areas in certain parts of the project. The plant palette will be native groupings with the character of the ravine; in garden courts there will be more variety and ornamentals

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Monk:

- Agreed with staff request for a variation in the color palette.
- Ms. Monk noticed that both Metropolitan Modern and Modern Agrarian styles are very horizontal and mixing with vertical or flat material could be positive.
- Ms. Monk asked why the activity area is located close to a major intersection.

Mr. McClosky replied that the area is elevated and there will be vertical and landscape separation from the street. Stormwater detention vaults are present as well.

- Ms. Monk suggested that good fencing be included to keep children from running into the street for balls, in example.
- Ms. Monk asked if the front doors of end units could be positioned more on the side.

Mr. McClosky replied that some have already been introduced at the end of the fourplex daylight. End units on the trail could be rotated.

Mr. Martin:

- Suggested a mixture of horizontal and vertical siding, particularly in the Metropolitan Modern areas.
- Mr. Martin stated that an opportunity had been missed [inaudible].
- Mr. Martin asked if a material was wood siding.

Mr. McClosky replied a stained fiber cement product.

- Mr. Martin asked if concrete would be pervious to control drainage.
- [Inaudible question]

Mr. McClosky replied phase two.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that one elevation in particular was very interesting and what the Board looks for.

Mr. McClosky replied yes, more detail-developed.

- Ms. Atvars stated that what was desired was to avoid looking like one palette across the hillside.
- Ms. Atvars asked that perspective views be brought to the next presentation.
- Ms. Atvars stated that in one rendering two of the same type of buildings face each other and mirroring could be avoided with different materials or swapping another corner unit style.
- Ms. Atvars agreed with the Board on more color variation in accents.
- Ms. Atvars stated that trees with different colors and textures would be helpful.
- Ms. Atvars stated that all buildings appeared to have the same roof shingle color and style and suggested variety.

Mr. Sutton:

- Was struggling with Modern and Agrarian and asked for clarification regarding the pitch on the roof.

Mr. McClosky replied four and twelve.

- Mr. Sutton stated that sometimes the roofs are pitched steeper and current design feels flat. Other buildings have interesting roof form that anchors the corners. A metal roof or changing the pitch could help.
- Mr. Sutton stated that landscape and the building to the north should be softened.
- Mr. Sutton suggested using a natural wood material on the first entry level.

Mr. Krueger:

- Agreed with Ms. Atvars that a pulled back perspective would be appreciated.
- Mr. Krueger suggested villages with particular color palettes.
- Mr. Krueger looked forward to a feature at the northwest corner mentioned in the Master Plan.

Mr. McClosky replied that the feature had not been developed yet.

- Mr. Krueger suggested renderings showing specific diversity around different buildings and courtyards.
- Mr. Krueger asked for renderings of buildings along the spine to see entries and driveways, and how elevation is broken up while driving down the street.
- Mr. Krueger suggested using a variety of brighter colors.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2018-01323, Woodside

Neighborhood: Southeast Redmond

Description: Construction of 170 homes with mixed-use townhomes and condominiums.

Location: 7041 – 196th Avenue Northeast

Applicant: Nick Abdelnour *with* Polygon WLH, LLC

Prior Review: 01/17/19 and 04/04/19

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

Mr. Krueger recused and Mr. Sutton led the agenda item.

Mr. Lee stated that the only staff comments were regarding missing renderings of the bus and picnic shelters which both staff and the Board had asked to be brought to this presentation. As the project is a Type 5 permit, ultimate approval will be made by City Council and the Design Review Board will only forward a recommendation of approval of design. The project has not yet submitted a formal application.

Mr. Richard Rawlings *with* Polygon Northwest stated that a bus shelter, picnic shelter and planting around the picnic shelter would be addressed as well as a comment regarding additional study of the transition zone on the south property line between the single-family community and the project. A new color scheme would also be presented.

The picnic shelter, 20' x 24' with fixed benches, has a tiered roof with an open-air piece between two roof layers and will either be two or three sides depending on how the plaza is developed. Lawn will be surrounded by shrubs. The color is an ocean blue with off-white posts.

For the bus shelter, durable panels such as frosted glass are proposed. Ownership is to be determined.

In the transition zone, yards are 15' and a buffer zone is 15'. Buildings are at the same foundation elevation. There is a trail connection between the two communities. Renderings were described. A dense and ornamental landscape is proposed.

The old color scheme was blue-gray; the new color scheme was displayed and is a more golden color.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Monk:

- Appreciated the updated renderings and color schemes.
- Ms. Monk asked if someone could speak to ownership and maintenance of the bus shelter.

Mr. Lee replied that the bus shelter was a public benefit for the City as part of the Development Agreement and would be owned and maintained by the Homeowner's Association. Mr. Rawlings asked if this would be the case if a City shelter were financed by the project and Mr. Lee replied that the project would need to maintain the shelter for the perpetuity of the building.

- Ms. Monk liked the mix of planting and suggested 25-30% of taller trees rather than 20% proposed to increase privacy and wildlife habitat.
- Ms. Monk liked the picnic shelter and was okay if other color options were considered.

Mr. Martin:

- Agreed with Ms. Monk.
- Mr. Martin suggested that screens be perforated metal or durable polycarbonate.
- Mr. Martin suggested that the picnic shelter be larger.
- Mr. Martin liked the colors.
- [Inaudible]
- Mr. Martin liked the mix of vegetation.

Ms. Atvars:

- Agreed with the Board on the majority of comments.
- Ms. Atvars agreed with Mr. Martin that the picnic shelter should be larger with more standing room.
- Ms. Atvars liked the small wall around the previously built picnic shelter on another project shown and recommended the same language for the bus shelter.

Mr. Rawlings replied that because the bus shelter is so close to the right-of-way, metro standards were followed.

- Ms. Atvars asked for more detail regarding plantings and site detailing.
- Ms. Atvars asked for clarification regarding a teal color in larger renderings but not on the color palette.

Mr. Rawlings replied that while the rendering appears teal, the actual color is a dusty light blue. A sample can be brought to the next presentation.

- Ms. Atvars recommended picking up the language elsewhere and hoped to see renderings reflect the proposed palettes more closely. A bolder blue could be used.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that the part that sticks up on top of the shelter is too tall and should be flatter.
- Mr. Sutton would be fine with a simpler design for the bus shelter.
- Mr. Sutton suggested pushing the benches of the picnic shelter to the perimeter to allow more standing space.
- Mr. Sutton stated more detail on landscaping, particularly in the buffer, would be needed before a recommendation could be given.

Mr. Krueger asked for a Motion to extend the meeting past 10:00 p.m. to 10:30 p.m.

MOTION BY MR. SUTTON TO EXTEND THE MEETING TO 10:30 P.M. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. MARTIN. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2019-00558, The Osprey

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: New mixed-use multi-family six-story building containing approximately 88 residential units, 2,700 square feet of commercial, residential lobby and amenity space

Location: 7430 – 159th Place Northeast

Applicant: Doug Pernerl *with* PemReal Advisors

Staff Contact: Elise Keim, 425-556-2480 or ekeim@redmond.gov

Ms. Keim stated that the applicants were present at the meeting for early design guidance. Staff is seeking specific feedback on materials, rooflines and proposed building shape seen in the early stage, how the building will address the Heron Rookery Trail and if modulation on 159th Place Northeast is sufficient.

Mr. Ryan Doone *with* HKS Architects stated that design reaction to the environment will result in a building with a feel of the land, and reaction to the diversity of architectural

styles in Redmond will be to have both a foot in the past and a modern touch. Local flow and annual energy consumption are being studied. A large 6' x 12' balcony is proposed for each unit for maximum ventilation. Redmond zoning code building height and massing requirements will be followed.

The concept is to find a way to re-interpret in a contemporary way existing pre-conditions unique to the place. Studying Coast Salish longhouse structures, a strong horizontal expression with moments of vertical articulation and an emphasis on the entry condition exists and this has been applied to the building. The history of Redmond and the logging industry indicate simple and strong roof forms, an articulated façade and texture in materials. Because of the corner location, an iconic element can symbolize the gateway entry to Redmond. Renderings of the site were described.

Ms. Kristen Lundquist *with* Brumbaugh & Associates continued with landscape elements. Large trees sit between the building and the trail defining the character of the edge, and this character will be reinforced.

Mr. Doone described further renderings.

Ms. Lundquist stated that there is a requirement for stormwater along the Rookery Trail and this will sit between the trail and the building. In addition, vertical landscape will occur at the building base to soften the edge. A substantial roof deck is a strong amenity taking advantage of views, solar access and moving activity and noise away from The Carter. A significant landscape component will occur on terraces to the east and north. Native plant materials will tie in with architectural character and connect to the context. More detail regarding the plant palette will be given at the next presentation.

Mr. Martin:

- Stated the site was challenging.
- Mr. Martin liked the reference to the longhouse tradition.
- Mr. Martin suggested further aspects be added to the material palette.
- [Inaudible]
- Mr. Martin stated that materials should be dynamic.
- Mr. Martin appreciated design concepts.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated being excited to see the site developed.
- Ms. Atvars stated that neighboring projects, The Carter and The Heron, have very successfully connected to the pedestrian space; upper terraces could have an exposed stair connection for residents to arrive at the trail.

- Ms. Atvars asked to see more detail on developing the 159th Place Northeast pedestrian experience; the entire community would appreciate that connection. Understanding space available, canopy coverage and spaces imagined in the commercial corner should be brought to the next presentation.
- Ms. Atvars agreed with the suggestion of Mr. Martin for the material palette, and suggested incorporating more metallic aspects for a more purposeful articulation.
- Ms. Atvars asked to see more material details.

Mr. Sutton:

- Believed that site may not accommodate the concept but there could be a path.
- Mr. Sutton suggested that the residential portion could step back to create relief.
- Mr. Sutton asked for clarification regarding many details such as the purpose of columns at ground level.
- Mr. Sutton asked to see iterations of how massing was arrived at.

Ms. Monk:

- Liked the exploration into Longhouse concepts.
- Ms. Monk stated that the right side of the building could use more ideas.
- Ms. Monk stated that the large balconies would set the project apart from other units in town.
- Ms. Monk suggested lightening vertical elements unless the lighting in renderings was inaccurate.

Mr. Doone asked which vertical elements were referred to and Ms. Monk replied in-between the balconies.

- Ms. Monk liked the dramatic first floor for a great first impression.

Mr. Krueger:

- Agreed with Ms. Monk that the right side of the building needs more work.
- Mr. Krueger was confused about some proportions.
- Mr. Krueger agreed with Ms. Atvars regarding examining The Carter and The Heron for ideas.
- Mr. Krueger suggested more contemporary forms to the south.

Mr. Martin:

- Suggested modern yet aged looking material, such as copper.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY MS. MONK TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:32 P.M. MOTION
SECONDED BY MS. ATVARIS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

October 3, 2109
MINUTES APPROVED ON

Carolyn Gaza
RECORDING SECRETARY