

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

January 23, 2014

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:** David Scott Meade, Craig Krueger, Kevin Sutton, Joe Palmquist, Mike Nichols

**EXCUSED ABSENCE:** Scott Waggoner

**STAFF PRESENT:** Steven Fischer, Manager; Gary Lee, Senior Planner; Dennis Lisk, Associate Planner

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Susan Trapp with Lady of Letters, Inc.

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 Chair David Scott Meade at 7:05 p.m.

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**LAND-2013-01227, Avalon Redmond Overlake Village Block 4**

**Description:** One 6-story mixed-use building, with ground-floor retail, five levels of residential and underground parking

**Location:** 2700 – 152<sup>nd</sup> Ave NE

**Architect:** David Heater *with* Ankrom Moisan Architects

**Applicant:** Avalon Bay Communities

**Prior Review Date:** 08/22/13, 11/22/13 and 01/16/14

**Staff Contact:** Dennis Lisk, 425-556-2471 or [dwlisk@redmond.gov](mailto:dwlisk@redmond.gov)

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**LAND-2013-01228, Avalon Redmond Overlake Village Block 7**

**Description:** One 6-story mixed-use building, with ground-floor retail, five levels of residential and underground parking

**Location:** 2700 – 152<sup>nd</sup> Ave NE

**Architect:** David Heater *with* Ankrom Moisan Architects

**Applicant:** Avalon Bay Communities

**Prior Review Date:** 08/22/13, 11/22/13 and 01/16/14

**Staff Contact:** Dennis Lisk, 425-556-2471 or [dwlisk@redmond.gov](mailto:dwlisk@redmond.gov)

Mr. Lisk noted that this was the fourth time these two projects were before the DRB. The applicant has responded to the Board's comments from the last meeting. Staff would like to add one item to the discussion, namely, a projecting sign on the northwest corner of Block 7, which staff member Carl McCarthy has noted would not be compliant with the City Sign Code. The projection could be left as an architectural feature, but not as a sign. Staff would like to discuss Block 4 and Block 7 at the same time for this project.

David Heater and Jenny Chapman presented on behalf of the applicant and thanked the DRB for its approval for the design presented at the last meeting. Several items have been noted for discussion, including the following:

1. The north elevation of Block 4 on 28<sup>th</sup> Street.
2. The balcony details for the glass and metal railings.

3. The parapet design, including its extension and detailing.
4. The concrete columns along the retail area.
5. The brick details in consideration.

With regard to the north elevation of Block 4, the applicant has worked from the inside of the building to improve the elevation and the plans. The applicant has eliminated a column at the building face and set that back in plane so that the bank of residential units appears to be floating. The plane that holds the parking entry and tenant loading will be recessed five feet to help shield those elements from view. Additional plantings have been placed in front of some of the mechanical elements. There is a decorative piece over the recess at the residential level to create a more pronounced entry and to give it some character. The glazing has been wrapped around the corner to highlight the retail area and activate the corner of the building. The middle portion of the building is now narrower by one unit, with brick now extended to the east to minimize the fiber cement panel.

The balcony design system is very simple. It starts with a metal framework and is the same on the metal balcony and the balcony with the glass guardrail. The perforated metal panel is attached to the outside so it can conceal the slab edge and the handrail. This will provide a seamless ribbon-like look to the balconies as they weave into the design, letting a special material come out front and center. The glass railing system is nearly identical, but it has a glass infill panel. The metal system is articulated. The DRB had a lot of comments about the parapet at the last meeting. The top parapet has been extended three feet beyond the lower parapet. That should give the building a look of solid massing. The parapet itself will have a small coping detail painted to match the fiber cement panel and a typical reveal. In one part of the parapet, a metal reveal has been added to give some distinction to the top of the building. The stud has been set back and a deeper furring strip has been used to achieve a four-inch reveal that can provide a nice, dark shadow line.

The transition has been changed from the fiber cement to the concrete column element, as well as in the area where the column reaches the ground. The fiber cement in the column is attached with a typical reveal system, which will be matched in the transition to the concrete material. The surface of the fiber cement and the concrete will be aligned to give a seamless look throughout the building. A slight reveal and a sealed concrete will be added at the bottom of the column to match the height, color, and look of the storefront curb. The brick panel on Block 4 is a very sleek, simple system on the building, and the applicant wants to have a small profile with the top cap piece. That is achieved with a break metal shape, which is the coping detail for the top of the brick. That works with the hardy panel and window system. The DRB had talked about using different mortar colors with the brick. The applicant has settled on a natural gray mortar color, which should provide texture and definition to the brick.

Moving to Block 7, the applicant spoke to the 153<sup>rd</sup> elevation and the elevator penthouse overruns. The applicant had a new elevation of 153<sup>rd</sup> to present as a way to show the DRB its depth and modulation. The same modulation is happening on the 152<sup>nd</sup> side. The applicant has added some lighter colored fiber cement paneling and a strip of blue color to make the 153<sup>rd</sup> elevation lighter and less heavy. The applicant has moved the elevator overrun nine feet from the edge of the building. There is a gray hardy panel now used to match the gray infill, which should help this element recede as well. Mr. Meade asked the Board if this project was ready for approval, and the Board generally agreed with that idea.

The DRB next discussed the signage on Block 7, which says "Avalon" down the side of the building. Mr. Fischer noted that this signage projects out and runs four or five stories. He said this was an attractive element, but this does not comply with the City's Sign Code. He asked if this element should come off this building completely.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

Mr. Nichols:

- Said the extended element with the sign should be kept, even if there is no signage on it.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Mr. Palmquist asked if there was any way around the Sign Code requirement.

- Mr. Lisk agreed the sign was attractive, but said there was not a lot of flexibility on this issue. He noted that the City Council has been clear about projecting signs, and a sign like this would not be acceptable.
- Mr. Palmquist asked if there were some way to bend the rules or find a way to cut out the letters from the extended piece. Mr. Fischer said staff has considered some different options, but he added that there was not a lot of leeway.
- Mr. Palmquist said the colors in the projection tie it back to the other corner, and would like to keep this element even if it does not have a sign.

Mr. Krueger:

- Said there was a similar projecting detail on the southwest corner of the building. Mr. Meade pointed out that that element did not project in the same way. Mr. Lisk said this would be considered a wall sign under the Sign Code. The area allowed for a wall sign is greater than for a projecting sign.
- Mr. Krueger asked if there were a way to make the projection in question not as deep, so that it could be used as a sign. He wanted to keep the projection, even without a sign, and liked its juxtaposition with Block 4.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked the applicant if the intent was to keep the projection, or get rid of it. The applicant said the intent of this element was to provide a beacon for the site and connect the vertical element of Block 7 with the horizontal elements of Block 4. The applicant said these pieces have always been seen as architectural features, not necessarily signage. They just happen to be nice places for signs.
- The applicant said signs were a designed element like any other element, and should be a beautiful part of the building. Thus, the text could be taken off the projection, and the projection could still stand on its own as a design element. A lot of thought was put into this projecting element. Mr. Sutton said he was good with this projection.

Mr. Meade:

- Said he liked the projecting element as well as a way to step outside of the form and create an art piece. Mr. Meade would like to keep the fin with or without the signage.
- The Board confirmed unanimously that this project was ready to come back for approval. Mr. Krueger thanked the applicant for responding to all of the DRB's comments from last week.

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**LAND-2013-01989, Redmond City Center**

**Description:** Two 9-story residential towers to be built in 2 phases. Phase One: 168 units and approximately 20,000 square feet of retail. Phase Two: Residential only, or residential and office.

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

**Applicant:** Oscar Del Moro *with* Cosmos Development Company

**Architect:** Robin Murphy *with* Stricker Cato Murphy Architects

**Prior Review:** 12/05/13

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

Mr. Lee noted that this is the second pre-application for this project. At the previous meeting, the DRB felt this project was going in the right direction. Staff is very happy with the project, but has a few suggestions. Staff likes the modulation on the front elevations and how this design is broken up vertically. The south elevation needs some work. It is an interior elevation on the podium and has a long, blank wall. Staff wants to make sure that elevation is active, because people are going to be walking up through that podium area. The east elevation needs some artwork or architectural detail. This is the elevation with the garage coming out of the ground. Staff wants to make sure some of the blank walls here have some articulation, and additional plantings would not be a complete answer here.

The front elevation has a bay that overhangs the truck loading zone. Staff is suggesting that this portion should be canted out so that it slopes upward. The previous plan had a rounded barrel element sloping up, which is not in the plan now. The hope is the base at this elevation could be pushed back so that the columns or anything supporting the base are out of the sight distance triangle from the driveway entrance. There are some slivers of common usable open space shown on the perimeter of the buildings, and staff

did not know if those would meet the required dimensions. This will be a Type 1 building, where rooftop open space can be built. Staff said the number of balconies on this building should be reduced, and the applicant appears to have done that in the new design. The hill climb has a feature that appears to be a statue. Staff is suggesting that whatever feature is placed here, it should be tall, big, and broad to draw attention from the street. Staff would also like to know how the podium would be finished for the second tower while the first tower is being built such that the podium would look interesting. Staff likes how this building is coming along overall.

Oscar Del Moro presented on behalf of the applicant. He said he is looking at this project in a creative manner. He said the designers on this project are looking to create something fantastic and put a footprint on the City. With this project, there is an opportunity for a footprint of the future. He showed the DRB some of the reasoning behind his design ideas. He noted that there was a lot of open space on this project and no roadways in the project at the plaza level. The City has a unique Code that allows for higher density and a greater height limit in exchange for open space. The applicant would like to envision a future where there are no cars at the plaza level. The park and transit center interact with this project as well. The project, involving two buildings, will evolve over several years. Phase One would be built first that would link to an open space that connects to the transit center. Phase Two would be a mixed-use project with retail and residential. The hill climb connects to the park and to another portion of open space. A third phase, or potential future of the site, would be a development over and under the transit center. A final build-out might include a civic center on the fire department site that would connect into an open space park which links to a hill climb and thus, an inter-block connection. The applicant said this was all a probable future and not guaranteed, but he said this project was an opportunity to set something in motion that is larger than what has been presented to the DRB right now.

Architect Robin Murphy next spoke on behalf of the applicant. He appreciated the comments from staff on modifications that should be made, and said he would respond to those in the next iteration of the project. The applicant showed sun studies with the proposed buildings and the shadow casting around the site. The lowest level has about 24,000 square feet with parking behind it. The parking is about two and a half feet below the level of the retail, which is at street level. The podium plan has a shaded region to the west and a public open space. The DRB had some concern at the last meeting about the adjacency of Tower B at the ground level to the public open space. This is an awkward situation, where a private residence is up against a public area. The applicant has made a change to include three stories of office space on Tower B. The applicant would welcome input on this point. The applicant has taken advantage of a section of the City Land Use Code that allows an increase of one story in exchange for modulating the building height at the edges of the building. The applicant said the massing has been broken down significantly, and the building is opened up to the west, where the open space is. There are places on the building that are five stories tall and places that are nine stories tall.

The northeast corner, which Mr. Lee had suggested to be canted out, has a brick shoulder to it that ties the base back into the building. In between, portions of the building will be brick and other materials, including metal siding, glass, and cement board siding. There were several punched openings before measuring five by seven or five by five. Now, spandrel glass has been added, floor to ceiling. Tower B, also known as Building B, has not been fully developed, but it steps down as it goes to the west. Building A does the same thing in order to bring in more sunlight to the courtyard area. There was a stepped out area at the retail level that was originally a colonnade, but staff has asked the applicant to infill it with retail space that goes into the sidewalk area. There could be doors in the retail area going out on to the sidewalk. There could also be some fanciful art panels wrapping around the structure in different areas. These panels could be cement, glass, or metal, and would tie the base together and give it some life and variety beyond that of a brick façade.

The applicant pointed out lighter and darker colors of brick. There would be a blend of colors to add some light to the brick elements as well. Staff noted that the south elevation needs work, and the applicant would appreciate comments from the DRB on this elevation. The applicant showed the distribution of common open space and residential open space. Staff was concerned some areas of open space would not qualify. Those spaces in question would be used by the office tenants. The applicant has added some relief to the building along 85<sup>th</sup>. Landscaping at the ground level will contribute to the existing pathways on the site. There would be a wall along it that would have some vertical landscaping to act as a buffer

between the residential apartments and the other buildings adjacent to the site. Building fire lanes all around the buildings would force the applicant to lose a lot of the open space on the site and lose the chance to add extra, open stories.

Landscape architect Andy Rasmussen next spoke to the DRB on behalf of the applicant about the hill climb element and the pedestrian open spaces. The applicant is trying to create a pleasant, urban environment at the levels of entry to the building and in the open spaces themselves. The main open space that runs along the edge of the project has a hill climb. This is intended to be a connector for the community. The hope is to collaborate with neighboring properties to make it more successful. Pedestrians could go to the site and connect to the skate park and transit center nearby. The connector links with a Type 9 path already on the site. The applicant has introduced some curving forms in the design to break up some of the linear nature necessary for fire truck access. There is a fine balance to achieving this, but the applicant is looking to be creative while still being attentive to the fire department's needs. The concrete walls on the site are a challenge, but the basic idea is to have some vertical green elements on the walls and perhaps a graffiti wall and more landscaping.

The applicant said this is a big project that breaks new ground in terms of height, opportunity, and working with neighbors. The idea is to direct the future so that there are certain paths for pedestrians that tie through the super-blocks that will be developed as a function of the roadway structure the City has in place. The applicant said this site has unique opportunities, such as a nearby park and transit center, and also good zoning and good incentives in the Code. Mr. Meade asked if there were any comments from the public on this topic. Seeing none, he asked for comments from the Board.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

##### Mr. Sutton:

- Was excited about the possibilities for the hill climb and how this project could interact with neighboring properties. Mr. Sutton said this was a good direction to go.
- He said there was a big cavern between the two proposed buildings. The angles of the buildings have been tweaked to open up the courtyard for the southern building, but the space still appears to be tight in between the two.
- Overall, Mr. Sutton thought the project was heading in the right direction.

##### Mr. Krueger:

- Said he liked the elevation on 85<sup>th</sup> and the breaking down of modulation on the northwest corner. Mr. Krueger said this would be a great elevation for people heading east on 85<sup>th</sup>.
- He liked the materials presented and the use of brick and the mix of colors. He also liked the shoulder at the northeast corner, which is setting up to be a dramatic edge to the building.
- Mr. Krueger said the vertical and horizontal modulation looks good, and he was looking forward to the details on Building B. He asked the applicant for more details at the next meeting about the streetscape from the sidewalk level.
- Mr. Krueger said he would like to include more information about the pedestrian corridor, and said he shared some of staff's concerns about what that corridor would look like, especially at the ground level.
- Mr. Krueger said some of staff's comments about adding open space at the upper levels were well taken and could be a great opportunity for rooftop terraces. He thanked the applicant for his work.

##### Mr. Palmquist:

- Liked the project, in that this was a big project, but not imposing in its size. Mr. Palmquist liked the different heights of the different blocks, which make it appear less bulky. He liked the massing presented so far, and encouraged the applicant to create new expressions to the building where the height is different to create a site with multiple buildings, in a sense, that are distinct from each other.
- Beyond that, Mr. Palmquist said this building was on a solid foundation to start with.

Mr. Nichols:

- Appreciated the evolution of the design, which has been very creative in maximizing the layout and use of space. Mr. Nichols said the south elevation needs some additional thought, as staff has indicated.
- Mr. Nichols would like to see the palette of materials and the colors in consideration, as well.
- He asked about the open, public space outside the buildings and said it could be an opportunity to tie into the neighborhood. He wanted to have the applicant consider some raised planters that could be separate or up against the buildings to break up the massing. Colored or stamped concrete could be an option, as well as a water feature.
- Mr. Nichols said the landscaping will be a key feature to making this project work. He said the project was off to a great start.

Mr. Meade:

- Said the color palette should include multiple ways to break down this project into smaller pieces, yet create a common language throughout it.
- Mr. Meade said anything that could be done to activate the hill climb, such that it feels like more of a meandering path, would make it feel more organic. He said it would be good to have places where people could linger and enjoy the retail areas nearby. This could be a very cool public plaza, in Mr. Meade's opinion, that would be very different from other Downtown Redmond experiences.
- He said that the rooftop elements could have some great opportunities for the applicant. Mr. Meade said the project is improving more and more, and hoped to see continued refinement to the design at the next meeting. At that point, the DRB can dive more into the details.
- Mr. Lee asked about his suggestion to cant the front façade. Mr. Meade said that was a sexy idea, and he was on board with that. The applicant asked if the cant could go over the 14-foot front setback. Mr. Lee said the building could not project beyond the property line, but could project up to it.
- Mr. Lee asked about the front elevation and the colored panels there. Mr. Meade said this was a good placeholder, but said there should be more refinement. He said this element should have a language of its own.
- Mr. Lee said this paneled area should have a good background base for the building, such that the building looks great behind the panels. Mr. Meade agreed with that statement. The applicant said the panels could be on stanchions with stainless steel wire cable. Mr. Meade wanted to make sure that if the panels were removed, what is behind them should keep with the rest of the building.

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**LAND-2013-01464, Capstone Overlake Village Block 3 Office**

**Description:** One 6-story office building with four levels of underground parking

**Location:** 155<sup>th</sup> Ave NE & NE 27<sup>th</sup>/28<sup>th</sup>

**Applicant:** Andy Paroline *with* Paroline Associates

**Prior Review Date:** 09/19/13 and 11/07/13

**Staff Contact:** Dennis Lisk, 425-556-2471 or [dwlisk@redmond.gov](mailto:dwlisk@redmond.gov)

Mr. Lisk noted that this was the third pre-application meeting for this project. It is a new office building about 225,000 square feet in size located on the former Group Health property in Overlake Village at the intersection of 156<sup>th</sup> and NE 28<sup>th</sup> Street. The applicant has further refined the details on this proposal, trying to address comments from the DRB and staff. The main concerns from staff include the pedestrian plaza area out in front of the building on the south façade and how that integrates with the hill climb pathway in this area. Staff believes this space should be a very pronounced gateway into the site. The previous versions of that were very green, and staff wants the applicant to back off on the green and use more hardscape elements to create an urban plaza feel. Staff is also concerned about building modulation, and what the applicant has presented would need administrative design flexibility as provided by the Code. Staff feels good about the way this building looks overall, and understands the applicant's arguments for the building modulation proposed. The consideration of design flexibility demands a look at the whole site, not just the particular issue that would be deviated from. The plaza area in front of the building needs to be part of the superior design considerations, in staff's opinion. Staff is looking for the DRB's comments on building materials, which should be presented tonight. Staff would also like to look at some of the fine-grain details for the ground-level façade as well.

Architect Patrick Gordon presented on behalf of the applicant with Randall Bennett and landscape architect Kristen Lundquist. The applicant said he strongly believed that this building will play an important part in the context of this neighborhood and the urban attitude of this landscape. The hope is that the building embraces the unique characteristics of the site. This project is in a transitional zone just south of the Microsoft campus, and the building should help the transition to the more urban landscape of Overlake Village. The applicant said he felt strongly that buildings need to be an honest expression of what is going on inside of them. This project will participate with both residential and business needs on the site. The façade on 156<sup>th</sup> has been changed according to the DRB's comments. The applicant is asking for administrative design flexibility in this area. Natural materials have been used in this area, and the buildings have a dynamic quality about them that reinforce the landscape of the site. Building 3 is the focus of tonight's meeting, but it needs to be understood in context of Buildings 2A, 2B, and 6. The applicant noted that there is a 70-foot elevation change from 156<sup>th</sup> to 152<sup>nd</sup>. These buildings, and Building 3 in particular, form a northern edge of the most public space in this development, notably the hill climb and the park. The applicant said the buildings need to express a dialogue between their interiors and exteriors. The buildings should also speak to the dynamism of the hill climb, as well. The understory of these buildings presents an opportunity to engage at the pedestrian level.

The applicant said it was important to have some continuity on the pedestrian path, specifically around the vehicular entrance into both Building 3 and Building 2B. This is an aesthetic issue and a safety issue. Some visual clues have been provided in this area to indicate this is a pedestrian zone. The area by the pedestrian drop off is a pedestrian path that is flanked with two pedestrian plazas that form the entrances to the two buildings. The plazas extend out to 156<sup>th</sup>, where Mr. Lisk raised the question about green versus hardscape materials. The applicant said there is a need to transition from the green parkway off of 156<sup>th</sup>, and he did not want to create hardscape for hardscape's sake. There is an issue of grade, as well, in that there is a 15-foot elevation change between 156<sup>th</sup> and 155<sup>th</sup> that needs to be mediated. The applicant is trying to create a clear indication of hardscape and entrance at the building entrances, sufficient paving in the plaza areas, and enough of a transition zone with landscaping and steps to deal with the elevation change. There is a 130-foot gap between Building 3 and Building 6 that is already paved with a road. There are sidewalks on both sides of the street, and the applicant would like to make sure there is some landscaping in this area. The applicant said the intent is to balance the landscape and hardscape materials. The space is set up to allow for cars and trucks to arrive and also to allow for pedestrian drop-off. The pedestrian has priority in this area, and cars will be directed to slow down through the different design elements.

Ms. Lundquist spoke next on behalf of the applicant to deal with the landscape architecture. The character along 156<sup>th</sup> is predominantly small-stature plantings with an evergreen carpet of ground cover. The landscaping is of somewhat native character which ties in with the context of the rest of 156<sup>th</sup> and starts to set up more of an urban character. On 28<sup>th</sup>, the landscaping is more urban. An array of street trees and a wider sidewalk helps make this transition to a more urban look. Moving to the west, the street starts to slope and there is a secondary trail through the landscape under a canopy of flowering cherries leading to the entry of Building 3. This is more of an intimate space that allows for people to stop. The landscape character creates a tapestry of bold colors and a rich treatment with seasonal quality. The entry plaza is marked by a large specimen tree. The drop off zone includes raised planters to provide some buffer for cars. Low plantings are in this location as well as clusters of ginkgo trees. To the north of the drop off area, there are larger landscape areas to provide some contrast. That landscape transitions back to the more native plantings along the northern edge. The applicant showed some plant palette boards to illustrate the character of the landscaping on the different sides of the buildings. Plants with a lot of winter character have been selected. Elm trees are planned for the streetscape along 28<sup>th</sup> with a nice fall color. The specimen tree will have a presence from day one, but should not outgrow the space.

Mr. Gordon next spoke on behalf of the applicant and noted that Mr. Lisk's concern about how the different spaces inform each other is very important. The applicant showed that the urban gateway on this site is not just about Building 3, but also about Building 6. The landscape integrates with the topography and the different buildings. The applicant said the sidewalk is more than just a sidewalk. Rather, it creates an urban gateway to the site. The applicant is asking for some flexibility on the elevations. The Code asks for the façade lengths to be limited to 120 feet before there is a break. The applicant is proposing a redistribution of the breakups in terms of the overall scale of Building 3 and how that building is affected

by the setbacks and the landscaping. The applicant said he did not want to get hung up on the idea of 120 feet being a magic number. The same idea is applied on the other two facades of Building 3. The north façade is the back side of the building, however, and there is no public view of it. This side will still have quality materials, but will have a different expression related to the landscape. The west elevation forms the gap between Buildings 2A and Building 3.

The applicant said that the facades of Buildings 2A, 3, and 6 need to be considered together. The gap between them forms a gateway to the site and helps break up the scale of these large buildings. The form of Building 6 relates to Building 3 and has a similar vocabulary of design. There may be different materials on Building 6, but some level of it, perhaps scale or setbacks, will carry across Building 6 and Building 3. The same concept continues with Buildings 2A and 2B, in that there is an attitude of materials and orientation that starts to make a connection between the buildings and the landscape. The south façade of Building 3 is a very glassy, transparent façade that will reveal what is going on inside it. The base of the façade shows the more pedestrian zones in this area. Vertical glass fins have been proposed, which will change in color in different light conditions. On the 156<sup>th</sup> street side, the applicant has added a transparent zone that has been called “the lantern,” which forms the northern half of the gateway. The base of the building has been set back and more glass has been used to turn the corner with the building. The rest of the building will take a different attitude about how transparent it is and how it takes a different responsibility in the landscape. There are shadow boxes and spandrel zones that would be lit up in the evening hours. The windows are bounded by a metal setback that gives more dimensionality to the glass.

The north elevation will be rarely seen. The trees surrounding the building obscure just about every view, but the natural building materials will still be used here to help it blend into the environment. Slate shingles will be used. Cantilevers will be introduced on the 156<sup>th</sup> side to add some texture. The west side is somewhat of a repeat of the east façade with the lantern element. Similar materials are used on other buildings on the site, including the slate shingles. These shingles set up a contrast with the transparent portions of the building. Renderings of the buildings show a sense of how the pedestrian level is set back, how the entrance is highlighted, and how different outdoor light conditions will impact the color of the buildings. The view from 156<sup>th</sup> shows the lantern element and also shows how Building 3 embraces 156<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Meade asked for any public comment at this point, and Tom Hinman spoke to the Board. He noted that he had spoken about this project before at a Parks and Trails meeting November 7, 2013. At that time, he noted that the park occurs in a larger context. He had questions about what urban parks are and how much hardscape and softscape is involved. He asked about a lack of green at the entries of Building 1 and 3. The original approved Master Plan had much more green at each terminus of the hill climb parkway, and he wanted to make sure there was a green corridor and buffer along 156<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Hinman said he would like reiterate support for the original green, parkway-style buffer extending south from Microsoft and some sidewalk setbacks. He also was excited to hear about the signature gateway for this project. He was not sure what the City’s urban vision for this space would be, but he said the public spaces as originally approved had a lot more green on each terminal of the hill climb. He said the landscaping plan presented at this meeting is reminiscent of the site’s heritage. Mr. Hinman said a themed entry with conifers would be a preferred option. He was concerned about conflicts with pedestrians on the 156h plaza, and he was pleased with the attention given to the east-west priority, but north-south traffic could be more telling. Finally, the eastern end of the hill climb, Mr. Hinman said the DRB might want to anticipate pedestrian access between Buildings 2B and 3 through the courtyard which would lead into the Microsoft campus. Mr. Hinman said that Microsoft, based on prior comments from the company, would appreciate the added utility of access through that route.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

##### Mr. Sutton:

- Asked about the planting area along 28<sup>th</sup> and the space between that planting and the building. The applicant said this was under the overhang of the building, and this space would have decorative gravel. It would not be within view of the sidewalk. Mr. Sutton asked if that space would be usable by the tenants. The applicant said there would be an opportunity for that in the future.
- Mr. Sutton said he loved the landscape plan, especially with regard to the changes in elevation. He asked about the lantern element on the building and if it wrapped around the building. The applicant



said the lantern does wrap around the building, but it is bracketed by two fins that come out even farther.

- Mr. Sutton said overall, he was happy with the design of project, which beforehand, he thought was too simple. He said the addition of the lantern fins was nice and the palette is rich in materials.

Mr. Krueger:

- Had similar questions to Mr. Sutton's about the urban nature of this project. Mr. Krueger had thought this project would be more like the Harbor Steps in Seattle, in that there would be places for people to gather. He was concerned about the gravel space the applicant mentioned earlier.
- Mr. Krueger said the design along 156<sup>th</sup> was acceptable to him, and the transition to the buildings to the north, but he was concerned about a lack of pedestrian interest as people turn the corner into Building 3.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the lantern and confirmed that it would be extended out beyond the cantilevered portion of the building. The applicant showed that there were two levels of the lantern projecting out. Mr. Krueger said it was a great feature.
- Mr. Krueger liked the materials, especially the slate presented. He was still struggling with the south elevation and the amount of blank surface presented, however. He appreciated all the work going into this project and the applicant's response to the DRB's comments.
- The applicant said he did not want a big, blank façade. He said the glass on the site would not be overly reflective and might reveal some of the people inside and thus activate the space in that way.

Mr. Palmquist:

- In response to the public comment received, Mr. Palmquist asked about moving from Building 2A and 2B, through Building 3, to get to Microsoft. Mr. Hinman came back to the microphone and talked about how access to the drop off zone would be achieved by not going through Building 3.
- Mr. Hinman said that the hill climb would not matter to several people in this portion of the campus if they had to go back and around to use it.
- Mr. Palmquist said that the east-west access through the building would kill the hill climb, in that people would have an easier way to get where they are going. However, going north-south, the applicant does indeed provide the hill climb as a good option. Mr. Palmquist wanted to make sure the hill climb was emphasized, and did not think it would be difficult to do that.
- The applicant responded to the public comment and said there was a considerable amount of green space on the site. If another pedestrian connection is needed, that would be entirely doable, but the applicant did not want to be presumptuous about what Microsoft employees want.
- Mr. Palmquist said all that the applicant could do would be to provide an opportunity for that pedestrian access to happen, and that issue could work itself out easily.
- Mr. Palmquist liked the south side of Building 3, in contrast to what Mr. Krueger mentioned earlier. Mr. Palmquist said the focus of this site is the park, and the south elevation, with a 30-foot sidewalk, is intended for pedestrian movement. He did not want to dilute the grandeur of the park and said the south side of the building was on the right track.
- Mr. Palmquist liked the south elevation, which appears to soften the building, especially with the idea of the glass changing color during different times of day. He asked about the slate tile, and said he would like to see the material at the next meeting in a larger rendering. He would suggest a darker color of tile to provide richness and texture to the building.
- In general, Mr. Palmquist liked the building and the idea of distributing the setbacks and modulation on the site. He said what the applicant was considering met the intent of the Code in terms of massing, and would like to see this project back for approval soon.

Mr. Nichols:

- Liked the project at the last meeting, and said the applicant has only enhanced that sense through the landscaping plan presented. Mr. Nichols said the entry element worked great from a pedestrian scale and appreciated the quality palette of materials.
- Mr. Nichols was concerned about glare off the glass at the last meeting, and he was hopeful the fins added to the glass would help. He asked about the pedestrian drop off and if pavers would be used. The applicant said concrete would be used with scoring patterns and different colors.

- Mr. Nichols asked about the trees on either side of the buildings were in raised planters. The applicant confirmed that was the case and that 24-inch high planters would be used. The planters would be a barrier for vehicles and would provide places to sit. Mr. Nichols said he liked the project.

Mr. Meade:

- Liked the drop off zone. Mr. Meade asked about oil stains and traffic patterns over time. The applicant said those items have been considered.
- Mr. Meade said he was concerned about the slate tile presented. The applicant showed the DRB another project in Alaska that has used a similar tile. Mr. Meade wanted to make sure the tile did not look too rustic on this site. He asked how the tile would interact with the windows. The applicant said that will be a technical challenge, but his firm is working on that.
- Mr. Meade said the building is beautiful and the renderings are excellent. He asked if the glass masses might have some sloping toward the top to create a bit of an angle. The applicant had not considered sloping, but noted that with the extended lantern, the glass will go beyond the parapet line and below the soffit line.
- The applicant said the slope will appear simply because the glass is set back in plane. He understood what Mr. Meade was asking, but did not think more sloping would be necessary or perceptible.
- Mr. Meade asked again about the void space below the cantilevered area. The applicant confirmed that some gravel would be used, in that not much would be able to grow there. Basalt rock might be used. Pavers might be added in the future.
- Mr. Meade asked about the specimen trees on the site and if they would be evergreen. The applicant said each of the buildings would have a large tree with a canopy, possibly a Japanese maple. The flowering cherry opposite the specimen trees would be a flowering cherry to present a great burst of color in the spring. The conifer trees would occur where the slope breaks against the building.
- The applicant continued and said the street trees have some gaps with utilities and light poles, but this presents an opportunity for a landscape presence such as Hinoki cypresses.
- The applicant reiterated that the area under the cantilever that the DRB has been asking about is about ten feet overhead, above the sidewalk, based on the slope.
- Mr. Meade said the project might be worth a design award, and said the applicant should come back for approval at the next meeting. Mr. Lisk confirmed with the Board that the applicant had made a sufficient argument for superior design on this site, thus allowing for administrative flexibility.
- Mr. Lisk said the applicant might have a few details to take care of, including a better explanation of the slate material and a discussion about possible monument signage. Mr. Lisk also asked about the landscaping on the heavily sloped area of the hill climb, and if those plantings would be trampled.
- The applicant said the sloped area in question makes a transition from the grade of the sidewalk to the grade of the stair. There will be some seat-walls in this area on the stair side.
- Mr. Lisk said if the Board was ready for approval, this project could indeed come for approval at the next meeting.
- Mr. Krueger asked about parking stalls for the building. The applicant said 680 spaces were provided, or three per 1,000 square feet. Mr. Krueger said that sounded like room for a lot of cars in an area so heavily served by transit. Mr. Lisk said that was what the Code allowed for, and the applicant is not asking to exceed that number.
- Mr. Meade asked about names and numbers for the buildings and how they might be identified. He did not want a large, ungainly-looking number on the outside of the building. The applicant said the client is working on naming the entire development. The applicant said he would argue for subtlety and discretion in regard to identifying the buildings.
- Mr. Meade said the project should come back for approval.

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**LAND-2013-00954, Koll Commerce Center Limited Edition MPD**

**Description:** Master Plan for redevelopment of 19 existing lots within the KCCLC office park

**Location:** 2039 152<sup>nd</sup> Ave NE

**Applicant:** Melody Westerdal

**Architect:** Steve Schlenker *with* CollinsWoerman

**Prior Review Date:** 08/01/13

**Staff Contact:** Dennis Lisk, 425-556-2471 or [dwlisk@redmond.gov](mailto:dwlisk@redmond.gov)

Mr. Lisk said this was the second pre-application meeting for this project, which is in the south part of Overlake Village. It is larger than three acres, and thus requires a Master Plan when redevelopment is considered and a development agreement that would have to be approved by City Council. The property is a business park of condominiums with 18 different property owners on the site, and a 19<sup>th</sup> that is commonly owned. The applicant is proposing a phased Master Plan that includes three phases. Typically, these types of plans are approved for a 20-year period. Right now, 1.1 million square feet of development has been presented, the great majority of which would be residential. This follows the vision of the Zoning Code for this part of Overlake Village. The City wants to see residential development here within a mixed-use environment. Office development, retail, and a hotel on the site have been proposed. The applicant wants to make some frontage improvements. Some street improvements are required under Code, and those improvements will be made incrementally as the site proceeds over time. Frontage improvements will be made along 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. Half-street improvements will be made on the west side of the site, creating a new 151<sup>st</sup> Avenue. A private street has been proposed through the middle of the site to create east-west access. Some interesting landscape features are part of the plan, as well. Staff would like feedback from the DRB on the Master Plan and how vehicle and pedestrian circulation is achieved around the property, as well as where open space has been placed.

Architect Steve Schlenker presented on behalf of the applicant. He showed the progress the design has made since the last meeting on this project, in August of 2013. Work on this project has been slowed by a comprehensive traffic study. Traffic engineers will incorporate that information into a future presentation to the DRB. The Board had questions about transit and parking at the last meeting that the applicant is hoping to address. The preferred design alternative has not changed substantially from the last meeting. Housing is on the north side of the site. Housing with a mix of office spaces and a hotel are on the south side of the site. A private access drive has been designed that would be the equivalent of NE 21<sup>st</sup> Street. An auto plaza comes off the main access drive. The applicant has changed that plaza to give it more flexibility and viability for the project in the future. More housing has now been proposed. The same incentives would be applied to get to maximum floor area ratio (FAR) and heights. At the last meeting, 1.6 million square feet of development had been proposed with a 2.65 FAR. The FAR that is allowed in this OV1 Zone is 5.35, and in housing alone would be 4. The main restriction to the FAR is parking that could be provided, in that there is a high water table issue on this site.

The applicant has increased the amount of housing and development on the site. The amount of open space originally provided was close to 20%, and only 15% was required. The auto court, an impervious area, was close to 50% of that open space. The applicant said, in light of the transit-centric nature of this neighborhood, a lot of automobile spaces might not be a good idea. The new site plan takes away part of the auto court, but keeps a distance of 65 feet between the auto court and the main development. This eliminates auto traffic from much of the site, which will be good for residents and pedestrians visiting the retail sites. The housing has been increased. Before, there were 770 units. Now, there are 884 units. To achieve that, an extra third level of parking has been added. The northeast drive is the primary access route to the site, and there is a turnaround off of that which would be a drop off area for the office. Off of that drive, there would be access points to the parking garages. Pedestrians would move through site using NE 20<sup>th</sup> and 151<sup>st</sup> Avenue NE into the center of the site. A proposed road the applicant is calling NE Koll Drive would have a pedestrian connection to NE 22<sup>nd</sup> via an urban pathway. At the end of the project, the future connections will be for NE 51<sup>st</sup> to go on and connect to NE 24<sup>th</sup>.

The applicant said the main plazas by the office and the hotel, as well as the ornamental garden in the center of the site would be public zones as well as pedestrian pathways. Semi-private residential courtyards would relate to the specific buildings on the site, but there will be links between the public and private spaces. Street landscaping and furniture will be provided at the public spaces. The character of the site will include residential sites that originally were proposed at a size of 1,000 square feet. That size may decrease in the future. Shadow studies show that the courtyards are quite large, more than 10,000 square feet in some cases. Thus, sunlight hits these courtyards throughout the day. The applicant is trying to keep most of the vehicle access points off the central drive and away from the drop off points at the office. The access point on 151<sup>st</sup> Avenue NE might be too close to NE 20<sup>th</sup>, but the applicant is hoping to get additional access points for the parking garages on the site. The applicant is still negotiating how this could be achieved.

The DRB asked at the last meeting how the public and private space would interact. The applicant showed, along 151<sup>st</sup>, a live-work area where the ground floor could be retail and above that could be a living space. The parking garage is wrapped in all cases by building units, including live-work and retail spaces. The applicant will lay out NE 22<sup>nd</sup> using a 25-foot-wide urban pathway, allowing the creation of a two-way street. That street will be like a neighborhood street and will allow for two lanes of traffic, street trees, and sidewalks. The applicant is hoping for some flexibility in terms of how that might develop. Some areas would not have parking, but would rather be more like a plaza. The parcel would be broken into three phases through the building of different access roads. The applicant wants each phase to stand by itself, but knows that certain requirements for each phase, such as street improvements, will make that a challenge. Tree surveys will be completed on the site to find new ways to enhance the walkways.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

##### Mr. Sutton:

- Asked about the addition of the third level of parking and the transitions to that parking area. Mr. Sutton would like to get more details on that in the future.
- He asked about the transition between Phase 1 and Phase 2, and the new residential building added in this area. Mr. Sutton said one of the buildings should be pulled back a bit to create a better visual connection looking in the east-west direction. The applicant said he would take that comment under advisement.
- With regard to Mr. Sutton's comments on the third level of parking, the applicant showed the transition zone and how one level of parking would be above the street. Mr. Sutton said he still needed more information on how that would look.

##### Mr. Krueger:

- Said this project would be tricky with two-story townhouses and two stories of parking behind them, especially with the grade changes on the site.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the easement on the west side of the office building and how that connected with the residential units, and if there would be pedestrian access in this area. The applicant said he was trying to determine if an easement was needed on the west half of the property. That depends on whether the owners want to sell the southern half of the property in two parcels.
- The applicant continued that the development of the site could land-lock other portions of the site without proper planning. A pedestrian access would continue to be provided, much like with the Group Health project presented earlier.
- Mr. Krueger said the southeast corner at 152<sup>nd</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> could be a tricky corner with vehicle access. He asked about the drop off area for the office space, and how that could be considered open space. The applicant noted that the area adjacent to the drop off area, not the drop off area itself, would be used as open space to meet the intent of the incentive program.
- Mr. Krueger said he liked this project before and thought that the applicant had made some good refinements. He said the project would be great, and hoped the applicant could take advantage of the park to the west of the site when it is developed.

##### Mr. Palmquist:

- Said the project was good for this site, but was having trouble with Phase 1 and Phase 2 and how the massing and pedestrian flow would work on the southern portion of this transition.
- Mr. Palmquist said the northern block, Phase 3, makes more sense to be a city block with a mid-block crossing, in that there will likely be development surrounding it. South of the site, however, this project hits a dead end with a mega-block from 20<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> and 140<sup>th</sup> to 156<sup>th</sup>.
- He said the traffic flow is more diagonal across the site rather than straight to the south. Mr. Palmquist said the building on the southeast corner blocks the natural traffic flow. He would like to see the massing reconsidered on the south half of the project.
- He did not think there would not be as much urban development on the south side of the site, which is nearer a residential area. There are great opportunities to bring in pedestrians off of 156<sup>th</sup>, however.
- The applicant saw Mr. Palmquist's point, but noted that 152<sup>nd</sup> is a main retail street. The hope is that the bulk of the people would move down 152<sup>nd</sup>. He said he would look at what Mr. Palmquist was considering to make 156<sup>th</sup> a stronger element.

- Mr. Palmquist said providing a straight path would be important, in that access to transit is about a half mile away. A strong corridor is forming between the Crossroads area and Microsoft. He said using city blocks would be important to help circulate traffic through this site.
- Mr. Palmquist said this project was on the right path and that this would be a good development for the site.

Mr. Nichols:

- Said he was seeing this project for the first time. Mr. Nichols said it was an impressive plan to rejuvenate the area. He liked the green roofs he was seeing on the buildings.
- He wanted to make sure the applicant would continue to pay attention to the heights of the buildings and how they would impact shadows on the open areas.
- Mr. Nichols said this project presented a great opportunity for the area and was looking forward to the next evolution of it.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked about the south edge, where the future hotel would be. Mr. Meade asked about how big the sidewalk would be, and noted that this area would have the highest speed limit adjacent to the site. He suggested that the sidewalk should step further away from the street.
- The applicant said this area of the site does not interface with the street on this site. There may be a berm against the garage in this spot. Mr. Meade appreciated this response.
- Mr. Meade asked if there were other issues from staff or the applicant to be raised. The applicant thanked the DRB members for their comments and promised to work on them at the next meeting for this project, most likely in late February. Traffic studies should be done around that time.
- Mr. Krueger asked Mr. Lisk if there was a modulation incentive involved in this project, and if the applicant could do some terracing at the edges of the site.
- Mr. Lisk said those provisions in the Code are for Downtown, not Overlake. Along 152<sup>nd</sup>, there is a provision in the Code that if a building is more than six stories tall an applicant would have to recess the upper stories from the street. That may or may not apply to this project.
- The applicant said he was under the impression that the recessing requirement was only north of 24<sup>th</sup> NE. Mr. Lisk said that this concept might be considered in the future for Overlake Village. Mr. Krueger did not know what flexibility the applicant had with this site.
- Mr. Lisk said the Master Plan was not a substitute for Zoning Code requirements. The incentives available are all in the Code. Adding new incentives would require changes to the Code.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:20 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).**

**March 6, 2014**  
**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

  
**RECORDING SECRETARY**