

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

October 17, 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>.

PRESENT: Design Review Board Chairman Kevin Sutton, Vice Chairman Diana Atvars, Commissioners Craig Krueger, Henry Liu, Ralph Martin, Stephanie Monk, and Schaffer White

EXCUSED ABSENCES: None

STAFF PRESENT: Kim Dietz, Aaron Ruffin, Benjamin Sticka and Cameron Zapata, Redmond Planning

MEETING MINUTES: Carolyn Garza, LLC

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

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 Mr. Sutton at 7:39 p.m.

APPROVAL OF DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

MOTION BY MR. WHITE TO APPROVE THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 5, 2019. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY THOSE WHO WERE PRESENT AT THE MEETING.

MOTION BY MS. MONK TO APPROVE THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 19, 2019. MOTION SECONDED BY MS. ATVARS. THE

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY THOSE WHO WERE PRESENT AT THE MEETING.

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 Date: 08/15/19

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

Mr. Ruffin stated that following the last presentation the Board had expressed concerns regarding the Central Utility Plant (CUP), façade materials and the amount of landscaping depicted on illustrations. A motion to approve Buildings 212, 213, 214 and 215 as presented was made with the request that the CUP be re-presented following incorporation of Board feedback. Staff has reviewed new materials and recommends approval.

Mr. Jeff Rovegno *with* Microsoft introduced Mr. Dale Alberda *with* NBBJ.

Mr. Alberda stated that Board concerns had been around a need for a better description of the appearance of the southeast corner from the street with and without landscape screening, a better description of materials and colors and how these relate to the rest of the village, and what noise could be expected from the plant running at full capacity. Staff also asked for the intent for night-time lighting of the building. A review of the site plan was given.

How the exterior palette and materials relate to the rest of the Sammamish Village was described in detail. The only detail unique to the CUP is the color of the equipment behind the screen.

A fairly extensive analysis of the acoustics of the building has been done. In a worst-case scenario when all cooling towers are running full speed, power goes out and generators turn on, the noise level will still be well within and under the limits for both Redmond and Bellevue. The glazing system reduces the decibel level by 30.

The CUP building exterior will not be lighted but subtle light will be on the equipment within the building at night.

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

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Martin:

- Asked if the glazing is a sound-reducing acoustical system or an insulated glass system.

Mr. Alberda replied that the system does not employ acoustic control but the double-glazed system by itself reduces the decibel level by approximately 30.

- Mr. Martin liked how the materials connect to the building next to the CUP and stated that great progress had been made.

Ms. Monk:

- Appreciated the acoustics study.
- Ms. Monk stated that any questions or concerns had been addressed.

Mr. Krueger:

- Liked that the CUP is different than the other buildings.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked for clarification around the aluminum panel.

Mr. Alberda replied that the purpose, agreed on by Microsoft, was for people to have a sense of the operations behind the panel and not the screen itself. Relating color back to the towers was more important.

- Ms. Atvars stated the design has become more refined and purposeful.

Mr. White:

- Suggested that illumination levels within the building in winter could be brighter, and later in the evening dimming down as a delayed sun effect.

Mr. Sutton:

- Agreed that the project looked good.

Mr. Liu:

- Liked the simplicity and thoughtful design.

Mr. Martin:

- Asked if there was a sample of painted metal that will treat the tanks.

Mr. Alberda replied that a sample was not available at the meeting but a sample could be brought in the future if important.

MOTION BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE LAND-2019-00730 Microsoft Refresh – Sammamish Village, CUP EXTERIOR BACKLIGHTING, LANDSCAPE, COLORS, FACADES, TRAILS AND ELEVATIONS AS DEPICTED IN THE PRESENTATION WITH THE STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR INCONSISTENCIES IN DOCUMENTS. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WHITE. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

PRE-APPROVAL

LAND-2018-01323 Woodside

Neighborhood: Southeast Redmond

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

Location: 7041 – 196th Avenue Northeast

Applicant: Sunshine Kapus *with* Polygon WLH, LLC

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

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

Mr. Krueger recused from the agenda item.

Ms. Zapata stated that the project consists of three parts; a Development Agreement, Master Plan and Site Plan Entitlement. The site is approximately 12 acres in Northeast Design District One. At the last presentation, the Board was generally satisfied with design, but the Board also had suggested that the size of the picnic shelter be increased and that tables be rearranged for additional standing room. Modified renderings will be presented.

Mr. Richard Rawlings *with* Polygon Northwest continued. Additional requests from the Board had been that the picnic shelter roof be simplified and a seat wall be installed; for options provided for the roof color of both the picnic shelter and bus shelter; and more detail regarding the buffer between the project and the community to the south.

Color samples were passed around to the Board. The picnic shelter was now proposed to be larger, 24' x 26'. Rearranged tables and a seat wall have been added. The bus shelter has increased in size to 6' x 14'. The buffer, 900' x 15', will be largely native, 30% larger than in the previous design.

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

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Liu:

- Asked about the roof articulation of the picnic shelter.

Mr. Rawlings replied that the slides compared the last design to now, and that the proposed blue is in the color samples.

- Mr. Liu personally liked the green color for metal.
- Mr. Liu stated that the bus shelter is smaller and can be simpler, but the picnic shelter is a public amenity space and suggested more detail, prefers two-tier roof.
- Mr. Liu asked about the quantity numbers in the buffer.

Mr. Rawlings replied quantities anticipated.

- Mr. Liu will trust the landscape architect to utilize various seasonal characteristics.

Mr. Rawlings explained some detail in changes of texture and color of the proposed buffer.

Mr. Rawlings asked Mr. Liu which color was preferred and **Mr. Liu replied green, but subsequently stated blue.**

Mr. Martin:

- Preferred copper red brown over blue.

- Mr. Martin asked what the seat wall material would be.

Mr. Rawlings replied concrete with a reveal, but not painted.

- Mr. Martin asked for clarification regarding the groundcover.

Mr. Rawlings replied a low-spreading groundcover.

- Mr. Martin liked the increase in treescape.
- Mr. Martin suggested a different roof in an interesting shape on the picnic structure.

Ms. Monk:

- Liked the simplified roof form provided but stated being flexible.
- Ms. Monk stated that the white slate color blended into the background for the bus shelter, the picnic shelter might be more likely to be used if the color stands out.
- Ms. Monk asked if the seat wall would be covered by the roof.

Mr. Rawlings replied no, outside.

- Ms. Monk liked the bench that was in the bus shelter previously, with someone with an injury or disability in mind to stay dry in rain.
- Ms. Monk liked the plant selection but was concerned about River Birch because of beetle problems in other Redmond trees.
- Ms. Monk liked the larger plant sizes.

Mr. White:

- Stated that roof detail for both structures should be presented when brought back for Approval.
- Mr. White preferred burnished slate first and blue a close second.
- Mr. White preferred the simplified roof.
- Mr. White stated that the character of picnic shelter renderings appeared plastic-like and suggested playing with the column thickness.
- Mr. White suggested extending the bus shelter roof out in a similar way to the picnic shelter, so that someone would have weather coverage standing on the outside.
- Mr. White stated that tree coverage had improved.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked Ms. Zapata if more detail would be presented in the future and what recommendations were needed from this meeting.

Ms. Zapata replied that the project is still in the prep process, and the applicant hopes for a green light to come back with a formal submittal. The formal submittal is when a recommendation will be made.

- Ms. Atvars hoped to see more detail in landscaping plans not only for the buffer but also for the shelter areas.

Mr. Rawlings replied that specific locations of plants have not been decided on.

- Ms. Atvars stated that the detail in landscaping will be needed for final approval, focusing on key common space areas.
- Ms. Atvars did not have a strong opinion regarding color, but stated that whatever is decided upon should be cohesive with the rest of the property and that browns may be more appropriate.
- Ms. Atvars agreed with other Board members that the picnic shelter roof could be popped back for extra flair.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked if a wall with a wider cap was the intent.

Mr. Rawlings replied more of a reveal.

- Mr. Sutton did not like the current rendering and suggested that the picnic shelter could sit on top of the seat wall, providing a more “L” shaped bench.
- Mr. Sutton agreed that extending roof form would be good.
- Mr. Sutton stated that whatever color is believed to be most appropriate for the development is fine.

Mr. Rawlings stated that brown would be the color.

- Mr. Sutton agreed with Ms. Atvars that a detailed landscape plan should be brought to the next presentation for Approval.

Ms. Zapata asked the Board if the project could come back for formal recommendation next and the Board replied yes.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2019-00585 Proctor Willows

Neighborhood: Willows/Rose Hill

Description: Development of townhouse and mixed-use residential building 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 Date: 02/21/19 and 08/15/19

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

Mr. Sticka stated that the project is located in the Northwest Design District Zone. At the last presentation, Board comments had regarded variation of the color palette, the Metropolitan Modern and Agrarian styles, mixture of siding, roof pitch, refinements to the landscape plan and more renderings to better understand the project. The applicant has addressed the majority of the comments and staff recommends Approval at the next presentation. Staff hoped for Board comments regarding revisions made by incorporating comments from the 08/15/19 meeting.

Mr. Richard Ferry *with* Quadrant Homes and Mr. Keith McCloskey *with* KTG Y introduced themselves. Mr. McCloskey displayed new views of architectural styles, groupings and colors. Both digital and physical color and material boards were shown.

Ms. Andrea Leuschke *with* Weisman Design Group, Landscape Architect, continued with revisions to the landscape plan including trees along Northeast 124th Street revised to meet Kirkland requirements. Refinements to the planting palette throughout the development were described. A maintenance access has been added. Walls have been revised. A local artist will work on a gateway feature. The trail has been moved to the property line.

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

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. White:

- Asked if there would be another Pre-Application.

Mr. Sticka replied that the presentation at this meeting was the second Pre-Application, only for the townhomes portion. The mixed-use building will come as a separate

application in the next month or two for a first Pre-Application. If the Board requests additional information, another Pre-Application can occur.

- Mr. White liked the Modern Agrarian buildings and liked the white color scheme, but asked if bays could be treated differently to break up the longer row of the structure.
- Mr. White stated that Transitional style is not clear in some choices made.
- Mr. White stated that another Pre-Application presentation would be good showing the building working better as a unit and more alignment in window systems.
- Mr. White stated that otherwise the project looked great.

Mr. Krueger:

- Liked what has been done with the overall site plan and appreciated the response to comments.
- Mr. Krueger liked the east elevation towards Willows Road and the Agrarian elevation.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the building should be simplified.
- Mr. Krueger liked the three different styles and appreciated landscaping themes for different courtyards.
- Mr. Krueger liked the retaining walls on Northeast 124th Street.
- Mr. Krueger liked the softening of the edge along the north side of the structure.
- Mr. Krueger liked the board and batten siding.

Mr. Martin:

- Stated the landscaping is very successful.
- Mr. Martin suggested the Metropolitan be very simple and modern, moving to the more organic down the hill.
- Mr. Martin agreed with Mr. White regarding modulation particularly in the Metropolitan.
- Mr. Martin stated that accents need to be more colorful and modern in the Metropolitan.
- Mr. Martin asked what EcoBlock is.

Ms. Leuschke replied a large-scale concrete block that is used to build walls. There is a textured surface.

Mr. Liu:

- Preferred a warm, neutral wall color with accents versus bright white with accents.
- Mr. Liu stated that dramatically varying both the roof forms and wall colors may not be necessary as the site is already unique.

Ms. Monk:

- Agreed with the Board particularly regarding the Metropolitan, not enough contrast.
- Ms. Monk liked the variations in roof colors and stated the Agrarian style looked great.
- Ms. Monk liked the bright white color palette and not neutral grey.
- Ms. Monk liked the landscaping, trail location and walls on Northeast 124th Street.
- Ms. Monk looked forward to seeing the gateway feature.
- Ms. Monk stated that more information on the green building design and green roof space was needed possibly in another Pre-Application session.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that the different styles looked like separate developments, too distinct, and more blending between the top and bottom of the hill would be better.
- Ms. Atvars liked the color scheme over the previous all-white.
- Ms. Atvars liked how the landscape package was presented.
- Ms. Atvars liked the terraces.
- Ms. Atvars agreed about simplifying the middle elevation.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated the neutral scheme is too flat and needs a little more contrast.
- Mr. Sutton asked that the stone be added in elevations.
- Mr. Sutton asked if there will be variations in texture in retaining walls or if the EcoBlock will all have the same texture.

Ms. Leuschke replied that the exact material is still to be determined.

Mr. White:

- Agreed with Ms. Atvars regarding roof forms.

Mr. Krueger:

- Liked the idea of styles becoming flatter and more intense moving west.

Mr. White:

- Stated that at some points there seemed to be too much repetition.

Mr. Sutton:

- Agreed with some form changes.

Mr. Sutton stated that another Pre-Application session would be needed.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2018-01187 Si-Five Homes (aka 166th Townhomes)

Neighborhood: Education Hill

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

Location: 8921 – 166th Avenue Northeast

Applicant: Gaurav and Jessica Bora *with* Smart Build

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

Mr. Sticka stated that staff recommends some additional modulation of the building, variety in materials and colors, and variation in roofline. The project is off to a good start but Board comments are hoped for.

Ms. Jennifer Kim *with* Medici Architects continued and stated that cross streets are 91st Street and 89th Street. The Bella Bottega shopping area is less than a mile to the southwest of the site. The lot area is 12,000 square feet and is zoned R-20 multi-family urban residential. Density allowed is six units, but only five are proposed. The site is in a transition overlay area due to the single-family R-5 zone to the east, but the site is exempt from an increased front setback because of the arterial with all-day transit. The R-20 zone allows for a 60-foot maximum height, but due to the transition overlay the maximum height allowed is 50-feet with a bonus, and a modification to the height maximum allowed is being requested. As the project is fewer than ten units, there is no affordability requirement.

Renderings were described. Minimum tree retention will be met and 29 new trees are proposed. The site has significant slope. All setback requirements are met and site triangles have been provided. Materials and colors were described. Varied perspectives of massing and modulation were displayed.

Mr. Sutton asked if the Board has the flexibility to grant the height request and Mr. Sticka replied that the applicant is within code as proposed.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Liu:

- Liked the unit design and elevations but asked what kind of service truck would be using a turn-around in the parking area.

Ms. Kim replied SU-30, larger than a van such as a UPS truck.

- Mr. Liu stated that the design seemed more commercial than residential.
- Mr. Liu stated that a walkway could be wider and not metal to avoid more noise and to preserve privacy.
- Mr. Liu stated that the first level felt unpleasant with a garbage area and parking garage.
- Mr. Liu stated that having weather protected access to units from the garage and the garage made more welcoming would help the project.
- Mr. Liu stated that the rest of the project looked very good.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked if there were a reason a driveway is on the higher end of the site.

Ms. Kim replied that Transportation directed the driveway location because of the proximity to cross streets.

- Ms. Atvars stated that everything felt very tall at the bottom level and suggested sinking the parking garage.

Ms. Kim replied that Transportation directed the design also but if allowed, sinking the building would be preferred.

- Ms. Atvars stated understanding the restrictions.

- Ms. Atvars asked for focus on livening the garage façade with landscaping or a different material.
- Ms. Atvars stated that a recently completed and similarly scaled condominium project nearby used the same material palette and suggested switching materials.
- Ms. Atvars liked the roof deck amenities.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked for the garage area ceiling height.

Ms. Kim replied 11'6", service truck height.

- Mr. Krueger asked why the turn-around was necessary.

Ms. Kim replied that Transportation directed the height.

- Mr. Krueger stated that a turn-around is not necessary if less than 150' deep for a fire or service truck.
- Mr. Krueger asked for the purpose of a site line triangle here.

Mr. Sticka replied that Transportation would be consulted and a written response would be part of the Board packet at the next presentation.

- Mr. Krueger understood constraints of the garage in regard to topography.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the streetscape side needs softening to relate a welcoming entry rather than utility.
- Mr. Krueger liked the presentation.

Ms. Monk:

- Asked if affordability could be considered although not a requirement.
- Ms. Monk stated not liking the mixed wide and narrow hardy plank next to each other
- Ms. Monk stated looking forward to hearing from Transportation as bringing the garage height down would help the design.
- Ms. Monk stated struggling with the maximum height modification.
- Ms. Monk agreed with Mr. Krueger that the streetscape should be softened.

Mr. Martin:

- Asked what a striped space is in the garage.

Ms. Kim replied the service truck turn around.

- Mr. Martin commented on color anchoring top and bottom of the building but did not indicate a location for the recording.
- Mr. Martin stated that concrete on the garage needs to be textured or patterned even with vines.
- Mr. Martin asked what was in the rooftop enclosed area

Ms. Kim replied mechanical in the stair.

- Mr. Martin asked what was on the roof deck.

Ms. Kim explained where the roof deck was on the rendering.

- Mr. Martin suggested using cedar to create a natural look.
- Mr. Martin stated that the garage needs to be brought down if possible.
- Mr. Martin agreed with Mr. Liu regarding access to units.

Mr. White:

- Asked if there is parallel parking at the street.

Ms. Kim replied no, that a service truck could not stop on the street.

- Mr. White stated that anything that can bring the building lower is good.
- Mr. White stated that the massing and composition at the southern elevation is good but the roof does not have rhythm.
- Mr. White stated that the presentation was clear and helpful.
- Mr. White stated that the eastern elevation needs to feel more approachable.
- Mr. White stated that the northeast corner could be developed more and organization overall should receive more work.
- Mr. White stated that the west elevation should be as developed as the south elevation.
- Mr. White suggested a staircase be pushed out for more of a break between the front doors and pathway; vines could also be brought through.

- Mr. White stated that the door into the parking garage should be more special and lighting could be a factor.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked if the driveway could be longer.

Ms. Kim replied that trees are being retained; Redmond code is strict regarding staying 5' outside of a dripline.

- Mr. Sutton stated that the Technical Committee may need to look at all the constraints being placed to determine if there can be some flexibility.
- Mr. Sutton asked if structural engineering has been done.

Ms. Kim replied very preliminary.

- Mr. Sutton stated concern around a cantilever that would require a column in the driveway turn-around.
- Mr. Sutton suggested that garbage could be moved as summer heat will make the area pungent, and openings in the garage wall could create cross ventilation.
- Mr. Sutton agreed with the Board that the street front stair feels too light and a cast in place permanent element may be needed.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked if entries could occur on the north side of the building.

Ms. Kim replied the option had not been considered.

- Ms. Atvars stated that front doors could be moved to the other side for a more peaceful feel.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked why a more open wall at the parking level instead of concrete enclosed was not considered to take some bulk from the building.

Mr. White:

- Asked about light pollution from headlights shining through the garage if open.

Ms. Kim replied that current development would not have an issue, but future development could experience an issue.

Mr. Liu:

- Liked the idea of an open garage with no walls.
- Mr. Liu suggested that a walkway be lowered with entry to units by stair.
- Mr. Liu asked if emergency parking instead of an internal turn-around could be offered to Transportation.

Mr. White:

- Liked the idea of Mr. Liu of lowering the walkway.

Mr. Krueger:

- Had no problem with 60' and asked if townhouses in the zone are allowed to be at 50'.

Mr. Sticka replied that the height would be researched and an answer would be available at the next presentation.

Mr. White:

- Suggested investing in a neighboring property for better access.
- Mr. White reiterated that a structural engineer may reveal that the turn-around cannot be achieved.

Mr. Martin:

- Suggested lighter materials around the garage structure.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:11 P.M. BY MS. MONK. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**November 21, 2019
MINUTES APPROVED ON**

**Carolyn Garza
RECORDING SECRETARY**