

Beauregard Urban Design Advisory Committee (BDAC) - Meeting Minutes

February 26, 2018

6:30 pm

Goodwin House Auditorium
(4800 Fillmore Avenue)

Committee Members in Attendance:

Pete Benavage, Chair
Donna Fossum, Co-Chair
Abed Benzina
Carolyn Griglione
Fatimah Mateen
Blair Davenport

City Staff:

Tom Canfield, City Architect, P&Z
Maya Contreras, Principal Planner,
P&Z
Sara Brandt-Vorel, Urban Planner,
P&Z

Applicant Team:

Douglas Carter, DCS Architects
Steve Saff, DCS Architects
Anita Sircar, DCS Architects
Jasina Bijelic, DCS Architects
Jonathan Rak, McGuire Woods
Megan Rappolt, McGuire Woods
Chip Ranno, Clear Real Estate
Services
Tim Helming, Monday Properties
Nick Malpede, Monday Properties

Agenda Items:

1. Welcome & Introductions (5 Minutes)
2. Responsibilities (5 Minutes)
 - a. Review and Approval of Draft
October 23, 2017 Meeting Minutes
3. New Business:
 - a. Applicant Presentation of
DSUP#2017-00019 Monday
Properties for 2000 N. Beauregard
Street
 - i. Presentation by Applicant
(30 Minutes)
 - ii. BDAC Questions for
Applicant (40 Minutes)
4. Questions & Public Comments on DSUP
Application (20-30 Minutes)
5. Staff Update on Projects (10 Minutes)
 - a. The Urban School - 1701 N.
Beauregard Street
 - b. The Gateway at King and
Beauregard Street – 4600 King
Street
 - c. Greenhill Development
 - d. The Church of the Resurrection –
2280 N. Beauregard Street
 - e. Mark Center sales
 - f. Morgan Properties
6. Next Steps (5 Minutes)
 - a. Overview of Next Steps by Staff on
the Development Review Process
for DSP#2017-0019

Responsibilities:

The Committee unanimously approved the minutes from the October 23, 2017 meeting.

Welcome and Introductions:

Mr. Benavage commenced the meeting and provided an overview of the meeting agenda and procedures. Committee members introduced themselves to the audience and applicant team. Mr. Benavage provided a description of the Beauregard Design Advisory Committee's responsibility to review plans in light of the Beauregard Small Area Plan and the Urban Design Guidelines.

New Business:

Applicant Presentation of DSUP#2018- 0006: Monday Properties 2000 N. Beauregard Street

Mr. Rak, attorney representing Monday Properties began by stating the applicant's appreciation to meet with the Committee. Mr. Rak iterated that the applicant team held a community meeting last week and they look forward to continuing to work with the community. Mr. Rak introduced members of the team.

Mr. Malpede, of Monday Properties provided an overview of Monday Properties history and experience both nationally and within the region, and a brief overview of the recent capital improvements Monday Properties has made on the remaining properties in the Adams neighborhood.

Mr. Carter, architect with Davis, Carter, Scott provided an overview of DCS's history and experience in the region and introduced the design team working on the Monday Properties project. Mr. Carter iterated the goal of presenting the project to the committee and community and listening for feedback.

Mr. Carter began with a description of the site within the Adams Neighborhood and the project focus on parcel 2000, the easternmost parcel within the neighborhood. The project goal is to create a quality piece of architecture and the team has been working with the City to ensure a high-quality design and materials. Mr. Carter stated the intent for the building to serve as a part of the urban fabric, emphasizing the curve of the site and site improvement such as sidewalks and plantings. Mr. Carter also provided a summary of the site design and key features, including the road alignment, amenity space, drop off areas and emergency vehicle easements.

Mr. Carter further summarized the building design, including:

- The floor plan which provides two separate building entrances;
- Overall building massing divided into two forms;
- An emphasis on creating a smaller feeling building as seen from the townhomes to the North;
- The garage design to provide easy access for residents;

- Green roof design;
- The use of landscaping and plantings to encourage the building to blend into the site;
- Requests for feedback on the possible garage screening, including an option for semi-reflective glass to high the garage, the use of a corridor with designs on the back wall where people could be seen walking inside the corridor.

Mr. Carter concluded his presentation by iterating some of the concerns he had heard voiced by the community, including:

- Noise from the proposed amenity space; and
- Impact of noise and lights from traffic entering the site to access the building and garage.

Mr. Carter stated the design team was willing to listen to the community and make revisions to the plans to address concerns, such as installing a barrier to alleviate the potential noise and lights from vehicular traffic.

Committee Discussion:

Ms. Fossum requested additional information on unit sizes, parking and additional storage. Mr. Carter responded that two bedroom units were approximately 1,100 SF, one bedroom units were approximately 700-750 SF and studios were approximately 500-600 SF. All units were slightly larger than existing market units and would contain a washer and dryer. Parking would be assigned and correlate to the resident's floor and additional storage would be available in the garage.

Mr. Benzina inquired what approvals would be required as part of the approval. Ms. Contreras responded that an amendment would be required for the use and that staff was working with the applicant to review the proposal within the goals of the small area plan. However, since the publication of the plan, which envisioned neighborhood-wide redevelopment at once, the market realities have changed, and the previously approved office and hotel uses were not supported by current market conditions. Ms. Contreras acknowledged that adjacent neighbors were concerned with the location of the proposed parallel road and that staff had asked the applicant to provide a traffic study to support more informed decision-making regarding the location of the road.

Mr. Benzina expressed his support for a residential use at the location and considered the building height appropriate for its location adjacent to the future ellipse. Mr. Benzina stated that should the garage be aboveground, the cost savings need to be directed into the building façade materials. Mr. Benzina stated the scale of the shorter clubhouse to that of the taller, primary building was of concern and Mr. Benzina wanted additional exploration of how the two buildings would related to each other and how the clubhouse may relate to future development.

Ms. Contreras provided background from the Beaugard Small Area Plan, reminding the group that the small area plan called for an Ellipse at the intersection of Beaugard and Seminary and would be constructed after 2.4 million square feet of new development, which would be a long ways off. Ms. Contreras confirmed that the proposed building would not preclude the forthcoming Ellipse or the West End Transitway. Ms. Contreras also iterated that the existing intersection of N. Beaugard Street and Mark Center Drive would remain but with some upgrades.

Ms. Griglione asked how the pool design could be integrated into the site to support safe pedestrian crossing from the main building. The members of the committee discussed the proposed building design, including the setback at the top of the building and concluded with a discussion on the possible facade materials, such as metal railings, corrugated metal and the location and use of metal.

Mr. Carter replied that metal is frequently used on new buildings and that the materials for the building skin were likely to change during the design process. Mr. Carter iterated the desire to have materials which reflect new building designs, but would ensure that materials selected for the exterior would be durable. Ms. Griglione inquired about possible confusion for visitors if the building is designed with multiple entrances, Mr. Carter responded that clear way finding with an East and West entrance labeling would be utilized.

Ms. Mateen asked a series of questions about the site and building design, including the location of garbage and loading, if ground floor retail was proposed, and if a barrier was proposed between the multi-family building and the townhouses to the rear. Mr. Carter responded the garbage and loading areas were proposed for the side of the building facing Mark Center Drive and would be enclosed, retail was not proposed for the ground floor, and that the applicant was open to a barrier including a wood or masonry wall and landscaping but would want input from the community. Ms. Mateen requested the presence of a landscape architect at the next meeting to provide guidance on possible plantings.

Ms. Davenport inquired if retail had been discussed as the small area plan indicated a possible retail location. Ms. Contreras responded that this location would be difficult for retail due to its remote location relative to existing retail and the City was focusing retail efforts further west near existing retail. Ms. Davenport asked if it would be feasible for another vehicular entrance to the parking garage, possibly off of North Beauregard Street. Mr. Carter responded it would not be possible to include a garage entrance off of North Beauregard Street as the building functionality would be severely impacted and the curve of North Beauregard Street would create an unacceptable traffic movement standard.

Ms. Fossum inquired about guest parking, and the design of the proposed road system, how trash would be moved through the two wings of the building and if a playground would be installed for children. Mr. Carter responded that the building was providing excess parking which would be signed for guests, the road ways had been designed to city standards and an electronic pull system would be used to ensure trash could be easily moved to the loading dock. Mr. Carter indicated they were still studying the option for a playground. Ms. Fossum concluded with iterating that light from the development should not spill into adjacent properties to which Ms. Contreras stated the City has an ordinance to ensure light does not spill over property lines to be a nuisance.

Mr. Benzina inquired about the proposed construction type, to which Mr. Carter responded it would be concrete podium with stick above. Mr. Benzina said he loved the curve of the building wing but wanted to ensure the design was constructible with the proposed building type. Mr. Benzina stated he appreciated the curve of the building but the curve was somewhat monolithic in terms of roof scale and height and wanted to see more articulation and dynamic design. Mr. Benzina inquired about the privacy treatment for the residential units at the base of the building.

Ms. Davenport inquired if the design team had considered different types of glass for different facades, such as a heavier glass on the south and west facade. Mr. Carter responded that it was a consideration and that all glass selected would be high performance glass and some may darken in response to the sun.

Ms. Griglione noted that the plans had labeled a community center in the bathhouse area and asked if that space would be open to the community. Mr. Carter indicated they were not sure they could make that commitment and still needed to refine the amenity area. Mr. Benzina stated he would like to see the massing of the existing office building located to the west of the amenity space. Mr. Benzina inquired how drainage would function with the window pattern and Mr. Carter stated the design would use an internal drainage system and downspouts would not be visible.

Mr. Benavage commended the applicant on a strong initial design and agreed with earlier statements for the need for safety when reaching the amenity building and indicated his concern about the height transition between the multi-family building and the adjacent townhomes. Mr. Benavage inquired if height could be added elsewhere in the building and therefore reduced in the area facing the townhouses to the north. Mr. Benavage inquired about the garage screening on the northern side of the building and wanted to ensure that headlights could not shine out onto the neighboring townhouses. Mr. Carter acknowledged the concern and stated they would continue to explore building materials to ensure headlights wouldn't be an issue while ensuring necessary venting and airflow. Mr. Benavage also inquired if the garage entrance could be moved so to reduce headlights and if there was an opportunity to adjust the location of the parallel road, possibly switching it and the garage entrance to the center portion of the property, as this would set a pattern for future development of the Adams Neighborhood; it would be harder to revision once things were constructed. Ms. Contreras stated that one of the CDD conditions requires the applicant to conduct a traffic study and that the applicant was working closely with staff to propose a potential road network that would not preclude long term development. Ms. Contreras also stated there would be future conversations regarding the road. Mr. Benavage stated that the positioning and nature of parallel road was important to the adjacent neighborhoods and would need to be discussed in great detail. He also inquired as to the ownership of the existing fence along the northern property line. Mr. Carter responded that Monday properties owned the fence and that a future point of discussion would identify if the fence should be combination of mason wall and landscaping to provide both visual and acoustic protection.

Mr. Benzina stated the site represented a design anomaly where the applicant was faced with an urban street with only one side and the applicant should not be penalized for a road with low traffic volume that does not continue through to Seminary Road.

Public Comments:

Mr. Bud Jackson, representing the Seminary Heights Condominium Board, stated the board's desire to be supportive of the project proposal but had several issues with the current design, including:

- The location the garage entrance which would encourage all residents to drive down the road and cause headlights to shine into the adjacent townhomes. Mr. Jackson requested the parking garage entrance be moved to the lobby area to reduce the impact of headlights;
- A request to designate the area to the north of the amenity space an Emergency Vehicle Easement or a play space;
- A request to switch the use and capacity of the B and C roads (as designated in the Beauregard Small Area Plan); and
- A request to mitigate the impact of units along the rear road.

Mr. Carter inquired if the applicant was unable to co-locate the traffic and loading entrances away from the Northern portion of the building if keeping loading along the north side would be permissible. Mr. Jackson stated no and that the issue needed to be solved by the applicant.

Ms. Rebecca Hierholzer stated she wanted the loading dock located as far away as possible from the townhomes as she already is woken at 6 a.m. from loading activities and wanted the applicant to explore options to reduce noise. Ms. Hierholzer also stated she was unhappy about increased traffic on site and wanted the applicant to explore alternative options for the garage entrance. Mr. Carter responded that the trash pick-up would be fully enclosed in the building and the applicant would arrange to use rear-loaded trucks to load and unload within the building.

Mr. Roger Sullivan, resident of the Seminary Park Condominium Association, stated he was encouraged by the initial design of trees between the two sites and stated his desire for the applicant to plant large evergreen trees.

Mr. Mike Uehlein, resident of Seminary Heights Condominium Association, inquired if a demographic analysis had been conducted to review possible transit patterns at the site. Mr. Uehlein also stated his concern for the multiple building entrances to cause confusion for Uber and similar ride-sharing platforms.

Ms. Annie Mills, a resident of Shirley Forest, indicated there was currently a lot of foot traffic across the site because of the location of Northern Virginia Community College and asked how pedestrian traffic would be impacted. Mr. Carter indicated the applicant was following all guidelines for sidewalks and pedestrian connectivity and would greatly improve the site.

Mr. Matt Thomas stated his desire to see the traffic impact studies and was concerned about the possible impacts of the design on traffic along Seminary Road. Mr. Thomas also inquired how access would be provided through the wall along the northern portion of the site.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m. after Ms. Contreras provided an update on ongoing West End projects.