

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

May 2, 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 and Kevin Sutton

EXCUSED ABSENCES: Ralph Martin, Stephanie Monk and Shaffer White

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Fischer, Aaron Ruffin 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 OF MINUTES

MOTION BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE THE APRIL 4, 2019 MEETING MINUTES. MOTION SECONDED BY MS. ATVAR. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY (Mr. Liu had not been in attendance and did not vote regarding the Minutes).

APPROVAL

LAND-2019-00228 Microsoft Refresh – Whatcom Village

Neighborhood: Overlake

Description: Construction of four mixed-use four and five-story office buildings

Location: South of Northeast 36th Street and east of 156th Avenue Northeast

Applicant: Michael Huey *with* CBRE

Prior Review Date: 02/21/19

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

Mr. Ruffin explained that this application was a part of the larger Microsoft redevelopment project. Staff has reviewed the development checklist and finds that the product is consistent with the goals and policies set forth in Redmond Zoning Code. Staff recommends approval of the project. The project came to the Design Review Board as a pre-application on February 21, 2019.

Mr. Gid Palmer, Development Manager for the project *with* Microsoft, stated that Microsoft respects the high standards of the community. Questions and comments had been taken from the pre-application presentation on February 21, 2019 and further detail would be presented at this meeting.

Mr. Palmer continued that the project represents what Microsoft hopes to create in the employee environment; daylight, sustainability, adaptive and flexible space, multiple amenity spaces and outdoor areas both on-site and in the terrace area.

Mr. John Chau *with* LMN Architects stated that the package submitted at this meeting is the same package submitted at the pre-application meeting with some evolution. Approval of the building design only is requested at this meeting, and landscape design will be presented at a later date. Renderings were displayed and details described regarding exterior articulation and views, but locations not explained for the audio recording. Buildings R and K are meant to be showcase buildings. Materiality and shading devices are subtle differences on each façade. All four buildings have different characteristics but will be visually connected. Terracotta and Charcoal colors are seen throughout the exteriors. Elevations were displayed and Mr. Chau explained again that further landscaping design would be presented in detail at a future meeting.

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

Mr. Ruffin asked for clarification regarding the durability of concrete panel. Mr. Chau replied TAKTL, lightweight and high strength concrete panel which comes in various colors and textures. The proposed material is extremely durable, higher end pre-cast in terracotta but thinner; returns are proposed metallic metal etching, wood soffits, and glass which is the equivalent of Viracon. The intention is for more transparent glass at the base where retail and restaurants occur and a durable look without heaviness.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Sutton

- Stated the project continues to be nice and materials make sense.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked if colors would be a random mix on the buildings.

Mr. Chau replied that there would be some variation in panels, and not so engineered to appear as a flat color.

- Ms. Atvars asked if the metal accent panels inside frames would be flat or textured.

Mr. Chau replied that the idea now was flat panel with metallic finish.

- Ms. Atvars advised caution regarding the panel seams as smoother is better, and to stay true to the renderings.
- Ms. Atvars asked how thick the frame feature would be on the thinnest edge.

Mr. Chau replied one foot.

- Ms. Atvars stated that one foot would feel okay, and did not want the feature to become lost with the sun shades.
- Ms. Atvars liked the variety of Building N.

Mr. Liu:

- Liked the roof terrace and appreciated the analysis of outdoor space.
- Mr. Liu stated that panels sing without the heaviness or mass of concrete.
- Mr. Liu asked how reveals and corners would be addressed.
- Mr. Liu stated that warmer tones may match better with terracotta.
- Mr. Liu stated that the project is nicely done.
- Mr. Liu hoped that the corner should be developed more in the next stage.

Mr. Krueger asked Mr. Liu if a response was needed regarding reveals and corners as final approval was being asked for. Mr. Liu replied that the lower mass should appear heavier and detail is modern. The building should not feel like masonry or heavier than the building actually is.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked for the thickness of the panel.

Mr. Chau replied that the panel is 5/8", a thin material.

- Mr. Krueger asked if the canopies are the same color, charcoal.

Mr. Chau replied yes; the same colors would be used for the column cover, canopy cover, shading devices with one exception; and terracotta metal accents on the charcoal building. Rooftop screening should be lighter grey as to disappear.

- Mr. Krueger asked if the shading devices matched the terracotta color.

Mr. Chau replied no. The components are the same with the exception of the frame and condition.

- Mr. Krueger asked if the horizontal shading devices are charcoal.

Mr. Chau replied yes.

- Mr. Krueger commented that how the presentation was done was helpful.
- Mr. Krueger commented that normally a project would experience one more presentation to the Design Review Board before final approval but plans had moved to the final point and this was good.
- Mr. Krueger asked about mechanical screening on the roof.

Mr. Chau described a rendering and explained that more than only a flat panel was planned.

- Mr. Krueger liked the rendering of the street edge along Northeast 36th Street.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the project looked good with only certain details to be refined.

MOTION TO APPROVE LAND-2019-00228, MICROSOFT REFRESH – WHATCOM VILLAGE BY MR. LIU BASED ON STANDARD CONDITION, STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD COMMENTS. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

PRE-APPROVAL REVIEW

Proctor Willows – Consolidated Review

- **LAND-2019-00349 Master Planned Development**
- **LAND-2019-00351 Development Agreement**

Neighborhood: Willows/Rose Hill

Description: Master Plan for mixed-use/residential with 22,000 square feet commercial in 15.38 acres

Location: Southwest corner of Northeast 124th Street and Willows Road Northeast

Applicant: Erik Enstrom *with* Quadrant Homes

Staff Contact: Amy Tarce, 425-556-2938 or atarce@redmond.gov

Ms. Tarce stated that the presentation would be a first introduction to the Proctor Willows Master Plan, which has been submitted to the City as a formal application and has an associated Development Agreement. The permit will be type-five which requires the City Council to be the decision-making body. The Design Review Board will be recommending actions. No recommendations need to be given at this presentation, as large elements of the Master Plan will be identified. Only feedback regarding the general layout of the site particularly around the relationship of open spaces to the buildings, linkages for pedestrians and transportation, and the overall treatment of the site is needed at this time.

The applicant is required to provide some public benefit and there are four items proposed. The degree of benefit to the City is conditioned on Design Review Board feedback regarding the type of enhancements or amenities that should be included. The elements are:

- The entry at Northeast 174th Street, being called a boulevard entry
- The Willows Road entrance for which there are not yet details but which can be examined in the next presentation
- The soft surface perimeter trail
- Wetland buffer enhancement; a significant section of the property is wetland and stream buffer, approximately 2.5 acres. Fifty percent of this area will include voluntary enhancements and the remainder is required due to regulation and environmental standards

Ten items are recommended for consideration by staff based on an analysis of Comprehensive Plan Policies which apply to the property. Some are recommendations and some are requirements.

- The street grid, organized in regard to site contour and elevations
- Take advantage of natural site features such as trees, wetlands and stream buffers
- Improved pedestrian connectivity to the property
- Bicycle lanes inside the property
- The soft surface trail should be continuous and not force trail users into roadways to continue to the western leg of the trail
- The soft surface trail should adequately serve a multi-generational community with seating, pet waste pick-up stations, interpretive signage and trailheads.
- Replacement tree locations
- More distinction to the metropolitan modern architectural style
- More green buildings and site features
- General idea regarding quantity and location of on-street parking

The applicant intends to come back for a site plan entitlement and a subdivision plat after approval of this phase. The Board will have another opportunity to review the project at a greater level of detail at that time. After this presentation, staff would like to be able to give the applicant clear directions regarding the overall site plan. Street edge treatment in regard to consistency to the Willows/Rose Hill vision for community character should also be determined.

Mr. Krueger stated having done work with Quadrant including feasibility studies on the property several years ago, but would not recuse at this level.

Ms. Bonnie Geers *with* Quadrant Homes, stated having began work on the project in 2016, a business park zone which has been rezoned as a Northwest Design District because of site constraints such as topography. A deep green commitment was made at the zoning level, meaning that all structures on the site must be green certified meeting either Built Green four-star or LEED Silver as a minimum. A menu of green building items needs to be selected from such as electric vehicle ready facilities and solar programs.

Mr. Keith McCloskey *with* KTGy Group continued. The overall project consists of just under 380 dwelling units. The mixed-use building will be composed of just under 200 stacked flat apartments over a variety of uses on the ground floor, 22,000 square feet of commercial or non-residential space. There will be 174 townhomes in three to seven-unit buildings distributed throughout the project adjusting for topography. Willows Road is to the east and Northeast 124th Street is to the north, zoned commercial and industrial. There are good views and farmland towards the east side of the property.

In architecture, each phase will have similar character but variation including multiple color schemes from building to building. The overall vision is for the site to use the same architectural styles while adapting to a variety of scales. Renderings were displayed. Different scales of open spaces are also planned. A serpentine road provides maximum percentage slope for fire trucks as well as a spine that mirrors the natural ravine.

Vehicular access arrives at a central open space with commercial presence. Shadow studies have been done. Further renderings were displayed including paseos and connections.

Mr. Nick Hagan *with* Weisman Design Group presented basic landscape design. Opportunities for visitors to view green space through the project with more developed spaces at entry points is an organizing element. Natural features will be taken advantage of with small play and picnic areas. A pedestrian street grid has been developed but further opportunities will continue to be explored. The trail should be an

active place that encourages people to engage. Replacement trees will include native plant material to tie in naturally to the site. Rural agricultural elements to the east and more commercial, technological elements to the west are being considered. A large informal lawn area will include storm detention. Bike repair and bike wash stations for the public, dog parks and child play areas are potential amenities.

Spaces are subdivided between moments for gathering between buildings and entry points. The northwest open space may be more urban in nature due to dense development.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked about guest parking throughout the site.

Mr. McCloskey stated that there would be an exhibit to come, but pointed out areas on a rendering.

- Ms. Atvars asked if each unit would have parking space or a driveway.

Mr. McCloskey replied that there are primarily two side-by-side parking spaces in a garage but there are some tandem spaces as well, with 20% guest parking.

- Ms. Atvars asked how traffic coming in and out of the site would be managed.

Mr. Jeremy Febus, civil engineer with KPFF Consulting Engineers, replied that there would be a new traffic signal at Northeast 124th Street, the City of Kirkland right-of-way. At the request of City of Redmond transportation engineers, the entrance off Willows Road will be restricted movements, right- in and right-out only.

- Ms. Atvars asked why the graphic of the lower amenity off of Willows Road included contour lines when the amenity had been described as flat.

Mr. Hagan replied that shown were the existing contour lines.

- Ms. Atvars suggested that roof deck amenities could be developed so that views don't consist of roof utility spaces.

Mr. Liu:

- Asked if the ravine is wetland or accessible to residents.

Mr. McCloskey replied that a soft surface trail is proposed in the outer portions of the buffer, but the bulk of the buffer will be 100% protected. Residents will be able to view the edges.

- Mr. Liu asked if the multi-use building would be used as a club house for the community.

Mr. McCloskey replied that there is an elevated podium deck and that a main lobby entry would be on the south side. The second floor would include amenities such as fitness, a club room and outdoor amenities. The building will be for the apartment rental community; townhome residents will use shared or private open spaces.

- Mr. Liu asked why the boulevard entrance stops mid-way through.

Mr. Febus replied that there was no technical reason, but that City standard has guided design.

- Mr. Liu stated liking the boulevard entry, but that the road should continue if there is space width-wise.

Mr. McCloskey replied that making the road wider may encroach on some retaining wall resulting in less room for landscaping.

- Mr. Liu asked if the metropolitan modern design would be carried from the townhomes to the mixed-use development

Mr. McCloskey replied that the design would be interpreted differently due to the scale of buildings, but the buildings would be compatible with each other.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked how much grading would be done on the recreation space.

Mr. McCloskey replied that there are one-foot contours with an average grade of eight to 10 percent currently. When complete, the space will be four to five percent, flat relative to the rest of the site; more usable but not flat in the sense of a soccer field.

- Mr. Sutton asked how the grade would be achieved.

Mr. McCloskey replied that building would move up from Willows Road. More detail will be available at future presentations. The vault will have an exposed face on a portion of

the side facing Northeast 124th Street and Willows Road with screening into the Willows buffer. A mix of landscape walls and street edge can be used to take up grade.

- Mr. Sutton was curious how much density could occur in regard to landscaping as the proposal is a significant change.
- Mr. Sutton asked if there would be a uniform treatment at the street.

Mr. McCloskey stated working with staff and that the wall on the edge of Northeast 124th Street currently is approximately 16-20 feet tall. Based on preliminary grading, a maximum wall height of 10 feet is possible. Materials, wall types and treatments are being discussed.

- Mr. Sutton asked if the walls would then be reconstructed.

Mr. McCloskey replied yes. City of Kirkland prefers arterials to include a buffered bike lane while City of Redmond prefers multi-modal trails. The compromise with the two municipalities is to include both. A project traffic engineer is working with both municipalities to install a longer queuing right-turn lane.

- Mr. Sutton stated that between the height of town homes and the grade, the elevation will be very high and asked what the pedestrian experience may be.
- Mr. Sutton stated that the trail on the southwest corner could be on the other side due to cars coming in and out of driveways, in the interest of a continuous trail.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that a change in personality from the west side to the east side could be achieved; materiality could be different along the east edge for a rural feel transitioning to urban feel to the west.
- Mr. Krueger liked the urban entry of Northeast 124th Street and the serpentine access off of Willows Road.
- Mr. Krueger stated that many buildings will be visible both from outside public space and internally, and wrap-around architecture would be good.

Mr. McCloskey replied that there are very nice view opportunities.

- Mr. Krueger stated that cluster buildings in the northeast corner were rigid and separation could occur for differentiation in edges.
- Mr. Krueger stated that there are ways to get through the site on a continuous trail.
- Mr. Krueger stated that an east and west visual connection could be made.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the public trail with connections to the Cross Kirkland Corridor and Redmond Connector was a public benefit.

- Mr. Krueger stated that the mixed-use building will need to be addressed regarding the exposure along Northeast 124th Street and internally.
- Mr. Krueger liked the boulevard entry.
- Mr. Krueger asked how many levels of parking were anticipated.

Mr. McCloskey replied one on grade level and likely two subterranean. A few feet of the upper garage will be exposed, but most will be covered by fill with a natural landscape berm. All that will be visible is the drive entry and an approximate 20 x 20-foot opening. Spaces will consider future residents visiting the leasing office, onsite staff, retail or commercial parking and resident parking below.

Ms. Tarce asked if the Board has any guidance for the gateway element to reinforce community character. Mr. Krueger asked for clarification that the gateway was at the northeast corner, and Ms. Tarce replied yes.

Ms. Tarce stated that staff would like to see a detailed section showing how tuck under mignonettes will appear on townhouses, as the grade may provide an opportunity for unique or distinctive architecture. At the Master Plan level detail is not being discussed, but Ms. Tarce asked the Board if conceptually a detailed section would be valuable at this point. Mr. McCloskey gave more detail regarding these areas.

- Mr. Krueger asked if the backsides of the townhomes would be three stories.

Mr. McCloskey replied yes.

Ms. Tarce asked if the tuck under section should be a part of the Master Plan review or site plan entitlement, and Mr. Krueger replied site plan entitlement.

Ms. Atvars:

- Recommended that a site section would be useful.

Ms. Tarce replied that for the sake of clarity, the applicant should provide the section.

Ms. Tarce asked for clarification that the way the project has been presented is okay with the Board, and Mr. Krueger replied yes.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked if thoughts could be brought back regarding a shared lane.

Ms. Tarce replied that the road may not need to be striped for a bicycle lane per traffic engineers. Bike amenities such as parking are required.

- Mr. Krueger stated that landscaping would be important, possibly reminiscent of the agricultural land being left while driving; however, drivers will need to focus on driving and not the gateway.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated being skeptical that the gateway will be a public benefit because of fast moving traffic.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated not indicating benches but rather architecture to enhance the edge along with landscaping.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that an integrated landscape feature stair could be interesting.

Mr. Krueger stated that the project would be brought back for approval of the Master Plan.

Ms. Tarce announced having submitted resignation today, and this meeting would be the last meeting attended. Ms. Tarce stated having enjoyed interacting with the Board and learning from comments.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTIONED BY MR. SUTTON TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:16 P.M.
SECONDED BY MS. ATVARIS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**June 20, 2019
MINUTES APPROVED ON**

**Carolyn Garza
RECORDING SECRETARY**

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

June 20, 2019

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. If you would like to listen to the recorded meeting, please submit a public records request for a copy of the audio tape at <https://www.redmond.gov/777/Public-Records-Requests>.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Craig Krueger

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

EXCUSED ABESENCES: Ralph Martin and Shaffer White

STAFF PRESENT: David Lee, Scott Reynolds and Benjamin Sticka, Redmond Planning

MEETING MINUTES: Carolyn Garza, LLC

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting, and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**MOTION BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM APRIL 18, 2019.
MOTION SECONDED BY MS. MONK. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY (MR. LIU ABSTAINED).**

**MOTION BY MS. ATVARS TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM MAY 2, 2019.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY (MS. MONK ABSTAINED).**

**MOTION BY MS. MONK TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM MAY 16, 2019.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY (MR. KRUEGER AND MR. LIU ABSTAINED).**

CALL TO ORDER

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Mr. Krueger at 7:00 p.m.

APPROVAL

LAND-2019-00458 Esterra Park Block 6B

Neighborhood: Overlake

Description: Two buildings with approximately 262 residential units including 124 affordable housing units

Location: Parcel number 6448900030

Applicant: Scott Clark *with* Clark|Barnes

Prior Review Date: 04/04/19

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

Mr. Lee stated that staff requests that the northwest corner be adjusted and recommends approval of the administrative modification.

Ms. Gonzalez displayed the view presented previously and the current revision. Storefront and overhang have been added.

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

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that the change was not significant and that roof modulation was improved with the new design.

Mr. Krueger asked Mr. Lee for clarification regarding what staff needed at this time. Mr. Lee replied that the request was a follow-up.

MOTION BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE LAND-2019-00458 ESTERRA PARK BLOCK 6B WITH STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR INCONSISTENCIES. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. LIU. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL

Proctor Willows- Consolidated Review

- **LAND-2019-00349 Master Planned Development**
- **LAND-2019-00351 Development Agreement**

Neighborhood: Willows/Rose Hill

Description: Master Plan for mixed-use/residential with 22,000 square feet commercial in 15.38 acres

Location: Southwest corner of Northeast 124th Street and Willows Road Northeast

Applicant: Erik Enstrom *with* Quadrant Homes

Prior Review Date: 05/02/19

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

Mr. Sticka stated that the request was for approval. Some included amenities will be private recreation open space, public open space, trails and additional enhancements. The applicant has successfully addressed comments made at the May 2, 2019 Design Review Board meeting. Staff recommends approval as proposed.

Ms. Bonnie Geers *with* Quadrant Homes stated that Mr. Fernanda Frisby *with* KTG Architecture Planning and Mr. Nick Hagan *with* Weisman Design Group were present and would speak. A multi-step entitlement process is in motion and the Master Plan is the first point to be presented regarding massing. There will be more presentations in the future.

Ms. Frisby, Project Manager *with* KTG, presented revisions to the Master Plan application including better alignment for improved views and improvements to the trail. Architectural development will be defined in the next presentation. Connectivity from east to west has been improved. Townhomes on the east side have been revised. Three different townhome building types are integrated into the topography.

Mr. Hagan, Principle *with* Weisman, presented refinements to the major open space area at the intersection of Willows Road and Northeast 124th Street. An additional children's play area has been added to the bike repair station area and dog park previously proposed. Staff and Parks are being worked with to possibly add a half basketball court. The lawn area is being examined for grade to function as a small ball field. Connectivity is at grade from Northeast 124th Street to the park. The gateway corner will contain an art element and informal seating such as boulders or planter walls rather than benches. Active areas will be distributed through the site. Elevations were displayed. A four-foot planter strip has been added next to Northeast 124th Street. The trail on the property line will benefit the business parks. Street parking was displayed.

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

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Monk:

- Liked what is being presented.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked how steps would be accessed and maintained and what plantings would be used.

Mr. Hagan replied that plantings would be primarily evergreens to screen year-round and plants that require minimal pruning, minimizing maintenance needs. Clinging vines can soften walls. Planting at access points can be lush and more vibrant.

- Ms. Atvars asked if fall protection fences for side yards would be needed.

Mr. Hagan replied that side yards would not be usable. Drop-offs would have fences and railings to protect residents.

- Ms. Atvars stated the project looked good.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that comments had been responded to well.
- Mr. Sutton liked the park but this should be contained with dense plantings or open style fencing to keep stray balls out of the roadway.

Mr. Liu:

- Asked about potential parking on the sidewalk side along the loop road.

Mr. Hagan replied yes, parking would be on the sidewalk side, keeping pedestrians on the opposite side of garage entries.

- Mr. Liu liked the layers of circulation and liked the project overall.

Mr. Krueger:

- Concurred with the other Board members.
- Mr. Krueger appreciated that the previous comments have been addressed.
- Mr. Krueger suggested that materials and colors with alternatives be presented soon.
- Mr. Krueger asked if staff had been consulted regarding bicycle lanes or bike sharing.

Ms. Geers replied that Ms. Tarce had been consulted on the topic. Sections do not support additional width for a bicycle lane and the recommendation from staff was not strong. The conclusion was that this would not be provided.

MOTION BY MS. MONK TO APPROVE PROCTOR WILLOWS – CONSOLIDATED REVIEW, LAND-2019-00349 Master Planned Development AND LAND-2019-00351

Development Agreement. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2018-01083 Modera Overlake

Neighborhood: Overlake

Description: New multi-family residential building with 246 units and associated leasing office, resident amenity areas, parking and exterior courtyard

Location: 15260 and 15248 Bel-Red Road

Applicant: Darrell Turner *with* GGLO

Prior Review Dates: 03/15/18, 11/01/18 and 02/07/19

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

Mr. Reynolds stated that Modera Overlake would be a pioneering project which would set the precedent for other development in the area. The vision is for the village to have a distinct look from downtown with high quality building materials. Staff recommendations are to replace metal on the Northeast 24th Street façade to reduce bulk, and design improvements in materials at the corner treatment at Northeast 21st Street. The plaza design has been updated to staff satisfaction. Design Review Board input is requested at this time regarding weather protection, administrative design flexibility at Northeast 21st Street, pedestrian experience and design changes mentioned in the staff report.

Mr. Steve Yeun *with* Mill Creek Residential explained material changes made based on suggestions from staff. The applicant hopes to obtain Design Review Board approval at the next presentation.

Ms. Tiina Ritval, a senior associate *with* GGLO, stated that substantial changes have been made since the last Design Review Board presentation to plaza design, materiality and street level improvements along Northeast 21st Street. Competitor developments are entirely clad in cementitious siding and this project proposes superior design and materiality in comparison for Overlake.

The massing strategy has not changed, expressing speed along Bel-Red Road, but a gateway expression has been added at the corner of Bel-Red Road and Northeast 21st Street. Responding to city feedback, the introduction of brick materiality complicates the material pallet, but the diagram remains intact and design retains power by using consistent reveal material. The carve at the base at Northeast 21st Street creates an articulation which breaks down building scale into smaller and more identifiable pieces, also required by the zoning code. The code-required modulation strategy remains the same. City staff suggested bringing brick materiality to grade, but this would work against the articulation created by the floating bay.

Mr. P.J. Benenati *with* GGLO, Landscape Architect, continued. Adjustments have been made at the ground level to benefit the public realm. Based on staff recommendation the plaza has been moved more centrally within the site plan and the plaza has been expanded. For pedestrian circulation and connectivity, the commercial space floor plate has been raised approximately two feet for a better relationship to the intersection and pedestrian crossing. Pedestrians can now come into the site through a covered colonnade into the plaza space. As grade drops down Bel-Red Road, the raised plaza elevates off of the busy road. Seating terraces and a wide staircase will connect the streetscape and upper plaza. Decorative lighting, specialty paving, movable furniture and an art element amenitize the plaza. Trees have been carefully located to provide shade but not to impede visibility to the commercial space. Grade change defines different pedestrian activities. An art opportunity at the private residential courtyard is in development. Warmth, transparency and activity is important to integrate into fencing and art. There is a variety of light fixture combinations.

A more quiet, residential feel comes from mounded planting and lower level path lights. There is a roof deck for solar access and views of downtown Bellevue. Indoor and outdoor amenities such as barbeques and fire pits will be provided. The indoor amenity has glazing and will act as a lantern.

Ms. Ritval displayed a rendering of the gateway corner. City staff and the design team agree that applying the same metal cladding as at the southwest Bel-Red Road façade will simplify the façade and strengthen design. Although staff has suggested a materiality change, the design team believes that materiality should be logical with a consistent reveal material. A patchwork of materiality would be more typical of Cleveland Street or downtown Redmond. Brick has been added to the ground level and upper floors of the massing. A metal band break helps define commercial as separate from residential above. White metal suggested by staff will be incorporated at the plaza edge.

Speed, drama and simplicity continue to be guiding principles in façade and detailing. A rendering of extended cladding expression suggested by staff was displayed and while the design team is in favor of the change, input from the Design Review Board is requested. The change to brick did result in a less bold and expressive design as the staff report indicates, and the opinion of the Board regarding the change is requested. Staff requested that the lone remaining column be removed and there is no problem with removal structurally; visibility will be improved and the commercial frontage will be more welcoming. Staff requested that cladding be changed at the corner, however part of the success of the current design is the thread of background reveal materiality. A change to brick would be closer to the downtown or Cleveland aesthetic and further from the more progressive and bold design which the Board has been in support of to this point. Staff proposed a change to full masonry return but the concern is that bulk

will be added to the upper portion of the building and Board comment is requested regarding this potential change as well.

Material changes on Northeast 21st Street, bringing brick to grade, will result in a more massive façade expression and is not favored. Removal of bulk on lower levels creates a pleasant buffer and better street level condition. The material board was on display. The design team believes the current balance of brick and metal is appropriate for the project and for the context.

Mr. Benenati stated that at the ground plain on Northeast 21st Street continues to be amenitized per staff recommendations.

Ms. Ritval stated that the concept of speed is important to be articulated on Bel-Red Road, and horizontal metal patterning and window configurations achieve this. The design team believes that the materials to be used meet the intent of code for superior materials and the opinion of the Board is desired. Further details were pointed out on the slides but locations not identified for the audio recording.

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

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked if there were a different material used on the upper top floor [at an unidentified corner].

Ms. Ritval replied yes, dark fiber cement panels on the upper level. Staff stated that this was an appropriate location and code compliant, an accent piece. The lower level is textured metal.

- Mr. Sutton asked if there would be a change in plane between the two.

Ms. Ritval replied in most cases, yes.

- Mr. Sutton asked for clarification about the corner, where staff has suggested a material change but the design team prefers not to change.

Ms. Ritval replied that at the point in question there is not a change in plane.

- Mr. Sutton asked for clarification regarding the two colors.

Ms. Ritval replied dark bronze and urbane bronze paint, similar.

- Mr. Sutton stated that there did not seem to be a rational break.
- Mr. Sutton asked for other changes in plane to be pointed out in a particular location.

Ms. Ritval replied that there is an intentional plane because of a sloping soffit.

- Mr. Sutton asked to see a rendering of the slope and asked further questions regarding the specific area without specifics for the audio recording.
- Mr. Sutton asked if the stairs at the plaza would be cantilevered concrete from the wall behind and suggested a vertical wall.

Mr. Benenati replied that the top landing would be a cantilevered concrete slab. The stair will likely be metal. The hope is to add warmth to the backdrop.

- Mr. Sutton stated being in favor of the project but some areas would need to be cleaned up.

Mr. Liu:

- Commented that the corner was complicated or busy and materials could be simpler.
- Mr. Liu asked for clarification regarding a white screen.

Ms. Ritval replied that the screen would be the same materiality applied. In the staff comment, the suggestion was that the materiality be changed to the same metal as the rest. There is a reveal.

- Mr. Liu asked if the screen was a proposal or option.

Ms. Ritval replied that City staff proposed and the design team is in support of the change to white metal in the location referred to.

- Mr. Liu commented that the white wall is very predominant and is a large mass.
- Mr. Liu asked if the plaza is separated by a gate or controlled access.

Mr. Benenati replied that the plaza will be public access and the gate and fence would occur in the back for access to the private residential courtyard.

- Mr. Liu commented that the gate or landscaped wall could be further developed as a backdrop of the public plaza with more artistic treatment than only a metal separation.

Mr. Benenati replied that a balance between warmth, permanence and visibility to eliminate safety concerns will be the next design step.

- Mr. Liu agreed that the wall should be visible and transparent and that there could be other methods than metal to achieve the wall such as baffles or angled glass.

Mr. Reynolds clarified the staff comment to the corner treatment for the plaza; staff concern was the massing effect. Feedback from the Board was requested for the next submittal.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that extending the exterior around the edge would make the Bel-Red Road façade appear monolithic and breaking the exterior up would be preferred.
- Ms. Monk agreed with Mr. Liu that the corner appeared busy with brick and the previous design was preferred.
- Ms. Monk stated that options would be helpful.
- Ms. Monk stated that a balance between being different and a good solid design should be focused on.

Ms. Atvars:

- Liked the speed expression but the darker piece helps separate the brick feature from the speed on the other side
- Ms. Atvars commented that the expression speeds into the courtyard, a loss of momentum.
- Ms. Atvars asked for clarification regarding white corrugation spacing.

Ms. Ritval replied that there were 3-D printed profiles, not the actual size.

- Ms. Atvars commented that the top of the roofline in the courtyard could be articulated more, being a very visible space to the public.
- Ms. Atvars asked if there is a plane change where darker reveals are met.

Ms. Ritval replied yes; the plane extends past.

- Ms. Atvars asked if brick was in-plane to the windows.

Ms. Ritval replied slightly off-plane.

- Ms. Atvars stated that if brick was in-plane with windows, wrapping brick would be recommended.
- Ms. Atvars asked for clarification regarding a beak-type feature that had changed from the first presentation.

Mr. Benenati replied that where the emphasis of plaza arrival and entry was the initial focus but the process has made the energy push more centrally into the site plan. Movable seating could help activate the area. The art shifts around the corner now.

- Ms. Atvars asked if a soffit treatment would be used on the overhang remaining.

Ms. Ritval replied yes, an accent color and prow.

- Ms. Atvars asked that the railings be rendered, as they are on the plans but not in renderings presented.
- Ms. Atvars agreed with Mr. Sutton that the stair to the private courtyard needs more refinement and asked where the gate door would be; the path of travel is confused.
- Ms. Atvars asked about weather overhang on Northeast 21st Street.

Mr. Benenati stated that clarification had not been received. Very deep building canopies would clutter the elevation.

Ms. Ritval explained an area of the rendering that contains services for the building and garage, but did not state the location for the audio recording.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked if canopies could be over residential doors which are not retail spaces.

Ms. Ritval replied that producing canopies on the façade would be out of character with the street level experience. Mr. Benenati replied that a common entry point is by the garage with built-in weather protection from the building above.

- Mr. Krueger expressed concern regarding white on Bel-Red Road; the presentation showed both with and without and is a significant feature. The feeling from the Board seems to be for what was presented previously.
- Mr. Krueger held a poll of the Board for preference regarding the Bel-Red Road façade. The consensus was for dark transition.

- Mr. Krueger asked for a rendering of the corner from a street perspective at the next presentation.
- Mr. Krueger liked the rest of the changes.

Ms. Ritval asked for clarification regarding the proposal for metal and if the Board would support this as a specialty material. Mr. Krueger replied that this was the conclusion being reached by the Board. Mr. Sutton added that as long as the gauge is thick enough the proposal will be fine. Ms. Monk agreed. Ms. Liu replied that a metal material board could be provided as there are superior metals available.

Mr. Reynolds asked if next steps could be summarized. Ms. Ritval understood that the dark metal treatment would be used, refinement on the stair element and art application in the plaza, railings to be seen in renderings, refinement in how areas are resolved and that canopies along Northeast 21st Street can potentially be eliminated.

Mr. Reynolds asked if there was further interest in the landscape paving area to the intersection at the northeast corner, and the Board replied yes. Ms. Ritval asked for clarification that previous design for the corner element was desired and if metal or masonry was preferred. Ms. Atvars stated being okay with masonry and that the corner should be handled in anything but brick to activate the space.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2019-00543 Seritage Place Parcel A

Neighborhood: Overlake

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

Location: 2200 148th Avenue Northeast

Applicant: Darrell Turner *with* GGLO

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

Mr. Lee stated that the Master Plan had been visited by the Board in late 2018, and that phase one of the Master Plan of the project would be presented at this meeting. Staff has outlined several areas for the applicant to explore further. The most important area for review for staff at this time is the private-public interface at the corner and how this will fit with the Master Plan. The phase is in two sections, one being infrastructure and the other being the building hub.

Mr. Ted Panton *with* GGLO displayed renderings. Success of the 3,000 square feet of retail will be a defining factor for the project. There is good southern exposure. Given the building height, rooflines present a wayfinding element. Retailing will be a layering experience drawing people in.

Mr. Benenati, Landscape Architect, stated that retail will be important, vibrant and active on day one. Moving energy to the hub is the goal with good visual access of the activity and retail.

Mr. Panton stated that a pass-through moves through the parking structure for bicycles and pedestrians to break the building open with a bold wayfinding element. The north façade is broken into two sections giving the building masses individual identities as well as breaking the scales. There is a cycle track along Northeast 24th Street. Signage and lighting can be integrated for a major entry point into the project.

Materials are only beginning to be examined, but the vision is a warm quality, wood-like feel. Permeable panels can be a part of the parking structure frontage.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked where the public-private interface is.

Mr. Panton replied the central portion or hub, which connects all four corners of the site. Specialized paving will be developed as part of the infrastructure plan.

- Mr. Krueger asked if the hub was a blending of public and private.

Mr. Panton stated that the raised patio areas are a different elevation than the west hub, and a concern is that there is a distinct cut-off point to where public realm ends and private realm begins. More integration may be needed to lessen the divide.

- Mr. Krueger stated that the presentation at this meeting appeared to be a massing study.

Ms. Atvars:

- Also had wondered if the courtyard between buildings would be accessible.

Mr. Panton stated 25 feet.

- Ms. Atvars wondered how the public could penetrate the mass, a collection of buildings.
- Ms. Atvars stated that blending landscape and public interaction will eliminate a fortress feel.

- Ms. Atvars stated that the office buildings and hotel will be taller than this project, and locating utilities on the roof will be the view and impression of Redmond. The building is tall but eventually will not be the tallest.
- Ms. Atvars asked if the intent is to lead as one building or three slightly different variations in materiality.

Mr. Panton replied that the hub segments are beginning to share a language. The courtyard breaks and through passages are an opportunity for definition.

Ms. Monk:

- Suggested that the City be worked with on the corner for a traffic calming element and installing something interactive.
- Ms. Monk stated believing that a large development is being brought to a human scale with details at ground level.
- Ms. Monk liked the vertical massing broken into three parts.
- Ms. Monk liked the garage portal and emphasis on bicycles.

Mr. Sutton:

- Is concerned that there is a lot happening in the massing in sketches and a clear, simple concept will be successful.
- Mr. Sutton stated that the Master Plan has many angular elements but the elements are not obvious in the renderings at the presentation.

Mr. Liu:

- Asked for clarification that the base consists of one-story retail and one-story residential.

Mr. Panton replied yes.

- Mr. Liu asked if balconies or other treatments could expose to the retail element.

Mr. Panton replied that there is opportunity for this.

- Mr. Liu asked if the top would include amenities.

Mr. Panton replied that there are community spaces placed at the top floor looking to the southwest, another layering element.

- Mr. Liu stated preferring to see a softer option in the corner than what appears to be a raised platform in the rendering; possibly a seating area, accessible stairs or steps, landscape or art features.

Mr. Panton replied that the edge could be dissolved more.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated feeling excited about the massing and stated the residential experience would feel very urban above the retail space.
- Mr. Krueger stated that there was a lot of attention at the hub and south and east elevations, but the north elevation feels ignored.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the northwest corner could be more dramatic at the roof.
- Mr. Krueger hoped to see how people would be moved to the transit area architecturally.

Mr. Panton replied that there would possibly be a lobby on the north side for the residents, and that the garage portal addressed bicycles and pedestrians.

Mr. Panton stated that comments would be addressed at the next presentation.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2019-00399/436 Penny Lane II & III

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: Project consists of 14 townhouse units within a single building and four townhouse units within a single building.

Location: 7960, 7970 and 7980 – 170th Avenue Northeast (Adair Road)

Applicant: Randy Barnett *with* Ichijo USA Co., LTD

Prior Review Date: 07/19/2018

Staff Contact: Elise Keim, 425-556-2480 or ekeim@redmond.gov

Mr. David Lee stated standing in for Ms. Keim. Previous staff critique was that design attempts were overstated with no unified feeling along major frontages.

Mr. Dan Umbach *with* Daniel Umbach, Architect continued. The facades have been completed and changes have been made to the north building in response to comments. Technically the project is two separate sites for development reasons; the south lot is 14 units facing 170th Place Northeast and the north site is the four-unit project facing Northeast 80th Street. Details in renderings were described but locations not described for the audio recording. Materials include cementitious siding, brick and wood or pre-finished wood product on portions of the façade. All units have ground floor

entry with a tandem garage space behind and second story living spaces, as well as a habitable attic with a door.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked for clarification regarding a space on the top that was not an outdoor space.

Mr. Umbach replied attic space, rumpus room, or bedroom.

- Mr. Krueger asked if the developer has built these previously.

Mr. Umbach replied that buildings of this dimension had not been built yet and the project will be a new experience. The buildings are unusually deep and why skylights are included to break up the inside. The layout is the only one that meets the development goals of the client.

Mr. Sutton:

- Does not like the dormer on the roof because it does not fit.
- Mr. Sutton asked if vertical materials are in the same plane.

Mr. Umbach replied that some are not in the same plane but others are.

- Mr. Sutton liked the beige shadow line for relief.
- Mr. Sutton liked the variety of form except for the dormers, with some relief between the ground floor and upper townhouse portion.
- Mr. Sutton supported brick to a single story only all around in an attempt to simplify materials.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked to see a streetscape rendering and commented on the angle.

Mr. Umbach replied to Mr. Sutton that building code requires windows to be used as egress and not only skylights, but the dormers could be moved to the back.

- Mr. Krueger agreed with Mr. Sutton.

Mr. Umbach replied that another option would be flat roof pieces; from a construction standpoint however, slope would be better than a flat roof.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked for clarification regarding how the patterning was arrived at and why the patterning works for the client.

Mr. Umbach replied that separation between each façade was even busier; grouping is to provide a difference in rhythm.

Mr. Sutton:

- Suggested that a shed element be removed, resulting in a traditional roof form reducing form language.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that on the north building, composition looks cohesive and balanced in a way the other buildings potentially could.
- Ms. Atvars would like to see how different products react together to be sure execution appears as smooth as in the renderings.
- Ms. Atvars asked if every unit will have a yard space to occupy.

Mr. Umbach replied that the space to occupy is the small patio in front of each unit; otherwise there is landscaping.

- Ms. Atvars asked if there will be fences between patios for separation.

Mr. Umbach replied that there will be fences between units and a taller privacy barrier between patios. Landscaping is not completely developed in current renderings.

- Ms. Atvars asked the fence barrier should be pulled closer to the patio, and if there would be consistency in how landscaping was cared for by individual residents or if the landscaping belongs to the community.
- Ms. Atvars asked what the point of the green screen panels would be.

Mr. Umbach replied to put vertical grain on the front of the building; images are not coordinated thoroughly with the landscape architect for this presentation but the next presentation will have more detailed renderings.

- Ms. Atvars stated that there should be a good reason for everything, all purposeful, and every angle needs to be considered.

Ms. Monk:

- Agreed with making a more consistent pattern to facades.

Mr. Umbach replied that the reason for a gap was because of zoning code. A building this long must be distinctly separated in some way. Other options will be examined.

- Ms. Monk asked if a particular area not identified for the recording could be broken up more, and that more windows might help the narrowness of the townhouse as well as provide more light.
- Ms. Monk liked the skylights and the concept of roof bump-outs, but bump-outs could be relocated to the back.

Mr. Liu:

- Stated that the elevations were good.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated liking the variety but form could be simplified.
- Mr. Krueger looked forward to the next presentation.

Mr. Lee did not have a presentation from staff, but asked if the next Seritage presentation should be broken down further focusing on one elevation or street. The Board agreed, however, that the presentation should stay together.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY MR. LIU TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:34 P.M. MOTION
SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

July 11, 2019
MINUTES APPROVED ON

Carolyn Garza
RECORDING SECRETARY