

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
April 21<sup>st</sup>, 2011**

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, Joe Palmquist, Lara Sirois, Scott Waggoner, Craig Krueger, Jannine McDonald, Mike Nichols

**EXCUSED ABSENCE:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Dennis Lisk, Associate Planner

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Susan Trapp, 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 7:00 p.m.

**PROJECT REVIEW**

**L110133, Benjamin Rush Elementary School**

**Description:** Replacement of existing elementary school with new school buildings

**Location:** 6101 - 152<sup>nd</sup> Ave NE

**Applicant:** Sean Ryan *with* Lake Washington School District

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

Mr. Lisk noted that this project has been before the DRB three times since last fall. At the last meeting, the Board gave a "thumbs up" to the proposed new school. This is a complete replacement of the existing school building, which has been in existence for forty years. The new project would be a two-story, consolidated campus building that is about 65,000 square feet. The site circulation would separate bus and parent drop-off. New landscaping will be added, including a restoration of a wetland area on the southern part of the site. New outdoor play areas will be installed. The gymnasium will be incorporated as part of the main building. Staff is happy with how the project has developed, and is recommending approval with the typical conditions attached.

Architect David Van Galen presented on behalf of the applicant. The phasing process has been narrowed down, as well as the construction process. The key, as mentioned before, is that students will be staying on site during construction. Some playground equipment will be moved. The upper sand field will remain without any improvements. Four classrooms and the existing covered play structure will be demolished. The school building will be built in phases, with the gym and the main school building built first. The side wing of the school would be built during a year and a half period after that. Students and staff will move in different parts of the building during construction. Building would start this fall, according to Sean Ryan from the school district. Some demolition would happen this summer. Some movement of students would happen during December of 2012 as new buildings are built. The entire project should be done by the fall of 2013.

There have not been many changes to the design since the DRB last saw this project; the applicant says the arrangement of the classroom clusters has changed slightly to increase daylight exposure. There are some structural complications with the roof in the area above the library, which may involve installing a dormer. The covered play area has some tables and some picnic areas. There is a paved area for play on the upper part of the site, which may be a spot for portable classrooms in the future. On the covered play

area, there is a low fence to keep small kids away from the bus and car drop-off areas. Those areas have been separated, with a fire lane on the back of the building.

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

##### Mr. Waggoner:

- Likes what he heard about the covered play area, which creates a better flow between the areas on that part of the site.
- Mr. Waggoner says in general, this project has made a solid progression, from its massing to its circulation. He is happy with the project overall.

##### Mr. Nichols:

- Noted that the DRB looked at the covered outdoor play area at the last meeting, and asked the applicant about its height. The applicant confirmed that the height was from 21 to 25 feet. There is a covered area for play and queuing before and after school, as well.
- Mr. Nichols says the project is on track.

##### Mr. Palmquist:

- Says he is ready to approve this project. Ms. McDonald agrees.

##### Mr. Krueger:

- Agreed with Mr. Waggoner that this project has had a solid progression the whole way through in terms of colors, materials, and design.

##### Ms. Sirois:

- Says it has been fun to watch the project take shape. Asked the applicant if the students would be able to tour the construction site.
- The applicant noted that students would be able to watch the construction. Mr. Ryan noted that site tours would be a big liability issue, and would not happen.

##### Mr. Meade:

- Asked about portables and when the DRB might be able to see them. He wanted to make sure the portables fit into the site as well as possible. He said that the portables should have as much glazing as possible to increase the portables' overall connection with the school.
- Mr. Meade added that bringing portables to grade can be a challenge, as well. It appears there are two portables planned for now. He asked that the ramps used for the portables be planned out to avoid complication.
- Mr. Meade suggested a different orientation for the portables, if possible. He noted that modifying those buildings is not too difficult to make them more desirable.
- Beyond that, Mr. Meade noted that he was ready to approve this project.

#### **MOTION BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO RECOMMEND L110133, BENJAMIN RUSH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TO THE HEARING EXAMINER, WITH THE STANDARD PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES CONDITION. MOTION APPROVED (7-0).**

Mr. Meade thanked the applicant for the excellent work done on this project and how the Board's comments, as well as the community's, have been integrated into the process. The applicant thanked the Board as well for helping improve the project with its comments.

#### **PRE-APPLICATION**

##### **PRE110004, Discount Tire Center/Veterinary Clinic**

**Description:** Construction of a new 7,000 square foot tire center and 5,000 square foot veterinary clinic

**Location:** 17777 NE 76<sup>th</sup> Street

**Applicant:** Madison Development

**Architects:** Discount Tires: William Amor *with* Bergman Architecture

Veterinary Clinic: Kirk Callison *with* Twist Architecture

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

Mr. Lisk noted that this was a Discount Tire Center and Veterinary Clinic that would be located at the Home Depot and Fred Meyer shopping center, in the northeast corner. There is a huge surplus of parking on this site, and these buildings would simply take up some of the lot that is not used. The proposal before the Board this evening is to modify the binding site plan to add the two new buildings. The tire center would be 7,000 square feet and be near 76<sup>th</sup> Street and 180<sup>th</sup>. The clinic, about 5,000 square feet, would be located a bit further to the west. Also, the parking lot would be re-stripped around these buildings and new landscaping would be added as needed. No impact on the trees along 180<sup>th</sup> has been proposed.

Mr. Lisk described this as a relatively pain-free placement of these buildings on this site surrounded by other commercial or industrial uses. An old cemetery is also nearby. These are single-story, fairly small buildings that do not look complicated. Staff generally is pleased with the veterinary office design, with one comment that the entry appears very big, given the type of use. Staff would like the DRB to consider that scaling issue, as well as any other design comments. Regarding the tire center, staff notes that this is an outlet of a national chain, and a prototypical building design has been used. The tire storage system has determined the form and shape of the building. The materials chosen are consistent with current design trends. Mr. Lisk says some of the materials may give the appearance of being too busy on some elevations. Staff says the gabled roof gesture on the north side of the building should be repeated on the north and south access of the building to make the roofline more visually interesting.

Consultant Joel Howitt presented on behalf of the applicant, as well as civil engineer Dave Segal and Tom Lee with Madison Development. Kirk Callison with Twist Architecture is responsible for the veterinary clinic. The Discount Tire architect is not at tonight's meeting. Mr. Howitt says the project is fairly straightforward, with very little impact on the site.

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

##### Mr. Meade:

- Noted that there were a few different site plans in the DRB's packet. The applicant noted that due to some electric utility issues, the vet center had to move from the east side to another part of the site.
- Mr. Meade asked the applicant to describe the wood siding on the vet center. The applicant noted that he was using lap siding and a stone base.
- The applicant agreed with the staff recommendation to reduce the scale of the entry. The veterinarian will do dental and basic surgery on the pets, on the back side of the building. There will be an exercise road for the pets on the east side of the building.
- Adding windows in the surgery center will not be an option, according to the veterinarian tenant. Therefore, more articulation has been added. Mr. Meade suggested adding a shed roof on the surgery center elevation facing the street, to allow it to bump out.
- Mr. Meade has no problem with the scale of the entry. The applicant says it would come down a little bit in pitch. It is slightly smaller than the images presented. Mr. Meade noted that it is important to stand out amid giant buildings like Home Depot and Fred Meyer. This building is 20 feet tall.
- The applicant appreciated the comment about the shed roof. Mr. Meade says the applicant should not worry too much about what is happening at grade, but should concentrate on the roof.

##### Mr. Krueger:

- Says the entry does appear very tall, and asked if the gutter on this section of roof could line up with the rest of the look.

##### Ms. Sirois:

- Agreed with Mr. Krueger, and said that this building is not competing with the retail shops on the site. She would like that entry element to be a little more intimate.
- However, Mr. Meade noted that pets would need some room to come into the building.

##### Mr. Nichols:

- Says he likes the scale, and notes that there is a great opportunity for lighting in that area underneath the roof in the entry area.

- Mr. Nichols noted that on the back side of the building, landscaping could take care of any concerns regarding screening. He likes the colors of the project.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Would like to see the entry drop a little bit, regarding the orientation of the project to the southwest. He noted that the project would get a lot of wind-blown rain, and bringing the gutters down to the same height would be smart.
- Mr. Palmquist says adding some weather protection, perhaps even shortening the length of the overhang, would be a good idea.
- Mr. Palmquist asked about boarding pets at this site. The applicant says the only boarding happening would occur during surgery.
- The applicant pointed out that there was a second entry into the site that would allow for surgery trainees to come in not through the main entry.

Ms. Sirois:

- Suggested pulling the shed dormer on the site across the design to cover that secondary entrance. She says a gable would be too much.
- The applicant says he has not had the time to review that idea.
- Mr. Meade asked about the dog run on the site; the applicant says he is considering that on a few parts of the site, possibly with some fencing. Mr. Meade says landscaping should reflect that, in that more than ground cover and bark chips should be used.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked about a ridge vent on the roof. A metal roof has been presented, but there is a chance shingles could be used with a ridge vent. Mr. Meade noted that if shingles were used, it would look very much like a house.
- Mr. Meade would prefer a metal roof to complete its commercial look. He would recommend taking all the stone off before changing the roof. The applicant is leaning toward the metal roofing.
- Ms. Sirois says hardy panel could be used to help save on wood siding costs, which the applicant took under advisement. The applicant says he does not want to take away the stone, if possible.
- Mr. Meade pointed out that he was trying to provide a hierarchy for the applicant, in terms of materials. A metal roof would be the first priority, with wood siding and stone as other options.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Likes the stone presented. As far as the entry, he is fine with what is presented. He asked about the signage. The applicant noted that the signage has been left off from this proposal.
- An existing monument sign is on the site that does not fit with the current proposal. The applicant would like to see some changes to that monument, possibly, or other changes.
- On the front of the building, the applicant says more signage with lighting might work.
- Mr. Meade suggested using stone and shed roofing on the monument sign to create an iconic look for the project.
- The applicant noted that the veterinarian is getting displaced by the City due to some road improvements. The sign on his current practice might be moved to this new site.
- Mr. Meade suggested designing the sign into the site so that it does not look like the sign has been simply tacked onto the project. The design may need to change to reflect that, slightly.
- Mr. Krueger likes the idea of using the monument sign rather than putting something directly on the building.
- The applicant says something with a symbol of the practice, like a letter "B," might be applied to the building. Mr. Meade says that sounds like a great idea, and wants the applicant to come back with more ideas about the vet center.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked the DRB to move onto the tire center. He said, regarding the gable Mr. Lisk mentioned, that it should be moved elsewhere, or that the other archway should be raised to make a design statement.
- Mr. Lisk noted that both of these buildings will be going in at the same time. While both buildings serve much different purposes, he is concerned that buildings so close to each other do not stick out in a design sense.

- There is nothing in the City Code to prevent different designs. He simply wants the project to be done well overall.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Noted that the gable shapes could be carried back such that they do not stick out so much.
- The applicant does not disagree with that idea. He noted that the Tire Center, in other locations, has been a good tenant.
- The applicant confirmed that the DRB is concerned about the gable peak, and that the project should break up the massing without looking like a Hollywood front.
- Mr. Waggoner says beyond that, the materials and colors look good.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Suggested the arches on the side could be moved to the front, and the gable could be eliminated. He recommended bringing the arches could be brought back about four or eight feet onto the roof, if possible.
- He questioned how much people would be able to see this design piece, up 26 feet high and very close to the road.

Mr. Meade:

- Recommended moving the gable element around to the west elevation, at the entry. He believes it is lost on the north end.
- The applicant noted that the north end was used for the gable to present a good face to the road.

Mr. McDonald:

- Noted that putting the gable on the north end adds to some confusion, from the parking lot, as to where the entry to the building would be.
- She recommended taking that element out altogether, and perhaps using color as a way to break up the massing.
- Mr. Meade asked if the arches on the east and the west could be lumped to flank the corner where the customers come in. He recommended capping that with a gable, or making it a parapet higher than anything else.

Mr. Meade:

- Said that the doors of the center would be open very often; that could change the look of the building. The applicant agreed those doors would stay open.
- Ms. Sirois says that concept would help get away from the busy-ness of the building design.
- Mr. Palmquist asked if an arch should stay on the east elevation, which is visible from the road. Mr. Meade says he would like to concentrate the arches at the entry.
- The applicant says perhaps the money used for brick, to break up the massing, should be used at the entry area. There may be another color of block that goes around the building, and grounds it. But the brick would go at the front door and the rest of the building would be left alone.
- Mr. Meade says that is exactly what he is saying, and the applicant said he could get the tenant to agree to that idea.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the pointed peak, which the applicant says could be removed. Mr. Krueger says the north elevation should be shifted to the right, to bring it to the corner. He says the brick on the west side could help create a parapet, possibly.
- Mr. Meade says raised parapets would not be needed, necessarily. He says the basic idea is to break of the façade.

Ms. Sirois:

- Says the idea Mr. Meade is proposing helps establish a front and back of the building, with richer materials put at the entrance.
- Ms. Sirois says if the parapet is not just lifted in the north elevation, but wrapped all around, it could provide a good design.

- Mr. Meade says he likes bricks, but those are not completely necessary here. Colored block could be used, possibly.
- The applicant noted that the red band around the building is the one critical element of branding for Discount Tire, and needs to be in place.
- Mr. Meade says getting rid of all the stucco around the building, and trading brick for block could be a good option. That would create a more durable building in the future.
- Mr. Meade says the applicant can come back for approval in the future, and that the project looks very close to that. Mr. Krueger noted the DRB needs a material board and colors. A red storefront material would be used. Mr. Palmquist suggested red bay doors could be used, too.
- Ms. Sirois says moving the brick to the north corner of the building allows the applicant a chance to run the red band uninterrupted around the project, which would look stronger in terms of branding.
- The DRB discussed the green color on the project, and the color of the roof. Mr. Meade suggested a darker color, like black, brown, or bronze would provide a solid, timeless look.
- The applicant said he would consider the red bay doors, too.
- Mr. Meade also suggested some weather protection for the entry door, with a slight overhang, roof, or awning in that area. The applicant agreed to that idea.
- Mr. Meade noted that some gooseneck lighting over the entry might be worth considering, too.
- Mr. Lisk pointed out that a landscape plan would be good to see at the next meeting on this project, as well.
- Mr. Meade says he likes the building, and that it only needs some fine tuning for approval. Mr. Krueger is concerned it might not be ready for approval, but Mr. Meade is confident some conditions could be added to help the project along.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION MADE BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MS. SIROIS TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:20 P.M. MOTION PASSES (7-0).**

**May 19, 2011**  
**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

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