



Docket Item #1
Design Review Board Case #2011-0003
Carlyle Plaza (Blocks 26A, 26B, and 28)

Application	General Data	
Project Name: Carlyle Plaza Two (South Carlyle) Location: 760 John Carlyle Street, 1800 Eisenhower Avenue, 340 Hooff's Run Drive (Blocks 26A, 26B, and 28) Applicant: Carlyle Plaza, LLC (JM Zell Partners), represented by Ken Wire of McGuire Woods	DRB Date:	January 19, 2012
	Site Area:	6.23 acres
	Zone:	CDD#11(South Carlyle)
	Proposed Use:	Residential and Office
	Gross Floor Area:	755,000 sf Office 633,000 sf Residential

Purpose of Application

Concept design review of the proposed Carlyle Plaza development which will include one or two office building(s), two residential buildings, a parking structure with open space on top and a transition area between the street level plaza and elevated open space.

Staff Reviewers: Tom Canfield, AIA tom.canfield@alexandriava.gov
Gwen Wright, gwen.wright@alexandriava.gov
Gary Wagner, RLA, gary.wagner@alexandriava.gov
Katie North, AICP, LEED AP katie.north@alexandriava.gov
James Roberts, james.roberts@alexandriava.gov.

DRB ACTION, NOVEMBER 17, 2011: The Board reviewed a draft outline for the Design Guidelines and discussed a process moving forward with the review of the development. The next meeting will be a worksession to discuss design alternatives and further details for the Design Guidelines.

I. OVERVIEW

Carlyle Plaza Two, LLC has submitted new materials for review of the development in South Carlyle. At the previous DRB meeting in November, the Board reviewed a draft outline for the Design Guidelines that will govern the final design of the buildings and discussed the process for reviewing the development. Staff and the applicant had originally thought the meeting in January would focus on the more specific details of the Design Guidelines. However, there are a number of issues that need to be addressed before delving into the Design Guidelines. The focus of the January meeting will be to provide feedback on the concepts proposed for the transition area and tower massing schemes. Depending on the feedback at this meeting, discussion of the Design Guidelines will occur at the meeting scheduled in February.

II. STAFF ANALYSIS

Transition Area

The transition area is a crucial piece in the success of the overall project and all alternatives need to be carefully examined. Although the original concept included an enclosed atrium component, upon further evaluation, staff agrees with the applicant's concerns about the success of this space. The applicant's preferred concept provided in the packet (page 11) has merit, although the following should be considered and addressed with the final design:

- The garage levels should be stepped back to provide greater depth and setback for the transition area, which currently appears too abruptly vertical. Additional stepping back of the garage levels could also diminish the steepness of the east façade of the green space that is adjacent to the trail.
- The landings should be large enough to provide some kind of feature or activity to encourage people to make the climb. The goal of the transition area is to create an interesting and inviting “journey” from the plaza at Eisenhower Avenue to the green space above the parking – a distance of 45 feet in elevation. It is important to break this journey into manageable segments that have interim “destinations”.
- The landings should allow for access into the buildings on either side and possibly include a covered or enclosed area relating to the buildings and the landings. This could help in creating interim destinations as noted above.
- Entire area should accommodate ADA requirements.
- Should there still be a single, welcoming stairway connecting upper and lower open space with the ramp system?
- The “flying bridge/stair” needs to feel integral to the overall composition, even if it is intended to function as a dramatic punctuation to the more natural steps and cascade of greenery and water. Staff is concerned that the stairs will be required by code to be covered (for safety reasons) and this could make the structure more massive than intended. Additionally, are the two platforms wide enough to accommodate seating areas or are they intended as only pass-through areas?
- Relationship of stairs with the plaza. If the flying bridge/stair is used, how does its landing in the plaza work with the overall plaza design?

- Relationship of wall/garden blocks with plaza. Again, how do the garden blocks work with the overall plaza design – can water features be used to tie the whole composition together?
- Where could water be incorporated along the wall and how can the water features in the green space on the upper level be tied to the plaza below? Staff believes that this is an important theme that should be further explored.
- Is the scale of the “garden blocks” correct? It may be possible to make the experience of walking through and behind them more interesting if their scale is increased somewhat (fewer, larger elements.)

Tower Massing

The applicant has provided three massing configurations for the site. In all three options, the two-tower office building is proposed at the same footprint and height. The variation between schemes comes from the adjustments to the heights and footprints of the two residential buildings. The table below summarizes the proposed stories (above the podium) for the three options. More information about each option is provided in the packet.

	A (page 16)	B (page 25)	C (page 34)
Office	16 & 18	16 & 18	16 & 18
Residential 1 (North)	15	24	23
Residential 2 (South)	22	15	16

Each of these options could be successful since they all provide some variation in height between the three buildings. There does need to be a design discussion and decision about whether the northernmost residential building should be the tallest and most iconic building or whether it should relate more closely to the other buildings along Holland Land in Carlyle, which are 12-14 stories.

Design Guidelines Outline

The proposed outline for the Design Guidelines (page 44 of the packet) is consistent with the discussions we have had thus far on this issue. Staff is comfortable moving forward with the Guidelines using this outline to fill in the specific details. Discussion of the Design Guidelines should occur at the February DRB meeting.

Other Design Issues

In addition to the three items above, there are a number of other issues that will need to be resolved. Some of these issues may be discussed further at this meeting or future meetings.

- Drop-off and loading area for the north residential building – location, configuration, and relationship to plaza pose many design problems.
- Treatment of both the Limerick and Savoy Street connections through the garage.
- Treatment of the garage edge facing the RPA and ASA facility.

III. CONCLUSION AND STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the DRB give direction to the applicant regarding the proposed transition area scheme, the three options for tower massing, and the outline for the Design Guidelines. The applicant should return to the DRB in February to discuss refinements made to the plan to address these comments as well as present more detailed Design Guidelines.

Next Meetings:

Thursday, February 16th – Confirmed

Thursday, March 15th – Proposed