

Beauregard Design Advisory Committee (BDAC) – Meeting Minutes

May 21, 2018

6:30 p.m.

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
Bud Jackson
Susan Scarlet-Macaw
Charles Carruthers

City Staff:

Tom Canfield, City Architect, P&Z
Maya Contreras, Principal Planner, P&Z
Ashley Labadie, Urban Planner, P&Z
Heather Diez, Division Chief, T&ES

Applicant Team:

Douglas Carter, DCS Architects
Steve Saff, DCS Architects
Anita Sircar, DCS Architects
Jasina Bijelic, DCS Architects
Aaron Vinson, Walter Phillips
Diana Milian, Walter Phillips
Jonathan Rak, McGuire Woods
Megan Rappolt, McGuire Woods
Chip Ranno, Clear Real Estate Services
Tim Helming, Monday Properties
Nick Malpede, Monday Properties
Tina Woods-Smith, TWS Design

Agenda Items:

1. Welcome & Introductions (10 Minutes)
2. Responsibilities (5 Minutes)
 - a. Overview of group mission and responsibilities
3. New Business:
 - a. Presentation of DSUP#2017-00019 Monday Properties for 2000 N. Beauregard St
 - i. Presentation by Staff (15 Minutes)
 - ii. Presentation by Applicant (30 Minutes)
 - iii. BDAC Questions for Applicant (20 Minutes)
4. Questions & Public Comments on DSUP Application (20-30 Minutes)
5. Staff Update on other projects in the Beauregard SAP (5 Minutes)

Welcome and Introductions:

Mr. Benavage commenced the meeting and provided an overview of the meeting agenda and procedures and acknowledged the new committee members. Mr. Benavage stated there would not be a committee vote this evening as the meeting would be used for a staff and applicant presentation. As a matter of housekeeping, Mr. Benavage stated the meeting minutes from February 26, 2018 were not ready but would be voted upon at the next BDAC meeting and placed on the website afterwards.

The new members of the committee, Mr. Bud Jackson, Ms. Susan Scarlet-Macaw and Mr. Charles Carruthers introduced themselves and stated their interest in serving as a member of the Beauregard Design Advisory Committee.

Mr. Benavage provided with an overview 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:

Staff Presentation of Beauregard Small Area Plan and Possible Amendments

Ms. Contreras gave a presentation of the Beauregard Small Area Plan and possible amendments to the Small Area Plan based on the applicant's proposed building design. The presentation included:

- An overview of the Small Area Plan and an orientation of the Adams Neighborhood and the 2000 N. Beauregard parcel;
- A discussion of the Design Guidelines, approved as a component of the rezoning and the CDD guidelines for development;
- An update on the project status and the discussion of the design matrix at the next meeting;
- Objectives of the Adams Neighborhood Design, including;
 - The Ellipse;
 - West End Transitway;
 - Framework streets to break up "super blocks"
 - Uses designated within the Small Area Plan;
 - A buffer of 45 feet between the Seminary Heights neighborhood and development to the South;
 - Coordination of a neighborhood wide infrastructure phasing plan, stormwater master plan, sustainability plan and an open space plan; and
 - Pedestrian Access points between the subject site and neighborhoods to the north.

Ms. Contreras indicated there had been differing opinions on the need for access points between the subject site and neighborhoods to the north and requested that BDAC serve as a forum for this discussion, so the connectivity could be properly timed. Mr. Benavage indicated the point could be discussed at a later point, but no decision would be made this evening.

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

Mr. Rak, attorney representing Monday Properties, began with introductions of the applicant team and provided an overview of Monday Properties' recent acquisition of the properties in the Adams Neighborhood and the recent investments in the remaining medical office buildings. Mr. Rak stated his client's goal of redeveloping 2000 N. Beauregard Street into a residential apartment building and their appreciation for the previous community feedback on the design, especially regarding site access. Mr. Rak stated the design team had spent weeks working with City staff to review 23 design iterations to address issues identified in the previous BDAC meeting.

Mr. Carter, architect with Douglas, Carter, Scott gave a presentation on the evolution of the project design, with key points including:

- The team listened closely during the previous BDAC and community meetings and have acted upon many of the comments;
- Proposal to develop a neighborhood park on the north side of the project, between the amenity building and the adjacent neighborhood;
- Willingness to create connections through the property for pedestrian connectivity;
- The switching of the "C" road and "B" roads to minimize the traffic flow along the northern border of the property and the utilization of the "C" road for pedestrians and cyclists;
- A simple four-way traffic intersection to move vehicular traffic off North Beauregard Street into the site;
- Requirement to maintain a rear access road along the northern portion the subject site to enable fire and emergency services to access the building. However, the access road will have minimal traffic of 4-6 vehicles a day, as many of the residents will drive into the garage and not utilize the access road, therefore vehicles using the road will likely be delivery vehicles;
- Rear access road is only 22 feet wide and buffered by an earthen berm on the northern property line. Area between the access road and the property line will also be planted with mixed evergreen trees, of varying sizes and the construction of a fence to create a barrier to minimize light and noise;
- Relocation of the building entrance to a location along North Beauregard Street and a revised location for the building leasing which will be accessed from a European style courtyard with trees;
- Potential loading dock noises will be managed by requiring 26-foot-long trash trucks, which will enter an enclosed area to pick up trash. Furthermore, the applicant expects approximately three move-ins/outs a week at a maximum and many residents will use smaller moving vehicles which are not equipped with a rear back-up beep; and

- Continued evolution of the building architecture to ensure the Ellipse would not be precluded through building construction and that building facade serves as an iconic gateway element.

A discussion between Mr. Carter and a nearby neighbor indicated that the patio areas of adjacent homes are approximately five feet from the existing parking lot. Mr. Carter stated the applicant could take measurements of the adjacent townhouses and create a section to show the dimensions and relationship between the townhouses and the proposed multi-family building.

Committee Discussion:

Ms. Fossum inquired if there would be a full-time staff person on-site, to which Mr. Carter responded that the main lobby would be staffed. Ms. Fossum inquired if the parking spaces would be restricted and Mr. Carter responded that 15% of the 300 parking spaces would be restricted. Ms. Fossum reiterated her concern with only one entrance to the building garage to which Ms. Contreras responded that she had inquired with the Fire Department after the previous BDAC meeting and the Fire Department found the one garage entrance acceptable. Ms. Sircar, architect with DCS also iterated that the garage would be sprinkled for safety.

Ms. Griglione asked as the main building entrance had been moved to the southwest corner of the building, what purpose the northeast entrance would serve. Mr. Carter responded that the northeast entrance was for convenience as the building length would otherwise create a very long walk for residents and delivery purposes. Ms. Griglione followed up with an inquiry about the location of mail boxes and where the mail delivery truck would load and unload. Mr. Carter responded the mail truck would go to the loading dock closest to the main building lobby. Ms. Contreras reminded the committee that the functionality questions would be worked out during later design phases. Ms. Griglione inquired about the applicant's plan for safe resident crossing of Mark Center Drive to the amenity space and pool. Mr. Carter indicated that residents could exit through the main entrance and cross at the traffic light. Ms. Contreras provided a brief overview of the location of the amenity building and building lobby to the overall sight and the inherent walkability and access to future transit options.

Ms. Davenport asked if there were plans for connecting the amenity space with additional development to the west and if the proposed amenity space had capacity for additional demand. Ms. Davenport stated her desire to see architectural details of the amenity building at the next meeting.

Ms. Scarlet-Macaw inquired about the distance between the planted trees along the northern edge of the property. Ms. Woods-Smith responded that the plans were still relatively conceptual and that the spacing would be more specific in the next design stage. Ms. Contreras also iterated that the Final Site Plan, a later design phase, would require a greater level of specificity including the location of all proposed plantings and species types.

Mr. Jackson inquired about the short-term and long-term plans for the remaining office buildings, and if the applicant was going to maintain office uses. Mr. Helming indicted Monday Properties had invested several million dollars into building improvements which typically have a useful life

Beauregard Design Advisory Committee (BDAC)
Meeting Minutes
May 21, 2018

of 20 years but iterated he did not have a way to determine the highest and best use of the property in the next 15 years. Mr. Jackson followed up inquiring that the applicant did not have an intention to change to residential uses to which Mr. Helming responded he could not say yes with 100% confidence. Ms. Contreras stated that market conditions do change, however the current proposal is only to change the land use at 2000 N. Beauregard Street and any future conversions would have to go through a similar process.

Mr. Jackson requested additional information on the park proposed for the area north of the amenity building to which Mr. Carter responded they had listened to community feedback and provided a green space or small pocket park for the neighborhood. Ms. Davenport and Ms. Griglione requested additional information on the berm proposed for the park area including a section and details on the rear area of the berm.

Mr. Benzina thanked the architects for their responsive design to address community comments and noted specifically the relocation of the garage entrance and the removal of the parallel road. Mr. Benzina requested a section to better understand the dimensions and site design. Mr. Benzina noted the importance of the gateway area along Mark Center Drive and the need for a focus on the architecture and landscaping in that area to signal the importance. Mr. Benzina also noted that all courtyards, as seen, were to be used for cars and asked if there would be a courtyard for residents. Therefore, would there be a way for the parking courtyard at the main entrance to move into the garage and instead that area could be used for pedestrians. Mr. Benzina inquired if the building would have two addresses, to which Mr. Carter responded it would only have one address.

Ms. Griglione asked about the functional operations of the trash trucks to which Mr. Carter stated a 26-foot-long trash truck would pull into the loading dock and pick up from the rear. Ms. Griglione stated she appreciated the design as it would reduce noise for nearby residents.

Mr. Carruthers clarified that there would be no intention for parking along the access road and that the parking in the round-about would be temporary, to which Mr. Carter affirmed. Mr. Carruthers indicated he wanted to hear from nearby residents and if the proposed park was envisioned as a dog park. Mr. Carter indicated the park was not intended to be a dog park. Mr. Carruthers stated the proposal had good massing, flow and function but wondered where residents could congregate outside for a BBQ or to play frisbee.

Ms. Mateen inquired about the plan for the parallel road and what the Mark Center intersection would look like by the time residents were moving into the building. Ms. Contreras responded that before the project would be heard by Planning Commission and City Council the applicant would submit a concept plan for the remainder of the neighborhood to show things such as open space and infrastructure.

Ms. Mateen was concerned about the functionality of the proposed intersection and potential traffic along the access road. Ms. Contreras stated there would be emergency access along the rear access road. A shared use path, for pedestrians and cyclists, is proposed for the location of the parallel road, however ongoing conversations about the use and timing have not yet occurred. Ms. Mateen indicated the pathway and access between the neighborhoods may be desirable, especially for

people walking dogs and inquired if the fence material had been determined. Mr. Carter indicated a decision had not yet been made.

Ms. Fossum inquired about the plans for the Clyde's property to which Mr. Helming responded they were working on acquiring the property. Ms. Fossum requested the applicant review the architecture and move away from the use of panel as a siding. Mr. Jackson asked the plans for Clyde's should Monday Properties acquire the site, Mr. Helming stated there is a lease in place for the next several years and at this point the neighborhood is a professional center and would remain so for the foreseeable future.

Mr. Benavage also thanked the design team for the revisions to the site design and inquired about the width of the loading dock and the distance from the garage to the north property line. The applicant team responded it was 15 feet and 95 feet, respectively. Mr. Benavage asked the applicant team to confirm those distances as the buildings appeared closer on the renderings.

Mr. Benavage said he had heard concerns about a pedestrian cut through at Stevens Street as it may encourage non-residents to park on Stevens Street and then cut through the site, however that should be weighed with the need for connectivity to the forthcoming transit corridor. Mr. Jackson stated some people may want the cut through for access to the pool amenity. Ms. Contreras noted that the pool would be a private resource for the residents of the new building, but that a request for a community meeting space could be made. Mr. Benzina pointed out the distinction between the need for a specific cut through versus connectivity as indicated in the small area plan. Mr. Benavage inquired about the location of crosswalks to promote connectivity and Ms. Contreras responded that the design was in the preliminary states however crosswalks would be proposed on site.

Public Comments:

Mr. Mike Uehlein, Community Representative from the Seminary Heights Association, stated their appreciation for the relocation of the road and garage entrance. Outstanding concern that traffic will be re-routed through the western parking lot and would request consideration of additional greenery along the green space of the remainder of the property. Mr. Uehlein also indicated there had not been a community vote on a possible pedestrian connection at the end of N. Steven Street, however at least 40 of 108 resident were in support of the connection and an official community vote was forthcoming. Mr. Uehlein concluded that the proposed parking, building height and zoning were significant changes from the Small Area Plan and an area of concern for the association.

Mr. Pete Benavage, reviewing the note handed out by Mr. Uehlein, stated that Ms. Michelle Rhineshuttle of the Seminary Heights Condominium Association, endorses the plan to switch the B and C road. Mr. Uehlein stated that he agreed the proposed road realignment was an improvement but was still concerned about the state of the road at move-in time for the multi-family building.

Beauregard Design Advisory Committee (BDAC)
Meeting Minutes
May 21, 2018

Ms. Maureen Brooks, a nearby neighbor, stated her appreciation for the revisions made by the team and the relocation of the road, but remained concern about the proposal as she felt it would change the nature of her neighborhood. Ms. Brooks also indicated concerns regarding increased traffic from Uber and Lyft type services especially upon the proposed access road, questions about retail on site, the availability of guest parking, parking in nearby neighborhoods due to BRAC and the possibility it would increase on-street parking, and possible impacts of drilling during construction on nearby homes.

Mr. Benavage followed up and asked if there would be any pile driving during construction to which Mr. Carter responded that the construction type was relatively light, only requiring a 10-foot excavation for the garage and he did not anticipate pile driving. Mr. Helming followed up that the Geotechnical report was consistent with Mr. Carter's response. Mr. Helming responded to Mr. Brooks to say no retail was planned and 15% of the proposed garage parking would be for guests, providing approximately 70 guest parking spaces.

An attendee of the meeting requested a virtual 3D tour of possible landscape buffers at the next meeting to which Mr. Carter responded they would explore that possibility.

Ms. Rebecca Hierholzer, neighbor, was concerned about the efficacy of the proposed buffers. Ms. Hierholzer described a series of noise experiments conducted with a friend standing on various locations around the Adams Neighborhood and Ms. Hierholzer's ability to hear the friend while remaining in her townhome. Ms. Hierholzer also stated she did not feel the proposed earthen berm would be an efficient solution, that she would need to review the loading proposal more thoroughly and that the new parallel road should be bordered by trees. Ms. Hierholzer inquired if a traffic study had been completed to which Ms. Contreras responded the traffic study should be forthcoming with future submissions.

Mr. Benavage inquired what could be done to minimize potential noise to which Ms. Hierholzer advocated an adjustment to the 10-foot shared pathway to relocate the neighborhood park and minimize the impact of noise from mothers and their children. Mr. Benavage inquired if the hours of the park could be limited to which Ms. Contreras responded that City parks already have standard operating hours.

Ms. Jenna Malone inquired if the transformers located in the courtyard would be noisy. Mr. Carter responded the noise would be limited.

Mr. Craig Wolfe asked about unit ownership and for a breakdown of the unit mixes. Mr. Helming responded the building was designed for apartments and would contain 23 studios, 171 one bedroom units and 99 two bedroom units.

A community member inquired about the project timing and if the northern building facade would have balconies. Mr. Helming responded that the project timeline was approximately 20- 24 months and that balconies were envisioned for the northern facade. Mr. Benavage added that if BDAC can wrap up its review over the summer the project may go to City Council in September.

Beauregard Design Advisory Committee (BDAC)

Meeting Minutes

May 21, 2018

Ms. Mateen inquired if the revisions to the master plan had been approved to which Ms. Contreras responded no.

Ms. Maureen Downs inquired if the building would cast a shadow on adjacent townhomes and if there were any proposed roof top facilities. Mr. Carter responded they would show a shadow study at the next BDAC meeting and that no roof top facilities were planned.

Mr. Matt Thomas inquired how long the applicant would be responsible for landscaping and maintaining plantings. Ms. Contreras responded that all new projects have a three-year landscaping bond.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.