

**CITY OF REDMOND  
PARKS & TRAILS COMMISSION  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
JOINT MEETING  
November 7, 2013**

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

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Scott Waggoner, Acting Chair; Craig Krueger, Mike Nichols, Kevin Sutton, Arielle Crowder

**PARKS & TRAILS COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:** Tom Sanko, Chair; Nicholas Lee, Vice Chair; Barney Kinzer, Aaron Knopf, Angela Birney, Joel Cherkis, Ellen Kaspi, Tina Sarin. Youth Advocates: Anton de Leon and Evan Blajev

**EXCUSED ABSENCE (DRB):** David Scott Meade, Joe Palmquist

**STAFF PRESENT:** Steven Fischer, Principal Planner; Dennis Lisk, Associate Planner; Carolyn Hope, Parks Planning and Cultural Services Manager

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

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Parks & Trails Commission/Design Review Board joint meeting was called to order by DRB Acting Chair Scott Waggoner at 6:30 p.m.

**DISCUSSION**

**Capstone Overlake Park**

**Description:** 2.7 acre park to be constructed as part of the redevelopment of the former Group Health Overlake property

**Location:** Overlake Village

**Applicant:** Capstone Partners

**Staff Contacts:** Dennis Lisk, (425) 556-2471 or [dwlisk@redmond.gov](mailto:dwlisk@redmond.gov) and Carolyn Hope, (425) 556-2313 or [cjhope@redmond.gov](mailto:cjhope@redmond.gov)

Mr. Lisk said he was the lead planner assigned to the Capstone project. The project's master plan was approved for the former Group Health hospital in December of 2011 by the Redmond City Council. That master plan envisioned a transformation of this site into a transit-oriented, multi-use development that would be developed over a period of time. Earlier this year, Capstone Partners, which worked on the master plan, purchased the property from Group Health and began the process of redeveloping the site. With that, Capstone decided to assume the responsibility for construction of the park, which is part of the master plan for the property. It is a 2.7 acre park in the middle of the site. Staff is generally very supportive of the idea of the developer taking on that responsibility for this site. Mr. Lisk said tonight's meeting was to begin the process of developing a vision for the park, which will be privately owned but completely accessible to the public. Mr. Lisk would like to develop a vision for the park, talk about some of the programming elements, and deal with three questions in the staff report, including the following:

1. What are the key design elements this park should have, which is a different, more urban park than Redmond has had in the past?
2. What are the ways that the different spaces within the park can be connected to each other and connected to rest of the development that will grow up around the park?
3. What activities should take place in this park?

Mr. Lisk said all these questions would open up to the general public as well. In December, there will be a community meeting on this project to get more public feedback and guide the design concepts for the park.

Carolyn Hope, the Park Planning and Cultural Services Manager for the City of Redmond, next presented to the Commission and Board. She said that Capstone would be looking for some vision from this joint meeting, which would be the same focus for the general public meeting in December. In January, Capstone should have some design concepts to share. Members of the public will be able to add some comments after the discussion of the Commission and Board. The members of the Board and Commission introduced themselves at this point, including two student advocates.

Mike Hubbard with Capstone presented to the joint meeting and dealt with the question of having Capstone deal with the park rather than having the City do it. He said the way the development agreement reads, Capstone would pay a fee, turn it over, and then have the City do the work. Mr. Hubbard noted that the park was the centerpiece of the development, and it must be well integrated to all the buildings on the site. He said the north half of the project will be the first phase. He added that the hill climb on the site, including the urban path and the garage next to it, are linked so closely to the park that they must be constructed together. Capstone wants to have the design for this project accepted by everyone in the community such that when it is time to break ground, the park plan is very clear.

Kristen Lundquist, landscape architect with Brumbaugh and Associates, said she was excited to see a design solution that would become the heart of the Overlake Village. She said the project was a unique urban center with over a thousand residential units. There will be office buildings, mixed use buildings, and retail spaces to create a vibrant, 24-hour urban experience that would be very new for this area of Redmond. She reviewed the master plan layout of the site with the Board and Commission, and showed the connections to the larger community beyond the urban village. The Microsoft campus is to the north, with some assisted living on the edge of that. The future light rail station and another public park opportunity are nearby as well, so connections between these elements are very important. The main vehicular access will come in through a spine road and the garage entrance. There is an important pedestrian link on the hill climb element as foot traffic moves west and east. Some gateway opportunities in three locations have been established to connect the green space. The front of the hotel and office buildings will serve as entrances to the urban village. The gateway at Building 3 is unique in that it ties in to more of an urban context at 156<sup>th</sup>, which will become even more urban in the future. The same urban feel has been established at the west end, in front of the hotel.

Ms. Lundquist noted that the site has some challenging topography. She first pointed out the elevation change surrounding the office buildings and how they link to the park and the hill climb. The lower edge of the project has an elevation of 345 feet, which is where the parking garage entrance is located. The hill climb moves up to an elevation of 375 feet. Thus, a lot of grading will happen in this location. A slope analysis diagram shows that there is a 3 to 1 slope on the site, or a 30% slope, that would not be accessible. Anything steeper than that becomes a challenge for planting, as well. The zone above this would be a 1 and 12 slope, which is what one would find on a steep accessible ramp. The zones along the street at Building 3 and the hotel have 1 and 20 slopes, which are much gentler. The slope on the spine road varies from fairly shallow to quite steep. In one 100-foot segment of the site, there is a 26-foot grade change. Most residents on the site will have some grade changes to deal with as well as they walk around the site. There is a 25-foot grade change in one location. The spine road has a 15-foot grade change before it evens out. Overall, there is a slope zone that wraps around the project and makes it unique. That presents an opportunity, but also presents some constraints on the site design. The designers do not consider this to be a destination park because it will not have athletic fields. It will be more of a destination for people who live in the immediate community and an amenity for the businesses on the site. It will also serve as a pathway for people coming off of light rail in Redmond.

Ms. Lundquist showed the Board and Commission some of the examples designers have considered in looking at this site. Slope opportunities and places along the hill climb will allow for gathering places. The spine road and hill climb areas will have bike lanes. Structured uses will be put in place for residents living around the park. Ms. Lundquist said this park would function as the hub and heart of this urban village, providing passive and active open space for the immediate community while becoming an amenity to the office and retail areas. The park will also help integrate the built environment around the site and offer connections to the surrounding neighborhoods. The designers are hoping to offer some non-structured

places, which is a hallmark of successful open spaces. No play structures or restroom facilities have been planned for the park.

Ms. Lundquist showed the Board and Commission the gateways at the west and east end. The hill climb is not a straight run, allowing for different gathering areas along the way. There are four arrival zones that happen in the park, including an important arrival space at Building 3. The site has a terrace level that is basically a level space that serves as a midpoint between the buildings. This allows for a connection to occur between the buildings and the park itself. A main courtyard could potentially face the park that would have some nice views in and around the site. The park has three main zones, including the park slope zone, which could be a very green space. The central park zone is a bit more level and could be easier to contend with in terms of accessibility. The upper park zone is much more connected to the steeper slopes, the buildings, and the sidewalks. Ms. Lundquist reiterated that the key elements to be included in the discussion of the Board and Commission include the connectivity of the spaces, the incorporation of the hill climb into the park, and an understanding of what activities might happen in the park.

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

##### Mr. Sanko:

- Asked if the height of the buildings portrayed was set. Mr. Sanko confirmed that the residential building would be five stories over a concrete podium. The zoning allows for ten stories. The office buildings can also go to ten stories, but the users of office space in this area tend to favor big floors.
- There is an FAR limitation on the site, so when the tenant demands are factored in, as well as the size of the floor, that would indicate shorter buildings. There will be 1,400 residential units on the entire site, and taller buildings may be built.
- Mr. Sanko asked about the sun hitting the south slope and how the buildings would impact that. He said the park would be much nicer with sun rather than shadow. The applicant noted that a shadow study was done as part of the master plan.
- Mr. Sanko asked if there were views to the west or south. The applicant said yes, though a view study has not been done. On the buildings' sixth floor, the Olympics and Mount Rainier should be visible.

##### Ms. Sarin:

- Asked about covered spaces and lighting, and how those elements would fit into this plan. The applicant said lighting has been considered, but not covered spaces as much. The lighting for the hill climb will be shared with the sidewalk area, and will be at a pedestrian scale.
- Lighting in the park has not been determined as of yet. Sidewalks will have some lighting.
- Ms. Sarin said that with no lighting, many residents and visitors to the park would not use the park facility. Likewise, she said that without covered areas, the park would not get as much use either.

##### Mr. Lee:

- Asked about what the applicant has learned on what not to do in a space like this. The applicant responded that the sun blocking issue is very important. The applicant is hoping to create a park that is not over-designed and also not over-landscaped.
- The size and scale of hardscape spaces are issues that the applicant wants to be very careful with. Smaller nodes with a variety of spaces will be a key to the park design.
- The applicant wants to be careful as well with lighting so as not to create a false sense of security in the park.
- Ms. Sarin asked if the applicant had considered any youth play spaces on the site. The applicant said the slopes will have some opportunities for imaginative play.

##### Mr. Cherkis:

- Asked if families with small children would be moving into the residential units on this site. The applicant said that was unclear. However, one of the residential buildings will have units of about 700 square feet apiece, meaning predominantly one-bedroom units.
- The other residential building will have two and three-bedroom units. It is unclear what the demand for residential units on this site will be. There will most likely be a demand for small families, but there will be a demand for singles as well.

Mr. Kinzer:

- Said this design was much like the new Downtown Redmond park project. He asked if there were some design cues that would help link the two parks somehow.
- The applicant agreed that would be a good idea.

Ms. Birney:

- Asked if the slope could handle some sort of water feature, perhaps along the bike path, to blend along with the environment.
- The applicant said that has been considered, but the likelihood of a water feature is slim due to maintenance issues that arise with such features. Storm water could be involved in a water feature, perhaps. The hope is to do something interesting with the park terracing, but a water feature is unlikely.

Mr. Knopf:

- Asked if there would be retail units on the site that would somehow use the park area as café seating, for example. The applicant said the retail would be on 152<sup>nd</sup>, which is a whole block from the park. The applicant said the hotel design could potentially spill into the park, however.
- The applicant said the office buildings could have an active space between them, but those buildings will not have retail units within them.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Asked if the park would be more of an amenity for the office buildings or the residential units. He said the flattest, most usable part of the park is furthest away and uphill from the residential users, and very close to the office buildings.
- The applicant said the park is for everybody, and is the centerpiece for the project. The applicant noted that the park has to be part of the draw to make the entire project work. However, the spine road on the site, as well as other factors, has dictated where the buildings will be.
- Mr. Waggoner said he would encourage a study of other options to see how the applicant could make the park that is equally accessible to all the surrounding buildings.

Mr. Krueger:

- Said that some cafes or espresso shops in the office buildings would spill out into the south-facing terrace outside the offices, which would be a nice space.
- Mr. Krueger said the idea of an amphitheater on this site would be intriguing.

Mr. Lee:

- Echoed Mr. Krueger's thought that a natural amphitheater could be created in the park.

Mr. Cherkis:

- Said people with pets would want to use this park, and asked if there would be a separate area for animals in the park. This would go back to the lighting issue, as well.
- Mr. Kinzer agreed that this is a 24/7, 365-day a year park with the residential units, especially with pet owners.
- Members of the Parks & Trails Commission asked how the applicant would navigate mobility challenges for people with disabilities.
- The applicant said dealing with disabilities was a huge challenge. Ramps are possible in some areas, but not in many others. The applicant is still working through those issues.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked if a walkway could be constructed from the upper portion of the park down around the ridge, gradually dropping down and avoiding the stairs. The applicant said that would be considered.
- Parks & Trails Commission members asked if there were any concerns about the north quadrant of the site. This area is all office space and would potentially become a ghost town at the close of business hours.
- The applicant said this project could be much like the Harbor Steps site in Seattle. That site is well lit and safe, and in the same way, the stairs on this project in Redmond could be lit 24/7.

- Commission members said retail and living space border the stairs of Harbor Steps, but in the Redmond plan, there would not be as much vibrancy.
- Mr. Lisk asked if any members of the public wanted to offer comments.

Tom Hinman, an Overlake resident and former Redmond Planning Commission member, addressed the Board and Commission. He said that Redmond residents have been through this type of process before about a major city park. He noted that the DRB is looking at some other projects on this site, including the Avalon Bay buildings on 152<sup>nd</sup> and Building 3 on the northeast corner. Mr. Hinman said he has questions about what the City's vision is for urban parks and how much is hardscape and how much is softscape. He asked about a lack of green at the entryways of Building 1 and Building 3. The original master plan had more green at the terminus of the hill climb pathway. He wanted to make sure there was a green corridor and buffer along 156<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Hinman said this project was early in the design phase, but he wanted to continue to emphasize softscapes on the site.

With regard to public access and parking, Mr. Hinman pointed out that Capstone said that none of the parking on the site will be accessible to the public. He said some solutions besides on-street parking should be considered in the planning process. Relative to pedestrians, Mr. Hinman said getting across the spine road on the site could be very interesting. Looking at 156<sup>th</sup>, Mr. Hinman asked for a more substantial setback off the sidewalk. With regard to the park design, Mr. Hinman said there was an opportunity to preserve the past character of the site. He was excited about the forest grove and tree box elements of the plan. He suggested transplanting smaller conifers on the site. As a member of Sustainable Redmond, Mr. Hinman has consulted with an arborist about Overlake Park. Semi-native cedars might be more tolerant and provide a conifer sense to the park.

Mr. Hinman said park programs should benefit residents and community members. He said each facility on this site should complement the whole neighborhood. He asked staff to define the level of service for this project. The park plan specifies park sizes and functions relative to surrounding neighborhood populations. He asked what that meant for the Overlake park project with regard to expected services. Mr. Hinman asked if any past park plans regarding Overlake would be used in the current process. He asked how day to day scheduling, park maintenance, and special events would be managed. He wanted to make sure community access would have priority over private events. Mr. Hinman said there would be opportunities for public art on the site, but he did not support the art timber concept on the site. Such a concept could be a painful reminder of what was once on the site.

Mary Wirta, a resident of the Idylwood neighborhood, next spoke to the Board and Commission. She said the west and southwest portions of the park had such a steep slope, those areas did not appear usable or accessible. By her reckoning, half of the park did not seem usable. She said the inclines on the walkway next to the road would not be easy to manage for the elderly or for people with disabilities. She said some access to 156<sup>th</sup> bus lines should be provided from the park, as well.

The applicant said access would be taken very seriously. The hope is to achieve as much comfortable access as possible. The applicant said that really complicated runs of switchbacks can go beyond accessible as well. So, the applicant is looking at different options for mobility. Regarding the bus stops on 156<sup>th</sup>, the sidewalks do lead there. The grades on the sidewalks vary quite a bit, from level to very steep conditions. There is not much that can be done about the grades on the street, but the public comments will be taken into consideration as a solution is worked out.

Josh Benaloh, who lives in the Overlake area and who has served on several Redmond transportation and neighborhood committees, next spoke to the Board and Commission. He liked the idea of having a water feature in this park, much like the one in downtown Bellevue. He recognized that maintenance could be an issue, but he would encourage that idea to remain under consideration. There were no other comments from the public. One Parks & Trails Commission member discussed the concept of a hilly park, and said those were just as fun for people as flatter areas.

The meeting concluded at 7:30 p.m.

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
MEETING  
November 7, 2013**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by DRB Acting Chair Scott Waggoner at 7:37 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.

**MEETING MINUTES**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 19, 2013 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (4-0) WITH ONE ABSTENTION.**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SUTTON AND SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 3, 2013 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).**

**SIGN PROGRAM**

**LAND-2013-01838, Allez Apartments**

**Description:** Sign Program for mixed-use building with 147 residential apartments and two first level retail spaces

**Location:** 8397 158<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast

**Applicant:** Steve Hintzke *with* Island Dog Signs LLC

**Staff Contact:** Carl McArthy, (425) 556-2412 or [cmcarthy@redmond.gov](mailto:cmcarthy@redmond.gov)

Mr. McArthy said staff is recommending approval on this project, which is across the street from Redmond City Hall. The staff report says that for multiple tenant buildings like this one, an applicant must come before the DRB for approval, as stated in the Redmond Zoning Code, RZC 21.44.010G11. There is a main sign, projecting ID signs, blade signs, retail signs, and a retail canopy sign. Staff says the Sign Program looks good, and feels the signs are very understated for the building. The City has worked with the applicant, and based on RZC 21.44.010G11, staff is recommending that the DRB approve the Allez Sign Program as presented. Steve Hintzke from Island Dog Signs said he did not have a presentation, but was available for questions.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

**Mr. Waggoner:**

- Said that all the signs presented appear to be of the maximum signage area. Mr. Waggoner asked if all the signs conformed with City requirements, as such. Mr. McArthy said the signs were well within the City parameters.
- Mr. Hintzke pointed out a table in that showed what was allowable per code versus what the project is proposing.

**Mr. Krueger:**

- Asked about two larger rectangular signs on the project that would be about two and a half feet tall. The applicant said the Sign Program is written with a little bit of flexibility on what those signs would be because tenants have not been signed yet for those retail spaces. Thus, it is unclear what sort of tenant logos and content would be involved in those signs.
- The applicant said the signs in question would be at the end of the canopy with standalone letters that would be either subtly lit from the front or, preferably, a halo-lit sign that would glow from the sides and would not give off a lot of light.
- Mr. Krueger said the program looked very attractive.

- Mr. Waggoner asked about some of the other signs that appeared to have acrylic letters with an internal light source. The applicant said there would be LED lights in the sign cabinets with these signs involving push-through letters. The letters would be visible with a minimum amount of light.
- Mr. Waggoner asked if these signs would be lit 24/7. The applicant said the color of the sign would be visible in the day and night.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the numbers and letters and different fonts available. The applicant said the idea was to have the signs between the two tenants share some similarities. The font would not necessarily be the same, but the overall size of the letters would be.

Mr. Nichols:

- Said his only concern was the potentially large canopy signs. He asked if the City would have a chance to weigh in on these signs when the permits for this project go through.
- Mr. McArthy said the general sign area meets the Sign Code. The sign facing City Hall could be illuminated in the evening, but the sign that is kitty-corner from a residential project either needs to be turned off at night or illuminated with a halo-lit system.
- At that point, said Mr. McArthy, each tenant would have to come in with a sign permit. Mr. Nichols said that answered his concerns. Mr. McArthy said this Sign Program simply sets the guidelines that all future tenants must meet.

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS TO APPROVE SIGN PROGRAM LAND-2013-01838, ALLEZ APARTMENTS, AS PRESENTED AND AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).**

**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

**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 located at the NE corner of the Capstone redevelopment site in Overlake Village just off 156<sup>th</sup> and the intersection with the new spine road proposed for this project. The applicant is proposing a 225,000 square foot building with underground parking. Primary access would come off the spine road via an auto court that would go towards the back corner of the building. A public plaza area is proposed along the south side of the building, which would be a continuation of the park and urban hill climb pathway. The applicant has done a good amount of work in refining the design concept for this building, but it is still early in the overall progress of this project. One consideration is the building's relationship to 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and specifically, the Code standard which requires a 10-foot built-to line up to that street front. There is a PSE easement present in that area right now, however. Part of the application hinges on how or if that built-to line can be complied with, with the easement in that location. The DRB, at the last meeting on this project, gave some direction to the applicant in terms of bumping out the building and other options. Mr. Lisk said the applicant has taken some of that direction.

The pedestrian plaza between this building and the building further west is an area that Mr. Lisk hoped to see more definition on from applicant in his presentation. Staff would like to see more building variety. Two more office buildings would be lined up down the hill west of this building, and staff would like to avoid an office campus look on the site. Staff would like to see how building modulation will work within the Code of the Overlake Village Design Standards as well as building materials. The Design Standards have some fairly stringent restrictions on some particular building materials. In dealing with some of these matters, the project may be getting into some administrative design flexibility if the applicant is proposing a departure from the Code standards. With that, the basic idea would be to offer a superior design. There is some amount of latitude for staff and the DRB to determine what is superior in that regard.

Architect Patrick Gordon from Zimmer Gunsul Frasca presented to the DRB on behalf of the applicant with Allyn Stellmacher, Randal Bennett, and landscape architect Kristen Lundquist of Brumbaugh and

Associates. The applicant said this project was before the DRB about six weeks ago, and spoke about how this building, Building 3, would be the first building on this site at 156<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. He said buildings 2A and 2B would be the next buildings on the site, and he would not talk about those designs, but the design of Building 3 would set up the conversation for those future buildings. The applicant wanted to discuss the pedestrian experience along 28<sup>th</sup> NE, which was a concern for the DRB at the last meeting. The applicant said this pedestrian experience would be a continuation of the hill climb. Coming west to east, this would be the termination of the hill climb that begins on 152<sup>nd</sup>. On 156<sup>th</sup>, there would be a gateway of sorts to the hill climb. The applicant wanted to discuss the character of this space, including softscape, hardscape, and overall character. This is a public and private space and would be a main entry to the village and park area.

The DRB had a concern about pedestrian safety at the last meeting. There is a major access to a parking garage for Building 3 that crosses this project. The applicant spoke about the build-to line on 156<sup>th</sup>, and said that the setback north of this project on 156<sup>th</sup> would serve as a bit of a transition to the build-to line. The applicant said the architectural concept for Building 3 answers some of the concerns of the DRB from the last meeting, which included how the building announces itself and how the southeast and southwest corners announce the overall development as well. The applicant has some ideas about the materials for the project and would encourage DRB feedback on them.

Mr. Stellmacher continued the presentation and said the transition on 156<sup>th</sup> between the softer, traditional buildings and the new buildings was very important. The PSE easement is in this right of way, and the applicant is proposing having some of the building come out and meet the face of the urban code requirement. The building would have a setback at the lower plane level that would create the transition to the urban development of Overlake Village. The two-story setback would be carried down the hill climb on the face of the buildings and would be connected to an overall pedestrian landscape experience. There is a ten-foot setback from the sidewalk to the face of the building and then an additional setback at the pedestrian level to move the building away and allow for landscaping and additional pedestrian safety. The applicant said there were a number of buildings in the overall project that would help, in the future, create the entire gateway experience. Building 3 would be the first building on the site and thus would help set up that experience. The applicant showed the DRB this transition from many angles. The applicant said the overall concept was to create a powerful design that is mapped around the hill climb experience and that is linked to the light rail station and the major arterials around the site.

Ms. Lundquist continued the presentation, and said there is a greenbelt established along 156<sup>th</sup>, and noted that there is a desire to maintain some of that character. There is a lot of buffer along the north side that would be maintained. There is an urban tapestry of landscape that moves down along the hill climb to help transition the project into its overall urban character. The entry to the building and plaza element will help bolster that transition.

The applicant said the automobile access presented on the site will accommodate fire trucks and also allow the movement of service vehicles across the hill climb area. The applicant is focused on creating small plazas around the entry to the site to create some variety. The pedestrian pathway will have some benches and areas to stop and gather to create some modulation and link the pedestrian experience of the daytime and nighttime. The setback of the building would create a pedestrian scale and a sense of connection between the landscape and the building. The understory of the building soffits may have some lighting to enhance the nighttime experience.

Relative to the development of the skin of the building, the applicant said a few simple materials would be used. The focus of this project is on the landscape and the hill climb, and the applicant wants the design to plug into those elements. Thus, the building will have a high-quality façade that faces the park. There is a lot of glass for transparency, connectivity, and a feeling of safety. The building transitions to simpler, quieter materials such as a natural metal. There is a lot of massing variation to deal with the size of the building. The applicant wants to make an exceptional experience with simple curtain walls on the front of the building, along with the setback and the landscape integration. The façade has a small break in it that allows the design to capture and reflect light in different ways to create a sense of play linked to the park element. The façade modulation for Buildings 2A and 2B are uncertain right now, but the applicant said



the idea was to create a family of buildings that would have some variety as well as continuity between them.

The applicant said the lighting will help activate the space in the evening, which was a concern of the DRB at the last meeting. The applicant wants to create a place that is safe for pedestrians in the day and night. He showed the DRB the overhang on 156<sup>th</sup> that would create interest from the west and east. The material used on this overhang would be glass with simple aluminum elements to create some texture and break up the massing. The north, east, and west facades are very straightforward. Either metal or slate material would be used. A black slate tile system could be used on the building to highlight the park setting, or perhaps a metal zinc panel to provide color and texture. Spandrel or ceramic elements could be involved as well. The south facing frontage could be a spectacular frame for the park and would provide some character as well. The applicant would like to use natural materials to anchor well with the park, such as slate or zinc. The big goal is to provide some texture, pattern, and variety.

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

##### Mr. Sutton:

- Seeing as there were no public comments from the audience, Mr. Sutton said he liked the material palette of the slate. He liked the wood on the underside of the soffit. He said was disappointed with the façade facing the park, which feels too simple to him.
- Mr. Sutton said this façade could be repeated on all three office buildings, and he would appreciate more breaks in the design. The façade looks perfectly vertical to him and he suggested that the design should lean out. He said the fins on the building could help somewhat, but he said the project felt a little too simple.
- He said the emphasis of the building has gone toward the park, which is critical, but he felt like the eastern side of the design was left out a little bit. He wanted to see another design gesture on that side. The applicant said Mr. Sutton's comments were in line with the overall concerns about how far to push the design.
- The applicant said, because this building is the first one to go in, he is still trying to sort out how much emphasis to put into it and how much emphasis would be carried by Buildings 6A and 6B, which would have an even larger presence on 156<sup>th</sup>.
- The applicant said, with regard to breaking up the façade, he was dealing with how to texture the façade to create a design with good variety. He hoped the building would be a backdrop for the park.
- Mr. Sutton said he liked the idea of the overhang and the setback, and said this was a good solution. The applicant said the simplicity of the design gives it some strength. He was hoping to create a strong wall that would be responsive to the changing light conditions rather than adding too much detail.
- Mr. Sutton said if that concept was extended down to the future buildings, and if the DRB could see the initial designs of those other buildings, the idea of simplicity might be read differently.

##### Mr. Krueger:

- Had no problem with what the applicant was proposing on 156<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Krueger said the design of this frontage was ingenious. However, the building itself looked very simple and corporate. Mr. Krueger was hoping for some sort of punch out or other modulation to help the building stand out.
- Mr. Krueger said he would like to see something stand out on this building that would be visible from the street and make it distinctive.
- He asked about the materials proposed, and wanted to see some sort of change of materials to add something more dramatic for the park-facing façade as well as the frontage along 156<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Krueger said he understood the idea of not overshadowing the park or the hill climb, but he was hoping for more variety on the facades.

##### Ms. Crowder:

- Liked the simplicity of the façade facing the park and did not mind the verticality. Ms. Crowder thought the building could be a simple, dynamic element that could reflect changing weather conditions.
- She said the other building facades left something to be desired, but she did like the depth of color on both materials. She loved the zinc and slate materials, in particular. She said the bump out on the park-facing façade looks very elegant, but said some parts of the project look corporate.

- The applicant clarified that Ms. Crowder was talking about the north, east, and west. She said that was indeed the case, and she wanted to reflect Mr. Krueger's and Mr. Sutton's comments about the concern over a look that would be too corporate.

Mr. Nichols:

- Liked the simple, elegant look of the building, which contrasts the nearby Microsoft buildings. Mr. Nichols liked the materials and the durable stone material presented. He asked about the wood soffit material, which the applicant said would be a natural product.
- Mr. Nichols liked the landscaping and the way it was so inviting to pedestrians. He asked about the south-facing façade and if there were any concerns about glare coming off of this building. The applicant said glare was an issue that was under consideration.
- Mr. Nichols asked about the parapet on the site. The applicant said the design would be a simple, elegant, metal design that would match the color of the stone surrounding it. A crisp metal element in this part of the design could capture the detail of the windows as well.
- Mr. Nichols asked about the surrounding material that would be used on the mechanical penthouse. The applicant said this would be a simple material, either zinc or a painted texture. The applicant said the penthouse would not be too visible, but would be surrounded with a simple metal material.
- Mr. Nichols confirmed that all the mechanical elements would be behind those penthouse walls. The applicant said in back of the building, there would be pads for emergency generators.
- Mr. Nichols asked if there was any intent for LEED certification. The applicant said a Silver or Gold LEED status would likely be the case.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Asked about the staff comments regarding the plaza and pedestrian zones around the east and south sides of the building. Mr. Waggoner said those zones looked great to him, and said the landscaping extending under the overhang was a great idea.
- Mr. Waggoner liked how the building entrance for pedestrians was pushed down the plaza from the main vehicle intersection.
- He asked about an area on the left end of the plan which had a drop-off zone and entry drive that looked like it went into a parking area. He said between-building vehicle access can almost be invisible in some business parks. He asked the applicant to find a way to signal to people that cars would be in this area.
- Mr. Waggoner liked the variety of the exterior enclosure and the quality of the material used. He said, over the course of the three proposed buildings, there might be an opportunity for more breaks in the façade design.
- He asked about the mechanical penthouse, and said because of the grade change on the site, some floors would be able to see the roofs of other buildings. He suggested that the applicant include the massing of those enclosures into the articulation of the buildings to make them look like a piece of the composition, especially on the lower buildings.
- Mr. Krueger asked the applicant to respond to the potential conflict between pedestrians and cars on the site. The applicant said a lot of thought has gone into this issue.
- The applicant said cars would cross into two buildings of the site. The paving defaults to the pedestrian zone, which does not have curbs. Traffic engineers have recommended a four-way stop at the pedestrian intersection to slow drivers down. The hope is not to introduce bollards.
- The application said the design would reflect that the vehicle access area is a continuation of the hill climb with a superimposed notion that cars would be coming through this area. The aspiration is to make this a pedestrian zone.
- Mr. Waggoner said the idea of defaulting to the pedestrian vernacular was a good idea. The applicant said some textural patterns in the concrete could help with the safety of this area.
- Mr. Waggoner said that some lighting should be provided in some of the landscaped areas near the building, especially in the winter months.
- Mr. Krueger confirmed with the applicant that the intersection with pedestrians would have a four-way stop. The applicant said that element was added after the last DRB meeting. Traffic engineers have suggested this intersection should line up with other two-lane roads on the site. The intersection would have a four-way stop with two lanes going in all directions.
- The applicant said the four-way stop concept has not been fully vetted, but it has been recommended by traffic engineers. Mr. Lisk said this would get a fair amount of discussion among city staff.

## **PRE-APPLICATION**

### **Sound Transit East Link**

**Description:** Planned extension of light rail transit service to Redmond

**Location:** Several locations in Overlake Neighborhood

**Applicant:** Sound Transit

**Prior Review Date:** 12/6/12

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

Mr. Lisk said this was a check-in point for Sound Transit, the applicant on this project, with regard to station design. The applicant is proposing a design build for this station, and will be putting out an RFP in the next year to reach out for design builders. To do that, Sound Transit would like to put together a package of design requirements. For the stations, that would mean getting to a 30% level of design. Staff has been working with the applicant on this for the past several months. Staff says the pedestrian and bicycle bridge extending across Highway 520 will be a major design element. It will have a lot of concrete as a base material. How that relates to the street should be a focus for the DRB. At the station platform, there is a ticket vending area. In Overlake Village, there is not a lot of context to indicate what that vending area should be. The Overlake Transit Center station is a much busier place with a bigger scale. A parking garage and bus operations, along with Microsoft Connector buses, will use this site. The light rail platform area design includes a full-length canopy, which is unusual and unique for Sound Transit.

Chad Zettle with Sound Transit Architecture and Debora Ashland, Director of Art and Architecture for Sound Transit, presented to the DRB on behalf of the applicant. The applicant spoke to the DRB in December of 2012 about this project. The applicant showed how light rail would travel from Seattle to Redmond. The applicant is currently in conceptual design and is using a design build delivery system. That process is a little different, but it does require DRB input for site plan entitlement and help guide the work going forward. The design builder will be back in front of the DRB for the ultimate site plan entitlement.

The applicant said Sound Transit has developed a philosophy of prescribing a design that requires the proposers to utilize the design unless an alternate technical concept is presented. Sound Transit would have to approve that alternate design. The applicant used the Angle Lake station design as an example of the design build process. Sound Transit wanted to provide some guidance for the design builders on this project so it would not be a blank slate. The applicant said the Angle Lake project brought in some alternative concepts which could be instructive to the Redmond process. Of the four proposers on the Angle Lake project, three of them submitted alternative technical concepts that were accepted by Sound Transit. The proposer that was selected had a similar design to the canopy element as laid out in the RFP, but had some different details. Sound Transit would like the DRB's input to make sure that the important needs for the Redmond project are relayed to the design builders.

The applicant said those needs could include what the DRB would like and what the DRB would not like. Sound Transit would include city staff in that decision making process as well. Looking at the Overlake Village Station, the applicant showed the alignment for the rail track, which would be parallel to Highway 520. The pedestrian and bicycle bridge, going over 520, will connect the neighborhood with the rail station. The City has provided some design funding for this bridge and is in the process of gathering construction funding for that bridge. The bridge would have a monumental stair coming off of the top of the ramp system down to the plaza level. The ramp itself would wind around to the plaza level. Canopies cover the eastbound and westbound platform. The entire platform measures around 380 feet. The canopies are about 30% of that length on each side. There are two entries to the platform at both ends of the station.

People will get to the station in many different ways, including 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE. This will be the main retail street for the neighborhood, and is also served by a bus line. These people will access the plaza on the north end of the station. The City and the applicant see this as the main public entrance to the station. The passenger drop off would happen on the newly-created plaza street. The ramp itself will bring pedestrians and cyclists from the other side of the highway to the north plaza area. The space under the ramps will have bike storage and bike racks. There is also room for utility equipment. The plaza will have seat walls and will connect to the main entry plaza.

The ticketing entries are an area that the neighborhood can use to define its individuality. The City wants a modern look for these entries, so the applicant has looked at some different column designs to reflect that desire. One design would involve a pre-cast concrete column supporting steel framework and translucent glass panels. Another would be a steel column system in a V-shape that picks up some of the V's in the pedestrian and bicycle bridge design. Both of these concepts would make a relationship between the bridge and the station in general. The design team ended up pursuing the steel column option. Entering the station, turnstiles would be used to gather tickets. The south entrance to the station would not connect to a plaza, but rather connects to the sidewalk and to the passenger drop-off area. There is a screen wall that separates the station from Highway 520.

The center of the station platforms will have a covered canopy with windscreens behind it. On the top portion, there is a radial fan shape for the screen wall, which has varying heights and some translucent glass infill. The platforms have a windscreen as well as benches and trip planning information. There is an inter-track fence that runs the length of the station that would prevent people from running across between the two platforms. The stations have a ballast track system. The trains are electric, and an overhead catenary system would be used to deliver the power. The applicant wants to create some separation from the highway for light rail patrons, but there is also a desire for the station to be perceived from the highway. The applicant is talking with the Washington Department of Transportation to determine the landscaping and walls between the station and Highway 520.

The applicant moved to the Overlake Transit Center station and the bridge connected to it. This station will be the terminus for East Link light rail. The highway, again, is a large divide at this site, so the pedestrian and bicycle bridge links the station to the community and the Microsoft campus. This bridge crosses Highway 520, the station site, and 156<sup>th</sup>. There are ramp systems connecting down on both sides. Microsoft is working with the applicant to provide additional funding for more canopies on this site. The company wanted full platform coverage with the canopies. This site has a bus loop and shuttle canopies for the Microsoft Connector system. There is an existing transit center on this site right now, and the new project would be phased in to allow for continuing operation of the transit center during construction.

The parking garage on this site has an office component that would be used by the Microsoft shuttle system. Sound Transit staff would also have a spot in this garage. The outer loop of the bus loop would be for the Microsoft Connector. The center would be for Metro Transit buses. The station platform sits between the tracks in this design. The first floor of the garage has a passenger drop off area. A pass-through goes out to the plaza level and there is room for an art piece as well. The platform entrance, where tickets would be purchased, has glazing on the east side and a metal panel system with some artwork or a different color. The center platform has windscreens spaced periodically with benches. The station itself sits in a retained cut because the light rail line will continue underneath 40<sup>th</sup> Street as it goes into Redmond. There are bus bays in the middle of the site.

Microsoft is working on some funding for the pedestrian and bicycle bridge and has some conceptual designs for the bridge. This is a large bridge structure that will connect Microsoft's east and west campuses. It will utilize vertical circulation at the parking garage to connect people down to the station. Ramps and stairs are on either end. The City and Microsoft both want to pick up on the vocabulary of the bridge trusses throughout the design of the station.

Sound Transit is working on the parking garage design through the design build process. The garage will meet City requirements. Imagery will be provided to design builders to give them an idea of the requirements that the City needs to meet, including modulating planes and articulation. That imagery can also display what the City and applicant do not want. The garages will always have elements of vertical circulation, which can be accentuated at the Overlake Transit Center. The applicant is looking for feedback on the garage project, including its lighting, from the DRB.

Mr. Waggoner asked if anyone in the audience had a comment to make. Tom Hinman spoke to the Board again and asked about the division of effort on the design and construction of the plaza in Overlake Village and how that would proceed. The applicant said the design would be part of the design builder's

work and would include the cul-de-sac plaza street and the plaza area with the pedestrian and bicycle bridge.

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

##### Ms. Crowder:

- Said that the parking garage is going in the right direction, and has a nice, modern look.
- Ms. Crowder said she liked the emphasis on pedestrian circulation. She said the design build process was an interesting one and the DRB would have to see how it develops in the future.

##### Mr. Nichols:

- Also liked the direction of the project and the design thought that has gone into the pedestrian crossings of Highway 520. Mr. Nichols said the design build process was the right way to go to give the applicant the best bang for the buck.
- He was excited about seeing this project evolve.

##### Mr. Krueger:

- Was happy to see this project coming forward, as he is an avid user of light rail. Mr. Krueger asked how wide the pedestrian and bicycle bridges would be. The applicant said that width would be 14 feet. Coming off the bridge to the ramp, the width would reduce to 10 feet. The stairs come in at that ramp area as well.
- Mr. Krueger said the bridge element looked very cool and would be very busy. He asked about how pedestrians would get off in the island area of the interior bus loop and how they would get to the outside. The applicant is considering railings to discourage people from crossing at areas where they should not be crossing.
- Mr. Krueger said the project looks great. As far as the parking garage, he said the applicant gave the DRB many options to look at, and he looked forward to when one design would be settled on.

##### Mr. Sutton:

- Asked about the pedestrian and bicycle bridge and how it would be funded. The applicant said the bridge would be funded by entities other than Sound Transit, but Sound Transit would be managing the design and construction of those bridges. The City of Redmond would maintain both bridges.
- Mr. Sutton asked how the extent of the bridge was defined, based on the funding. He noted that in the Overlake Transit Center, the bridge extends far beyond the street rather than utilizing the garage for its vertical circulation.
- The applicant responded that the garage actually did provide vertical circulation for the Microsoft bridge project. That circulation would be shared. Microsoft felt strongly about wanting the bridge to connect across 156<sup>th</sup> to drop right into the campus, and they would be paying for this project.
- Mr. Sutton liked the direction of the pay stations and the entries suggested by the applicant, as well as the ramp design.

##### Mr. Waggoner:

- Confirmed with the applicant that the bridges would be part of the RFP, but that the funding mechanism would be different. Mr. Waggoner also confirmed that the final design and construction would go through Sound Transit and its design build teams.
- The applicant said the Overlake Transit Center is contingent on the three-party agreement approval. However, it is on track and slated for Sound Transit Board approval in December, 2013.
- Mr. Waggoner asked if each station would go up for a separate RFP. The applicant said the stations would go up together, so one team would do both station projects. Mr. Waggoner said that would be a good way to tie the design of the stations together.
- The applicant said the design build contract will include the stations, bridges, and track line leading into Bellevue.
- Mr. Waggoner liked the screen walls that would give highway drivers a view of the station as they were stopped in traffic. He asked if there was an art requirement for the design build contract.
- The applicant said there would be a 1% for art requirement, minus tunneling. Barbara Luecke, Sound Transit's Art Program manager, has been meeting with the City about this. Artists will work with the design builder to include art throughout the station sites.

- Mr. Waggoner asked about the color and material palette at the stations, and if there was a branded Sound Transit set of colors and materials that would have to be used. The applicant said that Sound Transit does not have a branding color scheme, but it does have a palette of colors that need to be used. That has to do with keeping upkeep simple, such as painting over graffiti.
- Mr. Waggoner said that sounded like a good idea. The applicant said the main idea is that any items painted in the field would have to stick to the Sound Transit colors. Mr. Waggoner hoped that the colors would stay on the lighter side.
- Mr. Waggoner confirmed that just the Overlake Transit Center would have parking and that the other station would not. The applicant said both stations would have a passenger drop off.
- Mr. Lisk asked the DRB about the ticket vending platform proposed for Overlake Village, one of which had heavy concrete pillars, the other of which was made of metal. Staff would prefer the concrete option, as it stood up better to the massive nature of the bridge. The applicant had said metal would be the preferred option.
- Mr. Sutton said he could go either way on the design. Mr. Krueger said he preferred the metal option, as did Mr. Nichols. Mr. Nichols said the metal tied in with the rest of project. Ms. Crowder liked the shape of the concrete, but liked the lighter look of the steel.
- Mr. Waggoner liked both ideas, and wondered if a mixed concrete and steel scheme could be used. He did not want to restrict the bidders from going either direction at this point. Both designs have transparent canopies, such that the upper part of the station would still relate well to the pedestrian and bicycle bridges.
- The applicant and the DRB members thanked each other for their time and comments.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:48 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).**

**January 16, 2014**  
**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**RECORDING SECRETARY**