

**Design Review Board Case #2017-0013**  
**Carlyle Plaza Two – South Residential Building**

Application	General Data	
<p><b>Project Name:</b> Carlyle Plaza Two – South Residential Building</p> <p><b>Location:</b> 340 &amp; 350 Hooff’s Run Drive (ultimately will have a Bartholomew Street address)</p> <p><b>Applicant:</b> Alder Branch Realty Limited Partnership, LLLP; represented by JM Zell Partners</p> <p><b>Architect:</b> Arquitectonica</p>	<b>DRB Date:</b>	January 18, 2017
	<b>Site Area:</b>	1.28 acres
	<b>Zone:</b>	CDD#11
	<b>Proposed Use:</b>	Residential
	<b>Dwelling Units:</b>	368 units
	<b>Gross Floor Area:</b>	357,861 sf
<b>Purpose of Application:</b>		
Final review of the South Residential Tower and associated site improvements.		
<p><b>Staff Reviewers:</b> Robert Kerns, AICP, <a href="mailto:robert.kerns@alexandriava.gov">robert.kerns@alexandriava.gov</a>  Thomas H. Canfield, AIA, <a href="mailto:tom.canfield@alexandriava.gov">tom.canfield@alexandriava.gov</a>  Nathan Imm <a href="mailto:nathan.imm@alexandriava.gov">nathan.imm@alexandriava.gov</a>  Stephanie Free, ASLA, LEED GA, <a href="mailto:stephanie.free@alexandriava.gov">stephanie.free@alexandriava.gov</a></p>		
<p><b>DRB WORK SESSION NOVEMBER 16, 2017:</b> Overall, the Board found that the applicant’s landscape design presentation addressed Staff’s comments in the Memorandum to the DRB dated November 9, 2017 (Attachment #1) with the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In regard to the Bartholomew Streetscape, the Board encouraged the applicant to consider a solution where tree grates are provided over the 4 tree wells located immediately adjacent to the stone entrance paving and to utilize the standard planted wells as indicated in the Carlyle Plaza Design Guidelines for the remainder of the street trees.</li> <li>• The Board encouraged the applicant to lower the height of the 5<sup>th</sup> floor perimeter terrace wall and utilize plant material and design which would allow for open views from the pool terrace looking south.</li> <li>• The adjustments to the geometry of the plant beds which separate the public and private spaces on the 16<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> floor terraces offer increased privacy to the unit terraces in conjunction with the 4 foot tall railing and 6 foot height metal screen wall. The DRB encouraged the applicant to utilize furniture which would provide an additional layer of</li> </ul>		

separation between the two uses, and to study a 2 to 3 foot gap between the building wall and the planter for ease of maintenance.

- The DRB supported Staff's recommendation for accessible circulation within the play area and the applicant's solution to create an interim accessible ramp which connects the upper and lower portions of the play area as presented to the Board at the work session.

The Board anticipates that the next submission will deliver a comprehensive package which addresses all former DRB comments and conditions related to the building design, integrated with the revised landscape design which will incorporate the Board's comments from the November Work Session.

**DRB ACTION, SEPTEMBER 28, 2017:** The DRB voted unanimously to **approve** the design of the pilotis (change from approved round to rectangular and different spacing) at the base of the east and south facades adjacent to the pool terrace. The Board agreed with Staff's recommendation to continue further design development of other design details as outlined in the staff report. The Board favored clear vision glass throughout the façade and was concerned that other techniques to cover the vertical and diagonal columns would disrupt the façade design. Balcony design overall is ongoing and the applicant will continue to work through details. Staff was concerned with balcony privacy conflicts on the south façade and between private and public areas on the two sky terraces. The Board noted the unique design challenge and opportunity of the garage entrance at Limerick Street and suggested further study regarding illumination and ceiling design, as well as measures to screen the high section of exposed garage along the north edge of the drive. The applicant will present architectural and landscape material selections at the next meeting.

**DRB ACTION, MARCH 23, 2017:** The DRB voted unanimously to **approve** a 4'-0" increase in the overall building height. The DRB agreed with staff's recommendations to support the relocation of the trash loading area, and the elimination of the rooftop amenity space; applicant will instead explore providing a rooftop amenity space on one or both of the projecting roof terraces at the 16<sup>th</sup> or 26<sup>th</sup> floor. The DRB also voted unanimously to **approve** two possible options for revised balcony design: 1) Outboard balconies with glass railings that protrude from the north and south building façades contained by the inside edge of the large façade panel; or 2) No balconies. This approval is subject to the condition that the applicant continue to work to enhance the actual and/or perceived depth of the building slots, and work with Staff on the overall aesthetic, materiality, and detailing for the selected option to develop a façade and balcony solution that meets the intentions of the Eisenhower East and Carlyle Plaza Design Guidelines. The Board will review the final building façade and balcony design through electronic coordination and continued staff-applicant meetings (as required) and provide comments.

**DRB COMMENTS, JANUARY 19, 2017:** The DRB concurred with the Staff recommendation to defer a decision or action on the rooftop plans until the plans are further developed and provided in concert with the other conditions of approval. The rooftop amenity space as provided by the Applicant was seen as limited in utility and aesthetic appeal.

**DRB WORK SESSION, JULY 21, 2016:** On a motion by Mr. Lewis, and seconded by Councilman Chapman, the DRB voted to **approve** the massing, form, scale, and general architectural character of the tower and low-rise residential liner for Phase 1 of the Carlyle Plaza Two development, subject to the conditions below to be addressed prior to final site plan submission. The motion passed 5-0.

1. Applicant will provide a Roof Plan identifying mechanical equipment and amenity areas, if any, and detail Terrace Levels on Floors 16 and 26.
2. Applicant will provide more setback depth between front and back planes for low-rise units (between 12-16” total difference).
3. Applicant will work to minimize visibility of the mullions to reduce contrast between metal and glass.

**DRB WORK SESSION, JUNE 23, 2016:** The DRB continued to review the concept for the tower, tower top, and liner units. The Board directed the applicant to submit a final package for review and approval of the tower massing, liner units, parking and landscape deck at the next DRB meeting. The DRB stated that materials and other details would most likely need to be fleshed out in subsequent DRB meetings.

**DRB WORK SESSION, APRIL 21, 2016:** The DRB continued to review the concept for the tower and liners units. The DRB will continue to review the plans for this development at future work sessions, requesting that the applicant to provide alternative designs for review.

**DRB ACTION, MARCH 17, 2016:** The DRB reviewed the initial concept for Phase 1 and provided feedback on the tower massing and liner units. The DRB will continue to review the plans for this development at future work sessions and official meetings.

## **I. OVERVIEW**

The applicant, Alder Branch Realty Limited Partnership, LLLP; represented by JM Zell Partners, is requesting final Design Review Board (DRB) **approval** of the architectural design for the Carlyle Plaza Two South Residential Tower and associated site improvements. The applicant also requests the DRB’s **approval** of the total residential floor area to be developed with this first phase of the Carlyle Plaza Two development.

Since this development is located within Carlyle Plaza Two, the DRB’s approval is required prior to approval of the Final Site Plan.

### **General Project Description & Summary of Issues**

Phase 1 of the Carlyle Plaza Two development in South Carlyle (Block 32) includes the South Residential Tower and the low-rise liner units along Bartholomew Street in addition to a portion of the parking garage to support these buildings, the related open space on top of the garage, and the terraced deck between the garage and the Alexandria

Renew tank/field. However, the current submission and requested of approval does not include the architectural design of the low-rise liner units. The reason for exclusion of this building's design is that the applicant is currently re-engineering the structure of the liner building as a cost saving measure to preserve the quality of materials used on the façades of both the liner units and the Tower. Staff supports this approach for reasons discussed in detail within the Staff Analysis section of this report.

Additional issues to be discussed with the Staff Analysis include:

- Total residential floor area of the Phase 1 development,
- South Residential Tower Design:
  - Façade materials
  - Façade setbacks
  - Diagonal column colors
  - Cantilever soffit materials
- Limerick Street Underpass, and
- Bartholomew Street streetscape design and materials.

## **II. BACKGROUND**

### **Project Evolution**

With the Carlyle Plaza Two approval in 2012, the City Council approved the general site configuration, design guidelines, infrastructure, and allowed the Design Review Board (DRB) to review and approve the final design, height, and floor area of each of the buildings. In April of 2013, the Carlyle DRB approved the original design by FxFowle for the South Residential Tower. Prior to approval, the DRB reviewed the design several times at meetings in November 2012, December 2012, and February 2013. In July 2016, the DRB approved the massing, form, scale, and general architectural character of the residential tower and low-rise residential liner as designed by Arquitectonica. Prior to approval, the DRB reviewed the design several times at work sessions in March, April, and June of 2016.

The DRB reviewed modifications to the approved South Residential Tower design several times at meetings in January, March, and September of 2017. The changes primarily included revisions to the building height, roof plan, balcony and pilotis design, building materials, and façade setbacks. Additionally, the DRB reviewed the landscape design at a work session in November 2017 and provided comments regarding tree well design on Bartholomew Street, accessibility of the playground, and the opportunity to emphasize views from the pool terrace.

### **Site Context**

The entire Carlyle Plaza Two site includes about 6 acres of land located south of Eisenhower Avenue, between Holland Lane to the east and John Carlyle Street and Bartholomew Street to the west. The Alexan Carlyle, an existing five-story residential building is west of the southern portion of the site, and the future Carlyle Plaza One office building will be west of the northern portion of the site. The Alexandria Renew

expansion site is immediately south of this property and is an integral piece of the overall development.

Phase 1, where the South Residential Tower will be located, is on the southwestern portion of the overall Carlyle Plaza Two site. It is bounded by Holland Lane to the east and Bartholomew Street to the west. The future extension of Savoy Street marks the northern boundary of the phase. The future extension of Limerick Street is the southern boundary of the applicant's property, and this phase will include a connection to a portion of the terraced deck on the northeast portion of the Alexandria Renew site. Today, the Alexandria Renew building and multipurpose field construction is complete.

### **III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The South Residential Tower is designed as a 34-story high-rise tower with a 4-story low-rise residential building along the west side to provide an active-use buffer between the garage and Alexan Carlyle on the west side of Bartholomew Street. The tower is a simple but strong form, consisting of three rectangular solids of approximately equal height, with the middle volume slipped approximately 25 feet to the south. This geometry of stacked blocks is constrained to the north-south direction, resulting in flat sides facing east and west. The building skin expression along the east and west facades is dominated by a large-scale grid of dark frames in one- and two-story heights. These frames are infilled with inset glazing, metallic mullions and slab edges. This rhythm is broken by a central, recessed slot which runs down the center of the tower and is offset in the middle volume, reflecting the dramatic shift of the cantilevered center volumes. The slot runs vertically down the building on all four facades and then horizontally along the fifth (amenity) floor of the tower, which is the dividing line between the building base and high-rise portions.

The tower and the liner units together provide a total of 368 units (tower: 360 units; low-rise component: 8 units) with approximately 100,000 square feet of parking garage space. The proposed building would reach a total height of approximately 359 feet above average finished grade to the top of the roof.

The total amount of open space proposed with this first phase of development is approximately 3 acres. This includes both permanent and interim open spaces that are either private or publicly accessible. The private open space consists of the amenity terraces on the 16<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> floors of the South Residential Tower and the pool deck on top of the parking garage. These spaces are planned for use exclusively by the South Residential Tower's residents. The publicly accessible open space includes the remaining area on top of the garage, the terraced deck between the garage and Alexandria Renew, and the interim open space located on-grade to the north which is planned for the future phases of development within Carlyle Plaza Two. The design of both the private and public spaces will continue to be refined through coordination with Staff during the Final Site Plan review process.

#### **IV. STAFF ANALYSIS**

As described above, the applicant has made a number of changes to the design of the previously approved South Residential Tower. However, Staff believes that the current submission successfully reflects the Board's comments in regard to these changes, and that the design satisfies the intent of the Carlyle Plaza Two Design Guidelines. While Staff recommends the DRB's approval, it also offers the following analysis of the remaining issues for the Board's consideration:

##### **Low-Rise Liner Units**

The applicant's request for approval does not include the architectural design of the low-rise liner units along Bartholomew Street. As previously noted, the applicant is currently re-engineering the building structure and intends to submit the liner unit architecture to the Board as a separate package. Therefore, the DRB's Condition #2, which requires a setback depth of 12 inches to 16 inches between the liner units' front and back planes, will be addressed with a separate DRB submission focused on the architectural design of the liner units. Further detail on the scrim which acts as interim screening of the parking garage on the north and east elevations will also be reviewed at that time.

Staff understands the applicant's desire to proceed with the review process of the South Residential Tower and supports this direction as the Tower's design has evolved to a point where DRB approval is recommended and will not be affected by the re-engineering of the low-rise unit structure. Staff recommends that the applicant provide the first full submission for the design of this building for review by the Board at a scheduled DRB meeting within 6 months of the DRB's approval of the South Residential Tower and associated site improvements.

##### **Residential Floor Area**

The Allowable Gross Floor Area (AGFA) anticipated for the South Residential Tower and low-rise liner units combined was estimated at 333,163 square feet at the time of City Council approval of the project's Development Special Use Permit (DSUP) in 2012. With this approval, City Council granted the Board authority to review and approve the final design of the buildings, including the height and floor area, within the Carlyle Plaza Two as a condition of the project's DSUP. The current application proposes an AGFA of 357,361 square feet, which is an increase of 24,198 square feet. Subsequently, the applicant seeks the DRB's formal approval of an increase in the residential floor area to be developed with Phase 1 of Carlyle Plaza Two.

The increase in residential floor area in Phase 1 of the development has no visible effect on the building and site design that has been reviewed over the last year. Approval of this increase is a procedural requirement to allow the project to advance as it is currently designed. However, the increase in floor area within this phase will result in less residential floor area available for development in future phases of Carlyle Plaza Two.

## **South Residential Tower Design**

### *Facade Materials*

The applicant proposes a simple palette of building materials consisting of metal panel and vision glass organized in a strong grid pattern and a series of vertical recessed slots on each façade. Staff finds the proposed composition of materials complements the rhythm of the façade's patterning through the use of coordinated shades of gray metal paneling and two tones of vision glass.

As indicated on the building elevation drawings, the darkest shade of metal panel, "Charcoal" (MP-1.1), defines the grid, the perimeter of the three distinct building volumes, and the edges of the vertical recessed slot on all four facades. In contrast, the lightest color, "Silversmith" (MP-1.2), defines the horizontal floors of the north and south facades and the horizontal floors between the double-height glazing on the east and west facades. Finally, the proposed medium shade of gray, "Silverstorm" (MP-1.3), is used to define the horizontal floors within the vertical recessed slots.

Although Staff finds the arrangement of the metal paneling indicated on the building elevations to be successfully executed, the renderings on the 9<sup>th</sup> page of the current submission (titled "Renderings") appear to misrepresent the "Silverstorm" color as a much lighter shade than the material sample. It is Staff's recommendation that the medium shade, "Silverstorm" (MP-1.3), as represented in the building elevations and material samples, be implemented as the horizontal floor coverings within the slots to emphasize the slot's vertical expression and continuity with the darker glass.

The applicant also proposes two tones of vision glass on the building facades. The majority of all four facades will consist of clear vision glass, represented on the drawings as "Clearsubstrate" (GL-1.1), while the recessed vertical slots will consist of a gray-toned vision glass, "Solargray" (GL-1.2). The glazing is framed, as described above, by the metal paneling which wraps both the mullions and slab edges creating a rhythm of single and double-height glazing that cascades across the east and west building facades. On the north and south facades, only the perimeter of the three distinct volumes and the slot are framed with metal panel, while the clear vision glass is expressed seamlessly adjacent to the "Solargray" tone which follows the vertical expression of the building columns. Additionally, the current balcony design offers complete privacy without the use of a divider or screen, which preserves the purity of the north and south facades.

Overall, Staff finds the two tones of vision glass complement the proposed metal paneling and together create a successful composition of building materials. Further, the continuation of these materials to the Tower's base carries this expression to the street level and highlights the Tower's main entrance on Bartholomew Street.

### *Façade Setbacks*

The proposed design maintains a 12-inch deep inset from the mullions to the glazing of the vertical slot on all four facades of the South Tower, which effectively accentuate the slot's significance within the overall design. In regard to the single and double-height

glazing, the applicant offers two options: 1) a 4-inch deep inset at the single-height glazing and an 8-inch deep inset at the double-height glazing and, 2) a 4-inch deep inset at both the single and double-height glazing.

While the difference between the two options may appear to be negligible in the images on the 9<sup>th</sup> page of the submission, titled “Renderings,” Staff offers strong support for the option with the 4-inch and 8-inch deep insets as described above. First, Staff believes that the renderings on page 9 do not accurately represent the depth of the 8-inch recess, and that this depth will read more strongly in actuality, especially when viewed over the entire façade of the building and not just a portion of it as shown in the rendering. Secondly, Staff finds this option meets the intent of the original design which was approved with 4”/8”/12” deep insets at the glazing. Therefore, Staff recommends that the DRB’s approval of the South Tower design specifically includes implementation of a 4-inch deep inset at the single-height glazing, an 8-inch deep inset at the double-height glazing, and a 12-inch deep inset at the vertical slots.

#### *Diagonal Column Colors*

The diagonally sloped columns were introduced to the DRB in March 2017 as a method to support the Tower’s 25-foot cantilevers in the north and south directions. Staff and the DRB expressed concern at that time for the visual effect of these columns as seen through the glass facades and their impact on the corner living rooms.

The applicant has continued to work with Staff to incorporate the DRB comments and reduce the visual impact of these sloped columns on the overall appearance of the facades. The current submission includes a scaled shadow-box study which replicates a daylit room with the proposed clear vision glass receiving direct sunlight. Within each box is a sloped column which represents the size and location of the columns as they would be viewed through the Tower’s glass façade. The applicant then offers a comparison of the columns behind the glass painted either white or gray.

Staff believes that both the white and gray colored columns are comparable solutions which successfully minimize the visual impacts of these diagonal columns on the building facade. The applicant may choose to refine either the white or gray color to achieve a shade that most greatly obscures the visibility of the columns, and can continue to work with staff through final resolution of this issue.

#### *Cantilever Soffit Materials*

Another distinctive feature of the South Residential Tower is a cantilevered shift in building mass at the mid-section of the tower. This device is best seen in the east/west elevations and creates dramatic terraced spaces as a resident amenity. As indicated on the paged titled “Cantilever Soffits 15<sup>th</sup> & 25<sup>th</sup> Floor RCPS,” the edges of the soffits are defined by a 2-foot wide band of “Charcoal” (MP-1.1) metal panel. This band follows the outer edge of the cantilever and returns to the building face to align with the edges of the vertical slot. The area inside of this band consists of “Silverstorm” (MP-1.3) metal panel arranged in a stacked rectangular grid which is interrupted where the joints of the metal panel express alignment with the north and south facing building columns.



The “Charcoal” and “Silverstorm” metal panel used as the soffit materials is an effective approach consistent with the materials and geometric patterning of the Tower’s facades. Accentuation of the slot with the dark gray 2-foot band is a successful gesture that reinforces the importance of the slot’s distinction from the grid as read from below and on the building facades. Staff recommends that the applicant continue to further develop this design with a joint pattern that also expresses the east and west facing building columns and to also incorporate lighting that complements the proposed pattern and materials.

### **The Limerick Street Underpass**

The covered entrance bay at Limerick Street is more than three levels high, with the ends of the parking decks on the north side exposed. It spans Limerick Street between Bartholomew Street and Holland Lane, offering a publicly accessible connection between these two streets beneath the terraced amenity deck. The previous concept for the design of this underpass proposed a suspended ceiling feature in a grid pattern of varying depths and minimal screening of the parking garage levels. The Board noted the unique design challenge that this underpass presents and suggested that the applicant study a simplified ceiling design and alternatives to creatively screen the exposed parking decks according to the Carlyle Plaza Two Design Guidelines.

The current design proposes a smooth, simplified ceiling and a series of vertical “fins” which begin at finished grade and continue up the full height of the exposed parking decks on the north side of Limerick Street. On the west façade of the underpass, facing Bartholomew Street, the applicant proposes to use the same metal screening system that is installed on the AlexRenew parking garage located to the south. At the approximate mid-point of this facade, the screen angles away from the vertical structure of the garage, creating a pocket for plant material.

Staff believes the current design of the underpass is a significant improvement from the previous concept. The applicant incorporated the DRB’s comments to achieve a design which screens the parking garage and meets the goals of the Carlyle Plaza Two Design Guidelines to ensure a welcoming, inviting entry and memorable experience. The “fins” also act as a sculptural element that creates a sense of movement to draw visitors through the extension between Bartholomew Street and Holland Lane, and a unified composition with the existing features on the AlexRenew site is provided. However, the lighting design is not incorporated with current submission; therefore, Staff recommends that the applicant continue to coordinate with Staff to ensure a creative lighting design that will heighten the experience through the underpass.

### **The Bartholomew Street Streetscape**

The South Residential Tower and low-rise liner units have primary frontage on Bartholomew Street, with the main pedestrian entrances to the Tower and the liner units accessed from its eastern sidewalk. The majority of materials proposed within this streetscape are consistent with the Carlyle Plaza Two and Eisenhower East Design Guidelines with a few exceptions.

The applicant continues to propose a series of eight square tree wells with metal grate coverings near the South Tower's main entrance. At the DRB work session in November 2017, the Board recommended the applicant work with Staff to study an option where metal grates cover only the four tree wells located immediately adjacent to the entrance stone paving in order to emphasize the main entry to the South Residential Tower. As a result, the remaining tree wells adjacent to the curb would be sized and planted consistent with the Design Guidelines.

Secondly, the applicant proposes a wide band of stone paving which connects the Tower's main entrance to the back of the curb on Bartholomew Street. While Staff believes this is a successful gesture, the finish of the proposed stone is problematic for exterior use. The proposed stone is a Virginia Mist granite with a honed finish. While Staff has no objections to the type and color of stone, the honed finish is smooth to the touch and is not recommended for exterior walking surfaces. Staff recommends use of the same stone with a flamed or thermal finish to provide traction suitable for exterior conditions.

## **V. ANALYSIS NARRATIVE**

Staff believes that the current design of the South Residential Tower and site improvements has satisfied the Board's comments and meets the intentions of the Carlyle Plaza Two Design Guidelines. It is recommended that the applicant continue to work with Staff to further refine the below listed items through the Final Site Plan approval process:


1. Provide the first full submission for the design of the low-rise liner units for review by the Board at a scheduled DRB meeting within 6 months of the DRB's approval of the South Residential Tower and associated site improvements.
2. For the design of the South Residential Tower, Staff recommends that the applicant coordinate with Staff to address the following:
  - a. Utilize the medium gray metal panel, "Silverstorm" (MP-1.3), at horizontal floor coverings within the recessed vertical slots as represented in the building elevations.
  - b. Provide a 4-inch deep inset at the single-height glazing, an 8-inch deep inset at the double-height glazing, and a 12-inch deep inset at the vertical slots.
  - c. Refine either the gray or white paint shade to achieve the best possible hue that most successfully obscures the visibility of the diagonal columns as viewed through the glass facades.
  - d. Continue to develop the design of cantilever soffits with a joint pattern that also expresses the east and west facing building columns and to also incorporate lighting that complements the proposed pattern and materials.
3. Incorporate a creative lighting design that will heighten the experience through the Limerick Street Underpass.

4. For the design of the open space and site improvements, Staff recommends that the applicant coordinate with Staff to address the following:
  - a. Refine the design of the private amenity spaces, public amenity terrace, and streetscapes including the quantity and arrangement of the square tree wells with metal grate covers on Bartholomew Street.
  - b. Revise the proposed finish of the streetscape stone paving on Bartholomew Street to provide traction suitable for exterior conditions.

## **VI. CONCLUSION**

Staff recommends that the DRB **approve** the architectural design for the Carlyle Plaza Two South Residential Tower and associated site improvements with refinement of the items noted in the Staff Analysis and Analysis Narrative with the Final Site Plan approval process. Staff also recommends that the DRB **approve** of the total residential floor area to be developed with this first phase of the Carlyle Plaza Two development.

# Eisenhower East / Carlyle Blocks



# City of Alexandria, Virginia

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: NOVEMBER 9, 2017

TO: MEMBERS OF THE CARLYLE/EISENHOWER EAST DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB)

FROM: ROB KERNS; DIVISION CHIEF, PLANNING AND ZONING

SUBJECT: CARLYLE PLAZA II – SOUTH RESIDENTIAL TOWER NOVEMBER DRB SUBMISSION

---

The applicant of the Carlyle Plaza II –South Residential Tower made a submission to the DRB on October 17, 2017 for review by the Board at the November 16, 2017 DRB meeting. The submission is confined to illustrative graphics which describe the landscape design intent for the public and private open spaces.

City staff recommends that the DRB review the submitted materials as a work session or discussion as the applicant’s design team has stated that they continue to work through the structural engineering and cost considerations of the project. These considerations may result in changes to the landscape, particularly of the upper terraces, and would then necessitate reconsideration by the DRB if an action is taken. Additionally, we have reviewed the playground area with our internal ADA and playground safety staff, and find that there are significant concerns with its layout, equipment, and access and do not believe that this area is ready for design consideration at this time. Staff offers the following comments in consideration of this submission as points of discussion for the work session:

- The Bartholomew Streetscape:
  - The streetscape paving materials should reflect the City’s standard concrete/brick hybrid detail.
    - Staff believes the use of stone paving at the main lobby is a successful design gesture to emphasize the entrance. This material may be allowed upon review by T&ES and with a maintenance agreement.

- As stated in the Carlyle Plaza South Design Guidelines, the street tree wells should be sized according to the Eisenhower East Design Guidelines.
    - Accordingly, tree grates are not supported on non-retail streetscapes.
  - The overhang at the lobby entrance should be shown to indicate its relationship to the streetscape elements.
  - Provide the size, scale, and overall design intent of the public art piece.
- 5<sup>th</sup> Floor Terrace and Low Rise Building Roof:
    - The program of the “Front Porch” is not communicated and requires further study.
    - Staff encourages the applicant to refine the paving material palette. The “Pool Terrace Paving” exhibit shows a continuous material throughout the entire terrace, while other plan sheets show varying colors and patterns of materials. The materials selected should be high-quality materials with slip resistance around the pool terrace, and stain resistance on the amenity terrace near the grill and dining areas.
  - 16<sup>th</sup>/26<sup>th</sup> Floor Terraces:
    - Given the limited size of the rooftop terraces, the applicant should enhance the indoor/outdoor relationship between the “Amenity Rooms” and the “Common Terraces” through the use of coordinated materials and furnishings.
    - The 4 foot railing to match the parapet and 6 foot high perforated metal screen wall do not offer sufficient privacy to the “Private Terraces.” Staff encourages the applicant to study alternatives to provide a more significant physical barrier between the public and private spaces.
    - The program of the “Common Terraces” should maximize view sheds and draw users to these points to take advantage views.
  - Elevated Park Playground:
    - As previously stated, Staff has significant concerns with the layout, equipment, and access within the play area, especially for disabled users. Condition #24 of the approved Development Special Use Permit provides specific guidelines for the play area design and lists regulatory guidelines that must be met. Staff suggests that the applicant revise the design of the play area to meet the requirements of this condition and the associated guidelines.

For future DRB submissions and reviews, City staff believes that it is important to focus on the primary architecture and conditions of approval first, prior to completing the landscape review. A number of architectural items are yet to be addressed by the applicant, including: 1) Staff’s direction to the applicant in the September DRB staff

report, 2) the DRB's comments at the September meeting, and 3) two of the DRB's conditions that were enacted with the July 2016 approval. The following list summarizes these items:

**1) Staff's direction in the September 2017 staff report, which the Board agreed:**

- *Utilize vision glass as presented in approved renderings, except for the portion concealing penthouse mechanical spaces.*
- *Staff continues to have concerns that the East/West slots are not sufficiently visually distinct from the surrounding architecture.*
- *Adjust balconies or units to eliminate privacy conflicts and the use of physical barriers within balconies.*
- *Resolve privacy issues between public and private terraces on 16th and 26th floors. Provide details requested (see above).*
- ~~*Return pilotis design to the approved version incorporating circular columns with consistent spacing.*~~ (Item resolved at September meeting)
- *Provide architectural lighting in the garage and provide visual barriers where the parking levels overlook the street.*
- *Identify the soffit material, patterning and any lighting used beneath the 16th and 26th floor projections.*
- *Provide a timeline for use of the "future staging area," describe and show screening provided.*
- *Show the overhangs of the building that create the "front porch" at the pool level in plan view by using a dotted line or other graphic convention.*

**2) The DRB's action at this meeting in September:**

*The DRB voted unanimously to **approve** the design of the pilotis (change from approved round to rectangular and different spacing) at the base of the east and south facades adjacent to the pool terrace. The Board agreed with Staff's recommendation to continue further design development of other design details as outlined in the staff report. The Board favored clear vision glass throughout the façade and was concerned that other techniques to cover the vertical and diagonal columns would disrupt the façade design. Balcony design overall is ongoing and the applicant will continue to work through details. Staff was concerned with balcony privacy conflicts on the south façade and between private and public areas on the two sky terraces. The Board noted the unique design challenge and opportunity of the garage entrance at Limerick Street and suggested further study regarding illumination and ceiling design, as well as measures to screen the high section of exposed garage along the north edge of the drive. The applicant will present architectural and landscape material selections at the next meeting.*

**3) The DRB stipulated conditions with the original approval in July of 2016:**

*"2. Provide more setback depth between front and back planes for low-rise units (between 12-16" total difference)."*

*“3. Applicant will work to minimize visibility of the mullions to reduce contrast between metal and glass.”*

Given that the content in the current submission does not include architectural information and subsequently does not address Staff’s comments and the DRB’s comments and conditions of approval, Staff recommends that the meeting on November 16, 2017 in regard to this application be held as a work session to discuss the landscape elements with no formal staff report or action by the Board.