

The Beauregard Design Advisory Committee (BDAC)

February 18, 2014

7:00pm to 9:00pm

Jerome "Buddie" Ford Nature Center

Committee Members in Attendance:

Gus Ardura
Pete Benavage
Abed Benzina
Don Buch
Matt Clark
Carolyn Griglione
Donna Fossum
Mark Ramirez
Shawn Glerum

Absent:

None

Community:

Stephanie Booth
Danny Blum
Elizabeth Wright
Annabelle Fisher
James E. Brown
Judy Cooper
Anja Publicouer
Paul Smedberg
Kimberly Wright
David Newbacher
Mary Ann Mahoney
Whit Huffman
Sharon Annear

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting began at 7:00 p.m. A quorum for the meeting was established.

DISCUSSION

- Ms. Fossum makes motion to nominate Mr. Benavage as Chairperson.
- Mr. Buch asks what the purpose of the Chair is, as opposed to staff.
- Ms. Fossum responds that the chair should run the meeting and conduct business.
- Mr. Clark seconds the motion.
- By vote of 5-2, Mr. Benavage is elected chair.

City Staff:

Jeff Farner, Deputy Director, P&Z
Rob Kerns, Division Chief, P&Z
Patricia Esher, Principal Planner, P&Z
Richard Lawrence, Urban Planner, P&Z
Amy Friedlander, Urban Planner, P&Z

Applicant Representatives:

Michael Eastwood, Home Properties
Cathy Puskar, Walsh Colucci
Chris Harvey, Hord Coplan Macht
Chris Schein, Hord Coplan Macht

Agenda Items

1. Review and Approval of Draft
December 17, 2013 Meeting Minutes
2. Applicant Introduction of DSUP2013-
0026: Seminary Overlook Concept II
3. Old Business
4. New Business - Next Steps

- Mr. Benavage gives remarks (attached).
- Minutes from January 23, 2013 meeting approved, with one change by Ms. Fossum.
- Ms. Puskar gave an overview of the goals of the meeting and the purpose of the design guidelines established in Beauregard and how they are implemented in the project. The intention of the guidelines is to create distinctive architecture in a contemporary vernacular, and that is what the applicant team is attempting to accomplish.

Seminary Overlook Review

- Mr. Buch asked Ms. Puskar to elaborate on where the design of the project gets approved in the process. Ms. Puskar responded that the design is decided at City Council, as it is with all projects. The goal of the advisory committees is to review the project as it moves forward with a representative group of citizens, and while there will always be differences in opinion, at the end of the day the decision remains with City Council.
- Ms. Puskar continued with a summary of the changes made to the design since the previous meeting and responded to several concerns raised at that meeting by BDAC members. Ms. Puskar said that Ms. Griglione’s concern about the nature of the open space and private open spaces would be addressed starting tonight as they have progressed the design to start answering those questions and the team would bring an exhibit of access to Hammond school next meeting. Ms. Puskar continued to address Mr. Buch’s concern about architectural styles and preferences and said that the explanation of the architecture would be more clear. Ms. Puskar also mentioned that the transition to Parkside condominiums was reconsidered and that heights had been reduced on the “legs” of the building.
- Ms. Griglione expressed concern about the tree canopy related design guidelines and whether they were being adequately addressed. Ms. Puskar responded that they are prepared to comply with the conditions and the design standards.

Architecture Review

- Mr. Harvey began with an overview of the changes made in the design of the buildings since the last meeting. Introduced a diagram to show the different skins and facades on each building.
 Landbay A – tower element at new Kenmore and Seminary improved, scale elements: brick, bays, activity court space between buildings, garage completely wrapped with residential units.
 Landbay B – Pushed building arm to Van Dorn St, made it more of a signature element, added detail to entry court, garage is completely buried, added more stepdown to Parkside and took off units, will include an open space buffer as well.
 Diagram – strategy to break down longer facades. Deep brick, inspiration from Old Town perhaps, with a rhythm of punched openings, bookend features. Variety of openings with a unique ground plan including stoops and scale devices. Breaks 5 story building into base, middle, top.
 Façade Type A – tower element with articulation, balconies pulled into buildings to make them semi-private. Red color in drawings indicates brick, tan is “Nichiha” material or cementitious/hardipanel, exploring metal for bays, as well as introduction of colors, scale, size of materials for rest of the building. Showed old view of design, described new

articulations, addition of glass and vertical elements. Pedestrian bridge will add more verticality and be lit at night, intended to be more playful with glass windows and Nichiha or metal panels.

Façade type B – more plane of brick, precedent in the neighborhood. Longer elements including bays, balconies, canopies at the top, create a layering effect. Moved the entry out to the corner so you see it when you turn the corner.

Façade Type C – Parkside façade, took off units, keeping row of trees there. Creating a 3 story building adjacent to 2 story Parkside.

Façade Type D – Inner Courts, looking at lighter colors so that the light bounces around, 2 story masonry base.

Open Space Review

- Mr. Schein began with an overview of the landscape concepts. Public streetscape and storm water – complete streets, parallel parking, foundation plantings along buildings, curb to building distance is 25' compared to Old Town's 14'. Precedent images to show how streets are traditional but have to treat more water, tree planting boxes are modified to contain more water while still allowing access from parallel parked cars.
- Ms. Fossum asked about bike access, Ms. Puskar responded that bike access is along the trail, though they are allowed on sidewalks per City ordinance.
- Entry Court A – responding to Mr. Benzina's comment, moved entry and added another formal entry on the garage building. Brick sidewalks intended to slow cars down for pedestrians, curbsless environment with special pavers. Ms. Puskar added that this is a private street and therefore they can use special paving, slight departure from design standards but it creates a special open area. Mr. Buch asked if there was parking on both sides, Mr. Schein responded that there's no parking along entry, but some parking beyond entrances.
- Entry Court B – Entry garden and plaza, street slopes downward to go under pedestrian bridge, with a traffic circle at end. Opportunity for landscaping in plaza garden, benches and seating, congregation area, pedestrian quality of streets.
- Central Green – fronted by new Kenmore and old Kenmore, roughly 1 acre in size, 150'x150'; gardens around perimeter, one separating park from street, other separates park from bike trail, wall contains space to perhaps make an amphitheater. Play area will be naturalistic and sculptural, separated from green and protected from road. Mr. Clark asked if stormwater would be treated in park and that it could be used as an educational element. Mr. Schein responded yes, but that the design is still in early stages. Ms. Fossum expressed concern about whether there would be dogs allowed in the apartments and if so, that there would need to be space for a dog park. Mr. Schein responded that dogs are something that they deal with on all projects, likely not as much pressure on this open space as ones they work on in DC because there are additional options in the area.
- Amenity Courtyard A – private spaces connected visually to public spaces, division of pool space and all-year recreational space as required by code, outdoor grill/eating areas.
- Amenity Courtyard B – smaller and narrower than A, but similarly fenced and gated because it has a pool with visual connections.

BDAC Comment

- Mr. Ramirez complimented the team for their work on the architecture and development of signature gateway elements, asked about the two corners not shown: Seminary Rd. and old Kenmore and the loading dock and garage entry on Landbay B. Mr. Harvey responded that the pedestrian sky bridge is at the loading dock and garage entry, so they didn't do a tower because the bridge is the feature.
- Ms. Griglione repeated the question about the nature of the building corner at old Kenmore and Seminary road. Asked about the design guideline that requires proposed off street trails to connect to existing trails where feasible and how the Seminary Overlook trail will connect to Hammond, other neighborhoods, Pickett St. She also asked about how the guidelines require that each neighborhood shall provide open space within a 5 minute walk and that existing community parks will be linked in an open space network. Ms. Puskar responded that the design guidelines are written for the entire Beauvergard Small Area Plan area, so the 5 minute walk is more relevant to other neighborhoods in Beauvergard. The neighborhood guidelines discuss a future ped/bike connection to be constructed by others to Hammond, but there is a large grade change. Currently it's not feasible, but perhaps in the future it might be, as well as a potential to connect at Street A. Ms. Griglione also asked about whether the plantings would be irrigated in case of drought. Mr. Schein responded that the plant palette has to tolerate both water and drought and it was unlikely that they would be irrigated.
- Mr. Buch said that the design seemed to be an improvement, but commented that he felt that there was too much glass on the corner elements. Mr. Buch asked if there was a constraint on building footprints – the footprints in the Small Area Plan look to be smaller than the proposed footprints. Ms. Puskar responded that they revised the blocks at City Council and increased the amount of central open space from 0.35 acres to about 1 acre.
- Mr. Benzina welcomed the opportunity for a variety of open space, hierarchy of spaces from public to private, and visually open private space. He suggested that the entry courts be renamed “mews,” also suggested he would like to see a ground floor plan superimposed with a landscape plan to understand where entrances, courtyards, doors, pedestrian entrances, stoops are relative to the open spaces. Mr. Benzina continued with comment on the architecture, overall goal to break down elements and said he'd like to see the team push the idea of creating a base/middle/top, perhaps creating a 3-story bay and making sure the architecture is a “good soldier.” Suggested that there's more opportunity for variety in material palette, but that overall the project was moving in the right direction.
- Mr. Ardura commended the team on breaking down the scale of the buildings and creating a sense of articulation. Mr. Ardura asked about what would happen along old Kenmore avenue regarding the phasing and streetscaping, if the western side of Kenmore would be enhanced. Ms. Puskar said that the team was not doing anything at this time, but the comment was noted.
- Ms. Fossum thanked the team for responding to the BDAC's comments, asked about impacts of the density to parking and parking spaces, though it is not part of the BDAC's purview. Ms. Puskar said that they would bring information next time. Ms. Fossum asked about light spillover from the uplighted elements and asked the team to bring material samples, to which Mr. Harvey agreed.

- Mr. Clark asked about whether you enter the building on Landbay A from new Kenmore. Mr. Harvey said that entry used to be internalized, was brought out so that there was a secondary entrance and that they would bring floorplans next time to look at it more closely.
- Mr. Glerum said while this was the first time he had seen the project, the old images for comparison were helpful to see changes and understand the increased level of richness. He mentioned that seeing materials will help the group understand the project.
- Mr. Benavage asked about snow removal impacts and where the team envisioned pedestrians walking as there's no retail required, Ms. Puskar responded that on the public streets will be plowed just like other public streets and that it was a request of Parkside condominiums that there be connectivity, particularly from Parkside to the library and shopping center.
- Mr. Benavage skipped agenda item #4 and opened the meeting for public comment.

Public Comment

- Ms. Fisher expressed concern about using brick on the facades, asked whether Kenmore would remain open to the public, and asked whether Home Properties owned the medical building across Seminary Rd. Ms. Puskar responded that Kenmore would remain open to the public, and said that WRIT owned the medical building and has since sold it.
- Mr. Blum expressed concern about the agenda and minutes not being up to date. Mr. Benavage responded that minutes are not approved until the following meeting and that this was the first time the group had seen the presentation as well, Ms. Puskar responded that the presentation evolves until the meeting date, but that the final presentation will be forwarded to staff to publish on the website. Mr. Farner responded that the agenda had been up for a week, notified associations adjacent to project. Ms. Fossum suggested that the draft presentation be called "background materials." Mr. Blum expressed concern about how parking spaces will be affected by stoops and trees, did not hear discussion about improvements to transit or bus stops. Mr. Blum expressed his appreciation for the new material palette and efforts to make a better stepdown to Parkside, asked about how utility poles and trees are integrated as lights coming off Home Properties today floods Parkside. Ms. Puskar asked if the fence along the property line was Parkside's or Home Properties', Mr. Blum responded that the fence is Parkside's, the trees are Home Properties'.
- Ms. Wright suggested having garden plots as an amenity for people living on the property. She echoed Mr. Blum's question about transit stops and light pollution. She asked if utilities would be undergrounded, Ms. Puskar responded they will be. Ms. Wright asked if these complete streets would not be large enough, particularly for bikes. Ms. Puskar responded that the public streets will have 12' drive lanes, parking, and sidewalks. The private streets will be narrower, but not intended for primary travel. She also responded that transit stops are not part of the group's purview, but that they are coordinating with City staff to address the issues.
- Ms. Annear asked how many levels the parking garages would be and whether the plants would survive street salt, Ms. Puskar responded that they would be 5 levels, below the

roof line. Mr. Schein responded that trees in streets in this area tend to be very salt tolerant, but that they would consider it.

- Mr. Benavage concluded the meeting, next meeting to be announced. Meeting adjourned at 9:00.

Attachment
Pete Benavage – Introductory Remarks

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I would like to present a few remarks to clarify this Committee's purpose, and the procedures I intend to follow in chairing these meetings.

First, the BDAC's mission is as is depicted on the mission statement slide before you. In layman's terms, our function is to review DSUP applications, as filed by developers and property owners within the Beauregard Small Area Plan, pursuant to the CDD's 21 and 22. That review has only one objective: to ensure that any such application is in compliance with the SAP and the applicable CDD, and also meets the City's approved urban design guidelines for both. There are some gray areas in those design guidelines, and within those areas, this committee can exercise its judgment in making final recommendations to City Council. But our writ is very narrow, and we will follow it.

Second – and let me be very clear about this point – the SAP and CDDs are for our purposes settled law. The SAP (City Ordinance #4765 of 16 June 2012) and the CDDs pursuant thereto are not to be re-opened for debate before this committee. Period.

Third, wherever possible, this committee's procedures are to be regulated by **Robert's Rules of Order (Revised)**, and governed by the applicable sections of the **Virginia Freedom of Information Act**. Now I recognize that we are not the U. S. House of Representatives, and therefore Robert's Rules can and will be adapted to our specific situation. But they are a standard, and an objective standard, to which we can all appeal.

Fourth, this committee faces a hard adjournment time because of the constraints of the facility staff, and the time required to place the rooms in order for tomorrow's activities. Therefore, our time for debate at any given meeting is restricted. These meetings are essentially working meetings for the committee members, open for public observation. As such, the priority for questions and debate will be given to the committee members. Whenever practicable, I will allocate time at the conclusion of the committee's deliberations for public comment. If the

committee's deliberations are protracted, they can be continued at the next meeting. In any event, written comments from the public and the committee members may be submitted for inclusion in the record, and consideration by the committee as a whole. With both written and oral comments, all are enjoined to keep them germane and succinct. I would also like to caution all concerned that we will not be continually rehashing what was discussed at a previous meeting for those who are newcomers, or who may have missed said previous meeting. Minutes, when approved, are published, as is a taped recording of each session. If someone misses a meeting, it will be incumbent on that individual to research what was said.

Fifth , I do not see this as an adversarial process, but rather a collaborative one, designed to seek consensus on the matching of each respective DSUP application to the appropriate urban design guidelines. As the plans and concepts for each application evolve, we will eventually have before us a package upon which we may vote to recommend or not to the City Council. There will be multiple meetings and discussions long before such a vote occurs. This will not be a precipitate action on the committee's part.

Finally, as I just said, I do not see these meetings as adversarial in nature. They are serious, to be sure, but there is no reason why we cannot introduce a little levity once in a while to avoid becoming too dry and self-important. But always, I expect respect for others, no matter how much we may have differing points of view. Simply put, let's use the basic good manners with which we were all raised. That way we can really accomplish something, and even have a bit of fun doing it.

Thank you for your patience.