

**Beauregard Design Advisory Committee (BDAC) – Meeting Minutes**

July 23, 2018

6:30 p.m.

Goodwin House Auditorium  
(4800 Fillmore Avenue)

**Committee Members in Attendance:**

Pete Benavage, Chair  
Donna Fossum, Vice-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:**

Tim Helmig, Monday Properties  
Nick Malpede, Monday Properties  
Chip Ranno, Clear Real Estate Services  
Robert Dinkelspiel, Clear Real Estate Services  
Megan Rappolt, McGuire Woods  
Douglas Carter, DCS Architects  
Anita Sircar, DCS Architects  
JP Gonzalez, DCS Architects  
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 Minutes)

**Welcome and Introductions:**

Mr. Benavage called the meeting to order and the committee and city staff introduced themselves to the gathered assembly. Mr. Benavage provided an overview of BDAC's responsibility to review the project proposal for compliance with the Beauregard Urban Design Standards and Guidelines.

**Responsibilities:**

With unanimous consent, Mr. Benavage declared the meeting minutes from the June 25, 2018 BDAC meeting to be approved.

**New Business:**

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

Ms. Contreras provided an overview of the meeting agenda and informed the committee that the Matrix of the BDAC Urban Design Standards and Guidelines ("Matrix") would be handed out to committee members at the end of the meeting. The next BDAC meeting on August 6, 2018 would include a discussion of the Matrix and areas of discrepancy between the applicant's proposal and the Matrix.

Mr. Helmig began by thanking the Committee, city staff and the community for attending the BDAC meetings and for providing the applicant team with feedback. Tonight's meeting would show the project evolution, the proposed architecture, and highlight the ways in which the project design had evolved based on feedback from city staff, the community and BDAC.

Mr. Carter gave a presentation which highlighted aspects of the project design and evolution, including:

- Updated presentation with all materials labeled on elevations, including corrugated metal, Sto walls, fiber cement and brick;
- Simplified building design with differentiation between the east and west building through a change in materials and colors; Utilizing a grey and yellow color pattern on the eastern building with a complimentary beige and lighter grey color pattern on the western building;
- Lightened building colors, from deep rust red to brighter and lighter tones per request from staff;
- Increased size of windows due to feedback from BDAC;
- Enclosed loading dock to reduce potential noise impacts from loading/unloading of trash;
- Identified locations for plantings to provide screening, including augmenting the existing trees along the property line with additional plantings, plantings along the north wall of the parking garage to screen the structure, and the use of planters along the ground floor units adjacent to the driveway to increase privacy for tenants;
- Finalized garage screening design of a panel screen with a playful pattern of punched holes to permit ambient light to be visible but prevent headlights and noise from emanating from the garage; and

- Enhanced design of the amenity building, utilizing a fin feature to project a taller building presence, coordinating material color across the amenity building and main building and providing greater detail on the proposed building design.

**Committee Discussion:**

Mr. Benzina began the committee discussion by thanking the applicant team for the improved building design and presenting a coherent narrative. Mr. Benzina indicated he appreciated the design team's efforts to:

- Provide a clear design and mitigate the building length by breaking the building into segments;
- Use dramatic design elements, such as a swooping design on the corner of the building and a playful approach to the garage screening with the panel and window patterns;
- Effective use of materials and the change of colors, especially the use of Sto at the top of the buildings;
- Coordinate the amenity building with the main building, especially with the use of the roof canopy; and
- Use of larger windows and an effective window pattern.

Mr. Benzina indicated the project was on the right track and reminded the applicant team that the devil would be in the details to successfully implement the building and exhorted the design team to ensure the swooping element could be constructed and maintained, and to include an accurate representation of the vents, window sills and details on the building.

Ms. Davenport stated her appreciation for the color palette and asked if the beige color had been finalized. Mr. Carter brought forth an initial material board with samples of the colors and materials. Mr. Benzina inquired if the panels would be painted or colored to which Mr. Carter responded the final technical approach to affix the panels, had not yet been determined, and that would dictate the color treatment for the panels. Ms. Davenport concluded her comments by stating the need for the balcony materials to be stain resistant.

Mr. Jackson inquired if there would be an option to change the color of the garage panel to break up the monolithic nature of the length of the wall section. Mr. Carter responded that they could explore alternate colors to break it up. Mr. Benzina stated he liked the color as it would encourage the wall to blend in and disappear from view.

Mr. Jackson asked if there had been discussion about the fence line and extending the fence. Ms. Woods-Smith stated the applicant team had been waiting for consensus from the adjacent communities on the fence. Mr. Jackson asked when the fence was extended if it would go the full length of the Adams neighborhood. Mr. Ranno stated it would just go the length of the property in question. Mr. Jackson replied that this it may create a bifurcated look if there were a break in the fence and it would make sense to go the full length of the Adams Neighborhood. Ms. Contreras

stated that typically construction was limited to one parcel. Mr. Benavage stated there may be some economies of scale to construct a fence along the entire Adams Neighborhood and encouraged additional discussion between the applicant team and adjacent communities.

Mr. Jackson asked if there was any discussion for treatment of the driveway to slow traffic. Ms. Contreras responded that emergency services wanted to keep the road as designed and staff would add a condition to provide road mitigation if speed became an issue. Mr. Benavage offered that for clarity of discussion that references to "the driveway" would mean the small road to the north, while "the parallel road" would refer to the realigned road in the middle of the Adams Neighborhood.

Mr. Jackson asked if there had been more discussion about the park and the definition of a park. Ms. Contreras stated the team was still finalizing the design and landscaping and staff heard the neighbor's concerns in regards to a proposed bench and path in the park and the possible level of use and that the discussion should be continued at Planning Commission.

Ms. Fossum stated her support to extend the fence through the Adams Neighborhood as a gesture of goodwill, but there was no need to involve BDAC or city staff in that ongoing discussion. Ms. Fossum inquired how the Emergency Vehicle Easement (EVE) was to be treated. Ms. Contreras stated staff was working closely with emergency services for a final design that would be accessible for emergency vehicles but would discourage passenger vehicles. Staff would also add conditions so that the EVE could be upgraded to stop traffic, if needed, but clarified that the use of bollards was discouraged by emergency services.

Ms. Fossum inquired if there could be more visual interest added to the garage wall, such as the painting of a mural. Ms. Contreras stated that staff had encouraged the applicant team to utilize a design approach which would minimize the presence of the garage wall and make it disappear. Ms. Fossum suggested a darker material color to make the wall disappear.

Ms. Mateen echoed her support of a mural on the garage wall and pivoted to ask if there would be a wall surrounding the pool area. Mr. Carter responded that a six-foot masonry wall with a hedge was proposed for the pool. The masonry wall would also include some slits to break up the wall, the proposed hedges would be the same height as the wall, and the applicant team was exploring acoustic blocks on the inside of the wall to absorb potential noise from the pool but was still exploring materials to ensure durability. Ms. Mateen asked if the northern pool wall could be taller to which Mr. Carter offered the possibility of exploring that request. Ms. Mateen concluded by asking the color of the pool wall to which Mr. Carter responded it would be the darker brick, as seen in the multi-family building.

Mr. Carruthers stated his comments would echo those of Mr. Benzina and Ms. Davenport and that he agreed the sweeping portion of the multi-family building now stood alone and appreciated the cleaner design as shown by the applicant team. Mr. Carruthers also stated that he liked the relationship between the amenity building and the main building and wanted to ensure there would be a walkway transition between the two buildings, but that the presentation represented a great leap forward.

Ms. Griglione inquired who was driving the design for the project to which Ms. Contreras responded that staff had provided comments at the previous BDAC meeting, which could be found online and had been emailed to BDAC, with key design refinements including refining the design and differentiating the two buildings to break up the massing, the focus on the building hyphen, and further refinement of the amenity building. Ms. Griglione stated that she felt her position was different than the rest of the committee and that the building "still seemed very run of the mill and didn't knock her socks off," and that she wanted the building to stand out. Ms. Griglione stated her concern that drivers would not be able to see the top of the building with the swooping curve and would really only experience the building at eye-level. Ms. Griglione also was concerned that there was no reference to the underlying history of the site in the building design and wondered why there was no reference to local Indian tribes. Ms. Contreras stated there were no guideline requirements or a history or art requirement within the small area plan. Ms. Griglione stated her desire for the design to incorporate references to American Indians and to incorporate a blue color into the design as there was lots of blue in the neighborhood. Ms. Contreras stated the importance of the first 20 feet of the building for the pedestrian experience and that staff had been looking closely at the ground level with plantings and detailing. Furthermore, while BDAC and staff reviews the plans in from a unique perspective, viewing the building in its entirety, the actual experience of the building would be in segments and broken up as a pedestrian or vehicular driver, which led to staff's focus on breaking the building design into smaller massing. Ms. Contreras pointed out as the site is surrounded by a number of existing buildings of various heights, there would be many views of the building and opportunities to experience the swooping top.

Mr. Jackson stated his desire to have a discussion with City Council in regard to the small area plan and the long-term fidelity to the plan.

Ms. Griglione wanted to ensure the project would be constructed as it was represented to BDAC and wanted to know what guarantees would be in place to ensure consistency with the images, and what timeframe could be expected for the building. Mr. Ranno stated that the project would still need to go through final site plan approval and then break ground, so another 2-2.5 years.

Mr. Benavage, referring to changes to a previous project after BDAC approval, requested that if significant changes were to occur to this project after receiving a vote from BDAC and prior to the Planning Commission hearing, the committee be reconvened for a consultation. Ms. Contreras inquired what a consultation might entail and that she would be happy to talk about the specifics of the earlier project. Mr. Benzina stated in his experience there was a specific process the city already utilizes that typically occurs during the building permit process where revisions to the design are reviewed against what was approved. Mr. Benavage stated his intent to continue the discussion outside of the meeting.

Mr. Carruthers indicated his concern that when viewing the screening of rooftop equipment, the screening could be a new material or color. Ms. Contreras stated there was already a condition that all rooftop equipment is to be screened in a material which is consistent with the building. Ms. Davenport asked if there was a porosity consideration as a material with too much porosity would allow views of the equipment, Ms. Contreras responded this was reviewed during the Final Site

Plan process. Ms. Contreras then provided an overview of the design process from drawings, hearing, and final site plan through construction.

Ms. Fossum noted that [with her experience] as a member of Beauregard advisory groups and working on the Beauregard Small Area Plan [that] the focus of redevelopment had been the Town Center neighborhood. However, this project was in the Adams neighborhood and as the Town Center was unlikely to be developed per the Small Area Plan, the entire area west of I-395 was going to be a far different neighborhood than envisioned in the small area plan. Specifically, she noted that there would be far fewer “owned” residential units and that the plan before BDAC would add to the 10,000+ commercial rental units that already existed west of I-395 in the City. To put this number in context, she noted that there are fewer than 10,000 commercial rental units in the City east of Quaker Lane. She concluded by noting that BDAC cannot do anything to change these conditions.

Mr. Benavage, referring to Slide 27 of the presentation, asked if the double row of trees along N. Beauregard, as recommended by the City and depicted in that slide, took into consideration the required right-of-way for the transit corridor. Ms. Contreras responded that the right-of-way requirements had been taken into consideration.

Ms. Griglione asked what the lighting would be like across the site. Ms. Contreras stated the pool lighting would be on private property while the light along the streets would be reviewed by code for compliance with City standards. Ms. Griglione stated her concern that the pool lighting not impact adjacent properties to which Ms. Contreras stated the pool lighting would be reviewed at Final Site Plan and the lighting along N. Beauregard Street, within the public right-of-way would likely be the City’s standard cobra head lights and the applicant would have to maintain minimum lighting standards.

Mr. Jackson asked if there would be space in the proposal available for community meetings as there had been previous discussion about this topic, Ms. Brandt-Vorel responded that the applicant team had agreed to provide meeting space within the remaining office buildings for nearby community rooms subject to the availability of the rooms and would be conditioned as a part of the applicant’s DSUP conditions.

**Public Comments:**

Mr. Mike Uehlein, Community Representative from the Seminary Heights Association appreciated the feedback and project refinements, but the Seminary Heights association still had concerns about the development proposal, which could be found in the letter posted on the BDAC website. Mr. Uehlein provided an update on an ongoing conversation between Seminary Heights and the applicant team in regard to the fence between the properties and that the two parties were in an ongoing discussion on how and when to update the proposed fence. Mr. Uehlein inquired when might be an appropriate time to discuss the possible pedestrian access point at N. Stevens street. Ms. Contreras stated that the next BDAC meeting was scheduled for August 6<sup>th</sup> and if consensus could be reached prior to that meeting it would then be a good forum to discuss. Mr. Uehlein stated that Seminary Heights was generally supportive of the pedestrian access but would

like a private access gate that would prevent non-residents from utilizing the back alley-way behind Nicky Lane and cutting through a space behind private residences, while maintaining all public access to N. Stevens street. Ms. Contreras asked that images could be provided with the next meeting to assist with the discussion.

Mr. Jackson inquired if the controlled access gate was part of the discussion between Mr. Uehlein and the applicant team and Mr. Uehlein responded it was part of the discussion. Mr. Uehlein concluded his comments that the association was still concerned with the proposed park that abuts the residences, as the residents deeply opposed the park, but they would bring those concerns up with Planning Commission.

Ms. Rebecca Hierholzer, resident of Seminary Heights, stated that it appeared the site plan was incorrect and some of the homes shown on the site plan were closer to the property line than shown. Ms. Hierholzer, referring to an image of the north west perspective, stated she was concerned about the potential noise from balconies and if there any balconies were to be removed from the design this would be a good location to consider. However, Ms. Hierholzer stated she generally liked the design changes to the building and found the design to be calm and clean. Ms. Hierholzer asked if the height of the pool wall could be higher than six feet. Ms. Contreras acknowledged previous discussions about this and asked how high Ms. Hierholzer was envisioning and stated while recognizing Ms. Hierholzer's goal of reducing noise, it may not be feasible to increase the height of the wall to a degree that would reduce noise and maintain a reasonable wall height. However, Ms. Contreras stated that staff would continue to work with the applicant and use their noise study to explore noise mitigation. Ms. Fossum thought a six-foot wall would be too low and that eight feet would be appropriate, and Ms. Contreras said she would coordinate with Code.

Ms. Hierholzer stated the CDD conditions required speed mitigation on roads in the small area plan and Ms. Contreras stated the driveway was a small road and did not envision the site being a high-speed area but could add a condition to the DSUP permitting mitigation if the driveway resulted in noise. Ms. Contreras also provided clarity on the difference between CDD and DSUP conditions. Mr. Jackson asked if speed bumps or other options could be utilized, and Mr. Carruthers warned that some forms of speed mitigation can result in more noise being created.

Mr. Sullivan stated his appreciation for the completion of the recent survey but stated there were a few inaccuracies on the site plan which should be updated, including better differentiation on the lane widths on Seminary Road and the inclusion of the cul-de-sac in Seminary Heights which was not shown.

Mr. Jackson inquired about the project timeframe after BDAC's vote. Ms. Contreras stated the next BDAC meeting was on Monday, August 6<sup>th</sup> and the project was scheduled for public hearing in October, with Planning Commission on Tuesday, October 2 at 7 p.m. and City Council on Saturday, October 13 at 9:30 a.m.

Ms. Brandt-Vorel stated that a copy of the Matrix and compiled deviations were handed out to members of BDAC this evening and would be posted on the website shortly for public review. Mr. Benavage stated the matrix was a list of all the guidelines and standards in the Small Area Plan

Beauregard Design Advisory Committee (BDAC)  
Meeting Minutes  
July 23, 2018

and the next meeting would discuss the applicant's exceptions to guidelines, followed by a public comment period, a discussion by BDAC and then a vote. Ms. Contreras thanked the applicant team and the committee for their time this evening, and Mr. Benavage concluded the meeting by commending the applicant on their presentation and the significant progress made on the building design.