

## Beauregard Design Advisory Committee (BDAC) – Meeting Summary

September 21, 2020

7:00 p.m.

Virtual Meeting

### **Committee Members in Attendance:**

Donna Fossum, Acting Chair

Abed Benzina

Carolyn Griglione

Fatimah Mateen

Bud Jackson

Pete Benevage (excused)

### **City Staff:**

Maya Contreras, Principal Planner, P&Z

Tom Canfield, City Architect, P&Z

Bill Cook, Urban Planner, P&Z

### **Applicant Team:**

Megan Rappolt, Planner, Wire Gill LLP

Ken Wire, Attorney, Wire Gill LLP

Chris Bell, Hekemian & Co.

Matt Renauld, Mahan Rykiel Assoc Inc.

Travis D’Onofrio, Mahan Rykiel Assoc Inc.

Aaron Vinson, Walter L Philips Inc.

Daniel Pietropaoli, Walter L Philips Inc.

Benjamin Briar, NVR Inc.

Chilton MacGregor, NVR Inc.

Jack Chudovan, NVR Inc.

### **Agenda Items:**

1. Call To Order

2. Overview

a. Virtual Meeting Statement,  
Overview and Etiquette

b. Roll Call of BDAC Members

c. Introductions of Staff and  
Applicant Team

3. New Business:

a. Applicant presentation of Upland  
Park Phase 1 proposal  
(DSUP#2019-0017)

b. BDAC questions for applicant

c. Community questions for the  
applicant

4. Staff Update on other Projects:

a. Church of the Resurrection/The  
Spire

b. Monday Properties

c. Newport Village

d. Ferdinand T. Day Elementary  
School

5. Schedule Next Meeting

6. Adjourn

*Meeting presentations, materials, and recordings are archived on the BDAC webpage at:*

<https://www.alexandriava.gov/74981>

Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic emergency, the 7:00 p.m. September 21, 2020 meeting of the Beauregard Design Advisory Committee is being held electronically pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3708.2(A)(3), the Continuity of Government ordinance adopted by the City Council on June 20, 2020 or Sections 4-0.00(g) in HB29 and HB30 to undertake essential business. All of the members of the Board, staff, and applicant team are participating from remote locations through a Zoom Meeting. The meeting can be accessed by the public through the [Beauregard Design Advisory Committee website](#) or calling into the meeting. Please see the BDAC website for links and phone numbers to access the Zoom Meeting. A video recording of the meeting will be available online after the meeting. Public Comment will be received at the meeting during the public comment period or comments can be emailed to staff by emailing [william.cook@alexandriava.gov](mailto:william.cook@alexandriava.gov). For reasonable disability accommodation, contact [Jackie.Cato@alexandriava.gov](mailto:Jackie.Cato@alexandriava.gov) or 703.746.3810, Virginia Relay 711.

**Welcome and Introductions:**

Mr. Cook read the virtual meetings statement and called the roll. All members present except Mr. Benevage. Ms. Fossum called the meeting to order. Ms. Contreras introduced staff.

**New Business & Discussion:**

Mr. Wire introduces the applicant team including architects, engineers, and landscape architects, and begins the presentation at 7:10. The first several minutes are an overview of the proposed project features, project phases, contextual surroundings, and main points of the small area plan.

Referring to slide 8, Ms. Griglione asks whether drivers will be able to pass from Seminary to Fillmore via Fairbanks. Mr. Bell confirms that this road alignment will remain. She also asks for confirmation that the tree canopy requirement is reduced from 40% per the Beauregard Small Area Plan to 25% per the proposed development plan, and whether the Environmental Policy Commission (EPC) has commented. Mr. Wire noted that the tree canopy requirement is plan-wide, and that the plan affords more open space than in earlier concepts.

At around 7:25, Mr. Renault describes the Phase 1 park design noting certain refinements since the last iteration. He also notes provision of a temporary pathway connecting to the City's open space located at the corner of Seminary and Beauregard.

Ms. Fossum asks if barbeque grills or pavilions for people to gather have been considered, as they are not available in the area, are popular in other parts of the city, and people might appreciate them. Mr. Bell notes they had not yet been specifically considered yet, more discussions will happen with RPCA to determine park needs. Ms. Mateen asks if consideration has been given to people who might be visiting the park by car. Mr. Wire notes the on-street parking facilities, 69 on-street spaces throughout the community, with about 16 in direct proximity to the park.

Ms. Griglione in reference to slide 17, is concerned about how to prevent cars from parking on the sidewalk given the curbsless street condition. Mr. Renault explains that the streetscape condition is defined by planters, benches, street lights, and other features. She also questions how to prevent potential safety conflicts given the right turn in from Seminary. Mr. Wire notes that the paving surface acts as a signal to drivers. Ms. Fossum notes that large crosswalks she is familiar with near Holmes Run are generally respected. Ms. Contreras notes that these are ongoing discussions with RPCA and the applicant.

In response to Mr. Jackson's question, Mr. Renault confirms that park areas and paths will be lighted, and Mr. Wire notes that photometric plans are a requirement of the DSUP application later. Ms. Contreras also clarifies that public streets will meet city standards, and that public art is a requirement of the application.

Mr. Wire clarifies for Ms. Mateen that food trucks could potentially be in the 16 spaces near the park subject to other city regulations. She stresses concern about pedestrian conditions along Seminary. Additional development will generate additional foot traffic, and cars do not currently

stop at the crosswalks at Seminary Rd and Fairbanks/Heritage Lane. Ms. Contreras explains that TES is currently looking at a 4-way signalized intersection at that location.

Leading into the discussion of architecture, Mr. Wire notes many of the prescriptive requirements of the design guidelines pertaining to townhouses, with the majority being satisfied (height requirement, roof setbacks, screened alleys, mid-block passages, quality of materials) and flexibility requested on just a few, such as the requirement for individualized townhouse facades. The applicant and staff including the City Architect have worked on the design considerably.

At about 7:58 Mr. Chudovan describes architectural changes and refinements, first noting a series of color schemes for each landbay. He explains the location of each scheme and the differences between front and rear elevations. For the end elevations, he describes two designs, one for all-brick, and one for brick/siding combinations. He notes recent meetings with staff to discuss strategies for adding more design elements to the side elevations. He reiterates these are still being refined with staff.

In response to comments from the previous meeting, he shows an aerial perspective with more developed rooflines and more realistic topography, noting the 4<sup>th</sup> floor setback reduces the perception of height from Seminary. Mr. Wire notes that the center-end extensions have been reduced in height to be coplaner with the top of the rear parapets.

Mr. Benzina wants the roof to be expressed as simply as possible, with a parapet that minimally conceals the slope of the roof pitch. He notes that the height of the solid wall above the 3<sup>rd</sup> level windows needs some detail to break up the mass, perhaps a soldier course or other brick detail element.

Mr. Wire notes that slide 34 shows many of the design guidelines in one image (brick on the ends and wrapping the corners, height, setback, façade differentiation in the middle of the row). Ms. Fossum reiterates that the roofline treatments on the ends should be reduced in height. Mr. Benzina also notes that slide 34 shows how the feature is fighting with the rest of the design. Mr. Canfield agrees with lowering the element as low as possible, and while some approaches were considered that followed the slope of the roof, these were not favorable since the roof has such a gentle slope which is not attractive.

Ms. Griglione asks whether the 3<sup>rd</sup> story windows can be made taller to fill in the heaviness of the façade near the parapet. She's still not convinced bringing down the roofline on the ends is enough, referring to slide 34 where the inner sides of these elements are visible from certain perspectives. Mr. Benzina restates that the slope is low and not impressive. Covering it is better.

Mr. Canfield agrees the ends are a small but important part of the building, and staff will work through it with the applicant. A plane change between the brick and the siding might help, and perhaps the brick ends and the mixed material ends need to be more different. For the heaviness above the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor windows, perhaps the parapet height could be reduced by utilizing a railing instead, or some other solid structure set back from the brick. Mr. Benzina concurs. Mr. Chudovan notes that customers prefer the perception of a solid wall on the roof terraces.

Ms. Fossum references the precedent images, which she thought had attractive, finished ends. Mr. Bell notes it should be possible to emulate some of those elements. Mr. Canfield reiterates past comments about having simplicity in the inside units. The precedent images are quite simple, with brick from top to bottom, and a simple grid of windows.

At 8:37 PM, Mr. Wire initiates discussion of Design Standards and Guidelines. Mr. Benzina advises to focus on what is not met, since the list is extensive and he believes most have been met.

- Chapter 3: Plane Framework-
  - the deviation was keeping Fairbanks in its existing location rather than shifting it farther west.
- Chapter 4: Urban Design-
  - Wire highlighted garden walls, mid-block passages, and building orientation as areas where special attention was paid.
  - Ms. Mateen noted that the townhouse rows facing the park have ends facing Seminary. Would this be considered contrary to the guidelines? Mr. Wire summarized conversations with staff regarding this placement, which was determined preferable to have front doors facing the park. Ms. Contreras noted this could be an example where flexibility is requested. Mr. Wire will correct the matrix to make this matter clearer. Ms. Mateen seemed agreeable to the choice, but wanted the matter clear for purposes of applying the guidelines.
  - Wire noted that some flexibility was applied regarding guidelines for “special details” of townhouse entries “to enhance the distinction of each unit” and cited past discussions about a visually simplified approach. This was not identified in the matrix as an area where flexibility was applied.
  - Ms. Mateen had concerns about the color scheme of the project in relationship to surrounding projects, and that without coordination a “hodge podge” look might develop without a grander scheme.
- Chapters 5, 6, and 7 were briefly mentioned, with no deviations highlighted.
- Chapter 8: Public Realm- Streetscape-
  - Wire noted one area in the north section of the site where the sidewalk is 5’ wide instead of the minimum 6’ due to space constraints.

### **Public Comments**

There were no members of the public wishing to speak.

There was a brief discussion of a future meeting date in late October. Staff will coordinate by email.

The meeting was adjourned at 9PM.