

Beauregard Design Advisory Committee (BDAC) – Meeting Minutes

June 25, 2018

6:30 p.m.

Goodwin House Auditorium
(4800 Fillmore Avenue)

Committee Members in Attendance:

Pete Benavage, Chair
Donna Fossum, Co-Chair
Abed Benzina
Carolyn Griglione
Fatimah Mateen
Blair Davenport
Bud Jackson
Charles Carruthers

City Staff:

Tom Canfield, City Architect, P&Z
Maya Contreras, Principal Planner, P&Z
Sara Brandt-Vorel, Urban Planner, P&Z

Applicant Team:

Douglas Carter, DCS Architects
Anita Sircar, DCS Architects
Jasina Bijelic, DCS Architects
Diana Milian, Walter Phillips
Jonathan Rak, McGuire Woods
Megan Rappolt, McGuire Woods
Chip Ranno, Clear Real Estate Services
Nick Malpede, Monday Properties
Tina Woods-Smith, TWS Design

Agenda Items:

1. Welcome & Introductions (10 Minutes)
2. Responsibilities (5 Minutes)
 - a. Overview of group mission and responsibilities
 - b. Approval of previous meeting minutes
3. New Business:
 - a. Presentation of DSUP#2017-00019 Monday Properties for 2000 N. Beauregard St
 - i. Presentation by Applicant (30 Minutes)
 - ii. BDAC Questions for Applicant (30 Minutes)
4. Questions & Public Comments on DSUP Application (20-30 Minutes)
5. Staff Update on other projects in the Beauregard SAP (5 Minutes)

Welcome and Introductions:

Mr. Benavage commenced the meeting and provided an overview of the meeting agenda and stated there would not be a committee vote this evening as the meeting would be used for an applicant presentation.

Responsibilities:

On a motion from Ms. Fossum and seconded by Ms. Davenport, the meeting minutes from the February 2, 2018 and March 21, 2018 BDAC meetings were unanimously approved.

New Business:

Applicant Presentation of DSUP#2018- 0006: Monday Properties 2000 N. Beauregard Street

Ms. Contreras commenced the new business of the meeting by providing a summary of the applicant's recent community meeting held on Thursday, June 21, 2018. The meeting which was attended by approximately 15 community members and consisted of a 20-minute project presentation and a site tour of the property. Much of the discussion that evening consisted of potential landscaping and exploring the proposed building lines on the site.

Mr. Rak provided additional detail about the previous community meeting and informed the audience that Monday Properties had completed a survey of the site and adjacent properties and was able to flag the outline of the proposed building and walked the site with neighbors to discuss the building location. Key takeaways from the community meeting included:

- The opportunity to incorporate healthy and mature trees along the property line into the proposed landscape plan to immediately provide height and volume to the proposed landscaped barrier and would be supplemented by additional plantings.
- Having heard concerns about potential noise from the pool area, the applicant team was going to show acoustic buffering options during the forthcoming presentation.
- The applicant team heard concerns about drainage along the property line and Mr. Rak was able to review and confirm that future drainage will drain away from adjacent residential properties.

Mr. Carter began the presentation with an introduction of the design team and an overview of the subject site. Mr. Carter briefly reviewed previous revisions to the design, including:

- The applicant team removed the parallel road along the northern boundary of the Adams Neighborhood and revised the road system with an enhanced central road;
- The design aligned internal roadways to ensure future development was feasible, but there was no current plan for remaining buildings in Adams neighborhood;
- Continued use of the rear access road to provide a drop off area for one building and to ensure emergency vehicle access as required by the Fire Marshall. Plans for the emergency vehicle access from Seminary Road would be an area which appears as a lawn but has underground improvements to support the weight of a fire truck;

- Re-designed the Mark Center Drive alignment on 2000 N. Beauregard Street to a four-way intersection;
- Realigned the parking garage entrance to direct vehicular traffic from Mark Center Drive into the garage instead of the previous design which directed vehicular traffic onto the rear access road and then into the parking garage;
- Designed the building courtyard and parking area to support leasing activities; and
- Continued location of loading dock along the rear access road may expect one moving truck every three days and timing of resident move-in/move-out can be managed by on-site manager. Trash removal would occur in the same loading dock; however, a smaller loading dock will ensure a smaller trash truck which will back into the space, close the loading dock door and then pick-up trash to reduce external noise. Timing for trash removal will also be managed.

Mr. Carter discussed the proposed building design including:

- Potential building materials including a darker, cooler brick along the base with a lighter color brick above. A metal panel on the curved building portion which will have a slight sheen and a smooth transition around the curve. The metal is an aluminum which will not rust over time.
- The objective of creating a statement building at the intersection of N. Beauregard Street and Seminary Road and the applicant's use of a curved building design to create the statement.
- The use of design elements such as ledges and a recess to emphasize the curved portion of the building.
- The use of a darker orange or brown panel as a building accent color with a darker grey color selected as the accent color for the recess at the top of the curved building.
- The use of a glass wall in front of the garage along N. Beauregard Street to separate the two portions of the buildings and contain a recessed area which will be planted.
- Overview of design iterations to reduce the presence of the building including a rear access road designed for Uber and building drop-off.

Ms. Fossum inquired about the location of possible guest parking and if a party room was envisioned to which Mr. Carter responded parking would be available in the garage and an amenity party room was to be located in the amenity/pool building.

Mr. Carter outlined the proposed landscaping, including:

- Landscaping plan which would integrate 20-30 existing mature trees along the northern border which could be saved and plant smaller evergreens underneath to create a screen at the ground level with a mature canopy above. Trees species of a variety of heights would be utilized to create variation in the height and visual appearance and provide screening.
- The creation of a small passive park or open space near the neighbors most affected by the design, the end result was a 70-foot buffer of open space between the homes and the road.

Ms. Davenport inquired if the open space was to be heavily planted or kept as open space to which Ms. Contreras responded that the final park design had yet to be determined but that end design would ensure that headlights do not interfere with neighbors. However, the final design should be consistent with the small area plan which calls for open space and parks, but in a more passive nature.

Mr. Carter discussed the garage design, including:

- Screening of the garage, including planting evergreens between the garage and the northern rear access road, creating a green screen which would cause the garage to disappear from view.
- Screening materials for the garage wall, including a perforated metal option which was being reviewed for code compliance.

Ms. Griglione asked how the perforated metal may prevent garage noise from spilling over to nearby neighbors, especially squealing tires. Mr. Carter responded that the metal would not cut down on noise, however the squealing tires was from a finished concrete and the applicant would not use a finish on the garage concrete which would create noise.

Mr. Carter outlined the proposed club house/amenity building, including:

- The location of the clubhouse in line with the main building lobby entrance to encourage residents to safely cross the street at an established crosswalk.
- Designing a light, open, and airy building with glass frontage to put eyes on the street and allow pedestrians to see activity within the amenity building to create a safer neighborhood environment.
- The use of a six-foot masonry wall to encircle the pool and stop potential noise from the clubhouse from impacting neighbors. The masonry wall would utilize the same color brick as the base of the multi-family building.

Mr. Jackson inquired if the design of the wall or fence proposed for the northern perimeter had been determined. Mr. Carter posited the team was looking at options which would allow the applicant to preserve as many existing trees and other landscaping options which would mitigate noise. Mr. Rak iterated there were many opinions for the treatment of the wall/fence and the applicant team was open to hear comments and inputs on the possible design options.

Committee Discussion:

Mr. Carruthers asked if there was a view of the site from the intersection of N. Beauregard Street and Mark Center Drive to show how the two building entrances related to each other. Mr. Carter stated they did not have a view with an updated clubhouse design but showed an image of the scale and highlighted the crosswalk between and the entrance to the main building. Mr. Carruthers requested a view with an updated clubhouse at the next meeting.

Mr. Benzina suggested a crosswalk material different from the adjacent roadway or to use a table design to emphasize the crosswalk.

Mr. Jackson inquired where the affordable housing for the project would be located. Ms. Contreras answered that the project would be presented to the Alexandria Housing Affordability Advisory Committee (AHAAC) as they oversee affordable housing and would review the affordable housing proposal while the Beauregard Design Advisory Committee's (BDAC) purview was design and architecture. Mr. Benavage stated AHAAC was the group with the expertise and authority to review affordable housing, but that this group could raise those concerns in the meeting minutes for consideration. Ms. Contreras stated Mr. Jackson would be able to attend the AHAAC meeting as a citizen and voice his concerns or questions in regards to affordable housing. Mr. Jackson inquired what contribution was being made to which Ms. Contreras responded that the small area plan had designated a contribution, set in each neighborhood, and the affordable housing contribution was a portion of the overall contribution. Mr. Benavage added the ordinance which established BDAC delineated the responsibility to enforce the design guidelines and to review applications within the Beauregard Small Area Plan for consistency with the Design Standards and Guidelines, however the affordable housing component would be deferred to AHAAC. Mr. Benavage provided clarification that usually BDAC would not review the street network, but in the instance of Monday Properties' proposal, the street was placed in the Coordinated Design District as a design element and it therefore came under BDAC's purview to review.

Ms. Mateen inquired about the material that was shown for the top portion of the curved building design along N. Beauregard Street, if the material was used on other buildings in the area, and what the material was to be used. Mr. Carter responded that it was a corrugated aluminum metal with a horizontal alignment which is visible up close but appears smoother as one moves away from the building. Ms. Bijelic stated that the Arlington Mill Community Center's main tower uses the same metal material. Mr. Benzina requested precedent images with the next presentation to better understand the materials. Ms. Mateen stated that the design guidelines prohibited vinyl and aluminum siding to which Mr. Benzina responded that the applicant's material would not be considered siding but a type of metal panel and Mr. Canfield, the City Architect, agreed with Mr. Benzina's statement. Mr. Benavage clarified that the type prohibited would be the long vinyl siding which was typical on single-family homes.

Ms. Fossum stated that a goal of the small area plan was to create visual harmony yet the lack of brick in the design was not harmonious with the neighborhood. Mr. Carter pointed out that the base of the building was all brick and masonry while the curve of the building did have more metal.

Ms. Mateen inquired about vegetation shown on the proposed building signs and Mr. Carter responded the signs would stay green. Furthermore, the proposed plaza was designed to feel like a small-scale European plaza with plantings and greenery. Ms. Mateen asked if a waterfall would be feasible to which Mr. Carter responded the maintenance cost made a waterfall prohibitive to the project. Ms. Mateen asked for the distance between the rear access road and the north side of the building, Mr. Carter responded it was 22-feet wide for the road which allowed two car lanes in addition to a sidewalk and a 17-foot buffer between the road and the property line. Mr. Carter indicated the area could be bermed up before dipping down to a fence and strong landscaping next to the fence. Ms. Mateen inquired if 22-foot road met minimum City requirements to which Ms. Contreras responded it was appropriate and could even go smaller, but 22-feet supported

emergency vehicle use. Ms. Mateen requested clarification for the location of the proposed landscaping to which Mr. Carter responded the trees would be on the applicant's property. Ms. Mateen asked if a tunnel could be used between the amenity building and main building to which Mr. Carter responded the tunnel would be very expensive and Ms. Contreras stated that the Mark Center Drive extension would be a public street and the City did not support a tunnel underneath a public street.

Mr. Benzina stated the applicant's desire to be responsive to adjacent neighbors with lots of buffering and plantings has led to a sidewalk width of six-feet which would not support high levels of pedestrian activity. Mr. Benzina further discussed loading and inquired how people in the North building would load and unload and asked about the connectivity between the two buildings. Mr. Carter responded that a corridor system runs through both buildings and a freight elevator would deliver people from the loading dock to the proper floor. Mr. Benzina reiterated a comment from an earlier meeting that when using the proposed 3A construction the execution of detail will be very important.

When viewing slide 24, Mr. Benzina stated that he liked the corrugated metal but was unsure of the elevation of the curved building as he felt the use of stepping and ledges along the curved façade weakened the impression of the curved design. Ms. Contreras offered that the next meeting could provide images of all the façade designs for discussion. Ms. Griglione agreed with Mr. Benzina that she preferred a more sleek and smooth façade instead of the current design which included colors, windows and panels. Ms. Davenport however offered that she did not want to see too much metal on the building and appreciated the change in façade materials.

Mr. Benzina stated the windows were an area of concern and that he liked the syncopation of the window design but would like to know the type, configuration, and height of the windows to ensure that the proposed wood construction would be able to support the proposed window system. Mr. Benzina offered that a simpler window design may allow for easier delivery of the proposed structure.

Mr. Benzina switched to a discussion of the proposed garage and stated that when viewing the curtain wall in front of the garage the structure would likely need to be steel and not as minimalist as shown in the images, and recommended the applicant team refine the design. He further recommended that the applicant review the Mosaic District garage for an example of a successful curtain wall. Mr. Benzina called attention to the treatment of the walls perpendicular to the garage.

Ms. Davenport inquired if the brick was a true brick with color all the way through which Mr. Carter affirmed. Ms. Davenport asked if there was a required open percentage for the garage screen to which Ms. Sircar responded the design was intended to be open and the design team was working to confirm the percentage with Code, however the design may end up closed after completing an air-flow analysis.

Ms. Griglione stated her displeasure with not understanding where the proposed materials were to be located on the building. Ms. Contreras stated that the applicant team could develop a graphic which diagrammed the building materials. The design team led a discussion which generally

identified the use of a darker brick around the base of the building, lighter color brick to be used along public streets and a corrugated metal to be used along the top of the building. Ms. Fossum asked if the number of proposed materials was typical to which Ms. Contreras stated that the number of proposed materials was consistent with a building of this scale. Ms. Fossum inquired how the materials of the amenity building would relate to the multi-family building. Ms. Bijelic stated the amenity building would use the same metal, white metal canopy and similar wall of dark brick, seen on the ground floor of the multi-family building, would encircle the pool area.

Ms. Fossum inquired who would control the window coverings as Ms. Fossum appreciated a uniform appearance of window shades, to which Mr. Carter responded the building would come with standard horizontal blinds. Ms. Fossum directed the applicant team to review the building footprint image and reiterated her belief that the single garage entrance would not be adequate during emergencies. Ms. Contreras responded that staff had already confirmed with code that one entrance was sufficient and could send Ms. Fossum an email with a written response confirming the garage design was code-compliant.

Mr. Benavage inquired if it would be feasible to provide an enclosed pool which would be available year-round. Mr. Ranno responded an enclosed pool was not considered as it was cost prohibitive. Ms. Fossum asked who the typical tenant may be and if there was an expectation for many children to live in the building as noise from pools typical comes from children. Mr. Carter stated that their studies indicated that multi-family construction generates a very low number of children.

Public Comments:

Mr. Roger Sullivan asked if the recent survey of the adjacent communities had been integrated into the drawings presented this evening to which Mr. Benzina stated that page 13 of the presentation with building sections showed the exact distances and heights. Mr. Sullivan also stated that while the curved building portion may be beautiful from Seminary Road, it appeared very high from the perspective of the immediately adjacent townhomes. Ms. Bijelic stated the curved of the building began to curve back down on the edge which faces the townhomes and the higher curve was focused along Seminary Road and N. Beauregard Street.

Ms. Nicole Brockoff of the Seminary Heights neighborhood asked for a description of the amenity area, the park space to the north, and clarification on lines seen on the site plan. Ms. Contreras stated that the final design of the open space had not been settled and that the design of the amenity area had been to place the building along the street front to create an active street front and pull the pool, which would be surrounded by a blank wall, to the interior of the project site. Furthermore, several concerns were voiced about pedestrian safety, so pulling the formal entrance to the amenity area moved pedestrians further away from the proposed garage entrance and vehicular traffic. Ms. Brockoff asked the definition of a passive park and Ms. Contreras responded it was open space geared for contemplation but would not have a playground or sports field, but the design had not been settled. Ms. Brockoff iterated that activity seemed to be pushed towards adjacent neighbors and Ms. Contreras stated there was approximately 150 – 170 feet between the northern fence line to the rear wall of the pool area to ensure that activity was removed from the

neighbors. Additional options to reduce potential noise on neighbors included limiting the hours of the proposed park/open space and to monitor the space. Ms. Contreras recommended tabling the discussion of the open space to a later meeting when the configuration had been more finalized. Ms. Brockoff concluded by asking about the parking lot to which Ms. Contreras responded that the proposal ended at the property line and nothing was proposed for adjacent properties but that the applicant would have to show the interim treatment of the parking lot area.

Mr. Jackson inquired if there were any thoughts about speed bumps to which Ms. Contreras responded that she would see if they were needed and could be conditioned.

Ms. Rebecca Hierholzer stated her thanks to the applicant team and city staff and asked a series of questions, including if dogs would be permitted in the building; if there were other amenity spaces identified; the height of the clubhouse and surrounding wall; and the orientation of the pool. Ms. Contreras responded that the walls surrounding the pool area would comply with the City Code requirements and that a perspective of the pool building could be requested from the applicant team to show the height, orientation and plantings.

Ms. Griglione inquired how the pool area would be serviced, to which Mr. Carter responded that the service area would be located within the amenity building.

Ms. Hierholzer inquired if there would be additional traffic signals other than at the intersection of N. Beauregard Street and Mark Center Drive, and where package delivery vehicles could park on site. Ms. Contreras responded that no additional signals were proposed at this time and that staff would work with the applicant team to designate a parking spot for delivery vehicles.

Ms. Susan Sullivan inquired how residents would get from the building lobby to the amenity building. Ms. Contreras responded there would be a signaled traffic light and cross-walk to cross Mark Center Drive.

Ms. Fossum inquired how much parking was located in the garage and if on-street parking would be limited to leasing or guests. Ms. Sircar responded there were 485 spaces in the parking garage for residents and visitors.

Mr. Benzina inquired about the LEED design and Ms. Contreras responded it would be required to achieve LEED Certified or equivalent.

Mr. Mike Uehlein, Community Representative from the Seminary Heights Association, stated his desire to work with Monday Properties to discuss the fence option and stated his appreciation for the conversation regarding preserving the mature trees and the idea of combining a berm, with the combination of tall mature trees and smaller lower plantings to create a screen.

Ms. Hierholzer voiced her concern about encouraging pedestrians to walk along the periphery of the Adams neighborhood and requested the relocation of sidewalks away from Seminary Heights. Ms. Milian stated the team was still exploring issues of connectivity as they were hearing many perspectives from the community. Ms. Mateen iterated that the design of the Beauregard Small Area Plan was to encourage a walkable neighborhood.

Mr. Mo Seifeldein inquired if there were plans for electric charging stations in the garage to which it was indicated that a percentage of the parking spaces would likely be electric.

Mr. Jackson inquired if the parking was exclusive to the site to which Mr. Rak responded it was and would not be rented out.

Mr. Benavage recommended another meeting in early August to review the matrix and *possibly* vote. However, if a vote were to be held, the committee would permit public comment prior to the vote. Ms. Contreras stated that the Matrix and any meeting materials would be posted on the BDAC website and available to the public.

Meeting adjourned.