

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

September 5, 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, Kevin Sutton and Shaffer White

EXCUSED ABESENCES: Henry Liu, Ralph Martin and Stephanie Monk

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Fischer, Elise Keim, Gary Lee, Sarah Pyle, Scott Reynolds and Cameron Zapata, 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. Krueger stated that a new Chairperson needed to be elected at this time. Mr. Krueger has reached the term limit of the position and will continue as a Board member until a replacement is found.

MOTION BY MR. KRUEGER TO NOMINATE MR. SUTTON FOR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD CHAIRPERSON. MOTION SECONDED BY MS. ATVARS. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Sutton accepted the position.

MOTION BY MR. KRUEGER TO NOMINATE MS. ATVARS FOR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD VICE CHAIRPERSON. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WHITE. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Ms. Atvars accepted the position.

Ms. Keim stated that new time constraints were in effect. Applicant presentations for approval are limited to 10 minutes. Applicant presentations for pre-application are limited to 15 minutes. Staff will keep time and applicants will be made aware when close to the end of the time allowed.

Mr. Sutton continued the meeting.

APPROVAL

LAND-2019-00766 Microsoft Refresh – Garage Portals

Neighborhood: Overlake

Description: Administrative modification to add surface level portals to previously approved underground garage

Location: Microsoft Refresh Main Campus

Applicant: Microsoft

Prior Review: 02/21/19 (Pre-Application for Refresh Project)

Staff Contact: Gary lee, 425-556-2418 or glee@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee stated that staff recommended approval with standard conditions for inconsistencies.

Mr. Rafael Viñoly-Menendez, Architect *with* LMN Architects, explained renderings of the development of the garage portals. The design elements are critical to the gateway concept; access, daylight and ventilation into below-grade spaces, landscape elements into the lower levels and timber construction as a unifying element. A material board demonstrated a simple palette. Timber salvaged from the site can hopefully be utilized. Wayfinding graphics will be an important overlay.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that questions had been answered.
- Mr. Krueger liked the variety of materials and lighting.

Mr. White:

- Asked about a discrepancy in a slide shown.

Mr. Viñoly-Menendez replied that there was an error on the slide.

- Asked about landscaping in the Chelan Village.

Mr. Viñoly-Menendez replied that because the plaza and Whatcom portals are along the perimeter of the garage edge, there are true retaining walls. Landscape can be introduced in a thinner perimeter edge element.

- Mr. White asked if there would be an opportunity to continue columns to lower levels, not for a structural purpose but for a preview of above.
- Mr. White liked the Sammamish Village timbers.

Ms. Atvars:

- Recalled a rolling hill to the ground plain in the original design and asked for clarification regarding the change.

Mr. Viñoly-Menendez replied that the original idea was that the area could be walked on, but accessibility is needed for all. Completely detaching eliminated all access. Elevation drove the conceptual shift.

- Ms. Atvars asked about drainage and gutter systems, specifically in Whatcom Village.

Mr. Viñoly-Menendez replied roofs slope and gutters are captured in the detail. In Whatcom Village there is a fairly minimal slope compared to the other Villages.

- Ms. Atvars stated that the gutters were difficult to decipher in renderings. Staff should stay aware towards avoiding a thick gutter element.

Mr. Viñoly-Menendez replied that all are run towards the elevator shaft.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked for more clarification regarding the elevator shaft.

Mr. Viñoly-Menendez replied that there is a chase that extends the length of the elevator bank and displayed a rendering.

- Mr. Sutton agreed with Ms. Atvars that staff should remain aware regarding the gutters.
- Mr. Sutton asked if everyone was comfortable with the amount of overhang for wind-driven rain.

Mr. Viñoly-Menendez replied that edge protection is a challenge with timber.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the first two were strong but the last two not as strong.

MOTION BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE LAND-2019-00766 Microsoft Refresh – Garage Portals WITH STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR INCONSISTENCIES. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WHITE. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL

LAND-2019-00839, Microsoft Refresh – Chelan Village MLUE

Neighborhood: Overlake

Description: Two four-story office buildings

Location: Microsoft Refresh Main Campus

Applicant: Microsoft

Staff Contact: Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or glee@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee stated that while design has come a long way and staff recommends approval, there is one condition suggested that at the time of the Certificate of Occupancy, plantings in front of a blank wall be examined to determine what is surviving and the addition of further landscaping if needed.

Mr. Rus Sherman *with* WRNS Studio stated that Chelan Village is the smallest village with only two buildings, one workplace building and one Global Engagement Center (GEC) building. The GEC is where Microsoft will bring clientele from around the world. The project sits on the border of the campus edge and legacy forest, and the nickname for the project has become the Forest Portal. Renderings were displayed.

Five factors have been used to create the project; the pastoral drive, garden wall, forest portal, earth and sky and connectivity to the forest. The pastoral drive is a road through the existing forest. The garden wall is a hand-laid stone wall forming the understory of both buildings. The forest portal is created by the overlap of Buildings J and K. Earth and sky were not discussed in the presentation due to presentation time constraints. Connectivity to the outside is a critical part of the project with views from the connecting bridge. An indoor hanging garden is in the shape of Lake Chelan. Materials recall the Pacific Northwest and include black basalt, three different types of glass and copper anodized metal as an accent. Elevations were displayed.

The walls mentioned by Mr. Lee are a part of multi-purpose rooms that require solid wall. A comment regarding the roofline has been addressed by breaking up to enhance the scale.

Although the presentation time had been used, Mr. Sutton requested that the landscape renderings be described. Mr. Sherman continued to display views around the project.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. White:

- Asked for clarification regarding cladding on Building J.

Mr. Sherman replied that the understory of the building is the garden wall and made of hand-set adhered limestone and basalt panels. There are two different types of glazing; acuity glass and crystal grey solar glass. Copper anodized vertical fins project out eight-inches to create an implied plane. There is play with light and depth, color of the glass and copper.

- Mr. White asked if the grooves would be evenly spaced.

Mr. Sherman replied yes, evenly spaced.

- Mr. White asked about smooth and grooved areas.

Mr. Sherman replied that the grooves are ¼" at 3" on center.

- Mr. White asked to see fin detail on Building K.

Mr. Sherman replied that wood may be becoming copper. Further texture details were described.

- Mr. White hoped that there would not be a discernable pattern but rather the feeling that each is a unique piece.
- Mr. white felt good about Building K but because of the speed of the approval process was not as confident regarding Building J.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked if there were more fin details available.

Mr. Sherman replied that two manufacturers had been contacted. The twist has been designed by engineers.

- Mr. Krueger agreed with Mr. White that the building had come along way since the last presentation to the Board.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the project looked strong.

- Mr. Krueger asked about roof equipment screening.

Mr. Sherman replied that the v-grooved panel will catch light in different ways at different times of the day. Building J, in addition to housing mechanical systems, is taking venting from the kitchen and the garage. The goal is to have roof equipment blend into the sky.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that the Board had had more time to discuss other village projects over multiple presentations and that the presentation gave the Board a lot to process since the last visit.
- Ms. Atvars did not see past comments addressed in the current proposal.
- Ms. Atvars liked the wall concept but the renderings are not representing well and materials are not reading.
- Ms. Atvars stated that the wall heights were taller than the inspiration design.
- Ms. Atvars stated that function is different than the inspiration in scale.
- Ms. Atvars stated being concerned regarding the fins on Building K and that more detail was needed for a deviation for roof modulation; Ms. Atvars asked for clarification regarding height.

Mr. Sherman replied that the height is not deviating; the elevation has enough deviation across. The building does not front the public way. There is enough variation in overall elevation to allay concerns about there not being enough massing change.

- Ms. Atvars asked for clarification regarding what is behind the blank walls.

Mr. Sherman displayed the Plans and replied that these are a series of three sub-dividable multi-purpose rooms where walls can retract to create one large meeting space. Because of audio-visual equipment and the way the rooms are used, puncturing walls with openings is problematic. The exhibition area is punctuated with openings. The area will be carefully landscaped.

- Ms. Atvars stated that the Landscape Architect should provide more detail to the Board on how the wall will be addressed on the record.

Mr. Brad McGuirt (*not on sign-in sheet*) with Berger Partnership replied that trees to the right of the building are large conifers and more will be planted into the space.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked what the depth of a planter would be.

Mr. McGuirt replied 15 to 18' in depth which may be expanded. There is good grade, local soils, room to grow and good sunlight. There can be layering of the landscape with flowering and/or deciduous trees with the backdrop of large conifers.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that questions had been answered.
- Ms. Atvars stated that the building would be welcoming people from all over the world and the building, more than any others, needs to be particularly attractive from all sides despite no street frontage.
- Ms. Atvars stated that Building K is strong but more interesting and dynamic design purpose could be built into Building J. Ms. Atvars asked what the inspiration behind Building J design was.

Mr. Sherman replied that Building J is a workplace while Building K is an outward building for visitors. Building J was intended to be a very subtle play of materiality and texture while creating a form that brings landscape into the buildings. The ground plane of Building J weaves and allows the landscape to engage within the internal workplace-focused building. Amenity space always comes out to garden space. The two buildings work in concert on the ground plane. Material placement was discussed in further detail.

- Ms. Atvars stated that the ground plane between the two buildings was very successful.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated being comfortable with the presentation and trusting that details will be worked out.

Mr. White:

- Replied that given the scope of this project, more pre-applications would have been preferred. Some details are still unclear but Mr. White was comfortable with what was presented. Mr. White recommended adding a condition to Approval that staff would have the option to review the planter depth outside of the multi-purpose room.

Mr. Krueger:

- Agreed with Mr. White
- Mr. Krueger stated that this may be a good example of why presentations should not be time-limited and discussion of deeper detail would have been preferred.

Mr. Sherman replied that many details were in the Earth and Sky portion of the presentation which was removed due to the time limit.

- Mr. Krueger was comfortable with an additional condition to Approval.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated not being comfortable with Approval with so many questions unanswered. Important design moves may be reading differently in renderings than will be built.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked if another presentation could be brought.

Mr. Lee replied that there would be another opportunity in two weeks.

Mr. Sherman replied that whatever information the City needs would be provided. Final construction details would not be clear for another five to six months. Some information can be ready for another presentation, however.

Mr. Eric Ragde, Development Manager *with* Microsoft, stated another presentation can be made.

- Mr. Sutton listed further questions which, when answered, would present a better picture for the Board.
- Mr. Sutton hoped to see how buildings would appear in the evening, including up lighting or downlighting, to expose any opportunities or concerns.

Mr. Krueger:

- Agreed that another presentation should be made answering questions.

Mr. White:

- Expressed specific questions.

Mr. Sherman asked when drawings would be required in order to be included in the next meeting. Staff replied early next week.

FORMAL APPLICATION REVIEW

LAND-2019-00658, Avalon Redmond Campus

Neighborhood: Overlake

Description: Demo five buildings containing 48 apartments and construct one new building with 214 apartments and approximately 280 associated parking spaces adjacent or within the structure

Location: 15606 Northeast 40th Street

Applicant: Derek Bottles *with* AvalonBay Communities, Inc.

Prior Review: 03/07/19

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

Mr. Reynolds stated that additional Board feedback was asked for regarding gateway design, massing, podium transition and compliance.

Mr. Derek Bottles *with* AvalonBay Communities, Inc., owner and applicant, stated that improvements had been requested at the first presentation and these have been incorporated into the revised design. The goal for this presentation is to receive Approval for materials and final input from the Board of further refinements for the next overall Approval presentation.

Mr. Dave Maul *with* RMA Architects continued with a brief overview of the project. Design changes since the last presentation include enhancing the building entry, increased modulation on 156th Avenue Northeast and the podium transition with architectural finish concrete. Planters are bioretention swales for stormwater. No deviations are requested.

Mr. Mark Brumbaugh, Landscape Architect *with* Brumbaugh & Associates, stated that at the last presentation more urban character and strong connectivity to light rail across the street was requested and design changes were described. A dog walk has been added. A new wide sidewalk along 156th Avenue Northeast will have a bike repair station as an amenity. Along Northeast 40th Street, landscaping will be natural and informal. There is a green roof with seating and amenities.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked if existing street trees will remain.

Mr. Brumbaugh replied that the trees will be replaced. The project requires a new multi-use 10' sidewalk and there will be new street trees on both frontages.

- Ms. Atvars would support concrete with an architectural finish but asked for clarification regarding painting of concrete in places.

Mr. Maul described a rendering. Painting would only be at ground level corners.

- Ms. Atvars hoped that execution is successful where hardy panel is transitioned to above and that concrete finish would be fine compared to paint.

Mr. Maul agreed and replied that the paint was in response to previous comments.

- Ms. Atvars asked if exposed concrete was on the same plane and if there is a shadow line.

Mr. Maul replied that there is a cantilever above.

- Ms. Atvars stated that in a courtyard, artistic screen with plants could be added.

Mr. Maul replied that some plants were not included in renderings so that the building could be seen, but agreed. There is ample space.

- Ms. Atvars asked that renderings of these areas with options should be brought to the next presentation.
- Ms. Atvars cautioned to examine how trim works on corners and asked why plank siding does not continue to the top level.

Mr. Maul replied that the desire was for the top level to be different. Decks stick out further over the top of the column, and a beam will be cantilevered in future design for a larger deck on top as a point.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the 15' inset towards the soffits was successful.
- Mr. White was not in favor of a 6' bump out and would prefer the same 15' inset to occur here as well, for corner punctuation.

Mr. Maul replied that the courtyards could become too small.

- Mr. White was not in favor of a grey mass and stated that the area needs more interest if remaining on the same plane.

- Mr. White asked for additional roof modulation.
- Mr. White believed a gateway statement would benefit the project.
- Mr. White would like more development of the concrete wall.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked for clarification regarding the organization of design as the street elevation does not appear to have an overall theme or intent on 156th Avenue Northeast.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the long wall heading from the southwest corner along Northeast 40th Street could benefit from change.
- Mr. Krueger asked for renderings of corners in more detail.
- Mr. Krueger asked for more detail regarding exposed concrete.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that the ground floor still feels recessed back.

Mr. Maul replied that a canopy projects out but that more detailed views would be provided.

- Mr. Sutton was concerned about the lap siding columns and stated that panel may be more successful.
- Mr. Sutton stated that concrete should be consistent and not carry paint down in a particular location. A change of plane of concrete could be successful.
- Mr. Sutton hoped to see more detail regarding concrete.
- Mr. Sutton stated that if all are within the same plane the finish can be brought down, but if there is a change in plane the concrete should be consistent across.
- Mr. Sutton stated that landscaping could be brought into the 15' recess.

Mr. Maul summarized what the Board had asked for and the Board agreed. Mr. Sutton suggested that the comments be focused on at the next presentation and that the overall project would not require as much detail in the next presentation.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2019-00136, Building X

Neighborhood: Willows/Rose Hill

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

Location: 10301 Willows Road Northeast

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

Prior Review: 03/21/19 and 07/11/19

Staff Contact: Cameron Zapata, 425-556-2411 or czapata@redmond.gov

Ms. Zapata stated that the project was a Site Plan Entitlement for a 350,000 square foot building and associated parking. At the last presentation, discussed were a parking garage, screening requirements along Willows Road and color options. Staff asked for thoughts of the Board regarding screening requirements and if these address modulation variation and blank walls; four color options in an attempt to provide a natural tone, and if Approval can be sought at the next presentation.

Mr. Craig Webb *with* Gehry Partners introduced Shannon Nichol, Landscape Architect *with* GGN. Mr. Webb stated that the building will be on a very steep site. There have been some minor changes in the Site Plan Entitlement (SPE) process. The existing intersection will be signalized as a part of the project to allow for better access. There is now no change to the existing bus stop on the west side of Willows Road. A parking garage screening design was shown which may allow the façade to float better with more transparency as well as provide a better relationship with the landscape. A vigorous landscape maintenance regime would occur for this site. Further renderings incorporating previous comments were described. Mr. Webb explained that the truck dock was in the only location possible considering stormwater and grade. Feedback from the Board regarding colors would be appreciated and a final suggestion will be brought to the next presentation.

Ms. Nichol stated that key strategies are to help the landscape integrate into the building and the Sammamish River Valley; people, plants and water. There are places for groups integrated with planting, softscapes and walking routes. Renderings were described. Drainage is intercepted at the top of the site. Run-off water is directed in-between vehicle and pedestrian zones. Three different vines are proposed. The applicant has agreed to allow the City to widen Willows Road in the future, the result being that trees may not remain along the frontage at that time.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that substitute vegetation can be started in advance of a widening project.
- Mr. Krueger liked the idea of vines covering cables on the garage.
- Mr. Krueger asked to see a more detailed rendering of the loading dock corner with truck doors, the view turning into the driveway off of Willows Road, including materials and scale.
- Mr. Krueger liked the original color chosen by the applicant, and commented that there is too much grey on buildings in Redmond.
- Mr. Krueger stated that along with the other materials, the façade will be a great looking addition to the City.

Ms. Atvars:

- Appreciated the thoroughness of the presentations.
- Ms. Atvars asked how large of a space would be screened.

Mr. Webb replied approximately 50', and stated that Ms. Nichol was searching for plant material that would successfully accomplish the screen. There are two garage levels.

- Ms. Atvars suggested combining screening strategies, an option with columns outside mesh for an interesting texture and adds more separation.
- Ms. Atvars asked for a timeframe regarding how long vines would take to mature to fill 50'.

Ms. Nichol replied that accurate answers would need to be brought to the next presentation, but in general five to seven years for the western clematis. There is enough irregularity in growth that there will be variety. Angular vines will typically grow slower

- Ms. Atvars stated that when more of the façade will be seen with road widening, the vines should be established.
- Ms. Atvars asked to see evening renderings showing how much light will come from the parking garage including the different screening options.
- Ms. Atvars liked the wood color but the color should be further reviewed.

Mr. White:

- Appreciated the presentation.
- Mr. White hoped the loading dock would be a beautiful design, but it is also dependent on the screening material chosen.

Mr. Webb displayed an eight-foot screen wall, the highest allowed per code.

- Mr. White stated the Board seemed to be comfortable with the amount of landscaping.
- Mr. White asked if a different metallic finish were possible, and stated that dark colors become too massive.
- Mr. White liked Ms. Atvars idea regarding screening strategies and further renderings would be helpful.

Ms. Nichol replied that vines around cables will be very closely researched.

- Mr. White suggested extending lower glass down to match the height of the railing above.

Mr. Webb replied that this had been examined but the result was not liked.

- Mr. White stated that if the comments can be addressed at the next presentation, an Approval decision can most likely be made at that time.

Mr. Sutton:

- Hoped to see a fail-safe for headlights in the event that development does not occur as forecast.
- Mr. Sutton stated liking the darker color but is okay with lighter green.
- Mr. Sutton stated that the next presentation can be for Approval.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY MR. KRUEGER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:52 P.M. MOTION
SECONDED BY MR. WHITE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**October 17, 2019
MINUTES APPROVED ON**

**Carolyn Garza
RECORDING SECRETARY**