

Beauregard Urban Design Advisory Committee (BDAC) - Meeting Minutes

September 25, 2017

6:30 pm

Northern Virginia Community Campus, Bisdorf Building
(5000 Dawes Avenue, Room 196)

APPROVED AT 10.23.17 BDAC MEETING

Committee Members in Attendance:

Pete Benavage, Chair
Donna Fossum, Co-Chair
Abed Benzina
Carolyn Griglione
Fatimah Mateen

Absent Committee Members:

Ben Jehle

City Staff:

Tom Canfield, City Architect, P&Z
Maya Contreras, Principal Planner,
P&Z
Sara Brandt-Vorel, Urban Planner,
P&Z
Ashley Labadie, Urban Planner, P&Z
Eric Keeler, Division Chief, Office of
Housing

Applicant Team:

John Welsh, AHC Inc.
Haley Norris, ACH Inc.
Lee Quill, Cunningham | Quill
Architects
Robin McGrew, Cunningham | Quill
Architects
Bob Hruby, Campion Hruby
Landscape Architects
Kevin Gaughan, Campion Hruby
Landscape Architects
Duncan Blair, Land Carroll & Blair

Agenda Items:

1. Welcome & Introductions (5 Minutes)
2. Responsibilities (5 Minutes)
 - a. Review and Approval of Draft June 19, 2017 Meeting Minutes
3. New Business:
 - a. Applicant Presentation of DSUP#2016-0044: Church of the Resurrection Completeness Submission (80 Minutes)
 - i. Presentation by Applicant
 - ii. Discussion of Site Architecture
 - iii. Discussion of Beauregard Urban Design Matrix
4. Questions & Public Comments (15 Minutes)
 - a. Public Comments
 - b. Staff Update on Projects:
 - i. 1701 N. Beauregard – The Urban School
 - ii. Beauregard Properties/Mark Center Sale by JBG
 - iii. Gateway at King and Beauregard
 - iv. Fairlington Presbyterian
 - v. Vulcan
 - vi. Greenhill
5. Next Steps (5 Minutes)

Welcome and Introductions:

Mr. Benavage commenced the meeting by providing an overview of the role of the Beauregard Design Advisory Committee and stated that the committee's task is to review applications within the Beauregard Small Area Plan for their compliance with the Design Guidelines, provided in the form of the design matrix, and that the meeting should focus on the importance of the design and not be a comment on the proposed use. Mr. Benavage stated that any additional concerns, outside of the design discussion, should be brought forward to the Planning Commission and City Council.

Staff Update on Projects:

Ms. Contreras provided a brief update on a number of nearby projects, including updates on the West End School, the Gateway at King and Beauregard, the sale of the Beauregard Properties by JBG to Morgan Properties, Fairlington Presbyterian Church, and the Vulcan site.

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Benavage called the meeting to order. A quorum for the meeting was established.

All members of the Beauregard Design Advisory Committee introduced themselves to the audience and provided a brief summary of their background and previous involvement with the committee. City staff members in attendance stated their names and departments.

Responsibilities:

The Committee approved the minutes from the June 19, 2017 meeting.

New Business:

Applicant Presentation of DSUP#2016-0044: Church of the Resurrection Completeness Submission

Revered Belser, of the Episcopal Church of the Resurrection, provided an introduction stating the Church's desire to provide affordable housing in the community and that the proposed redevelopment was supported by the congregation and the diocese. The Church along with their design and development team had previously presented to BDAC on June 19th and had been working on requested revisions since the last meeting. Revered Belser stated the desire of the applicant team to continue working with the community and to continue to refine the plans and to accommodate as many concerns as possible.

Mr. Welsh, the Vice President of Multi-family Development at AHC, introduced himself and stated he was pleased to be at the meeting to talk about the building's design progress as a result of ongoing discussions with City staff and the community. Mr. Welsh provided a brief introduction of AHC, Inc., the affordable housing developer which has partnered with the Church of the Resurrection to redevelop the subject site. Mr. Welsh iterated the local need for additional affordable housing in the City as previously envisioned affordable housing would be

less likely with the recent sale of the JBG properties [discussed in the update of recent projects provided by Ms. Contreras]. Mr. Welsh turned the presentation over to Lee Quill of Cunningham Quill Architects, PLLC.

Mr. Quill introduced the design team, including Bob Hruby and Kevin Gaughan of Campion Hruby Landscape Architects and Robin McGrew of Cunningham|Quill Architects. Mr. Quill stated that many of the design changes in the building were a result of comments from the BDAC meeting of June 19, 2017. Mr. Quill provided an overview of the project including:

- An overview of the site with the relationship of the multi-family building and church building in relation to Goodwin House;
- Overview of feasibility studies to increase the number of units along N. Beauregard Street to activate the building frontage;
- Possible design changes to the internal floor plan to activate the building frontage;
- The addition of windows at the end of the hallways and along corridors to increase interior lighting;
- The design of the church and the shared courtyard and gathering space with the multi-family building; and
- Proposed landscaping along North Beauregard Street.

Mr. Quill also highlighted revisions to the multi-family building based on comments provided by City Staff, BDAC, and the community, including:

- Increased use of glass at the corner of the multi-family building at the intersection of North Beauregard Street and Fillmore Avenue to create an airy feeling, activate the street corner, and enhance the building's prominent corner;
- The increased use of a warm-colored brick along the building façade and the equivalent reduction in panel. Introduction of brick rustication along the base of the building and between window groupings to create a stronger pattern language;
- Increased use of grading and terracing along N. Beauregard Street;
- Increased use of brick façade along Fillmore Avenue;
- Evolution of the garage screening to including abstract forms of the building design incorporated across the screens and using different materials to create depth as an artistic screen;
- Increased design focus at the end of buildings to reduce the blank segments. Design interventions include a reveal in the stair tower with vertical windows, the addition of windows to the kitchens and bedrooms of end units; and
- Revisions to the courtyard such as a large glass area in the center and variations to the width and color of the panel siding. The variation will be emphasized with the changing of the sun and create additional shadows and visual interest during the day.

Mr. Quill provided a brief overview of the proposed Church design, including the interior layout of the church to accommodate proposed church operations and the use of various design elements such as repeated materials of brick and panel seen in both the church and multi-family building.

Mr. Gaughan described the architectural landscape process at the site, acknowledging that the extreme grade limited flat areas for gathering, but that a focus was on creating areas for play, gathering, rest, and socializing. As such, the community terrace and gathering space were important design elements to achieve this goal. Additional points in regards to the landscaping included:

- An overview of landscaping along North Beauregard Street, working within the 10-10-10 city guidelines, the goal was to create a low maintenance and beautiful streetscape that utilized terraces next to the building to break down the steep grade and reduce stormwater runoff;
- The gathering space adjacent to the church was designed to be flexible and provide both public and private public spaces;
- The multi-family courtyard garden is the one large open space that created an opportunity for large and small gatherings. The design was broken into two terraces enabling the upper terrace to feel more private while the lower courtyard to become more public and encourage a social feeling; and
- Turf would be used to create a durable play surface for kids or other activities, however the overall amount of turf would hopefully be kept low to reduce intensive maintenance and create a more ecologically sensitive design.

Committee Discussion for the Multi-Family Building:

Ms. Griglione inquired where a child could play and if the design had incorporated a place for school bus pick-up and drop off. Ms. Mateen followed up with a landscape question asking if the stairway ascending North Beauregard Street was continuous or if there were landings. Mr. Gaughan responded there were several landings along the stairwell. Ms. Mateen required about the design for railings and Ms. Griglione asked about possible lighting for the stairs. Mr. Gaughan responded that the railings would be metal with a simple picket detail and that foot lights would create an even distribution of lighting for the stairs.

The BDAC committee had a brief discussion about bike access to the site and the likelihood of children in the building biking to school.

Ms. Mateen stated that when looking at the view of the building, from the courtyard, that she preferred the limited color palette and that the courtyard wall still appeared a little flat. She inquired if there was a way to increase the gradation or increase the visual interest. Ms. Griglione noted that the windows on the exterior of the building had an interesting window pattern and if the same pattern could be integrated into the interior courtyard. Ms. McGrew responded that they would study this request.

Ms. Fossum inquired how much of the landscaping was above the garage structure and what precautions would be taken to ensure the plantings would not disrupt the garage. Mr. Gaughan stated that all plants would be in the minimum required amounts of dirt required for the plant's success and Ms. McGrew stated the building design and podium were calibrated to ensure they would not settle and disrupt the planters.

Ms. Fossum voiced a concern about the possible airflow design as it related to the roof design and placement of heaters to which Mr. Quill responded he would double check with the engineers but that the design was to ensure adequate airflow. Ms. Fossum inquired if there was a way to visually screen the mechanical equipment on the roof from Goodwin House to which Mr. Quill stated it was important to maintain access to the units and that they would not be able to disguise everything.

Mr. Benzina inquired about the height of the windows and the overall sustainability for the multi-family building. Ms. McGrew responded that the window modules had differing heights from 5'9" to 6" and that the building was seeking Earthcraft Gold certification.

Mr. Benzina stated his appreciation that the applicant had paid attention to previous BDAC comments with their design iterations such that the windows were all hung at the same height and commended the applicant on the new materials to emphasize the massing of the shapes. Mr. Benzina requested that additional information be provided on the location of vents and the way joints were placed on the panels, and requested that the vents be shown on the elevations. Furthermore, Mr. Benzina indicated there was a design disconnect between the residential windows located beneath the garage screen and the remainder of the building.

Mr. Benzina inquired how the laundry rooms would be vented to which Ms. McGrew responded that the laundry would be vented to the roof.

Mr. Benzina requested additional details along the base of the building along Fillmore Avenue as it is an important entry way and suggested more design focus along the loading dock and adjacent three doors. Mr. Benzina also agreed with his colleagues in regards to the courtyard, encouraging additional study of the flipping and syncopation of the windows and exploring the introduction of vertical elements in the courtyard.

Ms. Fossum inquired about the concrete articulations in the landscaping along Fillmore Avenue. Mr. Gaughan stated that the concrete wall would be cast in place and due to the grade of the site; the wall would only be visible from the multi-family building. Ms. Fossum requested a visual of the wall in scale.

Mr. Benzina inquired if the larger windows, shown in the upper corner of the multi-family building, could be incorporated as the living room windows, suggesting that all windows are mounted at the same height but the larger windows would come down lower so they're larger. This would create variety in the scale of windows and create a hierarchy of windows. Mr. Quill responded that to get an articulation in the windows they would have to shrink the size of the bedroom windows otherwise the project would require super windows which are outside of the project's budget.

Mr. Benavage inquired about amenities such as a green roof, or adding planters to the roof to break up the design and increase the visual appeal to Goodwin House and adding a vegetable garden in the courtyard. Mr. Benavage also asked for clarity on the status of the power lines shown on the elevations along N. Beauregard Street. Mr. Quill responded that it was an ongoing discussion between the applicant and the City about undergrounding. Mr. Benavage asked for

updated elevations which would show what the building would look like if the power lines were to remain above ground.

Mr. Benavage asked how the proposed trees could interact with the power lines and wondered if that could cause issues down the road. Mr. Gaughan responded that the power lines and trees would not align and that the trees selected had a maximum height of 15- 20 feet while the power lines were approximately 30 feet above the ground.

Ms. Fossum inquired if there were 35 bedrooms per floor how many laundry units would be provided. Ms. McGrew stated that there would be one laundry room per floor and that the vendor had not yet come into size the appropriate number of washer and dryers. Mr. Welsh acknowledged the committee's concerns over laundry and stated they would explore longer laundry room hours to ensure there was adequate time and capacity for residents to do laundry.

Mr. Benzina concluded the multi-family discussion by asking the applicant team explore the potential impact to the building façade for the stormwater and drainage requirements.

Committee Discussion for the Church Building:

Ms. Griglione inquired if the church's main entrance was off the courtyard or the parking lot. Mr. Quill responded that the main entrance was from the parking lot.

Committee Discussion for the Design Matrix:

Mr. Benavage stated that many of the committee members would like a little more time to digest the matrix. Ms. Contreras stated the project needed to go to hearing and offered a follow up meeting in October to discuss the matrix. Mr. Quill inquired that if there were only one or two categories in the matrix where the project did not comply if they could be discussed this evening. As there were only two components of the matrix to discuss, the committee agreed. Mr. Benavage read the comment out loud, "Multi-family residential buildings shall provide a minimum solid to void ratio of 70%/30%."

Mr. Quill stated that the comment was in regards to the lower wall of the multi-family building which is actually used as a retaining wall due to the steep grade of the subject site. Mr. Quill stated that in areas that have active uses the building had been opened up as much as possible, however the area behind the wall was dirt and they were unsure how to activate dead space and did not want to create a false façade with a dead window. Mr. Quill stated that the area had also been heavily landscaped and activated the corner of the building where people would congregate. Ms. Contreras added that staff also reviewed and agreed that the landscaping was a good approach to cover the wall and that the intent of the guideline was being met through the streetscape activation discussed by Mr. Quill. Members of BDAC requested an updated elevation of the building frontage along North Beauregard which would show the appearance of the building with mature trees and the power lines.

Mr. Benavage read the matrix comment, "A Comprehensive wayfinding system shall be provided within the CDD #21 and #22. It shall be consistent with the City's wayfinding program and requirements." and asked for clarity on staff's comment. Ms. Contreras stated staff

had been caught up in the review and as the project was not located in CDD #21 or #22 it would not be applicable, however the project would utilize standard wayfinding, similar to what you seen in the Mark Center or parking in Old Town. Mr. Benavage asked if the sign standards had been compared with the new sign regulations to which Ms. Contreras responded that during the drafting of conditions staff would lay out planned signage and sign conditions.

Public Comment:

Ms. Puskar, attorney for Goodwin House stated that the purpose of BDAC is to review the design and not use, however many of the statements made by the applicant related to the financing of the project and brought the potential building use into the realm of discussion. Ms. Puskar stated that there had been improvements made to the building design, such as the increased use of better materials, simplification of the design and removal of the previously selected colorful panels. However Ms. Puskar iterated that the Goodwin House façade [of the multi-family building] still felt like a tertiary view and that the courtyards and view from Goodwin House presented a lot of panel. Ms. Puskar requested additional brick added to those areas of the multi-family building. Furthermore, Ms. Puskar stated that Goodwin House had agreed to grant the Church of the Resurrection permission to join CDD #23 [of which, Goodwin House is the only party]. As such, Goodwin House expects that the applicant will meet all CDD requirements such as open space, contributions and undergrounding of utilities.

Ms. Puskar provided a brief summary of comments and concerns voiced by Goodwin House residents who were unable to attend the meeting, including:

- A request for a playground for children;
- An additional barrier to separate the road between Goodwin House and the church's parking lot;
- The requested parking reduction for the church;
- A request for views of the proposal from street level outside of Goodwin House and walking down the road from Goodwin House; and
- Concerns over the amount of proposed hardi-panel on the church building.

Mr. Benavage provided an administrative clarification that there would be an additional meeting and would reserve time for public comment.

Ms. Laura Lawson stated she had just reviewed the guidelines; especially those related to parking, traffic flow, and sidewalks. Ms. Lawson indicated she was very concerned about the building's design and its impact on nearby traffic, especially as there had been an accident along Fillmore Avenue the previous day. Ms. Lawson elaborated her concern as the current design created a four-way driveway within close proximity to the four-way intersection at Fillmore Avenue and N. Beauregard Street and how this configuration could impact ambulance access, possible traffic back-ups, and emergency access to Goodwin House. Ms. Lawson requested that the committee examine the road design.

Ms. Betty Cranwell voiced her concern about the proposed multi-family building design and stated that the multiple colors selected for the building materials should be simplified so it better

matched the design of Goodwin House. Ms. Cranwell also indicated her concern with traffic and parking at the proposed development.

Mr. James Hoban iterated his support for Ms. Puskar's earlier comments and requested views of the proposed project from several vantage points, including from the ground-floor circle at the base of Goodwin house, a view looking down from the fifth floor, and a view from the 15th floor. Ms. Puskar also iterated a request of the project from the existing private road.

Mr. Mike McCaffree indicated he felt the proposed design was stark and therefore inconsistent with the adjacent area and the surrounding Beauregard corridor.

Mr. Bill McCulla inquired about the proposed trash pick-up from the church, if the plan was to continue using cans; how the trash would be picked up; the proposed screening for trashcans; and the route for trash trucks. Mr. McCulla also iterated his concerns were applicable to the multi-family building as well and that one trash shoot in the multi-family building may not provide adequate capacity. Mr. Quill responded that the trash room in the multi-family building would be entirely enclosed and a compactor series would be used to compress the volume of trash. Therefore the trash would be loaded into bins, and then transferred to a trash truck within the loading dock area of the building.

Ms. Sandy Connell indicated she was disappointed by the design of the building and would not want to live there as it resembled a prison. Ms. Connell also stated her concerns about the safety of children in the courtyard; how school buses could come in and out of the site; and over the proposed capacity of washers and dryers for the project.

Ms. Ann Monehan stated that the current plans, compared to the initial plans, looked like a building 2.0 and was more interesting. Ms. Moynihan stated she appreciated the variations in the building's surface and liked the use of a brown brick and the use of variegated brick. Ms. Moynihan also indicated she liked the tower element in the multi-family building and that it reflected the church tower's use of steel and windows and created a nice integrated design and complimented Goodwin House.

Ms. Barbara Eversman stated the project was truly a good thing coming into the corridor for people who did not have the opportunity to live at Goodwin House and have the financial means to do so. Ms. Eversman stated this project would support people who work in Alexandria, such as policemen, fireman, nurses and teachers who are good working people and this was something the community wants.

Mr. Benavage stated he appreciated everyone who was able to come out and attend the meeting and wanted to compliment the applicant on the tremendous amount of work address the previous comments provided by BDAC. Mr. Benavage stated next meeting on the 23rd would focus on the architectural changes requested this evening, including a short presentation by the applicant and most of the meeting would be dedicated to discussion, followed by a committee vote.

The meeting concluded at 9:09 p.m.