

## **The Beauregard Design Advisory Group**

May 12, 2014

6:30 pm

Burke Library

### **Committee Members in Attendance:**

Gus Ardura  
Pete Benavage  
Abed Benzina  
Don Buch  
Carolyn Griglione  
Donna Fossum  
Mark Ramirez  
Shawn Glerum  
Matt Clark

### **Absent:**

None

### **City Staff:**

Jeff Farner, Deputy Director, P&Z  
Patricia Escher, Principal Planner, P&Z

### **Applicant Representatives:**

Michael Eastwood, Home Properties  
Cathy Puskar, Walsh Colucci  
Chris Harvey, Hord Coplan Macht  
Chris Schein, Hord Coplan Macht

### **Community:**

Danny Blum  
James E. Brown  
Judy Cooper  
Annabelle Fisher  
Shirley Downs  
Sharon Annear

### **Agenda Items**

1. Review and Approval of Draft April 7, 2013 Meeting Minutes
2. Applicant Introduction of DSUP2013-0026: Seminary Overlook, Preliminary
3. Design Guidelines Comment Matrix Review
4. Vote on the Application
5. New Business - Next Steps

## **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting began at 7:00 p.m. A quorum for the meeting was established.

### **DISCUSSION:**

- Minutes from April 7<sup>th</sup> were approved.

#### *Seminary Overlook*

- Ms. Puskar began the applicant's presentation stating that most of the representations are graphics that the group has seen, but that there are some new images that the applicant would

like to present. She stated that the proposal is scheduled for the June dockets for both the Planning Commission on June 3<sup>rd</sup> and City Council on June 14<sup>th</sup>.

- She wanted to address some concerns that were raised by the community about the site's marine clay soil and the structural integrity of the building. The applicant has a team of professional consultants that are working on the project which includes a geotechnical engineer. The geotechnical engineer reviews the soil samples of the site and makes specific recommendations for the building construction. These recommendations are then incorporated into the building and site design by the civil engineer and architect. Additionally, buildings are built to specific Building Code requirements that should account for some amount of seismic activity.
- Another question was whether these units would have operable windows and Ms. Puskar indicated that they would with the exception of some of the ground floor units would have sliding glass doors.
- Ms. Puskar indicated that the power lines that are between the subject property and the Parkside community are located on the Parkside property and are not part of the proposed redevelopment of the Seminary Overlook proposal.
- Mr. Harvey began the presentation of the property. He discussed design elements such as ground level stoops, creating an active ground plane. He stated some of the graphics will be ones the group has already seen, but there are some new views in tonight's presentation.
- Ms. Fossum asked if a door was left open, could it potentially allow illegal access to the entire building. She thought that was a security concern.
- Mr. Harvey discussed the design features that strengthen the base element with horizontal banding and recessing of the band material. He felt that the buildings facing the park have a stronger vernacular with the use of a singular color along those facades.
- Ms. Griglione liked that the balcony railings were now more transparent and the windows on either sides of the pedestrian bridges are now larger and more transparent.
- Mr. Harvey indicated that they were now reviewing some accent materials for the underside of the canopies.
- Ms. Griglione thought that the one of the elevations looked more like a college dorm than an apartment building.
- Mr. Benzina indicated that there is a trend now to make college dorms look more like nice apartments.
- Mr. Harvey showed the location of the existing apartment building as it relates to the Parkside community and the new location of the proposed building. He discussed the

variations of green spaces with ample distance from Parkside. He also indicate that the balconies wouldn't be facing directly towards Parkside.

- Ms. Griglione expressed concern about security issues with the balconies and that they should be designed with that in mind.
- Mr. Schein discussed the overall landscape design, the private street design will have varied materials and be more pedestrian oriented, creating a sense of place. He indicated that loading would be internal to the site. Within Landbay B, the central amenity space is made up of a series of spaces to provide interest and create some privacy for the residents, while still maintaining a visual connection between the amenity space and the central green.
- Ms. Griglione indicated that access to the lower field at Hammond should be studied.
- Mr. Schein discussed the central open space would have an interpretive element perhaps recalling the agricultural nature of the property.
- Ms. Fossum indicated that dogs and their management should be thought about and the location of trash receptacles.
- Ms. Griglione indicated that the wall in the garden should be a good height for all age groups to use – from the young to the old.

*Design guideline Matrix Discussion:*

- The Advisory Group and staff discussed the matrix, made some changes and corrections. Staff will forward to Mr. Benavage to review. The Matrix and the Advisory Group's letter will go to the Planning Commission and City Council.

*Additional Discussion:*

- Mr. Benzina told the applicant that the graphics in the presentation were very helpful, especially the before and after's. He acknowledged the amount of work done, but still had some concerns about the transparency of the ground level units and the similar sized openings to the upper level units. He felt that the internal courtyards should have some variation of color.
- Mr. Ramirez agreed with Mr. Benzina with respect to the ground level entries.

*Public Comment:*

- Ms. Fisher stated that ground level entries are similar to other garden apartment situations and is part of living in a city. She did not like the color of the brick on the building facades facing the central green.

- Ms. Downs discussed the sound wall and the additional right-of-way needed for the widening of the road has had negative impacts to the neighborhood and should be protested.
- Ms. Annear wanted to discuss the soils, earthquake construction and operable windows.
- Ms. Puskar stated it was discussed previously and restated her earlier comments.
- Ms. Copper raised concern about the building proximity and height to Van Dorm street and thought it would be over whelming.
- Mr. Benavage indicated that more glass would help to soften this building façade and the building was at an angle to Van Dorn, so it would not be a long façade.
- Mr. Blum stated this project should be responsible for undergrounding the power lines on Parkside and the rendering showing the proposed development and Parkside is inaccurate. He sated that this was a linear space that may accommodate some active uses such Frisbee or a game of catch if design in such a way to accommodate those uses.
- Mr. Benavage Closed the public portion of the meeting.
- Mr. Benavage explained to the Advisory Group that they had four options on how they could proceed with the voting process. A motion will be made and seconded.  
 Then the members can:
  - Vote yes on the motion;
  - Vote no on the motion;
  - Abstain from voting on the motion; or
  - Vote yes on the motion with reservations and submit a letter under separate cover.
- Mr. Benavage made a motion to recommend approval of the proposal. The motion was seconded. The vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously with a 7-0 to recommendation for approval to the City Council.

Meeting was adjoined at 8:15 pm