

Beauregard Design Advisory Committee (BDAC) – Meeting Minutes

August 06, 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
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
Jasna Bijelic, DCS Architects
Anita Sircar, DCS Architects
JP Gonzalez, DCS Architects
Tina Woods-Smith, TWS Design

Agenda Items:

1. Welcome & Introductions
(5 Minutes)
2. Responsibilities (5 Minutes)
 - a. Overview of group mission and responsibilities
 - b. Approval of previous meeting minutes
3. New Business:
 - a. Discussion of Beauregard Urban Design Standards and Guidelines Matrix
 - i. BDAC Discussion of Matrix and Questions for Applicant
4. Public Questions & Comments on BDAC Matrix
5. BDAC Debate and Vote on Application for DSUP #2017-0019: Monday Properties

Welcome and Introductions:

Mr. Benavage called the meeting to order, decrying the muggy humidity and constant rain the Washington area has been enduring 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 July 23, 2018 BDAC meeting to be approved.

New Business:

Mr. Benavage asked for presentation from the applicant – no presentation offered. He went on open the floor for public comments. Rebecca called to inform Mr. Benavage that abutting neighbors would be provided with formal letter. The applicant stated they already provided comments.

Mr. Benavage proceeded forward with reviewing the matrix, starting with non-compliant issues.

While no discussion was raised by BDAC, Ms. Brandt-Vorel remarked that feedback from members regarding how to classify the open space and asked to confirm if passive space was the intended goal.

Ms. Mateen sought to find balance between shielding townhomes from disruptive activity, while also find ways to activate the open space. Ms. Mateen inquired how the developer would ensure balancing the desire for a usable open space with concerns from the neighbors. Ms. Davenport provided an overview of the proposed park dimensions and noted that passive amenities, such as benches could contribute to the site design and public use. Ms. Contreras also stated that parks immediately adjacent to residential are a compatible land use that occurs throughout the City

Mr. Benevage asked if aerial views were available for review discussion.

Ms. Fossum asked if Clyde's sign would remain after construction to which the applicant noted it is not a parcel in their control and that the sign is currently located in the median.

Mr. Benavage asked for clarification if there would be delineation between green space and open space, and publicly-accessible open space. Mr. Benavage inquired if benches could be placed closer to the street due to the site conditions, to which the applicant team agreed to locate the benches closer to the southern boundary of the park, close to the street. Mr. Benzina posited that it would be challenging for a landscape architect to design a passive open space that created a sense of place, while defining the type of activity and constraints that create a delineated edge to space.

The applicant team shared that their Landscape Architect but was focused on making the space a passive open space; The landscaping of the area would be densely planted to encourage a passive

use and the Landscape Architect would continue to work closely with staff to meet City standards.

Matrix Discussion

3d) General Land Use Plan i.(2): *“Affordable and workforce rental housing units shall be dispersed throughout the Plan area in neighborhoods containing residential units and shall include a mix of unit types, a mix of affordability levels and a mix of existing and new units, including accessible units”*.

Ms. Fossum inquired if the applicant was intending to provide Affordable Housing on site. The applicant team indicated on-site affordable housing was not proposed, as the Beauregard Small Area Plan did not require on-site affordable housing at this location. Ms. Contreras provided further clarification and indicated they applicant team was providing the required contributions per the Small Area Plan, including the dedication of the right-of-way for the West End Transitway.

3d) General Land Use Plan i.(4): *“Public open space shall be provided within each neighborhood as shown in Diagram 3.h, and should include types such as community gardens, passive open space, urban squares and neighborhood parks.”*

Ms. Griglione stated her concern regarding the applicant’s language that included “slightly, proposed, and may” are legal terms that create “wiggle room” and stated she felt the language may create opportunities for loopholes.

3d) General Land Use Plan i 3.(d). *“Adams neighborhood shall be principally developed as office uses, with some retail and/or hotel uses.”*

Mr. Benavage stated the applicant was in the process of applying for a deviation to this standard through a Master Plan Amendment.

3d) General Land Use Plan ii.(2): *“Retail uses are encouraged along Optional Retail Frontages”*

Ms. Mateen inquired why retail was not a component of the development to which the applicant responded that the existing commercial centers, nearby, were an adequate mix of uses. Ms. Contreras provided additional insight stating that the existing transportation network created obstacles and challenges for business longevity and viability. Ms. Contreras stated staff’s intent to continue working with applicants to promote economic development activities for shopping center redevelopment and future large-scale retail attraction.

3d) General Land Use Plan ii (3). *“Facilities for flexible community functions should be considered as part of the DSUP process.”*

Ms. Griglione stated her appreciation that the applicant had agreed to provide community meeting space and inquired when the meeting space would be available for the community to use. The applicant team indicated community meeting space would become available when the multi-family building received the Certificate of Occupancy.

3 e) Building Heights i.(1): *“Each block shall conform to the building height specified in Diagram 3.e.2.”*

Mr. Benzina inquired about the height standards and asked if staff would work with applicant to avoid problems with permitting. Ms. Brandt-Vorel responded that a note had been included in the site plan to addresses this point and staff would continue to monitor.

As a point of clarification, Ms. Griglione inquired if the renderings provided at the meeting were the most up-to-date, to which Ms. Brandt-Vorel confirmed that the renderings in question were included in the most recent formal submission for consideration by Planning Commission and City Council and the applicant would have to develop their building in conformance with those submitted renderings.

3 g) Bicycle & Pedestrian Network i.(2) *“The various bicycle facilities shall be coordinated with the City’s Transportation Master Plan, and Bicycle and Pedestrian Mobility Plan.”*

Ms. Griglione inquired if there was bike parking in the garage and if bicycle parking would be publicly accessible. The Applicant responded that there were 102 bicycle spaces in the garage, and 6 bike spaces on -site to meet the bicycle master plan standard. Ms. Brandt-Vorel stated the publicly available bicycle location was on the right of the front door. Ms. Mateen inquired about any potential bike share service. The Applicant responded and said, there were no existing plans, but the design does not preclude; as shared mobility services are an ever-changing field the applicant team would remain open to changes but have not moved forward on that concept.

3 g) Bicycle & Pedestrian Network ii.(3). *“Non-vehicular connections to surrounding communities outside the Small Area Plan should be provided as shown on Diagram 3.g so as to enhance overall regional connectivity.”*

Mr. Benavage inquired about the potential for the pedestrian connection at North Stevens Street and the applicant team responded that the potential connection had not been precluded from their plans, should the neighbors reach consensus through ongoing negotiations.

In response to applicant comments on the matrix, Ms. Mateen asked what it meant to be reviewed at Final Site Plan. Ms. Brandt-Vorel responded that some items in the Beauregard Small Area Plan are a level of plan detail typically provided at a later design phase. As such, the applicant’s current submittals indicate that the plans will meet the requirement and staff will review during the Final Site Plan to ensure compliance.

4 c) Building Frontages and Setbacks – Building Streetwall i. (6) *“With the exception of utility rooms, building mechanical equipment, utilities boxes and meters and trash storage shall be located on building roofs, below grade, or in alleys where possible. Where otherwise provided, they shall be adequately screened with landscaping walls or integrated as part of the design of the building. Bathroom and dryer vents shall be permitted to vent through walls.”*

Ms. Mateen inquired if it was usual for vents to be documented in renderings to which Ms. Contreras responded that at this stage in the project it was not typical. However, a standard condition for the project would require vents to be organized and painted to match the building to be as unobtrusive as possible.

4 f) Residential Uses at Grade ii. (1): *“Stoops, porches and direct individual entries should be encouraged for ground floor residential units.”*

Mr. Benavage briefly reiterated an earlier discussion on stoops as they related to the building design.

4 g) Garden Walls, Retaining Walls and Fences ii (3): *“Retaining walls where visible from an adjoining street should include a brick or stone veneer, and should include pattern changes or similar design measures to relieve visual monotony of longer walls.”*

Mr. Benavage stated his initial questions were already answered, Ms. Contreras provided clarity, stating the walls around the pool were not considered a retaining wall as it was not holding back dirt.

5 b) Signage i.(4): *“Signs shall be in the form of a window sign, a band sign, a blade sign, a nameplate sign, a marquee sign, a painted dimensional sign, flat sign, illuminated sign, fabricated dimension sign or awnings.”*

Mr. Benavage inquired if the design standard was abreast of the new Sign Ordinance, Ms. Brandt-Vorel stated that the applicant had submitted a sign program as part of the submission and their signage would have to comply with signage ordinance. However, the coordinated sign program would provide some flexibility and ensure the applicant provided wayfinding, loading docks, no parking zones, and that the signage was integrated with the overall site design.

As a follow up to signage questions, Ms. Mateen inquired about signage and illumination related to the emergency access circle near the Seminary Road entrance; inquiring if there would be signage in the turn-around. Ms. Brandt-Vorel responded that the applicant proposed a monument sign at the location and noted that the Sign Ordinance limits illumination for signage facing residences. Ms. Griglione stated she felt there was a level of signage pollution in the city and asked for creative solutions to reduce signage, including an app for the building and if a form of Braille could be added to exterior to help people with vision issues identify the property and location.

5 f) Building Roofs and Tops: *“Rooftop equipment shall be concealed by a parapet and/or screened architecturally, employing building materials and design treatment consistent with the exterior facades of the building. Where not visible from the adjoining street and/or open space ,the screening requirements may be waived. Where screening is provided, it shall be integral to the building and designed to minimize its overall impact.”*

Ms. Griglione inquired what rooftop equipment would be visible. Ms. Contreras responded that city standards do not permit mechanical equipment to be visible from the public right of way, however, there are no requirements for screening from buildings taller than the existing building.

8 f) Street Trees i.(7): *“Trees adjacent to the transit way and local transit stops shall not interfere with transit operations. There should be adequate vertical clearance for trees and transit vehicles.”*

Ms. Griglione stated her appreciation for the efforts made by the applicant to preserve trees and had exceeded City standards, especially related to plantings at the back-alley way and the green space. Ms. Griglione inquired about the maintenance and long-term care of trees. Ms. Contreras provided an overview of the requirements for planting and maintenance bonds and how the applicant was responsible for the care of the tree plantings.

Mr. Benevage stated that the entire Matrix document had been reviewed and suggested that the applicant review and potentially incorporate the thematic styles of the wayfinding signage on King Street as exemplar. Ms. Fossum added that the adjacent Monday Properties office buildings would benefit from enhanced and improved way finding.

Ms. Griglione raised concerns regarding the physical appearance of the garage and suggesting an additional review, as she felt the existing appearance on the north side was very simple while the garage façade on the Beauregard side was more appealing. Ms. Griglione suggested a possible condition to continue refining the garage façade to keep it unobtrusive while less brutal

Ms. Fossum moved to approve the guidelines with additional comments, to be incorporated into a letter to the applicant. Mr. Benzina seconded the motion.

Mr. Benevage called for a vote, resulting in a 7-0 decision for approval with one-member absence.

Mr. Benavage closed out the meeting by stating his gratitude to all the stakeholders in the process. Ms. Contreras expressed staff's gratitude for BDAC representatives and community stakeholders for their hard work and long-term commitment to ensuring this process was efficient and committed.

With no other matters to deliberate, Mr. Benavage called the meeting to close.