

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

September 19, 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:** Vice-Chairman Diana Atvars

Board members: Craig Krueger, Henry Liu, Ralph Martin and Stephanie Monk

**EXCUSED ABESENCES:** Chairman Kevin Sutton and Shaffer White

**STAFF PRESENT:** David Lee, Gary Lee 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.

Vice Chairperson Atvars reiterated the presentation time limits instituted at the last Design Review Board meeting. Projects that are 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**

MOTION to approve the August 1, 2019 Meeting Minutes by Ms. Monk. MOTION seconded by Mr. Krueger. The MOTION passed unanimously.

**APPROVAL**

**LAND-2019-00766 Microsoft Refresh – Chelan Village MLUE**

**Neighborhood:** Overlake

**Description:** Two four-story office buildings

**Location:** Microsoft Refresh Main Campus

**Applicant:** Microsoft

**Prior Review:** 09/05/19

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

Mr. Lee stated that the Board was not comfortable with Approval at the 09-05-19 meeting and that additional information was requested regarding fins and extra perspectives. Staff continues to recommend Approval.

Mr. Rus Sherman *with* WRNS Studio, Architect, stated having the additional information requested at the last presentation; the detail quality of the stone wall, the quality of fins and nuances of the skin on Building J. Small items such as night renderings would also be presented.

A fly-through video of the project was shown. Stonework detail, night views and other perspectives requested were also displayed. Fins respond to the program on the inside. The Building J skin was described in detail. The Building K roofline is in juxtaposition to the flow of the lower level; the roof is not visible from an open space and therefore not subject to criteria. Projected growth of landscape beds over time was shown, covering 50% of wall by year three.

Ms. Atvars asked if there were comments from the audience and there were none.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

Mr. Martin:

- Was impressed with the progression of the project.
- Mr. Martin stated that all questions and issues had been answered.

Mr. Liu:

- Was impressed with the presentation.
- Mr. Liu asked if the roof garden on Building K would be landscape or artificial turf.

Mr. Sherman replied that the green roof is not accessible and was not intended to be inhabited, but that a deck space looks over. The assembly occupancy load would increase greatly if made accessible.

Ms. Monk:

- Agreed with Mr. Martin and Mr. Liu.

- Ms. Monk appreciated that feedback from Board had been taken into consideration.

Mr. Krueger:

- Appreciated the fly-through video.
- Mr. Krueger appreciated all information and understood the fins much better.
- Mr. Krueger had no problem with the Building K roofline.
- Mr. Krueger stated the form was solid and attractive.

Ms. Atvars:

- Agreed with the rest of the Board.
- Ms. Atvars stated having a better sense of the full picture.

**MOTION BY MS. MONK TO APPROVE LAND-2019-00839, Microsoft Refresh – Chelan Village MLUE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS; WHERE PRESENTATION MATERIAL INCONSISTENCIES OCCUR IN FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS AFTER THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HAS APPROVED THE PROJECT, THE ELEVATIONS APPROVED BY THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD WILL PREVAIL. IF AFTER DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL THERE ARE ANY INCONSISTENCIES IN THE INFORMATION PROVIDED FOR ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LANDSCAPE PLANS, LIGHTING PLANS, MATERIAL AND COLOR BETWEEN PRESENTATION BOARDS AND DRAWINGS, THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AND REDMOND PLANNING STAFF WILL REVIEW AND DETERMINE WHICH DESIGN VERSION WILL BE FOLLOWED FOR THE SITE PLAN ENTITLEMENT AND BUILDING PERMITS. AN ADDITIONAL NATIVE TYPE EVERGREEN TREE SHALL BE PLANTED BETWEEN THE WALKWAY AND THE LARGE BLANK WALL OF BUILDING 201 FACING THE PASTORAL DRIVE SHOWN ON PAGE 73 OF THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MATERIALS FROM SEPTEMBER 5, 2019 IF THE EXISTING/REMAINING TREES AND UNDERSTORY VEGETATION NEAR THIS WALL IS FOUND TO BE TOO SPARSE AT THE TIME OF BUILDING INSPECTION BY PLANNING STAFF TO SOFTEN THE BLANK WALL. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. LIU. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Ms. Atvars recused from the next project and Mr. Krueger would lead the item.

## **APPROVAL**

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

**Neighborhood:** Downtown

**Description:** Administrative Modification to existing Site Plan Entitlement (LAND-2016-02100). Project is one mixed-use building and consists of a residential tower to the north and an office/residential tower to the south.

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

**Applicant:** Katerina Prochaska, Jackson|Main Architecture

**Prior Review:** 07/11/19

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

Mr. Sticka stated that at the last presentation, additional clarity regarding massing and modulation was requested and the questions have been addressed. Staff recommends Approval.

Ms. Katerina Prochaska *with* Jackson|Main Architecture gave a brief introduction.

Mr. Oscar Del Moro *with* Cosmos stated that the project started in 2010 with the awareness that projects in the Downtown zone would influence future re-development.

Ms. Prochaska continued. Renderings were displayed. The podium is open to the public and there is a pedestrian link through the plaza. The pedestrian experience throughout was described in detail.

Mr. Krueger stated that there is a limited amount of time for presentations during an Approval and suggested that before versus current design be moved onto.

Ms. Prochaska pointed out design details which have changed as the result of Board comments from the last presentation on the renderings.

Mr. Krueger asked if there were comments or questions from the audience and there were none.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

Ms. Monk:

- Stated there was a definite improvement in the northeast corner, less massive.
- Ms. Monk stated that the increased public space would be great.
- Ms. Monk stated that the fifth-floor white section did not have consistent windows on the rendering and asked if there was purposeful design at that space.

Ms. Prochaska replied that the windows in the rendering in question were proposed to change. Ms. Monk asked that the question be disregarded.

- Ms. Monk stated that birch trees around Redmond are not thriving and attention should be given regarding this.
- Ms. Monk stated that the design was coming along well.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked for clarification around the material boards.

Ms. Prochaska replied that one of the boards was being presented at this meeting.

Mr. Martin:

- Appreciated the time and care taken on the corner, a vast improvement.
- Mr. Martin stated that bringing people through will help the project quite a bit.
- Mr. Martin stated that the brackets do not appear to be structural.

Mr. Liu:

- Appreciated the process and had no further comment.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the project has progressed through many iterations.
- Mr. Krueger appreciated the corners being addressed.

**MOTION BY MR. LIU TO APPROVE LAND-2019-00504, Redmond City Center WITH MATERIALS PRESENTED AND STANDARD CONDITIONS. MOTION SECONDED BY MS. MONK. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Ms. Atvars returned to the meeting to lead the next project.

## **PRE-APPLICATION**

### **LAND-2019-00543, Seritage Place Parcel A**

**Neighborhood:** Overlake

**Description:** The project is Parcel A of the Seritage Master Plan. Project will include 443 market-rate residential units, commercial space and approximately 604 parking stalls. The project will include five levels of approximately 353,292 square feet of Type VA wood-framed residential construction over approximately 309,082 square feet of Type IA concrete construction

**Location:** 2200 – 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast

**Applicant:** Darrell Turner *with* GGLO.

**Prior Review:** 06/20/19

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

Mr. Lee stated that staff believes the project is strong but needs improvements. In addition to general Board thoughts and comments, four specific items were in question: general articulation of the western façade, glazing materials in the design of the eastern façade in relation to the pedestrian experience, the northwest corner roofline along the western façade and the softening of the transition from the sidewalk to patio.

In regard to the sidewalk to patio, staff appreciates that the applicant has lowered the distance between the patio and main sidewalk for more connection along the busy intersection.

Mr. John Reischl, Vice President of Development *with* Seritage, thanked the Board and looked forward to feedback.

Mr. Ted Panton *with* GGLO described the intent of design details in renderings. There is over 30,000 square feet of retail space within the project which will create a positive around-the-clock environment.

Mr. PJ Benenati *with* GGLO presented landscape elements including benches, trash receptacles, lighting and bike parking.

Ms. Atvars asked if there were comments from the audience and there were none.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

Mr. Krueger:

- Liked the initial concept of movement and interest and the current iteration is very good.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the north elevation is good.

- Mr. Krueger stated that the east elevation needs work, a lack of landscaping.
- Mr. Krueger liked the simplicity of materials but suggested variety in places.

Ms. Monk:

- Agreed with Mr. Krueger regarding wood usage and variety in places.
- Ms. Monk liked the cedar soffit and black metal material mix.
- Ms. Monk suggested that a roofline modulation could be broken up.
- Ms. Monk appreciated the gasket concept.
- Ms. Monk asked for the thought process for benches, in example, for a bus stop.

Mr. Panton replied that no bus stops are currently planned but benches are laid out per guidelines.

- Ms. Monk liked the different colored concrete at the Hub.
- Ms. Monk liked how the project is coming together.

Mr. Martin:

- Agreed with Board members so far.
- Mr. Martin asked if space above retail was residential or amenities.

Mr. Panton replied predominantly residential units, a double height amenity space in the middle of the block and a bike room.

- Mr. Martin asked if people walking under the overhang would be able to see the residential units.

Mr. Panton replied yes.

- Mr. Martin stated there is an opportunity for a break in materiality at the bridge, possibly glass.

Mr. Panton replied that there are structural limitations but changing materials will be explored.

- Mr. Martin stated that transitions from sidewalk to upper patios are an improvement.
- Mr. Martin stated that there was an opportunity for further materiality in the Hub to create a dynamic spot.
- Mr. Martin stated the project was progressing well and liked materiality.

Mr. Liu:

- Asked if there is an allowance for varied building height.

Mr. Panton replied construction type was considered.

- Mr. Liu suggested some massing could be varied to improve views but understood a need to maximize units.

Mr. Panton replied that the particular massing view referred to supports movement.

Mr. Benenati replied that sunlight is part of the massing concept.

- Mr. Liu understood that the massing conclusion had been extensively examined by the design team but suggested a different architectural style.
- Mr. Liu agreed with most Board comments but felt that different materials in texture and color are fighting each other and the canopy scale could be refined.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked how transitions would be detailed where artificial wood touches wood soffits and asked for physical samples.
- Ms. Atvars suggested mixing different wood tones to break up the amount of the product.

Mr. Panton replied that the intimate character of wood set the tone of the project.

- Ms. Atvars was excited to not to see flat hardy panels and liked the palette.
- Ms. Atvars asked if there would be an opportunity to change a vertical aspect on one side.
- Ms. Atvars asked for clarification regarding a super-graphic for the parking sign.

Mr. Panton stated that the sign would be more artful than depicted currently.

- Ms. Atvars recommended that the sign not overpower other aspects of the project.
- Ms. Atvars asked Mr. Lee if further feedback was needed.

Mr. Lee replied that comments would be appreciated regarding the general articulation of the western façade.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that the gasket helps a lot and that the level of articulation is fine.
- Ms. Monk stated that the other façade is too flat and could benefit from more articulation.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that the planes work well but suggested different material options on different planes.
- Ms. Atvars was pro-gasket.

Mr. Martin:

- Agreed with Ms. Atvars on different materials in the vertical articulation of the large mass

Mr. Panton repeated details given by Mr. Martin to ensure understanding and stated appreciating the feedback. Solidity and timelessness are the goal.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated being uncomfortable with the left side of the building and wood moving up with no differentiation at the corner and that a change in material could be a solution.

Mr. Liu:

- Stated being good with articulation overall.

Mr. Lee stated that comments regarding the northwest corner roofline on Northeast 24<sup>th</sup> Street and Lumiere would be appreciated. Mr. Panton stated that the original proposal had a form which led eyes down to the heart of the Master Plan and asked if more drama should be added as the street is very busy.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated not caring for that aspect of the original design at that location, a bulky element.
- Mr. Krueger liked roof treatments in other corners.

Ms. Atvars:

- Agreed with Mr. Krueger that the forms have improved in this iteration.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that the design is fine and interesting and there is no need to change.

Mr. Martin:

- Agreed with Mr. Krueger that the design is heavy at the top.
- Mr. Martin liked the massing.
- Mr. Martin suggested studying how the roof bends around.

Mr. Liu:

- Stated being fine with massing.
- Mr. Liu stated that the design does feel bulky and that smooth material and different colors could be examined.

Mr. Panton asked the Board for a summary of suggestions to focus on.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked for purposeful design particularly related to materials and for explanations around choices.
- Ms. Atvars asked to see physical samples and a focus on material transitions.

Mr. Krueger:

- Suggested adding color to the palette in particular locations, same material but different color to add interest.

Ms. Atvars asked the Board if there were any other changes.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that summaries provided could be compiled by Mr. Lee.

Mr. Lee stated understanding that the east façade roofline is an issue to add, as well as breaking up wood massing with gasket work and incorporating metal scribes on the east façade for the pedestrian experience. The northwest corner is fine.

Mr. Lee had no further business for the Board.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY MR. KRUEGER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:09 P.M. MOTION  
SECONDED BY MR. LIU. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**October 17, 2019**  
**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

**Carolyn Garza**  
**RECORDING SECRETARY**