## City of Alexandria Carlyle/Eisenhower East Design Review Board Public Hearing Agenda

Thursday, October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2014 7:00 pm City Manager's Conference Room Room 3500, City Hall

- 1. Call to order
- 2. DRB #2014-0003: Hoffman Block 2

315 Stovall Street

Design review of an amendment to previously approved Stage 1 Development Special Use Permit #2005-0031 for increased density, height, and revised massing at a commercial office building at Hoffman Block 2.

By: Michael J. Perine

3. DRB #2014-0002: Panera Bread

1940 Duke Street

Design review of proposed signage that exceeds the maximum allowed area. By: Panera Bread

- 4. Other Business
- 5. Adjournment

## Summary of Notes (Hoffman 2)

- 1. Parking Garage & Western Facade: The west side will be highly visible from Teleg. Rd. and the interstate. The currently design needs significant improvement to make this structure and the western façade more appeal.
- 2. Urban Context/Pedestrian Character: The site's urban context needs to reinforce the area's pedestrian character. Careful attention should be paid to the building orientation and landscaping.

3. Building Design & Orientation: The distinct elements (tower, base, garage) need to be treated more coherently. Alternatives to the proposed NE corner building orientation should be explored; specifically, a pivot of the building floorplates to open up the main entrance towards the SE corner should be considered.

## Transcript Notes (Hoffman 2)

Comments Key: A/D = Architect/Developer;  $LQ = Lee\ Quill$ ;  $RL = Roger\ Lewis$ ;  $JC = John\ Chapman$ 

- 1. AD Typical floor plates are 32,000 sf; Lower floors are 48,000 sf; client wanted group programmatic uses located here.
- 2. LQ: West Façade: seen by a lot of Telg. Rd. traffic; there's an opportunity for technical elements to be expressed along this way.
- 3. RL:
- a. Facades will be seen mostly in an oblique manner.
- b. Perhaps a more vertical emphasis is appropriate.
- c. Additionally, a few questions are worth asking:
  - i. What are client aspirations?
  - ii. Will this be more than a GSA building?
  - iii. Should this be a parking garage people enjoy looking at?
- d. Base elements: A unifying treatment is needed. You have enough dialects in the tower; why not use elements from this feature in the base scheme?
  - i. Additionally, the eye needs somewhere to focus.
- 4. LQ: Make Stovall & Eisenhower more pedestrian-friendly. This is an urban context; the site should accommodate pedestrians even in light of the project's security requirements.
- 5. JC:
- a. The pedestrian and visual experiences are key. The building should orient towards the intersection; that's what we want. This will set the tone for the entire area.
- b. The parking garage will look old very quickly without significant work to improve the façade; this is what people will be seeing as they enter the area.
- 6. LQ: The landscaping should be done well; this is the western entrance to the EE/Carlyle area. This is a billboard!
  - a. People will not see what low; the high elevation will be visible from the

interstate.

- 7. RL: The S & W facades should be treated different than the N & E ones.
- 8. A/D: [In response to RL's statement "Let's talk about pivot."]
  - a. Staff comments were thought-provoking; there is a possibility of shifting the building E to reinforce the pedestrian atmosphere.
  - b. TSA: Concentrated their special use spaces on the ground floor, which is driving the building design at this level. We're considering a "light swale mote" that acts a security feature in lieu of the required fence at the perimeter. The fence would remain around the parking garage.
- 9. RL: I encourage you to talk to the agency about its programmatic needs.
- 10.LQ: The design of the embassy in London by Timberlake could be a prototype or case study for how to handle security in an urban context.
- 11.RL: It looks like the SE pivot towards the Metro station is the best alternative. I'm convinced you can do this just be rotating the floor plans. It seems more favorable than having the parking the site's NE corner, as proposed.
- 12. A/D: The challenge is how quickly Eisenhower Ave. climbs W of Stovall St.
- 13. LQ: My only concern is having all park space located on Block 3.
- 14. A/D: It could be a good draw to any retail at this location.

## 15.RL:

- a. It's important to recognize the difference in park typologies: This would be a forecourt that people pass through rather than a destination.
- b. Also, in the rest of the world building a government building elevates the aspiration of a project; it shouldn't be different here.
- 16. All: Discussion of work session.