# Carlyle/Eisenhower East Design Review Board July 17, 2007

**REQUEST:** Final design approval of materials and finishes for a 5-story residential

building with below-grade parking.

**LOCATION:** 310 Hooffs Run Drive (Block 27)

**APPLICANT:** Carlyle Centre, LLC, by Sean Caldwell of Trammell Crow Residential

**STAFF:** Thomas Canfield, City Architect, Planning & Zoning

Natalie Sun, Urban Planner, Planning & Zoning

**BOARD ACTION:** On a motion by Mr. Quill, seconded by Mr. Lewis, the Carlyle Design Review Board voted to <u>approve</u> the final design of the materials and finishes for the building, subject to compliance with all applicable codes, ordinances, and staff recommendations, including amendments to conditions #3 and #11. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

## I. REQUEST

Carlyle Centre, LLC has requested final DRB approval of the proposed materials and finishes for Carlyle Centre, a new five-story residential building at 310 Hooffs Run Drive. The DRB conditionally approved the concept design at the September 27, 2006 hearing and subsequently granted concept design approval after reviewing a revised submission (dated November 10, 2006) reflecting recommendations made by the Board and staff at the September 27, 2006 hearing.

#### II. PROJECT FACTS AND FIGURES

# Project Location:

The proposed residential building will be located on a 1.84-acre site in the Eisenhower East Small Area currently housing a self-storage facility. The proposed mixed-use office/retail Block P complex and South Carlyle Square are to the north; the Virginia Concrete facility to the east; a rental car storage lot to the south; and the planned Eisenhower Park to the west.

# Project Details:

The proposed project consists of a five-story residential wood-frame building on top of 1.5 levels of underground parking. The 300,000 SF development with 280 units (151 d.u./ac) stands at approximately 67 ft high. Although a single multifamily building, the building is stylistically broken down into three subunits – referred to in this report as Buildings A, B and C – each with a unique character. Fronting on both South Carlyle Square and the Meadow, Building A is conceived of as a traditional urban apartment building, with a one-story rusticated base of red brick with cast stone accents. Building B is demarcated by a round drum and constructed of salmon-colored brick, a

simple base, and multi-story window groupings. Building C is an Art Deco style building that recalls warehouses of the 1920s and 30s.

#### III. STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicant has continued to refine the design of the building to reflect the drawings dated November 10, 2006, which were approved by the Carlyle/Eisenhower East DRB. The current submission substantially reflects the approved design, and staff would like to call attention to a few areas that need revision or refinement.

# **General**

As specified in the EESAPDG, building materials should be of high quality. Staff has suggested to the applicant that less visible areas within the courtyard be studied for cost savings and opt for better quality materials fronting on the street – particularly windows, doors, and canopies on Buildings A and B. A variety of different styles and colors of windows and doors should be selected, reflecting the different characters of the building subunits. The mullions in the proposed vinyl window are between the glass and do not provide the articulation characteristic of a high quality façade. Different styles and colors of windows, with muntin divisions visible on the exterior, should be chosen, with patterns unique to each of the three building subunits. Staff is encouraging that a combination of metal and glass be used for the entrance canopies on Buildings A and B.

## **Building A**

Staff has expressed concerns about the visibility of the sloped asphalt roof on Building A and has encouraged the applicant to restudy the roof to ensure that the asphalt shingles will not be visible from the street level on adjacent public right of ways or other nearby publicly accessible spaces. Staff believes that the applicant has successfully resolved this issue and has reduced the area covered with asphalt by incorporating a balustrade at the top of the building, framing the mechanical equipment.

In the building base, staff suggests incorporating different mortar colors for a stronger, rusticated impression.

Additional information is needed to adequately assess the entrance canopy design on Building A. Staff has requested that ground-level views of the canopy be provided for further study.

The proposed red brick planter wall in the publicly accessible area on the east side of Building A visually seems to merge with the building facade and the sidewalk. Staff is suggesting that a different color/material be studied, such as precast or accent brick, with a material that complements but contrasts with the adjoining building and sidewalk.

## **Building B**

In the current design, the façade of this building subunit lacks variation. Staff is recommending that the applicant incorporate dark metal panels on the building bays with matching windows, for a richer more articulated façade.

## **Building C**

On Building C, the typical fenestration should consist of nine-panel window openings, as depicted in the approved plans dated November 10, 2006 (this would mean adding an additional horizontal muntin) to recreate the gridded effect of typical warehouse windows. Staff is suggesting that a different type of window be selected for the warehouse-style Building C, such as a casement or awning window that is compatible with this type of architecture.

The glossy painted metal door for the loading dock does not fit within the character of the south façade. A matte, charcoal grey finish would be more appropriate and match the adjacent garage doors, as shown in the approved plans dated November 10, 2006.

The hyphen between Buildings B and C should be clad in painted metal panels, in a dark accent color, as depicted in the approved plans dated November 10, 2006.

Table 1 details consistencies and conflicts with the applicable guidelines. Staff notes that there are a few inconsistencies, most of which have been approved by City Council and the DRB.

Table 1. Compliance with Eisenhower East Small Area Plan Design Guidelines

|                | REQUIRED   | PROVIDED  | COMPLY?         |
|----------------|--|---|-----------------|
| Land Use       | Residential 73,300 SF development area   | Residential<br>80,512 SF development area   | No <sup>1</sup> |
| Density        | 350,000 SF   | 297,395 SF (as depicted in FSP#1)<br>280 DU   | Yes             |
| Height         | 4-8 Stories  | 5 Stories, approx 61' high  | Yes             |
| Open Space     | 28,200 SF for South Carlyle Square   | 18,833 SF for South Carlyle Square  | No <sup>1</sup> |
| Parking        | Underground  | Underground – 1.5 levels  | Yes             |
| Infrastructure | Construction of portion of Park<br>Drive   | Interim plan shows lay-by for portion of Park Drive to immediate west of project, linked to existing Hooffs Run Drive | Yes             |
| Pedestrian     | Pedestrian amenities   | Sidewalks with street trees,<br>benches, trash receptacles and bike<br>racks shown                                    | Yes             |
|                | Protrusions must be 15 feet above sidewalk elevation and no larger than 4' by 12'. | Bay windows have been eliminated.   | Yes             |
|                | Curb cuts located on "C" Streets with active use depth of 50' on "B" street        | Garage entrance and loading dock on "C" and active uses on "B"  | Yes             |

|                                    | REQUIRED   | PROVIDED  | COMPLY?         |
|------------------------------------|--|---|-----------------|
| Building Design,<br>Mass and Scale | Articulated base, middle and top of buildings  | Articulated base, middle and top of buildings   | Yes             |
|                                    | Architectural feature (100' max) at axis termination of John Carlyle Street                              | 71' tall circular tower element provided  | Yes             |
|                                    | 7-10' building setbacks at 40-60' building height; 5-10' setback at 40-60' building height on "C" street | No building setbacks  | No <sup>2</sup> |
|                                    | Architecturally significant facades on "A" streets   | "A" street facades and "B" and "C" street facades are distinguished. One significant building break | Yes             |
|                                    | Highest level of design excellence and materials   | Brick and precast with vinyl windows and doors, hardipanel, FRP, fypon, and asphalt shingles        | No              |
|                                    | Two complete building breaks within parcel   | One complete break leading into a ground-level internal courtyard                                   | No <sup>1</sup> |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Approved by City Council on December 16, 2006.

#### IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Board **approve** the final design for this building as depicted by the applicant, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The applicant shall submit a larger base study to evaluate the rustication and treatment for the base of each building.
- 2. The windows shall have expressed mullions for all windows visible from the public right-of-way and/or a public street. A sample for each window and door type shall be approved by the Director of P&Z.
- 3. The return of each bay shall be the same masonry material as the adjoining primary façade.
- 4. Dryer/bathroom vents shall be located in a coordinated manner and painted to match the adjoining color of the building.
- 5. The applicant shall provide a material mock-up on-site prior to selection of materials.
- 6. On Building A, a different mortar color shall be incorporated in the building base.
- 7. Ground-level views of the Building A entrance canopy shall be provided. Staff recommends restudy by the Board of the entrance canopies and signage.
- 8. The applicant shall provide a sample for the proposed metal railings for Building A for approval by the Director of P&Z.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Approved by the Carlyle/Eisenhower East Design Review Board on September 27, 2006.

- 9. On Building B, dark metal panels with matching windows shall be incorporated.
- 10. For Building B, the metal panels shall be revised to provide more articulation.
- 11. If authorized by the encroachment ordinance, the piers at the Building C entrance canopy may project to the east no further than the stoops on the adjacent Building B. If not so authorized, these piers shall be moved back to be flush with the adjacent piers.
- 12. The glass and metal hyphen on Bartholomew Street shall be revised to be floor-to-ceiling windows.
- 13. For Building C, the mortar color shall be the same color for the main body of the building as the adjoining brick.