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:**	March 15, 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 Plan 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
Katye North, AICP, LEED AP katye.north@alexandriava.gov
James Roberts, james.roberts@alexandriava.gov.

DRB ACTION, FEBRUARY 16, 2012: The Board reviewed further refinements of the transition area, the ramp over Holland Lane, the Limerick Street pass-through and the Design Guidelines. Overall, the Board was pleased with the progress of the design of the transition area and is no longer as concerned with enclosing the area in an atrium space. The ramp proposal over Holland Lane seems to be a better alternative to the ramp landing on the plaza as long as the technical issues can be worked out. The Board liked the direction of the Limerick Street pass-through and indicated that lighting will be a key element of the perforated metal fins. The Board also suggested that the alternatives in the Design Guidelines needed to be narrowed down to two alternatives, which define building envelopes/footprints, maximum building heights and massing.

DRB ACTION, JANUARY 19, 2012: The Board reviewed options for tower massing and the transition area. With regard to the tower massing, the Board did not have a strong preference for one option over another, but did want to ensure that all of the options provide a greater variety in height and the building tops are well articulated. With regard to the transition area,

the Board suggested that the area needed to be better incorporated into the buildings (perhaps carrying it inside the building or extending the building out into the space) and the stairs at the ground level should be more inviting. There was also extensive discussion of the benefits of enclosing all or part of this area in an atrium space to make it useable year-round and also to mitigate the negative aspects of a north slope condition.

I. OVERVIEW

Carlyle Plaza Two, LLC has submitted updated Design Guidelines for review of the development in South Carlyle. At the previous DRB meeting in February, the Board reviewed options for the tower massing, treatment of the transition area and the alternative ramp design over Holland Lane. The focus of this meeting will be to provide additional feedback on:

- Transition area (continued discussion)
- Ramp over Holland Lane (continued discussion)
- Design Guidelines

II. STAFF ANALYSIS

Transition Area

At the last DRB hearing in February, the applicant presented a refined version of the transition zone that moved the free-standing elevator from the bridge connection to the office building. The new plan also moved the water feature that runs downs the biofilter blocks to the east side of the transition zone where it had a better relationship with the main plaza on the second level. Overall, the DRB was pleased with the direction that the design had taken and was no longer as concerned with incorporating some enclosed/atrium space into the design.

However, moving the free-standing elevator from the bridge to the office building created other design issues. For instance, without the free-standing elevator, there now may be no reason to go out to the end of the catwalk, and the bridge no longer seemed to be securely anchored visually, as it did with the free-standing elevator. As a possible solution, the DRB suggested widening the connection from the catwalk to the office building so that it becomes more of a gathering space and place to sit. This may give people a better comfort level of being out on an elevated structure, similar to the High Line in New York City.

There was also a concern for the green area that is tucked in between the transition area and the office building. This area is a dead end that needs to be either better connected to the office building or possibly enclosed. There is concern that it would be difficult for plants to survive in this heavily shaded location and the area could look bad if not properly maintained. In order to better understand the relationship of the building, parking garage and wrapping of the transition zone elements, it was suggested by the DRB that an exploded axonometric drawing and section through the area of the bridge connection be provided.

The applicant did submit an updated concept plan (see last sheet behind the Design Guidelines) that shows a wider bridge connection from the catwalk to the office building. However, not enough information was given about the design of the bridge connection and no information was given about the area between the transition area and the office building to provide an evaluation

for the DRB. It is anticipated that the applicant will provide more information about this area at the DRB hearing.

New Ramp Location over Holland Lane

At the last DRB hearing, the applicant showed a new pedestrian/bike ramp location that involved shifting the ramp away from the pedestrian plaza to the east side of Holland Lane where it would land in the African American Heritage Park. There are several benefits to this ramp location. It would allow for a layby off of Holland Lane with a direct lobby connection to the northeast residential/hotel building. It would also remove any conflicts between the ramp and the plaza, providing more open space for the plaza, and would eliminate pedestrian/bike conflicts with vehicular traffic along Eisenhower Avenue. Overall, the DRB was supportive of the revised ramp location, provided that technical issues can be resolved. Some of the concerns that were voiced by the DRB were:

- The appearance/design of the ramp and the extensive use of the proposed metal mesh fencing.
- The alignment of the ramp in relation to the Dominion Virginia Power substation.
- The width of the ramp to allow safe passage of bikers and pedestrians.
- The treatment of the area where the ramp is now pulled away from the building.

The applicant submitted an updated concept plan (see last sheet behind the Design Guidelines) that shows a more gentle curving ramp that attempts to focus away from ASA and substation and with a flared landing in the African American Heritage Park. However, there is very little information, such as grades, dimension, etc. to evaluate this alternative layout. It is anticipated that the applicant will provide more information about the ramp design at the DRB hearing. Staff did discuss the ramp location internally and made some general determinations that the applicant should consider for future submittals:

- The main portion of the ramp should be 14 feet wide to allow safe passage of pedestrians and bicyclists;
- The flared landing should be a minimum of 14 feet to minimize disturbance to the RPA and should taper into the existing sidewalk along Holland Lane;
- The applicant will be required to mitigate any disturbance within the RPA.
- Materials in RPA should be pervious.
- Railing height should generally meet Virginia and AASHTO safety standards of 54 inches, although some slightly lower heights may also be appropriate.

Design Guidelines

Staff has reviewed the most recent set of Design Guidelines dated March 5, 2012. The Design Guidelines are fairly consistent with previous discussions had with the DRB thus far. However, staff has several recommendations to various sections of the Design Guidelines, some of which are outlined below. Staff will coordinate with the applicant on some other minor changes recommended.

<u>Sustainability</u> –

- Expand the Sustainability chapter to include discussion of greywater reuse, biofiltration, LID along the streetscape, and other sustainable concepts. The applicant has previously

discussed these issues with staff and the DRB and staff feels there should be more information provided in this chapter. In particular, future opportunities for ASA greywater reuse should be discussed.

Building Massing Guidelines –

- Provide a plan with dimensions that shows the maximum footprint and the minimum distance between towers. The Design Guidelines (p.20) graphically show building footprints, but no dimensions or distances between towers have been provided.
- The minimum setback for the Residential Tower 2 from the liner units should be 20 feet. The Design Guidelines (p. 20) show a 10 foot setback between the liner units and the tower. Staff feels that this setback should be increased to a minimum of 20 feet for a better relationship between the tower and the existing residential building, and to be able to use the setback area for outdoor rooftop amenity space.
- The height range for the liner units should be 45-60 feet. The Design Guidelines (p.20) show the building height for the liner units at 50-85 feet. Staff has concerns that 85 feet may be too high and not compatible with the existing adjacent residential building and therefore recommends a height of 60 feet max for the liner units.
- Provide a note on the ground floor plan that individual unit entries are encouraged for the liner units. In order to activate the street and provide a better relationship with the adjacent multifamily building, staff recommends that individual entries be provided for ground floor units along Bartholomew St.
- Provide more clarity regarding building heights and demonstrate the differences between the two massing options graphically. It is important to both ensure the kind of dramatic massing that has been represented (as in "at least one of the residential towers shall be constructed to the maximum height of 375 ft.") and guarantee that a scheme with equalized building heights cannot be brought forward in the future (as in "the minimum difference in height between the two residential towers shall be eight stories or eighty feet.") Address all aspects of the approved massing studies in the design guidelines, while leaving a reasonable degree of flexibility.
- Provide a plan that identifies any areas of potential retail (see EESAP). While retail is not specifically recommended by the retail study for this location and is not currently included in the CDD use chart, some allowance to convert office or residential floor area to retail may be warranted in certain key locations, particularly at the John Carlyle and Eisenhower Ave intersection, the plaza and the possible hotel location.

Architectural Intent –

- Reduce emphasis on the spiral concept since this may not occur with alternate massing schemes. The applicant should amend the design guidelines to focus on the principle of variation in height, rather than the spiral concept.
- The importance of building tops needs to be addressed in this section, both in language and graphic form; alternate approaches can and should be explored to allow for some degree of flexibility in the future.
- Add a seventh principle that highlights the need for a strong corner feature at the NE residential one corner and NW office corner. Because of the highly visible nature of these two corners, staff recommends that the buildings have distinct architectural features in these locations.

- Address how a hotel use would be integrated into a residential building and show some graphics of this condition.
- Provide separate design guidelines for the two residential towers and discuss and graphically depict the stepback for Tower 1 at a level equal to the buildings north on Holland Lane.
- Provide a separate section of guidelines for the liner units with separate graphics and pictures of this condition.
- Provide a statement that acknowledges that any security features for office buildings, which may be required by a GSA tenant, must be integrated appropriately into the building and streetscape design, and show examples of this treatment.

Parking, Service and Loading –

- Move the service and loading entry point off of Savoy to be internal to the garage. There are three service and loading entry points; one off of Limerick, internal to the garage to serve the southern residential tower; one off of Holland Lane to service the northeast residential/hotel tower; and one off of Savoy to service both office towers. Staff is only concerned with the entry point off of Savoy Street, which is directly across the street from the existing multifamily residential building. This section of Savoy Street is a short section of street before it enters the parking garage. The service and loading entry point is centered between John Carlyle Street and parking garage, which breaks this short block face and impacts the streetscape. This short blockface is important for maintaining a pedestrian-friendly quality along this section of the street. Staff is recommending that the applicant explore relocating the service and loading entry point internal to the garage as it is provided off of Limerick Street.
- Use glazing for screened parking levels for the office building facades along John Carlyle, Eisenhower, and Savoy – since Green Screen was used for Carlyle Plaza I, it is not a treatment recommended for Carlyle Plaza II along these streets.

Interim Conditions –

- In addition to the interim building conditions referenced in the Design Guidelines, include the possibility of allowing interim uses for some of the temporary open areas, such as miniature golf, outdoor movies or trapeze classes.
- Include lighting as a potential interim treatment – including placement of public art light features on the interim facades and/or project of lighting features on the facades.

III. CONCLUSION AND STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends the DRB give final direction to the applicant regarding the design of the overall plan; the transition area; the design of the ramp over Holland Lane, and the Design Guidelines. The applicant should return to the DRB in April with any final refinements to the plan and Design Guidelines for approval by the DRB. Any final comments or concerns will be incorporated in the staff report for the case, which is tentatively scheduled to go to the Planning Commission and City Council in June.

Next Meeting: Thursday, April 19th – for final DRB action