

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

February 21, 2019

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Craig Krueger

Board members: Diana Atvars, Henry Liu, Ralph Martin, Stephanie Monk and Kevin Sutton

EXCUSED ABSENCES: Shaffer White

STAFF PRESENT: David Lee, Gary Lee and Amy Tarce, 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.

APPROVAL

LAND-2019-00096, Gill Investment Company

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: Multi-family exterior alteration including: replace all windows and patio doors, replace stair handrails and guards, replace balcony privacy partitions and guards, replace entry doors and install accessible door hardware, re-side entire building, install patio amenity area with stairs, and create accessible parking space

Location: 9110 Redmond Woodinville Road Northeast

Applicant: Jaspaul Gill

Prior Review Date: February 7, 2019

Staff Contact: Lawrence Chung, 425-556-2404 or lmchung@redmond.gov

Ms. Tarce began the presentation by stating that there were two options for revised elevation and staff was requesting guidance as to which option should move forward.

Mr. Craig Pontius *with* Citizen Design continued that there had been a number of comments from the Board at the last meeting. Two options were prepared in response.

Option A restores the original belly bands to original locations, eliminates gaps and replaces the two upper thirds of lap siding with a second siding color to go along with grey at the base. Also, part of Option A was the Burgundy red doors, dark trim to go with the roof and the proposed black windows. A material board was on display with paint samples.

Option B uses the same basic material palette but switches locations. Where Option A had a consistent two thirds board and batten at the top and lap siding on the bottom, this option takes advantage of the existing split at the middle. On the west street-facing side, the top two thirds of the building would remain board and batten from Option A, and the belly band the same color as siding for textural difference. The bottom two thirds of the other side have lap siding using the same belly band color trick to allow the dark band between the materials emphasize division.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Krueger:

- Suggested having the upper two floors in board and batten and the same cream color for the belly band.

Mr. Sutton:

- Liked the north and south elevations of Option B, but liked the black belly band trim, a hybrid of the two options.
- Mr. Sutton stated that a point of contention at the last meeting was the visible side of the building from street-side and liked the uniform black bands on Option A.
- Mr. Sutton stated in summary liking Option B for the north and south elevations and black belly band for the east and west elevations.
- Mr. Sutton believed the original design was lacking but liked the new designs.

Ms. Monk:

- Would be happy with either option and stated these were a great improvement over the original design.
- Ms. Monk liked the darker belly band and Option A but did not have a strong opinion around Option B; either would be a great improvement.

Mr. Martin:

- Believed Option B was more site responsive.

Mr. Liu:

- Liked Option A as is.

Ms. Atvars:

- Liked Option B.
- Ms. Atvars stated that of the east and west elevations, the east was better. Two-thirds of darker grey and lighter on top at the elevation visible from the street would read better with the height.
- Ms. Atvars suggested that only the balconies retain the darker punch of accent.
- Ms. Atvars did not believe the band needed to carry through the other sides.

Mr. Krueger:

- Liked Option B.
- Mr. Krueger suggested that the architect work with City staff to research the suggestion around color on the east end of the building for diversity to the color scheme.

MOTIONED BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE LAND-2019-00096, GILL INVESTMENT COMPANY, WITH THE STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR INCONSISTENCIES, THE BOARD PREFERENCE FOR OPTION B, AND FURTHER STUDYING WITH STAFF THE EAST ELEVATION COLOR. SECONDED BY MR. MARTIN. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2018-01453, Microsoft Refresh

Neighborhood: Overlake

Description: Landscape and architecture for campus design

Location: Microsoft Main Campus, south of Northeast 36th Street and west of 156th Avenue Northeast

Applicant: Aaron Dundson *with* Microsoft

Prior Review Date: 01/03/19

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

Mr. Lee stated that an overview of all Villages will be presented by the different architectural teams.

Mr. Krueger asked if comments should be made after each Village rather than waiting for the end of the presentations and Mr. Keith Donovan *with* Microsoft replied yes.

Mr. Donovan displayed the schematic design presentation for internal Microsoft leadership.

Ms. Rula Patil *with* Microsoft stated that two different design concepts had been considered; designing inside-out to optimize how employees work and specific function needs, and how architecturally the design fits with the broader context. Ms. Patil would present the inside-out approach and the architect teams would address the design expressions.

Team-based space or neighborhoods for eight to 16 team members have been designed. Windows with access to daylight and views and other positive amenities were always considered toward individual needs. There are support spaces for focus work, conferencing, kitchenettes and other communal uses. Tools for teams to expand from one team base to another exist in adjacent neighborhoods. Each floor has multiple neighborhoods. Connecting social spaces for a strong sense of community emphasizes inclusion in a larger team. These principles were given to all architects to incorporate. While the Villages belong to one larger campus, variety is critical.

Mr. Donovan stated that the four architects for four Villages were designing for unique character while still within the One Microsoft campus and the fabric of Redmond. A rendering of the forest thread connecting the urban part of the campus with the landscape and recreational part of the campus was shown. A variety of ground floor amenities are grouped around the main plaza, activating the plaza, tying in with the forest thread, and connecting urban transit with the landscape. The parking structure is in the center of the campus, allowing the center of the campus to be car free and walkable.

Mr. Donovan continued that connecting to existing buildings across 156th Avenue Northeast as well as facilities north of Northeast 36th Street and south of Northeast 31st Street, and the other 500 acres, was a big driver in planning principles. Whatcom, Washington, Sammamish and Chelan are the Village names.

Mr. John Chau *with* LMN continued with a presentation on Whatcom Village. The Village is composed of four buildings; two buildings have amenities such as food service, shared bikes and multi-purpose rooms on the ground floor. The second and third floors allow for more massing articulation. A slide rendering was described. The notion of weaving all together is within the design. The Whatcom commons and pedestrian connectivity across the central plaza are considered. To further articulate the

masses, slots or insets break up the longer façade. Articulation lifts the building at the ground level for amenity spaces.

The color sketch is concept only at this point. Integration between upper and lower masses is celebrated by glazing. Canopies and other activity will be created on the ground plane. Areas on the rendering were described by color codes, and different views were displayed. Sketches intentionally did not include color so that articulation, massing and materiality could be understood.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Martin:

- [Inaudible]
- Mr. Martin suggested that cubes at the end should come out farther, walls slanting out at the ends.
- Mr. Martin stated that the design was very strong.

Mr. Sutton:

- Agreed with Mr. Martin that a larger cantilever to be more dramatic is needed.
- Mr. Sutton stated that landscape does some of the weaving on horizontal planes on roofs.
- Mr. Sutton stated the design was a great start.

Mr. Liu:

- Asked if the campus was enclosed or open.

Mr. Donovan replied open. The buildings are secure and the scale of openness and transparency are being examined. The campus will be open for driving into and walking through as at the west campus on the other side of State Route 520.

- Mr. Liu asked if the open space would be open not only to employees but to the community or visitors.

Mr. Donovan replied that the answer would need to be brought to the next meeting, but generally, yes. Prioritizing use for employees would occur but there is no gate or barrier to stop people from coming in to enjoy the trails and retail amenities. Food amenities will be for employees only.

- Mr. Liu stated that creating open, green spaces is very successful. The large technology companies all have a different ideology, some enclosed and some playful with forms.
- Mr. Liu stated that there was a lot of opportunity at the rooftop.
- Mr. Liu stated looking forward to the next presentation.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that most comments would be made at the end of the presentation in regard to how all of the Villages will relate to each other.
- Ms. Atvars liked unoccupied green spaces mixed between levels and wondered if these would have an opportunity to have a vertical plane as well. Greenery spilling over the sides could be a nice addition.
- Ms. Atvars agreed with other Board members that the pop out move is important and should be developed but not every building should be similar to each other. Inverting colors or scaling down the pop would ensure that each building has a unique identify.

Ms. Monk:

- Agreed with Ms. Atvars regarding bringing the ground level and roof together with green above, providing interest about the roof.
- Ms. Monk liked the push-pull and form.
- Ms. Monk commented on a particular view being displayed but did not identify the location for the audio recording.
- Ms. Monk commented that the design was looking good.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that transparency, openness and light was good to see.
- Mr. Krueger would add comments at the end of the presentation regarding the relation of Villages to each other and the public.
- Mr. Krueger appreciated the massing and believed this was a great start.

Mr. Donovan stated that feedback regarding ways to better bring the Design Review Board through the official process would be appreciated.

Mr. Dan Simpson *with* ZGF Architects began the presentation for Washington Village. There will be a high public profile as the location is along 156th Avenue Northeast. The Village will help form the central campus plaza. An overhead bridge was shown in a slide which crosses State Route 520 from the transit center.

The five buildings in this Village respond to unique circumstances; geometry and vicinity of the site, the creation of something which will embrace the promenade or overhead bridge, and the creation of something different along the plaza and central courtyard space.

The ground floor will incorporate energy elements, an urban market hall environment with food service, retail and multi-purpose areas. There is only a small amount of workplace neighborhoods. Energizing this campus is paramount in creating transparency and accessibility.

Upstairs, the building forms and the idea of the building responds to the idea of the workplace as well. Neighborhood flexible team spaces with daylight access and views are gathered around central atrium core elements connecting the buildings vertically on the inside as well as connecting community spaces to the exterior. Interesting internal elements or geodes can be recognized as being connected to the outside and differentiated so that the idea of the building is not the same on all sides. The four to five story interconnected atrium space will be where employees gather for collaborative work. There are also kitchenettes and closed collaborative spaces.

The promenade is an elevated bridge crossing the freeway landing at the central plaza and a sense of welcome and arrival at both the bridge and street level is created with a threshold or gateway between buildings A and B. The bridge is approximately 25' wide, with landscaping on top and underneath. The elevation gain is 15'. Bike storage lockers, employee showers and a coffee shop will be located here.

The three buildings to the south form frontage and also have the opportunity to create a contrasting space, distinct from the central plaza. While the plaza presented in the images of Mr. Chau is large with a hardscape and urban quality, a more landscaped opportunity is being created in the center of these three buildings. Zones where atriums break out take on a more scaled down character with a strong indoor-outdoor quality.

The frontage along 156th Avenue Northeast from corner to corner is 1,500' long, the equivalent of four to five blocks. There is an existing vehicle access under the building across the street and a proposed new vehicle access on the side of the street of this project. There is a vehicular shuttle access planned and visual connectivity between a café and garden zone. A set back to enclose the drop-off and shuttle zone into a forecourt creates a sense of relief in the scale of the firmly defined street wall.

The buildings were displayed in renderings in black and white to show a range of expressions on the exterior. External terrace opportunities connect nature and the workplace. There is a base-middle-top overall massing strategy. Articulation will be detailed at a later presentation. The interface zone will have a great deal of depth; rooms which project out beyond the typical facades, the second-floor terrace and a series of operable openings at the upper levels to create a difference between

neighborhood and community zones within the building. There are two versions of exterior cladding, one with solidity and rhythm, and one with a glassier sense of daylight and sky.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that the café use of the space under the pedestrian bridge sounds great.
- Ms. Monk stated that the two concepts of curtain walls shown looked very interesting and natural light will be appreciated.
- Ms. Monk liked the geode concept.

Mr. Liu:

- Asked if the pedestrian bridge is part of the campus project.

Mr. Donavan replied that WSDOT and Sound Transit are being worked directly with. The entire bridge is ultimately a WSDOT project.

- Mr. Liu asked if the design team is working on the extension of the bridge as well as how the bridge ends.

Mr. Donavan replied yes.

- Mr. Liu stated that there may be more opportunity at the pedestrian arrival space.
- Mr. Liu stated that there are great things going on in many spaces and scales.
- Mr. Liu stated that the shuttle drop-off might be moved toward the south side, enhancing the arrival experience.
- Mr. Liu liked the extra wall design, simple but interchangeable and inviting light and natural materials to the view.

Mr. Krueger:

- Liked forms within the internal courtyard.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated the presentation looks very good so far.
- Ms. Atvars suggested exploring ways to extend the geode theme; that how the rocks break and materials used will be opportunities.

- Ms. Atvars asked if the landscaped courtyard blends into spaces inside, and if there will be greenery planned within the buildings.

Mr. Simpson replied that the greenery was to be determined, but blurring the distinction between courtyard space and interior space as well as extending ground plane sensibility was being examined.

- Ms. Atvars was curious to see more.

Mr. Martin:

- [Inaudible] the bridge is a front door to the campus [inaudible].

Mr. Simpson replied not having an answer to resolve the concern, especially between the landing and forest thread, but the topic is being worked on. The resolution of the forest thread, creeping from the southeast, is being examined and the definitiveness of the arrival and integration of forest thread within urban infrastructure is part of what is being worked on.

- [Inaudible]

Mr. Simpson replied that the number of non-rectilinear and non-Cartesian orientations is the reality of the Site Plan. Orientations range from due-west to southwest and southeast, as well as northeast and northwest, omni-directional. Discussions are around maintaining healthy and productive work environments with no glare and also the energy impacts of solar gain. Using technology to control operable blinds either inside or outside will involve maintenance cost as well as design but the idea is in play at this time. A fixed shading system for the various orientations is difficult and smart glare control would be good.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that the next presentation would be more telling in how materials will be pulled together.
- Mr. Sutton stated that while the concept was not as concrete on this Village, the materiality will play a large role.

Mr. Dale Alberda *with* NBBJ Architects continued with the Sammamish Village. What makes this Village unique from the others is that the location is the most embedded in the forest thread. A transition from pastoral landscape to a more urban structured part of the campus is desired. Being in the trees was leveraged. Amenities can be embedded in the forest edge and also adjacent to the activity fields to the north and east. The circulation and view axis into the site and on the site through spaces, and how

the street is connected to the center of the campus visually and physically for pedestrians is being considered. Working with how the Sammamish Spine will connect each building but also into the Washington Village and to Northeast 31st Street is another consideration.

An adjustment since the Master Plan was completed was to move Building G slightly to allow a direct visual connection from the corner of 156th Avenue Northeast and Northeast 31st Street. People arriving at that point will be able to look between the buildings and see all the way to the center of the campus. An overlay of the original Master Plan was displayed.

The ground plane is layered from the forest thread toward the street at Northeast 31st Street. Building G creates an urban edge and is rotated in such a way to allow an auto court to come into the site. Central gathering spaces, being called living rooms and dens, look toward landscape and outdoor amenities. The atrium has been staggered to create two story living rooms. Connectivity between living rooms does not diminish an ability to be in individual spaces but connects well enough for people to intuitively move from one living room to the next, in the spirit of the Microsoft term *Walk-up Culture*. Further views were displayed.

Each building has two heads and a link in the massing; heads are articulated with a particular sun control and links are where living rooms are expressed. Where shading will be needed is being explored. The correct dimension of space between buildings is being considered. An existing stand of trees at Northeast 31st Street and 156th Avenue Northeast has been preserved. The experience of indoor and outdoor merge together.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked for clarification regarding what resembled treehouses beyond living rooms.

Mr. Alberda replied that elevated outdoor rooms out of the living rooms was an idea being explored. The living rooms are a graduation from an interior space, to semi-interior space, to balconies or outlooks; independent structures bridged to.

- Mr. Sutton liked the conceptual idea, but aesthetically the design was a strong contrast to the rest of the building.
- Mr. Sutton asked if the first floor would be substantially taller than floors above.

Mr. Alberda replied that the first floor would be three feet taller than the typical office floor.

- Mr. Sutton commented that the bike commuter forum feels that the space wants taller volume.

Mr. Alberda commented that the bike storage would be a largely glass structure to celebrate bike commuting.

Mr. Martin:

- Felt the concepts were very strong.
- Mr. Martin commented [inaudible].

Mr. Liu

- Stated that when rotating the living rooms, the building seems cut in half and asked if building depth versus building height was considered.
- Mr. Liu stated that the vehicular access point appeared crowded and asked if a traffic study has been completed.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that the real effect of vertical sun shading was hard to see in the rendering and looked forward to seeing materiality. The fins should not be overly repetitive.
- Ms. Atvars wondered about the placement if the cafeteria amenity had been dictated by the Microsoft Master Plan.

Mr. Alberda replied yes.

- Ms. Atvars commented that the cafeteria appeared to be in the furthest corner from the other amenities and a mini-version of the cafeteria might be brought down so that employees do not necessarily have to walk so far in the middle of the day.
- Ms. Atvars asked if all cafeterias were required to be central and if so, why.

Mr. Donovan replied that in the Plan, Building 37 has café amenities and the employees in the village are not disadvantaged in this respect. The building without amenity space is a short walk from a building that does have a café. Adjacent buildings help to support the lunchtime rush.

- Ms. Atvars stated that knowing how amenities are distributed throughout the entire project would be helpful in order to understand how the buildings work together.

Ms. Monk:

- Liked the forest concept with water and nature.
- Ms. Monk liked the inside-outside links. Fresh air and the ability to step outside is valuable.
- Ms. Monk liked the treehouse concept.
- Ms. Monk appreciated that the stand of trees was being kept.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the interface of materiality through the forest thread was great.
- Mr. Krueger liked the staggered atrium.
- Mr. Krueger stated looking forward to the next iteration.

Mr. Rus Sheiman *with* WRNS Studio began the Chelan Village presentation. There are only two buildings making the Village the smallest. Building J is the executive office building and Building K is the Guest Engagement Center (GEC) for customers from all around the world to engage with Microsoft. There is no street frontage and a bridge between the urban campus and existing forest is provided. The architect calls the Village the civic portal. A great deal of effort is being made to save as many of the existing trees as possible and in particular, the trees that stand between Buildings J and K.

Views of elevations were shown and described. The trees can be seen through a bridge element connecting to Whatcom Village and playing fields are to the southeast. The lobby space of Building J is a blow-through lobby with glass on both sides, providing a view through to the plaza space and trees beyond. The lower two floors are seen as being underground. The upper two floors are of the air or trees. The upper two floors of Building K are light and transparent.

The massing strategies are different in both buildings because of different programmatic elements. Building J is seen as weaving between the plaza space and playing fields, pulling garden spaces. Each of the hub spaces continually view different sides. There is one amenity space in the southeast corner of the project engaging both the playing fields and legacy forest. Hub spaces where the building inflects public spaces engaging the garden side are connected between an open stair that weaves up through the building.

The ground plain responds to tree locations and the upper volume is cantilevered over with very heavy supports in the middle of the building. There is a connection across between both buildings. Building K (GEC) is where the hospitality and social spaces will be including a huge dining space as a part of the trees. There is a void space down the middle of the building where planting will engage people in the experience of the Pacific Northwest. Programmatically, level one has all exhibit spaces and a briefing center. Level two is dining terraces which open to the forest. Levels three and four are briefing suites. More renderings were displayed.

People from all over the world will come to the Visitor Center and the experience will not be generic but express the character of this area and the hometown of Microsoft.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Martin:

- [Inaudible]

Ms. Monk:

- Appreciated the preservation of trees and giving people a sense of place.
- Ms. Monk asked if the street would be a drop-off area or a connection to parking.

Mr. Sheiman replied that there is no connection to parking; the entry drive has existing parking and trees are planted in between parking or are existing. The path that exists is being reused.

Mr. Rafael Viñoly-Menendez *with* LMN Architects proceeded with the last presentation. As the campus is committed to be pedestrian and bicycle only, every vehicle whether bringing employees, visitors, services or goods must disappear. The strategy for arriving on the campus must be the same level of quality as experienced within the campus.

Views of the underground or below-grade spaces and particularly the garage portals, gateways into the Villages, were displayed. The loading dock is to the southeast. All visitors and employees will arrive below grade. Equitable access in terms of distance between points of surfacing onto the campus will be provided, and close walking distance to all main entry lobbies have been designed. The level two below-grade is the actual service loop incorporating all back of house loading, the catering kitchen for the entire campus, back of house spaces such as data, mail sorting and storage, and a service tunnel that brings in all goods brought by truck into a network of electric vehicles which then service basements of each of the building. None of the buildings have a back door at grade at the streetscape.

The garage has an extremely large footprint, and intuitive wayfinding not heavily reliant on signage is needed. Penetration of daylight, ventilation and views are important from every level of the garage space as well as the idea of landscape from the surface deeper into below-grade spaces and continuing the materiality of outdoor pavilions. A sense of individual Village identity but also commonality for easy navigation into and out of the campus is a guiding design principle. Further images were displayed. Openings in each of the floor plates, vertical circulation or the combination of elevators and stairs, and pavilions which are both weather protection and a gathering space to public plazas were shown.

At Whatcom Village, playing against the rigid geometry of buildings creates whimsy. Portals are not sealed boxes but rather preserve light, fresh air and views. The plaza portal is located at the end of the transition from the pedestrian bridge connecting from the light rail station and the west campus. This particular portal has an omni-directional quality in terms of the buildings which surround. The portals have glass in the covers to create variety of light, and at night and in winter will be lit from below to create a visually interesting piece of the building.

At Sammamish Village and Chelan Villages, the portal takes cues from engagement with landscape.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Martin:

- [inaudible]

Mr. Liu:

- Asked what the colors at the beginning of a diagram that had been shown indicated.

Mr. Viñoly-Menendez replied that the colors were meant to indicate that there is a difference between each. When looking at the elevator shaft elements, in example, each portal shaft would be clad with materials that reflect the character of the buildings in that Village. The timber structure is a common element to all, but the elevator shafts would have slight variations in terms of materiality that will reflect the character of each building. The colors do not indicate a color but rather a strategy.

- Mr. Liu liked the daylight terraces in the parking structure and asked if there would also be programmed space or if all four levels would be parking only.

Mr. Viñoly-Menendez replied that no programmed space was planned, but some informal spaces below grade could occur. No programmed spaces occur under the amenity level.

- Mr. Liu asked if the portal spaces are connected to atrium spaces or programmed space in the building.

Mr. Viñoly-Menendez replied no, that travel would be from below grade to the surface level and visually connect to individual amenities from there.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that this is a favorite part of the campus and tying everything together allows for creativity and unique forms.
- Ms. Atvars agreed with Mr. Martin that there is an opportunity to work with other team members at the bridge.
- Ms. Atvars asked if there would be a subtle, tasteful way to light, in colors, for pedestrian use to identify where parked.
- Ms. Atvars was interested in seeing how far landscape can be brought down to the parking areas.

Ms. Monk:

- Agreed with the other Board members
- Ms. Monk appreciated the concept of being at garage level four underground and seeing daylight.
- Ms. Monk asked about the buildings being vacated and the number of parking spots effected.

Mr. Viñoly-Menendez replied not having exact numbers for the current campus but approximately 6,000 seats are being vacated while approximately 13,000 seats are being put back in. The parking for the 13,000 seats is 50% Single Occupancy Vehicle (S.O.V.) down from the current percentage of 59%. Continued improvements in ride share, light rail and the shuttle system will be how the S.O.V. percentage will continue to move lower.

Mr. Donavan thanked the Board for comments.

APPROVAL**LAND-2018-00869, LMC Marymoor****Neighborhood:** Southeast Redmond**Description:** Proposal to construct (1) six story and (2) five story multi-family residential buildings with commercial space.**Location:** 17611 Northeast 70th Street**Applicant:** Rocky Flores *with* Encore Architects**Prior Review Dates:** 09/12/18, 12/06/18, 12/20/18 and 01/17/19

Mr. David Lee stated that Encore Architects had returned to present changes asked for by the Design Review Board at the last meeting. Mr. Shaffer White, Board member, was not present but had provided comments which were given the Board Members for discussion as well.

Mr. Brian Bellissimo *with* Encore Architects recapped that the buildings had been presented separately at previous meetings, and that the changes from the last round of each meeting would now be brought together. The presentation would focus on the last comments received and another full package will go to Council. The goals have remained the same throughout the project. Eclecticism has been a driving force in each building in material, form and use of art. Materials have been chosen; Z profile metal in blue-gray had been decided on at the last meeting to move away from curved corrugations. Painted fiber cement panels will be the canvas for art. A Redondo gray brick forms the base, and stack bond with darker grout is proposed. Specific art proposals are still moving through the Art commission.

At the last meeting the Board members were had agreed with the massing changes made and articulation of curved forms in elevation. A main comment was that art should be more distinct and prominent, potentially penetrating the rim of the top of the roof. Another comment had been regarding the courtyard pool area, that the termination of the art should actually drop down to the ground. Future maintenance is being examined. Another comment was that at the north façade, parapets should be more differentiated. Updated renderings of views were displayed and described.

A mural location may need to become glass to alleviate visibility from a garage. A color palette which brings more contrast and modulation to the courtyard would be used. Art balconies have been brought to the southern facades for pop, staggered at the corner for added effect.

The east building uses a simpler material palette. A comment regarding board form concrete has been incorporated. More views with descriptions of colors and materials were presented. A stack of balconies appeared lonely to the Board at the last meeting and these have been increased in size, now more usable and prominent as well as

holding a corner. The western building roofline has been articulated to capture a glass canopy and maintain the ribbon around the top.

Mr. Peter Nelson *with* Weisman Design Group addressed landscaping. The landscape plan had been well received at the last meeting so updates have been made as the buildings have changed, but the concept remains the same. The renderings were displayed including the minor shifts due to building changes. Since the last meeting, one element has been added; green roof has been added to provide more greenery to a building.

Bryan Bellissimo stated that there had been a request to pull back to view how the project will look for the community and a rendering was displayed. A desire to end cap the sixth floor of the west building has resulted in a unit brought down and around. The far west portion is a part of a 30-foot setback. Massing terminates at the stair tower acting as a gasket and transitions down to the five-story element.

Mr. Krueger asked if comments of Mr. White had been given to the applicant and David Lee replied no.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. White was not present at the meeting but provided written comments based on the materials online for consideration. Below is the text of the email to the Board from Mr. White.

...Overall, I think they are steps in the right direction.

These are comments based on their Design Change PDF.

Page 2: I could go either way on the mural touching the ground. I would have liked to see the inverse color facade idea for the inner court at least tried, but trust that the designers tried it and it just didn't work.

Page 3: I like the added verticality of the mural. One thing we have discussed is lighting. It would be great if lighting ensured the art pieces were nice and bright during the evenings. Serve as a beacon to the building.

Page 4: Good

Page 5: Good, though which we could get more of an inset at the mural base level.

Page 6:

1 - Kind of mixed on this one. I do want there to be something special about this corner, not sure if the wood siding is quite right, but could be on board as it looks like ties into the other wood elements.

2 - Works for me, though I would suggest the balcony panels perhaps have a different quality/version of panel than the other dark clad facades, but really just a thought.

3 - I actually prefer the previous white version. I feel like it sets up a nice rhythm with the other white verticals on this facade.

I also liked the idea of possibly using this white space as a frame for another mural/art piece. Perhaps something that ties into whatever is being done at the balconies. If that's not feasible, or overkill, then I see no harm in putting in the additional windows we see in the "current design".

Page 7: This is the big one for me. I mentioned this in the last meeting on this project, not sure if it was missed, or the designers don't agree. If they don't agree, I guess I can live with it, but want to make sure they tried it.

When we went to the thicker blades of the seesaw building on the right, it went from horizontal lap siding to more of the fiber cement board we see everywhere else.

I definitely like the thicker wall expression. However, I think there's plenty of fiber board on the industrial building across the way. I also think the horizontal lap siding has a more natural and delicate feel that supports the basic part of the building. Please do ask about this item with the designers. I'm concerned it just got missed.

Page 8:

1 - Not sure how I feel about this one. Maybe the material board will help. Seems a little too silvery in the rendering, but I do like the contrast with the other elements. Leave it up to the board.

2 - Good

3 - Good, though I wonder if there's not a chance for a bit more vibrancy in the color palette on the inside. So much color on the other facades, but this facade and courtyards feels like it takes more of its cues from the other buildings. Overall visually though I'm ok with it.

4 - Reads a little flat in the render, but I like the change up and the tie to the other facades.

Page 9:

1 - I prefer the previous. Feels a little stubby without it.

2 - Good

Mr. Krueger emphasized the comments in bold regarding page 7 of the email from Mr. White; Changing from lap siding to flat panel. Bryan Bellissimo replied that a simple white gasket was chosen. Wood tone does not show on the building any longer and the simpler white offered more of a pop.

Mr. Bellissimo stated that at a couple of previous meetings, there had been a desire expressed to thicken up and the proportion is better now. This is unchanged from the previous meeting.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked if the north building is blue.

Mr. Bellissimo replied the building reads bluer. Due to the renderings reflecting sunlight. The materials used are dark gray.

- Ms. Atvars commented liking the building on page 24 as it was before compared to now. The feel is too much wood product on the corner.

Mr. Bellissimo replied that the comment that changed the corner was to set the southwest corner off from the rest of the building.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated having made the comment in question regarding the corner and had hoped that metal or another more eclectic material would be used.
- Mr. Krueger agreed with Ms. Atvars that the previous iteration was better specific to the corner element.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that at the corner in question, the tall vertical wood in the middle felt more defined in the previous scheme and liked the gap with white corner next to it.

Mr. Krueger asked Ms. Atvars if the southeast corner towards the bike path was good, as the area had been a focus for Ms. Atvars, and Ms. Atvars replied yes.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked what would occur in the soffits in the north building.

Mr. Bellissimo replied that a gasket is created with hardy panel.

- Mr. Sutton asked if siding is treated like a plane that wraps and folds.

Mr. Bellissimo replied that this extends. There will be instances of mural on a return wall which will then transition to the soffit, particularly where a mural is horizontal. The soffit may receive the mural where elevated to be seen from the street. A rendering was described but without locations for the audio recording.

- Mr. Sutton asked if the southwest corner would not be as deep.

Mr. Bellissimo replied that there would be a change in plane of the metal of eight inches.

- Mr. Sutton stated liking a corner unidentified for the audio recording.

Mr. Bellissimo replied that a breaking point for the applicant was bringing art down to the pedestrian realm allowing this to break the base, breaking the plane and creating a gateway.

- Mr. Sutton stated that the mural on the left and the portion above windows on the slide being displayed became skinny and the mural should extend to the soffit.
- Mr. Sutton was very happy with how the project had progressed.
- Mr. Sutton preferred the older version of the corner discussed by Ms. Atvars and Mr. Krueger but staff can be worked with.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that the project had come a long way.
- Ms. Monk believed art on the side by the pool coming into the ground ties this into the building better.
- Ms. Monk believed the rounded corner worked out well.
- Ms. Monk agreed that the previous iteration of the southwest corner was preferred, too muted now with the extra wood color. Going back to the previous iteration or working with staff for a more colorful or interestingly textured element would be fine.

Mr. Martin:

- Stated that the soffits above the mural [inaudible].
- Mr. Martin asked about [inaudible].

Mr. Krueger replied recalling that the Board commented that the aspect was okay despite probably splashing from the pool.

- Mr. Martin commented [inaudible].

Mr. Liu:

- Stated that the project was coming together just fine.
- Mr. Liu stated not liking white with black or dark accent.

MOTIONED BY MS. MONK TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION OF DESIGN APPROVAL TO THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE AND TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH ALL STANDARD CONDITIONS. MS. MONK FURTHER MOVED THAT ALL ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGN FLEXIBILITIES CONTAINED WITHIN THE STAFF

MEMO MEET THE DECISION CRITERIA OF RZC 21.76.070.C.8.A AND IS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL BY THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE AND CITY COUNCIL. SECONDED BY MS. ATVARs.

MR KRUEGER ADDED THAT THE APPLICANT SHOULD VISIT WITH STAFF REGARDING THE SOUTHWEST CORNER AND ECLECTICISM.

Mr. Lee stated that prior to the Technical Committee forwarding a recommendation to City Council, the southwest corner should be brought back to the Design Review Board to recommend a more concrete idea. Ms. Atvars asked if this could be accomplished via email and Mr. Lee replied yes, as the recommendation has already been made.

Mr. Bellissimo asked if introducing art balconies on the southwest corner would accomplish eclecticism as artists are creating interesting art. The Arts Commission approval will not be immediate and the project should not be held up in the chance that the art will accomplish what is desired by the Board.

Mr. Sutton believed that the building should stand alone without the art.

Mr. Krueger replied that options will be worked on through Mr. Lee.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTIONED BY MR. SUTTON TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:04 P.M.
SECONDED BY MS. ATVARs. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**April 4, 2019
MINUTES APPROVED ON**

**Carolyn Garza
RECORDING SECRETARY**

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

May 16, 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 Kevin Sutton

Board members: Diana Atvars, Ralph Martin,
Stephanie Monk and Shaffer White

EXCUSED ABSENCES: Craig Krueger and Henry Liu

STAFF PRESENT: Steven Fischer, Carol Helland, David Lee and Gary Lee, 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. Sutton at 7:00 p.m.

APPROVAL

LAND-2018-00869 LMC Marymoor

Neighborhood: Southeast Redmond

Description: Proposal to construct (1) six-story and (2) five-story multi-family residential buildings with commercial space

Location: 17611 Northeast 70th Street

Applicant: Rocky Flores *with* Encore Architects

Prior Review Date: 09/20/18, 11/15/18, 12/06/18, 12/20/18, 01/17/19 and 02/21/19

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

Mr. Lee introduced the Board to Ms. Carol Helland, Deputy Planning Director. Ms. Helland stated having been with City of Redmond since the beginning of March, working

previously with the City of Bellevue for 23 years, and thanked the Design Review Board for their work.

Mr. Lee continued. At the time of the previous approval for LAND-2018-00868/00869 on February 21, 2019, the Design Review Board had asked that the southeast corner of the site be redesigned and sent for review through email. The result is a request for formal approval of the revision to the southeast corner as part of the Board recommendation to the Technical Committee.

MOTION BY MS. MONK TO APPROVE LAND-2018-00869 LMC MARYMOOR, AMENDING THE FEBRUARY 21, 2019 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION OF DESIGN APPROVAL TO THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE. THE AMENDMENT TO THE RECOMMENDATION IS IN REGARD TO ONLY THE REDESIGN AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE SITE. THE FEBRUARY 21, 2019 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION SHALL INCLUDE THE CONTENTS OF THE MAY 16, 2018 MEMO AND CONDITIONS SET FORTH IN THIS MEMO. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WHITE. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL

LAND-2015-01974 Archer Hotel

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: Seven-story building on the single lot, five-stories for hotel and multi-functional use and two-stories for a 170-car parking garage

Location: 7210 – 164th Avenue Northeast

Applicant: Bob Mannon *with* LodgeWorks Partners, LP

Prior Review Dates: 08/06/15, 01/21/16, 05/05/16 and 04/18/19

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

Mr. Lee stated that three items remained outstanding. Staff finds that concerns have been addressed and the project is ready for approval with the condition that the planting specifications for proposed trees not damage sidewalks and the recommendation that the use of **root berries** is strongly recommended.

Mr. Howie Beauchamp *with* LK Architecture began the presentation. Two options are being presented regarding planting. The first and preferred option is 10 to 12-foot tall trees with an immediate impact as opposed to a green screen which would require seasons for vines to cover. Renderings were displayed.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked what the material of the green screen would be.

Mr. Beauchamp replied that the product name is Greenscreen, a steel with epoxy type of coating over it attached to structural steel columns.

Mr. White:

- Stated leaning toward green screen as this matches better with the rest of the building, but not being completely opposed to trees.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked if any plantings would be removed in order to install the proposed plantings.

Mr. Beauchamp replied yes, there are three evergreen style trees on each side. Which option is chosen will determine how many and which trees would be removed.

- Mr. Sutton asked if the trees to be removed would be planted somewhere else.

Mr. Beauchamp replied not knowing if the trees would go back to a nursery, but that there is no intention of planting elsewhere on the site.

Ms. Monk:

- Asked if any material other than ivy had been explored for climbing on the metal trellis, citing that ivy is very invasive and can spread easily around the city through birds and seeds.

Mr. Beauchamp replied that the landscaper had recommended that two species of vines be planted, neither considered an ivy varietal. Both species flower white seasonally. Using the green screen option will require more trades working onsite, more in-depth than having a landscaper install three trees. Again, the trees would provide an immediate impact.

Ms. Atvars:

- Liked the green screen better but the proportion of the green screen seems long for the façade. Pulling up higher would make more sense.

Mr. Beauchamp replied that anchoring back to the building façade was not desired, and supporting from the ground was preferable for water proofing. The limitation is 14 feet.

- Ms. Atvars liked that trees could have a more dynamic height change and trees would be voted for.

Mr. Martin:

- Asked if a planted green wall had been considered.

Mr. Beauchamp replied that only the two options presented had been considered.

- Mr. Martin stated preferring a green screen.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated preferring the green screen, not with ivy but with a flowering vine. Evergreen shrubs would not work well in the location.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated preferring green screen.

Mr. Beauchamp continued to display renderings. Aluminum tube trellis brackets are 3 x 8, previously listed as 3 x 6. Top outriggers are 3 x 10. The fabricator from Wichita, Kansas will be installing onsite.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the new rendering was a much better design and liked the proportions.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked if plates are welded together.

Mr. Beauchamp replied there are male and female receiver plates. An anchor should work here. A rendering was described but without detail for the audio recording.

- Mr. Sutton stated that given the height of the building, this is not that noticeable.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that the design was an improvement.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that the design looks good.

Mr. Martin:

- Stated that the design was sufficient.
- Mr. Martin asked about a recessed box [inaudible].

Mr. Beauchamp replied that the intention was that the plate would be somewhat flush with the stone but not recessed.

- Mr. Martin asked if the area was sealed.

Mr. Beauchamp replied yes.

- Mr. Martin stated that the current presentation looked better than the previous presentation.

Mr. Lee stated that the façade item, relief of modulation on the east and west facades, needed to be addressed. Mr. Beauchamp stated only having the items presented as issues. Mr. Lee replied by listing the first two items, 1) blank wall mitigation for the southwest and southeast corners and 2) decorative brackets connecting the garage trellis to masonry columns of the south façade, but then realized that the east and west elevation façade treatment had been accepted as constructed; the Design Review Board would not make a decision on the issue.

MOTION BY MR. WHITE TO APPROVE MODIFICATIONS OF LAND-2015-01974 ARCHER HOTEL, BUILDING 2016-05548, GREEN SCREEN OPTION CHOSEN AND REVISED BRACKET AT TRELLIS APPROVED, EAST AND WEST ELEVATION MODIFICATIONS TO BE MADE AS DISCUSSED BY STAFF, WITH STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR INCONSISTENCIES. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. MARTIN. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5 Minute Break

APPROVAL**LAND-2019-00369 Microsoft Refresh – Washington Village****Neighborhood:** Overlake**Description:** Construction of five (5) five-story office buildings**Location:** Microsoft Main Campus, south of Northeast 36th Street and west of 156th Avenue Northeast**Applicant:** Aaron Dundson *with* Microsoft**Prior Review Date:** 02/21/19**Staff Contact:** Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or glee@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee stated that the request before the Board was for an approval of site plans, building elevations, color and materials. The package has been updated and refined since the last presentation. Staff had four areas of concern, resulting in a recommendation not to approve the package until additional information would be provided.

The concerns had been 1) lack of detail information for the bridge structure within the village; 2) a need for additional information justifying a request for Administrative Design Flexibility (ADF) for front set-back deviation; 3) an additional ADF request for the roof line modulation along 156th Avenue Northeast and 4) lack of clarity regarding use of exterior finishes.

Staff has met twice with the designers. A revised package was uploaded for Board review earlier this week that better addresses the original concerns of staff. The design team has further updated explanations to the point that staff now supports approval for the requests of the site plan, building elevations, colors and materials as to be presented at this meeting.

As there is still a lack of design detail for the bridge in the village, staff recommends that the bridge portion be continued for review later. Staff recommends that the updated package be approved with standard conditions for inconsistencies and with review of the bridge in the village to be continued.

Mr. Eric Ragde, Development Manager *with* Microsoft, stated believing that information from the Board and City has been implemented into the design of the village.

Mr. Dan Simpson and Mr. Allyn Stellmacher *with* ZGF began the presentation. The geode concept and five buildings of the village have grouped into two neighborhood clusters with Whatcom Village to the east and Sammamish Village to the south. The geode concept is to harness the internal energy of the buildings and common space, from inside outward. Renderings were described. The ground plain is brought to life with

meeting spaces and amenities. Being located at the center of the villages has made architecture stronger and nuanced.

Extra boards and material samples were displayed in addition to renderings. In the interface, material that clads the interface zone is a blend of cementitious panels. Glazing is the same used for the rest of the building with the exception of some areas set back. Exposed wood structure inside will reflect natural landscape outside. Components which make up levels two, three and four as well as set back pieces on level five are punctuated by simple Sine-wave profile modal inserts in the glazed system. A horizontal ribbon of metal connects all buildings. Simple textures, shapes and forms play with the light quality variety of Seattle. Materials were pointed out on renderings but locations not described for the audio recording. Poppies draw light through the mid-section of the building. The sheen separates activities at the center of the interface from outer layers, creating lower scale elements. Subtle articulation and reflection helps set up the internal action of the building in a powerful way. Demure plazas calm architectures.

At ground level, parts bump out to reclaim the understory creating modulation and pedestrian scale. Some tonation is taken from Whatcom Village to create a relationship in a sophisticated way. At the ground floors, all glazing is a higher clarity glass for better visibility in and out.

Mr. Stellmacher asked if there were questions to this point, and Mr. Sutton replied that the materials made sense.

A building C and D bridge connection involves budget and security concerns. Two options are being considered; one is a bridge and the other is not a bridge. Material options would not be significantly different. The preference of Microsoft is to provide a universality of access.

The first ADF is requested along the frontage of 156th Avenue Northeast. A defined setback maximum of 45 feet is asked to be raised to 111 feet as an overall strategy, an accommodation for modulation for an urban focal point as well as safety. Microsoft is working with arborists to preserve current trees if possible.

The second ADF is regarding a 100-foot maximum limit for roofline extension. An alternative strategy is proposed on buildings B and E. The top floor has been set back ten feet at the north edge reducing the sense of scale. A driver for modulation is the pedestrian experience.

Approval of the campus architecture is requested with the caveat that the bridge landing or promenade would be on hold for four to six weeks to allow review of all design issues. Mr. Sutton asked for a quick overview of the promenade.

Mr. Stellmacher replied that further details would be forthcoming regarding the elevated bridge structure and design coming across 156th Avenue Northeast. The connector is between the end of the public bridge and the promenade. Renderings were displayed. A bike café and storage are still planned. Extending the forest thread through is important. As the transition begins from pier nine toward campus, there is a sense of inflection; the bridge narrows and swerves gently to the right. The idea is to balance the amount of territory given to the upper pathway with open, generous space at the lower level as well. Landscape can then take a prominent role in the transition zone where there will be a mix of activities. The arrival is a gentle welcome into the campus, framed between the wings of buildings A and B but the arrival moment is the central plaza, not the touchdown point of the bridge.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked if all surfaces will be addressed.

Mr. Stellmacher replied being responsible for architecture of the Washington Village; the totality of the landscape surface will be handled by the landscape team.

- Mr. Sutton asked if the walking surface would be completely open or if there is freedom to use landscaping.

Mr. Stellmacher replied that the team would come back to the Board with detail.

Mr. Keith Donovan *with* Microsoft asked if Mr. Sutton was referring to the surface of the bridge over 156th Avenue Northeast meeting the campus. Mr. Sutton replied from pier nine to the left into campus. Mr. Donovan replied that this would be a part of the landscape package from the bridge design team, governed by the Redmond Public Works department. Mr. Stellmacher stated that the element would not be for this team to design but rather to integrate the structure, a supporting role.

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

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that the ADFs were fine and what is proposed satisfies.
- Ms. Atvars stated preferring a bridge but budget constraints were understood.
- Ms. Atvars stated that the exterior stair could be a nice texture in the space and in nicer weather, people may choose to use a stair.
- Ms. Atvars asked about new and existing trees.

Mr. Guy Michaelson, Landscape Architect *with* Berger Partnership, replied that there are significant stands of existing trees that will remain in pockets around the campus particularly on the east side. On 156th Avenue Northeast, trees on the corners and mid-block are hoped to be saved.

- Ms. Atvars stated that renderings show a mix of new and mature trees and hoped the trees were portrayed as accurately as possible.
- Ms. Atvars stated that there was a strong design behind the foliage.
- Ms. Atvars asked if renderings at evening for nighttime looks could be made as the current renderings only show sun reflections. A lighting plan was included in the Board packet.

Mr. Stellmacher replied that nighttime renderings have not been done. There will be illumination for pedestrian safety and particularly around the amenity zones and work space commons.

- Ms. Atvars stated that the illumination will add a horizontal striping to the buildings but this was fine.

Mr. Stellmacher replied that design was toward variety to fit all hours of the day.

- Ms. Atvars stated that on the promenade bridge, there may be an opportunity for a covering structure.
- Ms. Atvars stated that the geode concept could be cracked at the bridge.
- Ms. Atvars stated that landscape features on the bridge could spill over the edges.

Ms. Monk:

- Asked if locating a less busy street for the ADF had been investigated due to heavy traffic.

Mr. Stellmacher stated that the master plan provided a location for each major drop off facility in the campus organization, established in the phase of work prior to the design of the village.

- Ms. Monk stated interest in more information regarding the promenade gateway to uncover more opportunities in design.
- Ms. Monk stated that the texture of the walkway could slow bikes down, slightly bumpy.
- Ms. Monk stated agreeing with Ms. Atvars regarding preferring a bridge, a good escape from team-based rooms and also away from pedestrian traffic.

- Ms. Monk stated agreeing with Ms. Atvars that nighttime renderings would be great to see.

Mr. Martin:

- Stated that the book was very informative and well put together.
- Mr. Martin agreed with Ms. Atvars' and Ms. Monk's comments.
- Mr. Martin stated that the bike café could be more transparent, and facades could pick up a bicycle theme.
- Mr. Martin asked how bicyclist would be directed to the bike café.

Mr. Stellmacher replied that there will be a large bike repository with maintenance and refreshments, part of the overall campus amenity set. Mr. Stellmacher replied that the plan is for employee bike locations to be consolidated into three or four facilities around the campus. Employees will learn quickly where to go. Visitor bike storage and racks will be provided at other surface locations for convenience. Regular cyclists will be aware.

- Mr. Martin stated the roof modulation with setback is perfectly fine.
- [Inaudible]
- Mr. Martin asked how reflective the glass will be.

Mr. Simpson replied that standard reflectivity is 19%, and at vertical accent elements between 36% and 40%, providing dapple with bright sunlight and modulation on darker days.

Mr. Simpson replied that the goal is to create a sheen that shows the difference between glass.

Mr. Simpson replied that the crackle texture has more animation capturing light with fins. The light and sky color are captured by the different reflectivity that offers variety both nocturnally and in daylight, in terms of continual modulation during light and weather changes.

- Mr. Martin liked the geode concept.
- Mr. Martin suggested an element of surprise would be good.
- Mr. Martin stated the start was very strong.

Mr. White:

- Asked about the bridge option in the courtyard.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that the bridge should be there.

Ms. Monk:

- Asked if the end of the building could be broken up more.

Mr. White:

- Asked for clarification that permission is being requested to set further back

Mr. Stellmacher replied yes, for building C the requirement is five feet back, and design is at 111 feet back. The building would be moved back to create more porous space and to accommodate functional needs.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated liking the new design more.

Mr. Stellmacher asked Ms. Monk for clarification that the bridge should be kept and Ms. Monk replied yes.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that the plaza would be better without the bridge. The stair should be enclosed as there is a lot of activity and would become cleaner and simpler. The rest of the Board seems to be in favor of the bridge, however.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked for clarification that as the request is for flexibility as design progresses and that the Board, though of mixed opinions, would be okay approving the ADFs.

The Board agreed.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated overall the design was nice and complimented the presentation.

MOTION BY MS. ATVARS TO APPROVE THE TWO ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGN FLEXIBILITY REQUESTS SUBMITTED, SITE PLAN, COLORS, MATERIALS AND BUILDING ELEVATIONS AS PROPOSED WITH STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR INCONSISTENCIES. THE PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE WILL CONTINUE TO BE REVIEWED AT A LATER DATE. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. MARTIN. MOTION PASSED 4-0 WITH ONE RECUSAL.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY MS. ATVARS TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:39 P.M. MOTION SECONDED BY MS. MONK. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY