



**CITY OF REDMOND**  
**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

February 1, 2024, 7:00 p.m.

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

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Board Members Ana Cisneros, Henry Liu, Samson Ng, and Wanqin Su

**ABSENCES:** Chairperson Shaffer White & Vice-Chairperson Josiah Cline

**STAFF PRESENT:** Lauren Anderson, David Lee, Mason McGonagall and Tim McHarg, Redmond Planning

**MEETING MINUTES:** Carolyn Garza, LLC

**CALL TO ORDER:**

The meeting was called to order by Board Member Wanqin at 7:13 p.m.

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

**FIRST REVIEW**

**LAND-2023-00271, Microsoft Electric Vehicle Station and Facility**

**Neighborhood:** Southeast Redmond

**Description:** Microsoft is proposing to build an electric vehicle charging and maintenance facility for a 291 vehicle Commute & Shuttle fleet. This facility will act as the program home, parking, charging, and maintenance facility. There will be 225 surface parking stalls for buses with an overhead gantry charging system, a 165-stall surface parking lot for employees and visitors, a bus wash and maintenance facility, and office space.

**Location:** 19150 Union Hill Road

**Applicant:** Nick McDaniel *with* NBBJ and Mike Green *with* OAC Services for Microsoft

**Staff Contact:** Mason McGonagall, Senior Planner, 425-556-2475 or [mmcgonagall@redmond.gov](mailto:mmcgonagall@redmond.gov)

Planning Manager Lee presented the project for Senior Planner McGonagall. There were no public comments received.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

#### Board Member Liu:

- Stated that the sawtooth design could provide more consistent lighting inside.
- Board Member Liu stated that there is an opportunity at the Administration Building and Maintenance Bay to provide two separate roofs rather than one or a floating roof over the lobby to punctuate the entrance area.

Nick McDaniel, Project Designer *with* NBBJ, replied that the slant of the sawtooth roof is to keep heat underneath the sawtooth to a minimum for the comfort of bus drivers, and natural light from the north comes in but is more shaded. Some sawtooth carry cells to produce energy and the 10% angle facing south is ideal. As the buses drive through the yard, the light will come down between buses on the aisles, and if the light were coming from side the buses will shade the light, the least heat with the best light and natural ventilation.

- Board Member Liu stated appreciation for the thought process.

Nick McDaniel replied that regarding the large roof, water drains down to an infiltration swail with respect towards water and drainwell. Overall goals of the southeast neighborhood are to preserve an industrial character and look while linking natural habitat. The roof draining into the swail and low building character is the design approach. There is a four-foot roof overhang for character.

- Board Member Liu asked if the dispersion trench is storm water management or for water collection for sustainable uses.

Rhys Van Bemmal, Landscape Architect *with* Swift Company, replied that there are different ways water is to be treated on the site including water collection from the gantry roof to be used for flush fixtures inside the building. The mechanical team evaluated the need for collection from the main office roof, but collecting from the gantry and directing building roof water to infiltration was determined to be the best solution. Irrigation use is being researched and an infiltration pond will allow water to

recharge the aquifer at the southwest corner, a landscape amenity. The water hitting pavement surfaces is not permitted to infiltrate the aquifer and dark blue on the diagram represents that water that must be treated. Having building roof water directed to the infiltration area minimizes project impact on the Redmond stormwater system.

- Board Member Liu asked if the aquifer serves as an onsite infiltration for rainwater.

Rhys Van Bemmal replied yes.

- Board Member Liu stated still hoping for a highlight at the entrance.
- Board Member Liu asked for clarification regarding Concrete Masonry Unit blocks (CMU) on the material palette.

Nick McDaniel replied regular but ground face CMU from Mutual Materials, more stone character, another attempt to balance an industrial look with beauty.

Board Member Ng:

- Stated that the Administrative Design Flexibilities (ADF) make sense and stated agreement with staff analysis and recommendation to approve the ADFs.

Board Member Wanqin:

- Stated liking the project with ecological considerations.
- Board Member Wanqin asked if highlights could be made where water drains from the roof to help break up the large scale, a storytelling element and visual interest.

Nick McDaniel replied liking the idea of expressing the water from the roof on the path to the infiltration pond and the idea will be explored.

- Board Member Wanqin asked if tree locations are accurately rendered, page 13.

Nick McDaniel replied that trees are abstract and round on the rendering only.

Rhys Van Bemmal replied that while abstract on renderings, trees are correlated to the proposed layout. Species selection has been explored since the graphic was produced.

- Board Member Wanqin asked if trees shown are installation size, or how many years will be needed to achieve the size.

Rhys Van Bemmal replied that the rendering forms are not representative of how the trees will grow. Height could be reached at 20 years.

- Board Member Wanqin stated being curious about how planting will look at installation as planting is breaking down scale and screening in requested ADFs, the pedestrian experience in the future.

Nick McDaniel replied that the site is heavily wooded, and trees are being added.

- Board Member Wanqin stated that while the site will be very wooded in several years, installation size is the concern, and asked for further clarification.

Rhys Van Bemmal replied that City of Redmond standards will be met or exceeded regarding tree sizes. The understory mix will work together with trees at installation to serve the screening function. As landscape matures, trees will take over. Layering is proposed to mitigate pedestrian scale.

- Board Member Wanqin stated that planting could extend from the street to the building, pages 21 to 24.

Nick McDaniel replied that the building is far back from the sidewalk in most cases.

- Board Member Wanqin stated understanding the set back, and that understanding the scale will be helpful.
- Board Member Wanqin stated that a second package, particularly regarding the roof, would be helpful.

Board Member Cisneros:

- Stated that the project is interesting.
- Board Member Cisneros asked if a traffic study has been conducted regarding impact on the area.

Planning Manager Lee replied that Transportation Engineers are examining impact studies to ensure safe conditions for turning, coordinated internally.

Board Member Wanqin stated that a second package should be brought back to the Board.

Board Member Liu:

- Asked that next renderings reflect actual materiality, and if signage, public art or landscaping can occur at the entrance.

**MOTION by Board Member Liu to continue review of the project at the next Design Review Board Meeting for further comments. MOTION seconded by Board Member Cisneros. The MOTION passed unanimously.**

**FIRST REVIEW**

**LAND-2023-00155, One Sixty Fifth Ave Townhomes**

**Neighborhood:** Downtown

**Description:** Demolish existing Single-Family Residence (SFR) and garage. Construct seven single-family townhouses with attached two car garages and a shared driveway. The existing alley to the south subject property will be improved per City of Redmond standards and will be used to access the shared driveway. The project will propose to create seven-unit lot subdivision with easements for utilities and ingress/egress.

**Location:** 8042 165<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast

**Applicant:** Kelly Hallstrom *with* Medici Architects

**Staff Contact:** Lauren Anderson, Senior Planner, 425-556-2401 or [landerson@redmond.gov](mailto:landerson@redmond.gov)

Senior Planner Anderson presented the project. There were no public comments received.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

Board Member Cisneros:

- Stated that the package is nice.
- Board Member Cisneros stated that more context regarding what is in front of a northwest façade would be helpful.
- Board Member Cisneros asked to see actual photos of the materials proposed.
- Board Member Cisneros stated liking colors.

Board Member Ng:

- Stated liking the color scheme and asked if two smaller units should have slightly different colors for visual interest, Building Two East.

Kelly Hallstrom *with* Medici Architects replied that color schemes can be explored further.

Jennifer Kim *with* Medici Architects asked if the concern was regarding brown towers with gables, or beige in between.

- Board Member Ng replied the two middle units, not much differentiation between the two.

Kelly Hallstrom replied that cohesion was intentional, but colors can be explored.

Board Member Liu:

- Stated that on page two, the neighboring townhomes and the church across the street are warm tones, and that the building should be harmonious with surroundings if design intent is to be consistent with current schemes; the proposed color scheme is too bold and modern for the area.
- Board Member Liu stated that façade design has many articulations, and the variety of materials may be too busy, particularly the amount of white brick in upper levels.
- Board Member Liu stated that the stairway could be extended to an exterior wall to make the rooftop space a separate mass with privacy for the two units.
- Board Member Liu stated that large windows would make the rooftop more interesting.
- Board Member Liu stated that design language is not consistent in form and needs more privacy in function.

Kelly Hallstrom replied that roof deck level massing will be examined. The colors are white and grey, possibly not coming through on the color palette, neutral and not meant to stand out or contradict neighboring buildings, but colors can be revisited also.

- Board Member Liu stated that bringing options and comparisons will be helpful for the Board.

Board Member Wanqin:

- Stated that the site plan makes sense.
- Board Member Wanqin stated liking how the alley turns the building outwards, a more interesting frontage.
- Board Member Wanqin stated that an issue is the blank wall on the south of building units three and four, pages 22 and 24.

- Board Member Wanqin stated that seeing materials used in neighboring buildings and design context will be helpful.
- Board Member Wanqin stated that wood accent at the entrance of building four is successful in bringing warmth without a large gesture.

Jennifer Kim asked if a physical material palette should be brought back, or more realistic renderings.

Board Member Cisneros:

- Replied that a picture of real materials during two different times of day for shading would be helpful.

Board Member Liu:

- Asked for the distance between two buildings in the alleyway.

Jennifer Kim replied 25 feet.

**FIRST REVIEW**

**LAND-2023-00296, Redmond Town Center Master Plan**

**Neighborhood:** Downtown

**Description:** Master Planned Development including three seven-story mixed-use residential buildings, two 12-story mixed-use residential or office buildings, a two-story addition to an existing two-story parking garage, and associated landscape and streetscape improvements.

**Location:** 7530 - 164<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast

**Applicant:** Mitch Ptacek *with* GGLO

**Staff Contact:** Tim McHarg, Principal Planner, 425-556-2414 or [tmcharg@redmond.gov](mailto:tmcharg@redmond.gov)

Principal Planner McHarg presented the project. No Public Comment has been received as the Notice of Application will be issued tomorrow.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

Board Member Cisneros:

- Stated that the Master Plan reflects how the city is growing.
- Board Member Cisneros asked if a space on pages 34 and 35 is introducing two options, office or residential.

Principal Planner McHarg replied that what is proposed is two alternatives, and the applicant will determine which to pursue.

- Board Member Cisneros asked if both alternatives are the same height.

Principal Planner McHarg replied yes, that the height standard is the same in the zone for any use.

- Board Member Cisneros stated not having any concern at this point.

Principal Planner McHarg replied that because the project is a Master Plan, there is a less detailed design than with a Site Plan Entitlement, and if there are specific corner or gateway treatments to enhance the connection to and from the site, the Master Planning process is a good time to discuss.

- Board member Cisneros stated that Buildings 3A and 3D protect the interior of Redmond Town Center, and design that will bring people in will be needed.

Principal Planner McHarg replied that as shown in the northeast perspective most of the development is occurring at the south end of the site. Questions for the Board to consider could be around the connections and public face at the northern end of the site, as well as opportunities to improve the existing condition of the parking garage as part of the development of Buildings 3A and 3D.

- Board Member Cisneros suggested an open ground floor to bring people in.
- Board Member Cisneros asked if Northeast 74<sup>th</sup> Street will be pedestrian only.

Principal Planner McHarg stated that there will still be a pedestrian only area with the ability for maintenance vehicle access, as well as at the north-south open space. By connecting the two open spaces, there will be improved flow to the south and opportunities for community activities.

- Board Member Cisneros asked if there is a chance to connect on upper levels.

Principal Planner McHarg stated that the idea is not being proposed at this point, but a good question for the applicant.

- Board Member Cisneros gave an example of people attempting to move through the site in rain.

Board Member Liu:

- Asked if the gateway is considered from the light rail station to the north.

Principal Planner McHarg replied that in the Master Plan, page 50, several critical gateways are identified.

- Board Member Liu stated that the future vision for the district seems limited.
- Board Member Liu stated that the light rail station might be downplayed on the north side, and that the focus be on Downtown and a potential connection between Redmond Town Center and Marymoor Park, visual or physical.
- Board Member Liu asked if the discussion included which option, residential or office, for the tower was occurring.

Principal Planner McHarg replied that the Design Review Board does not have purview over what uses will be placed in a site, but rather over the design of the building. Design and not use is what is being discussed. The Board will not be recommending whether a building will be residential or office, but rather recommending design solutions for the two alternatives.

- Board Member Liu stated that on pages 36 and 37, the tower should be residential for human scale.
- Board Member Liu stated that an office element could be introduced but more appropriately at 4B or 41C east block.

Board Member Ng:

- Stated support for the comment from Board Member Liu regarding a connection to Marymoor Park.
- Board Member Ng stated being interested in how Redmond Town Center will connect to the surrounding city, currently like an island.
- Board Member Ng stated being interested in development of corners 3A and 3B.

Board Member Wanqin:

- Stated liking the redevelopment of the parking lot.
- Board Member Wanqin stated liking the connection on Northeast 74<sup>th</sup> Street to Bear Creek Parkway.
- Board Member Wanqin stated safety is a concern where pedestrian and vehicle access meet and suggested a design gesture to slow down or invite.
- Board Member Wanqin stated concern regarding pedestrians and the parking garage at light rail.
- Board Member Wanqin stated that simplifying the existing building is good.
- Board Member Wanqin stated that structure wise, the Plan looks great.

Mitch Ptacek, Architect with GGLO, replied that on page 49, modifications will be made independent of this first process, coming to the Design Review Board separately in another phase. A city goal for the zone is a potential pedestrian trail to Marymoor Park. Adding bike lanes on 164<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast and 166<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast to connect to the Central City project and existing infrastructure will pull downtown activity into the site. Intersection improvements and traffic calming ideas are being examined.

Marieke Lacasse with GGLO continued to discuss visions for space access, and that more information will be in the packet for the next meeting.

- Board Member Wanqin asked for a study regarding pedestrian experience.

**OTHER ITEMS**

Planning Manager Lee stated that there were no further items for the Board.

**ADJOURNMENT**

As Board Member Cisneros had left the meeting, a quorum for a MOTION to adjourn was not achieved. Board Member Wanqin stated that the meeting was concluded at 8:55 p.m.

**February 1, 2024**

---

MINUTES APPROVED ON

**Carolyn Garza**

---

RECORDING SECRETARY