

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

December 16, 2021

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

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairperson Shaffer White  
Vice Chairperson Josiah Cline  
  
Craig Krueger (substituting), Ana Cisneros

**EXCUSED ABSENCES:** Henry Liu

**STAFF PRESENT:** Andrea Kares, David Lee, Niomi Montes de Oca,  
Scott Reynolds and Cameron Zapata, Redmond  
Planning

**MEETING MINUTES:** Carolyn Garza, LLC

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Mr. White at 7:00 p.m.

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.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**MOTION to approve the September 2, 2021 Meeting Minutes by Mr. Cline. MOTION seconded by Ms. Cisneros. The MOTION passed unanimously.**

**MOTION to approve the October 21, 2021 Meeting Minutes by Ms. Cisneros. MOTION seconded by Mr. Krueger. The MOTION passed unanimously.**

**APPROVAL**

**LAND-2021-00920, LMC Marymoor Spectra Sign Program**

**Neighborhood:** Southeast Redmond

**Description:** Exterior building identity

**Location:** 17611 Northeast 70<sup>th</sup> Street

**Applicant:** Bob Ellis *with* Way Point Sign

**Staff Contact:** Carl McArthy, 425-556-2412 or [cmcarthy@redmond.gov](mailto:cmcarthy@redmond.gov)

Mr. Lee substituted for Mr. McArthy who was out of state. No public comment had been received.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the signs go along with the eclectic architecture approved.

Mr. Cline:

- Stated appreciating color choices and scheme, particularly a curved sign on the northwest corner.

Ms. Cisneros:

- Stated liking the logo colors but asked why they only occur on north signs and not on east and west lobby signs, page nine.

Mr. Peter van Overbeek *with* LMC replied that the only leasing lobby is in the north building, and the intention is for subtle color cues to draw more attention to that entrance for new residents or visitors.

- Ms. Cisneros stated that the reply made sense.

Mr. White:

- Stated that there could be an opportunity to brand all three buildings separately and asked if having a single leasing office was the reason for not doing this.

Mr. van Overbeek replied that the three buildings are under one ownership entity and from a marketing standpoint, the one name of Spectra was chosen for the community.

**MOTION by Ms. Cisneros to approve LAND-2021-00920, LMC Marymoor Spectra Sign Program, as shown in the Design Review Board Materials presented at this December 16, 2021 Design Review Board meeting. This approval includes all standard conditions. MOTION seconded by Mr. Cline. The MOTION passed unanimously.**

## **APPROVAL**

### **LAND-2021-00773, Redmond Senior and Community Center**

**Neighborhood:** Downtown

**Description:** Construct a new senior and community center on the site of the previous senior center. The new building includes a senior center area at the north end that generally replaces the previous senior center that had to be demolished. The southerly area of the building includes a gym, weight room facilities, flexible workout room, lockers rooms, and staff office space.

**Location:** 8703 – 160<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast

**Applicant:** Jack Chaffin and Sarah Burk *with* Johnston Architects

**Prior Review Date:** 08/05/21 & 09/23/21

**Staff Contact:** Cameron Zapata, 425-556-2411 or [czapata@redmond.gov](mailto:czapata@redmond.gov).

Ms. Zapata presented an overview of the project and stated that no public comments had been received.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

### **Mr. Cline:**

- Stated that greater articulation of the screen at the southwest elevation makes the area pop.
- Mr. Cline stated that the east elevation roof articulation and panel lightens the mass above and is a guide to the entrance point.
- Mr. Cline stated that the connection to the Sammamish River Trail is not ideal in the current rendering but acknowledged that the location is difficult with landscaping.
- Mr. Cline stated appreciation to be able to see the back of art wall panels.

### **Ms. Cisneros:**

- Stated liking the perforated protections, more modern in appearance.
- Ms. Cisneros stated that the changes have made the project even better.
- Ms. Cisneros asked for clarification regarding the west entrance rendering on page 44.

Mr. Jim Kalvelage *with* Opsis Architecture replied that the artist developed a master plan with the Arts Commission and the City of Redmond, focusing on connector walls between west and east sides. Metal panel is a backdrop for art to be integrated into metal panel. The form is still to be determined but being examined is colored glass inserted within metal panel, a more natural pattern on the river side, and a more grid pattern on the urban side. Glass could be lit at night but also appreciated during the day, round shapes, and different dimensions.

Mr. White:

- Asked if the art installations would be permanent.

Mr. Kalvelage replied permanent.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the mention of the Arts Commission emphasizes that many people are working on the building.
- Mr. Krueger congratulated the groups involved for sculptural development of the design.
- Mr. Krueger stated having no problems with the Administrative Design Flexibility (ADF) requests.

Mr. White:

- Asked for clarification regarding the reason for changes in the gym porch area.

Mr. Kalvelage replied that some angles felt not inherent to the geometry of the building. Walls were pushed back for proper response to the Heritage Tree, but the angled plan felt forced. The events terrace felt awkward with a missing commonality.

- Mr. White stated having hoped for more development at the western approach and asked for the distance from the path to a door entry.

Mr. Chris Jones *with* Groundswell Landscape Architecture replied approximately 50 feet. Landscaping along the Sammamish River trail has been pulled further south for visibility. An existing sculpture has been moved to announce a walkway. There are pedestrian light poles, not on the rendering, that march down the walkway. Many events such as Rockin' on the River occur at the location and the lawn area will be very crowded; keeping the northern to southern lawn porous is important, not segregating for flexibility.

- Mr. White suggested a slight offset between panels, every other shifting off for a break in the edge; the rendering creates the illusion that the distance of the walkway is longer.

Mr. Jones replied that the distance was probably 150 feet.

- Mr. White stated that a shifting plane would be consistent with the rest of the building.

Mr. Kalvelage replied that bump outs occurring near lights and benches would be another opportunity.

- Mr. White stated that anything that could create more rhythm on the long pathway would be helpful.

Mr. Cline:

- Stated that the ideas expressed would be helpful.

**MOTION by Ms. Cisneros to approve LAND-2021-00773, Redmond Senior and Community Center, as shown in the Design Review Board Materials presented at this December 16, 2021 Design Review Board meeting, as well as to forward a recommendation of approval of the two ADFs outlined in the staff memo. This approval includes all standard conditions. MOTION seconded by Mr. Cline. The MOTION passed unanimously.**

### **PRE-APPLICATION**

#### **LAND-2021-00682, AMLI Redmond Way**

**Neighborhood:** Downtown

**Description:** Demolition of an existing shopping center with parking to construct two (2) multi-family residential buildings totaling 582,500 gross square feet.

**Location:** 16771 Redmond Way

**Applicant:** Maja Adamski *with* SCB

**Staff Contact:** Niomi Montes de Oca, 425-556-2462 or [nmontesdeoca@redmond.gov](mailto:nmontesdeoca@redmond.gov)

Ms. Montes de Oca provided an overview of the project. Mr. Lee stated that no public comments had been received.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated liking the west building, a lot of positives; color choices, patterns, three different wings, roof modulation and a great presence on Redmond Way in any direction.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the east building, however, is a contrast in personality and colors, lacking interest.

- Mr. Krueger stated that the west building seems to be oriented for couples and single people, whereas the east building seems to be oriented for families, which could be more playful and welcoming.
- Mr. Krueger stated that more roof modulation is needed to the east building.

Ms. Cisneros:

- Stated agreeing with the comments of Mr. Krueger.
- Ms. Cisneros stated that the buildings look like separate projects.

Mr. Cline:

- Stated agreement with Mr. Krueger and Ms. Cisneros.
- Mr. Cline stated liking the materiality of the west building and wondered if there is an opportunity with white panel to become stacked to increase verticality through connection lines.
- Mr. Cline asked for clarification regarding track material on the east building.

Mr. Nolan Sit *with* SCB replied metal cap, to be playful with horizontal lines.

- Mr. Cline suggested that playfulness of the metal cap be extended through different elements of the building and not just as a treatment to the façade.
- Mr. Cline stated that a plain façade is at the pedestrian experience to the east exterior courtyard and suggested that elements from higher elevations be brought down, in example, into the stairwell.
- Mr. Cline stated concern regarding view lines from the rail platform into units at the same level on the east and west buildings and suggested a screening element or barrier for privacy.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the team has done an amazing job on the west building in the first presentation.
- Mr. White stated that the east building is not as far along in development and interest.
- Mr. White stated that the material palette may be overpowering but additional gestures could help.
- Mr. White stated that insets are needed along the main thoroughfare for rhythm, particularly if some required zoning modulation will be asked to be removed.
- Mr. White stated that the concept of the train is fun and liked the idea of Mr. Cline to play with metal cap.
- Mr. White stated having concerns regarding blank walls in a connector area.

- Mr. White stated that larger examples of the metal wall panel material would be helpful.
- Mr. White stated not being clear regarding ADFs.

Ms. Montes de Oca replied that some ADF requests pertain to other aspects of the zoning code and there will be extensive analysis for compliance.

- Mr. White stated that detail in future presentations will allow the Board to focus in.

Mr. Sit asked to discuss the ADFs for clarity. The first request is to ask for 12 ' rather than the 9' in code for the porches to make them more active and accessible; one as a pooch porch and one as a play porch. The porches occur along the entire façade.

- Mr. White stated that the Board is probably open to the request, but the first floor needs to be more developed.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that regarding ADFs, the staff report indicated that requests were not detailed regarding benefits, and more information is needed.

Mr. White:

- Agreed that a more dialed-in understanding of the benefits need to be brought to the next presentation.

Mr. Sit asked for clarification regarding a request for residential privacy setbacks. The request is for 5' for both primary and secondary windows with the understanding that along the east side of the east building there is a planned pedestrian walkway with a 14' buffer. On the west side, the courtyard already exists.

- Mr. White replied that a plan showing which windows would be impacted by the ADF, including existing and planned future conditions for adjacent properties, would be helpful.

Mr. Sit stated that comments have been heard regarding east building modulation. The design had been purposeful to give the development a sense of variety and scale. Perspectives from different corners and play between buildings are powerful.

- Mr. White stated that the approach was understandable but the simplified approach to the east building needs to be amplified in detailing and execution.

Mr. Sit asked to share an option for the east building modulation. Mr. White replied that options can be included in the presentation set, but if an option has not been provided to the public the Board is not allowed to review.

### **PRE-APPLICATION**

#### **LAND-2021-00886, SFT Redmond Commercial**

**Neighborhood:** Downtown

**Description:** Proposed project is a two-story 10,000 square-foot commercial building with 20 surface parking stalls.

**Location:** 8405 – 164<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast

**Applicant:** Paul Soldwedel *with* Magellan Architects

**Staff Contact:** Niomi Montes de Oca, 425-556-2462 or [nmontesdeoca@redmond.gov](mailto:nmontesdeoca@redmond.gov)

Ms. Montes de Oca introduced the project. Mr. Lee stated that no public comments had been received.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

#### **Ms. Cisneros:**

- Stated liking the north elevation, page five, materials, and colors.
- Ms. Cisneros stated that on page seven, south elevation, the elevation does not make sense with windows.
- Ms. Cisneros stated that wood materials should have different depths to emphasize metal aspects.

#### **Mr. Krueger:**

- Stated liking the building, great elevations, street presence and materials.
- Mr. Krueger stated liking the south elevation, playful with panels, materials, and colors.
- Mr. Krueger asked if landscaping could be added near the entrance of the parking lot to welcome users.

#### **Mr. Cline:**

- Stated liking the overall look, modern and sleek.
- Mr. Cline stated that the wood structure on the northern façade is appreciated, breaking up glazing, and asked if any glazing would need to be eliminated for the energy code.

Ms. Jamie Trenda *with* Magellan Architects replied that currently the goal is for a storefront system with wall or a curtain wall system to meet the energy code and still maintain transparency.

- Mr. Cline replied that keeping the transparency will be positive.
- Mr. Cline stated liking the similar height to the south to allow light and privacy.
- Mr. Cline stated that different perspectives in the presentation packet will be helpful, so that pausing video is not necessary.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the design is a very nice job on the western and northern elevations.
- Mr. White stated concern regarding the eastern elevation; in the existing condition there is a driveway with site lines, needing further development.
- Mr. White stated that material changes are good with plane changes as well.
- Mr. White stated that an opportunity could be to extend an overhang slightly and bring in wood vertical fins for character, in example.
- Mr. White stated that the other elevations are very successful.
- Mr. White asked if the ground floor was intended to be retail.

Ms. Trenda replied yes.

- Mr. White stated that the design team should look at how the second-floor office space is accessed without entering retail space, possibly a corridor access.
- Mr. White suggested flourishes in the front third for a sneak peak as driving down 164<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast.

Mr. Peter Lian stated that there will be one retail and no other tenants.

### **PRE-APPLICATION**

#### **LAND-2021-00938, Moment**

**Neighborhood:** Downtown

**Description:** Proposing a 17-unit, two building for sale townhome project. The north building will have seven units and the south building will have 10 units. The current building on the site will be demolished.

**Location:** 8440 – 160<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast

**Applicant:** Phil Hoban *with* Main Street Property

**Staff Contact:** Andrea Kares, 425-556-2480 or [akares@redmond.gov](mailto:akares@redmond.gov)

Ms. Kares introduced the project. Mr. Lee stated that no public comments had been received.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

Mr. Cline:

- Stated liking the site plan overall, providing commonality between both buildings.
- Mr. Cline stated agreeing with the staff report that facades seem dark and asked if an accent material, color, or lightening of wood or brick facades could be examined; lighter horizontal siding could lighten facades.
- Mr. Cline stated concern regarding the pedestrian experience on the access path to front doors related to building height.
- Mr. Cline asked how much light would be experienced in the motor court with four stories on the south side.
- Mr. Cline stated that pedestrian level views in renderings would be helpful.

Ms. Cisneros:

- Stated agreement with the comments of Mr. Cline.
- Ms. Cisneros suggested lighting options to address the dark colors.
- Ms. Cisneros stated liking the modulation and windows but being concerned regarding materials.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated agreement with Mr. Cline and Ms. Cisneros.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the entry is well-proportioned.
- Mr. Krueger asked if some darkness is coming from shadowing or change in color.
- Mr. Krueger stated liking the view from the street, where colors work with each other.
- Mr. Krueger suggested that the taupe color for siding could be lightened a couple of shades.
- Mr. Krueger asked if access will be affected by the commercial space and suggested an access to the north.
- Mr. Krueger stated there would be good use of larger decks facing 160<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast.

Mr. White:

- Stated that a better material board including color variations would be helpful at the next presentation.
- Mr. White stated that views from the two separate pedestrian paths would be helpful; the north path has nice spacing, but the south path feels cramped.

- Mr. White stated liking how the main street has been addressed and the mix of units.
- Mr. White stated that the point of Mr. Krueger regarding access is good.

Ms. Kim Faust *with* Main Street Property Group LLC replied that there is an access easement; the adjacent owner has been reached out to regarding terminating current access and providing another, but the adjacent owner is not willing at this point to do this. Efforts will continue to be made, however.

- Mr. White asked if there will be clear glazing or frost for light and privacy at the Mile House.

Curtis Bigelow *with* Scale Design stated that obscure glass is being examined due to the wall of apartments.

- Mr. White stated that the plan is nicely thought out and the Board concerns are regarding materiality; more than one option should be brought to the next presentation.
- Mr. White stated that there could be a common language but slightly different accents between the north and south buildings.

## **PRE-APPLICATION**

### **LAND-2021-00948, Anderson Park Apartments**

**Neighborhood:** Downtown

**Description:** New multi-family building with five-stories; proposed building area is +134,000 (gross square feet) with 102 residential units and 109 parking spaces.

**Location:** 16912 Northeast 79<sup>th</sup> Street

**Applicant:** Dirk McCulloch *with* Jackson Main

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

Mr. Reynolds provided an overview of the project. Mr. Lee stated that no public comment had been received.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the property is small and focusing the entry on the corner is good.
- Mr. Krueger asked for renderings showing the pedestrian experience at ground level; the form of the building could be brought to the ground to be more relatable to the adjacent sidewalk.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the backside looks fine.

- Mr. Krueger stated that the building is interesting and a great start, vertically and horizontally.

Mr. Cline:

- Stated liking the double height spaced lobby.
- Mr. Cline stated seeing many white and black buildings around Redmond, and that an accent could break up the two tonal facades in color or material.
- Mr. Cline stated appreciating the penthouses but there may be an opportunity to break up the two long roof facades.
- Mr. Cline stated that parking screen at the pedestrian level is interesting but may be difficult to make successful; perspectives from the pedestrian experience will be helpful as elevations read flat.

Ms. Cisneros:

- Stated that the elevation view is interesting in modulation but asked for clarification regarding materials.
- Ms. Cisneros stated that the design and concepts are very good.

Mr. White:

- Stated not being as impressed as the rest of the Board.
- Mr. White stated that there could be an opportunity to play with acute corners.
- Mr. White stated sharing staff concern regarding the ground floor; the north elevation is good but the south elevation at the park should have more engagement, such as ground floor unit access and porches, direct connectivity.
- Mr. White stated that the first and second floors could engage each other.
- Mr. White asked why parking is half underground.

Mr. Robin Murphy *with* Jackson Main replied that groundwater is high in Redmond and parking is being provided in a tight and complicated footprint. The ultimate depth of the building below grade is approximately 12'. Screening shown in renderings may not be the final solution.

- Mr. White asked how high the finished floor will be from the ground plane and suggested that a porch would be more possible if the height could be pushed down two or three feet.
- Mr. White stated that how the first floor and ground level experience is designed will be key.
- Mr. White stated that the upper story needs to come along further, possibly a cap and floor to ceiling glazing rather than generic punched windows.

- Mr. White stated that the penthouse corner units are interesting but can use further development, stronger along the top.
- Mr. White asked if there is an exterior corridor for top units.

Mr. Murphy replied yes, but a mezzanine opens to the community deck in the southeast quadrant between the two roofs.

- Mr. White stated that understanding the area better in renderings will be helpful.
- Mr. White summarized that a better sense of intent in materiality, the ground floor plan and refinement will be helpful.

Mr. Murphy replied that the interface with the urban realm and relationship to the park will be refined in the next renderings.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the building has approximately 14' of landscaping around the perimeter and that there is potential to build on the areas for the first-floor units.

Mr. Murphy asked Mr. Reynolds if there is flexibility to create stoops in the 14' space and terraced balconies to residential levels. Mr. Reynolds replied that staff can connect offline to have a conversation regarding code compliance.

## **OTHER ITEMS**

Mr. Lee thanked Mr. Krueger for joining the Board for this meeting.

Mr. Lee stated that three candidates have been narrowed down for the empty Board positions and they should be participating by the end of January. The mayor would like to be present for the first meeting of the full Board to answer questions.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY MR. KRUEGER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:00 P.M. MOTION SECONDED BY MS. CISNEROS. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

---

**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

---

**RECORDING SECRETARY**