



**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

March 7, 2024, 7:00 p.m.

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

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairperson Shaffer White, Vice-Chairperson Josiah Cline, Board Members Henry Liu, Samson Ng, and Wanqin Su

**ABSENCES:** Board Member Ana Cisneros

**STAFF PRESENT:** David Lee

**MEETING MINUTES:** Carolyn Garza, LLC

**CALL TO ORDER:**

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson White at 7:01 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.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

MOTION by Vice-Chairperson Cline to approve the January 18, 2024 Minutes.  
MOTION seconded by Board Member Liu. The MOTION passed unanimously.

**APPROVAL**

**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 Wanjin:

- Stated that a main concern had been how the building would look to the public, particularly along 192<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Northeast, but the pedestrian experience now looks good after additional information has been provided.
- Board Member Wanjin stated being comfortable approving Administrative Design Flexibilities (ADF).

#### Board Member Ng:

- Stated not having further comments.

#### Board Member Liu:

- Asked the applicant to explain an entry rendering.

Nick McDaniel *with* NBBJ replied that large perspectives were provided in latest renderings to show highlights to the entry. There are paths pointing to the entry and significant signage, and only employees will be coming to the service facility. Boulders, light poles, and benches also point toward the entry. Two perspectives were provided, from the employee parking lot and the walking path. An email received regarding adding signage to further emphasize the entry resulted in two alternate ideas, a two-foot blade next to the entry door or a large monument sign describing sustainable features of the project.

- Board Member Liu stated liking the perspective of the walkway pointing to the entry and that a large monument sign in a different color would be more beneficial than the blade.

- Board Member Liu stated that color contrast was more pronounced in previous renderings.

Board Member Cline:

- Stated agreement with Board Member Liu and stated appreciation for the three options presented for entry signage.
- Board Member Cline stated that a monument sign indicating the behind-the-scenes sustainable features is a good touch.
- Board Member Cline stated being comfortable allowing design staff to decide on signage.

Board Member White:

- Stated agreement with Board Member Cline.
- Board Member White stated that a condition can be added to an approval regarding signage.

MOTION by Board Member Liu to approve LAND-2023-00271, Microsoft Electric Vehicle Station and Facility, as shown in Design Review Board materials presented at the March 7, 2024 Design Review Board meeting. This approval includes all standard conditions also outlined in the March 7, 2024 staff memo. MOTION seconded by Board Member Wanqin. The MOTION passed unanimously.

**FORMAL REVIEW – ROUND ONE**

**LAND-2023-00259, LWSD Norman Rockwell Elementary School**

**Neighborhood:** Education Hill

**Description:** Construction of a new 79,450 Square Foot (+/-), 690 student capacity elementary school on underdeveloped land within the existing Normal Rockwell Elementary School campus.

**Location:** 11125 – 162<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Northeast

**Applicant:** Dion Serra *with* McGranahan Architects

**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 was no mention of public comment received.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

### Board Member Cline:

- Asked if weather protection at the central courtyard has been considered, to keep the space activated year-round.

Dion Serra *with* McGranahan Architects replied that school staff are being consulted regarding courtyard activities and outdoor learning. A special education program will also use the courtyard more regularly.

- Board Member Cline asked if gates on the lower level of the walkway will be a light color.

Dion Serra replied either stark white or light grey, to be determined.

- Board Member Cline asked if the closed gates could become a mural, possibly of the school mascot.

Dion Serra asked if more is needed as an identifier.

- Board Member Cline replied that there may be a missed opportunity to provide art to engage students and people driving by.
- Board Member Cline stated appreciating the bike canopy and racks.
- Board Member Cline stated that seeing site lighting on each elevation, particularly when sunset is in the four o'clock hour, will be helpful; in the past, areas of the building were not lit and pathways were not used.
- Board Member Cline stated liking the look of the new design compared to the old cinderblock construction.

### Board Member Wanqin:

- Stated liking the look of the building, modern and clean.
- Board Member Wanqin stated concern regarding parking lot screening along 162<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Northeast, page 84 and 4.04.
- Board Member Wanqin asked if the applicant is required to screen next to the right-of-way.

Planning Manager Lee replied that the issue would be examined.

- Board Member Wanqin stated only seeing lighting information for the right-of-way portion and how fixtures will look.

Board Member Ng:

- Stated agreement with other Board Members.
- Board Member Ng stated that the courtyard will be a wonderful space.
- Board Member Ng stated appreciating the bridge to the library, a destination.

Board Member Liu:

- Stated liking the video presentation, but that the review material was too large to download.
- Board Member Liu stated liking the concept of buildings surrounding a courtyard.
- Board Member Liu stated that the courtyard will provide comfort and safety to the kids.
- Board Member Liu stated liking the comment of Board Member Cline regarding artwork or graphics on the closed gate.
- Board Member Liu stated not having seen a material board but liking the color and tone in the video presentation, but that dark grey or charcoal bricks are a concern and suggested a lighter, warmer tone for an elementary school setting.

Board Member White:

- Stated that the project is a strong start and appreciated massing and second story glass.
- Board Member White stated that the next package should be more tailored for the Design Review Board purview and that a PDF would be helpful.
- Board Member White stated that a better understanding of materiality will need to be brought back with specific examples.
- Board Member White stated that options for tones in brick will be helpful.
- Board Member White stated that the sleek design can balance with playful flourishes.
- Board Member White stated that exterior night lighting perspectives will be helpful, assuming that there will be some occasional public use into evenings.
- Board Member White stated that screening locations and compliance can be addressed by staff, with any further concerns flagged for the Design Review Board.

Dion Serra asked for specific lighting requests, understanding that Board Member Cline would like site lighting on all four sides of the building.

Board Member Cline:

- Replied that because there are three pedestrian neighborhood connections, seeing lighting on all four sides will be helpful.

Dion Serra stated that there are two pedestrian accesses to the south and one to the north, and asked if the north side of the building does need lighting as all pathways are funneled around a fencing perimeter that leads to the front entrance.

- Board Member Cline asked to see what the arrival will look like from each pathway.

Dion Serra asked for clarification regarding timing of lighting renderings, early evening conditions with students on campus or an after-hours community event.

Board Member White:

- Replied that a worst-case scenario such as after-hours use at seven o'clock in the winter would be helpful, warm and welcoming or dark and scary.

Dion Serra asked if the lighting cut sheets and photo metric files provided had been viewed.

- Board Member White asked if the files were a part of the very large packet.

Dion Serra stated that cut sheets were separate and photo metric files are a part of the drawing package at the end.

Board Member Cline:

- Stated having seen the photo metrics but not the cut sheets.

Board Member Wanqin:

- Stated agreement with Board Member Cline, having seen the photo metrics but not the cut sheets.

Board Member White:

- Stated that a rendered exterior lighting image including foot candles will be the most accessible to the Board Members.

Board Member Wanjin:

- Stated appreciating information from surveys, but that the information is not within the Design Review Board purview and can be removed from the packet for review.

Dion Serra stated that regarding branding on the gate, there are other surfaces in the entry plaza and asked if the concern is the gate specifically.

Board Member White:

- Stated trusting the design team to make decisions best suited for the design intent.
- Board Member White stated that art on the gate is an idea but if something works better it can be proposed.

Board Member Cline:

- Stated that presenting options including the preferred are helpful to the Design Review Board.

Dion Serra stated that the video presentation is very close in the representation of colors and materials, but greener in the physical product. The suggestion for lighter brick is of concern as the entire palette may then need to be changed for cohesiveness. A photo of the physical sample can be included in the next package.

Board Member Liu:

- Stated that options in the presentation are helpful, either real materials or renderings of materials in lighting conditions.
- Board Member Liu stated that the concern is regarding the charcoal color of brick in the presentation.
- Board Member Liu stated that some contrast from metal panel would be good.

Dion Serra replied that the intention is for the dark colors to be close to each other and not intended to create contrast, and asked if the comment will be required to be addressed.

Board Member Liu:

- Stated that staff is asking the Design Review Board to review the color scheme and options will be helpful.

Board Member White:

- Stated understanding that staff would like to expedite the project and the next presentation should include a more detailed, thorough material palette, which was difficult to review from the video presentation. A photo of the material is helpful but more helpful would be a photo of the material on another project in a larger format with natural lighting.
- Board Member White stated that an alternate package including comments from the meeting should be included.
- Board Member White stated that the Design Review Board does not have a full picture of materials at this time.

Dion Serra asked if communication can be done online.

Planning Manager Lee replied that communication cannot occur outside of published Design Review Board meetings. Samples or photos of materials and options could be brought to the City to be reviewed at the next meeting on March 21, 2024 prior to another full package rendering.

Board Member Liu:

- Stated that if the preferred color scheme is based on a story, theory, or history, this can also be a part of the conversation, but without a reason, experience has shown that a charcoal color will not be enjoyed by the children.

Board Member White:

- Asked Planning Manager Lee for clarification regarding review of the material palette at the next meeting.

Planning Manager Lee replied that there should be comments collected for clarity, and asked Dion Serra if there is a budget limitation on certain colors and materials.

Dion Serra replied that the project is design-build, and that the contractor is working with subcontractors on specific pricing.

Board Member White:

- Asked if there has been buy-in by school stakeholders on the palette.

Ina Holzer *with* Lake Washington School District (LWSD) stated yes, speaking for the District, and that another consideration is the cost of maintaining certain colors. Brighter colors are harder to maintain and wear is seen sooner than in darker colors.

- Stated that the applicant will need to bring a small package and material photo, preferably on another building, as well as context regarding stakeholder discussions and maintenance issues.

Dion Serra replied that locations of other colors and elements are also being examined inside the space, other design elements where colors will come through, and if understanding that context of color will be necessary or beneficial.

Board Member Liu:

- Replied yes, that the interior color palette would be helpful to see cohesiveness.

Board Member White:

- Stated that the ideas behind intent are needed but nothing elaborate.
- Board Member White stated that the Board is impressed with the first package.

### **OTHER ITEMS**

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

### **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION by Board Member Liu to adjourn the meeting at 8:02 p.m. MOTION seconded by Vice-Chairperson Cline. The MOTION passed unanimously.

**April 18, 2024**

---

MINUTES APPROVED ON

**Carolyn Garza**

---

RECORDING SECRETARY