



WORKSESSION

Design Review Board Case EE/CDRB #2016-0002

2410 & 2460 Mill Road – Hoffman Town Center Blocks 4 & 5

| Application | General Data | |
|---|-----------------------------------|----------------|
| <p>Project Name: Hoffman Town Center Blocks 4 & 5</p> <p>Location: 2410 and 2460 Mill Road</p> <p>Applicant: S/C Eisenhower, LLC</p> <p>Architect: Cooper Carry</p> | DRB Date: | March 23, 2017 |
| | Site Area: | 5.08 acres |
| | Zone: | CDD#2 |
| | Proposed Use: | Mixed Use |
| | Proposed Gross Floor Area: | 975,000 sf |
| <p>Purpose of Application:</p> | | |
| <p>This application is for a Concept II review of a DSUP tentatively scheduled for public hearing in November 2017.</p> | | |
| <p>Staff Reviewers: Thomas H. Canfield, AIA tom.canfield@alexandriava.gov Robert Kerns, AICP, robert.kerns@alexandriava.gov Gary Wagner, RLA, gary.wagner@alexandriava.gov Nathan Imm, nathan.imm@alexandriava.gov Bill Cook, william.cook@alexandriava.gov</p> | | |
| <p>DRB COMMENTS – SUMMARY:</p> <p>Plaza:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plaza design and flexible programming was generally well received by the DRB. • Expand the Plaza as a bigger expression through extension of paving east and west to the edge of the plaza and crossing Mandeville. • Study asymmetrical plaza design that provides access and circulation to pedestrian entrances. Consider trees and other elements to help balance the asymmetry of the architecture. The current symmetry of the plaza feels forced as the architectural treatments are not perfectly symmetrical. • Concern with number of different gestures/materials – in particular above the retail base | | |

of the plaza. Work on achieving unity of expression and material in the plaza area. Diversity should come from retail storefronts.

- Core of plaza – Let retail be the strength of the plaza architecture. Allow bottom 40' of podium to be more uniform.
- Improve presentation of plaza terminus – realize retail user(s) is TBD but need to show potential.
- Continue close integration between architecture and landscape teams to ensure cohesive and unified experience, especially at ground level retail.
- Consider bold public art as a focal point to draw traffic to the plaza.

Mandeville/Stovall:

- Allow bottom 20' of retail at street to be the diverse element that is focal point of pedestrian experience
- Bring Mandeville apartment wing down to base retail with vertical elements from above respecting the ground floor retailer individual identity (e.g. bring a vertical element from above to the ground in the piers).
- SW corner engagement is fine.
- West side engagement is fine but north of the parking entrance look to extend the residential frame farther to the north.
- Look to engage the northwest corner with the simplification planned recommended for the north façade.

Mill:

- Consider using the Mandeville apartment wing exterior design on the Mill apartment exterior.
- Simplify the base of the building – don't force connectivity. Where logical and connected then keep it.

Senior Building:

- Must have resolved massing and express a clear architectural character in elevations prior to next DRB submission.
- The building must connect with to the ground.
- No closed courtyard.

Podium:

- Vision is to achieve full water retention on the roof(s) of the project – major sustainability goal/benefit
- Retention limits the uses – water retention, trail and urban agriculture. Strongly encouraged to achieve sustainability goal as well as other two uses
- Stonebridge explained the restriction on public connectivity to the podium
- Towers still seem to float above the podium – need to be more strongly connected

EXHIBITS:

1. Applicant: DRB Concept Submission 2, plans dated 2/23/17 (22 pages, 11" x 17")
2. Staff: Conceptual Massing/Parti/Expression dated 3/10/17 (3 pages, 11" x 17")
3. T&ES Staff: Mill Road and Mandeville Lane Road Diet Feasibility (8 pages, 8.5" x 11")

Hoffman Blocks 4 & 5 – DRB Work Session

3/16/17

This memo is in response to the site plan, general massing and floor plans submitted by the Applicant on 2/23/17 for approximately 975,000 sf of mixed use development on Blocks 4 and 5, which total 5 acres of the Hoffman Town Center (Exhibit 1). The site is at the north terminus of Swamp Fox Road, and is bounded by Mandeville Road to the south and east, Stovall Street to the west, and Mill Road to the north.

The proposed development will consist of 220,000 sf of retail, including approximately 80,000 sf of grocery, a 40,000 sf fitness center, and the balance consisting of ground level and second level in-line retail floor area. In addition, the project will include three residential towers consisting of approximately 755,000 sf. that will sit above the retail and above-grade parking structure.

Previous Work Session

A Work Session with the DRB was last held January 19, 2017. Key design topics of discussion included:

1. Above-ground parking, including screening requirements
2. Through versus terminated Swamp Fox street pros and cons
3. Treatment of podium architecture
4. Treatment of tower architecture
5. Functional/retail strategy discussion
6. Tower and massing discussion
7. General discussion and next steps

Comments were provided to the Applicant on February 1, 2017 by email in summary of the DRB Workshop Session:

1. Demonstrate the overall gestalt for the project, including the three-dimensional, formal relationship between the towers, the podium and how the towers are brought to the ground. Corners and tops of buildings should have distinct massing articulation that is integral to the overall parti.
2. Demonstrate how the continuous podium will be modulated to provide a varied streetwall.
3. Explore providing more variety in building height between the three towers, and demonstrate how each tower will be modulated; similarly, explore options to provide a variety of podium heights.
4. Provide a conceptual design for the plaza. The plaza should be designed as a flexible space to accommodate large gatherings, with special paving design, a variety of seating options and shade trees, but should not be overly cluttered. It should, however, include a significant element as a focal point.

5. Provide conceptual design schemes for the roofscape of the podium and towers and describe how the spaces are activated.
6. Work with T&ES to provide wider sidewalks along Mandeville St, and to extend the plaza design into the street.
7. Provide a diagram showing the different uses as an assemblage.
8. Demonstrate the nature of the retail surrounding the plaza and fronting the streets. Show where transparent glass is to be provided for the grocery store.
9. Demonstrate how the above grade parking structure that will be visible to the public will be integrated into the building design, particularly along all “A Street” frontages, where the design guidelines call for screening with an active use to a minimum depth of thirty feet.
10. Provide a diagram that fully explains parking allocation versus uses, so that staff can (for example) know where all of the major grocery tenant customers are going to park.

Subsequent Project Evolution

Staff reviewed the submitted plans at various times and delivered comments to the applicant on February 28, 2017.

Staff subsequently met with the Applicant on March 9 and March 16 to discuss findings and responses to the issues and concerns conveyed by Staff and the DRB. Renderings presented by the Applicant at those meetings showed further development of the project.

Staff produced a set of drawings to provide some ideas for addressing concerns related to the project massing and screening of the above-grade parking decks (Exhibit 2). The applicant will provide an overview of the latest plans at the next DRB meeting.

A summary of the current issues is as follows:

1. Towers
 - a. The applicant is continuing to explore ways to bring the towers to the ground.
 - b. Two massing diagrams provided by Staff in Exhibit 2 (1/3 and 2/3) show one possible approach.
2. Podium
 - a. The upper two parking levels must be screened from the right of way on “A” frontages. Section diagrams attached in Exhibit 2 (3/3) show a possible approach.
 - b. The metal grill/vents are not a satisfactory solution to staff in these locations.
 - c. The applicant will explore ways to create breaks in the podium formed by the continuation of the towers to the ground and to express a variety of podium architecture.
3. Middle Residential Building
 - a. The design is still evolving but there was agreement that the shorter part of the building fronting on Mandeville should come to grade, and be further distinguished so the middle building would read as two distinct masses
 - b. Diagrams provided by Staff again show possible approach.
4. Senior Housing

- a. Staff does not support the fully enclosed interior courtyard.
 - b. Explore varied heights that express the building as two forms, while connecting parts of the tower to grade.
 - c. Staff has continued concerns about the pedestrian entrance location, and has suggested that relocation near the plaza or Mill Road be explored.
 - d. Per the Design Guidelines, the corner of Mandeville Lane and Mill Road is a designated location for a required architectural feature such as a tower, gateway, or massing articulation.
5. Mill Road/North Elevation
- a. Develop an architectural base where the mechanical equipment is located that is consistent with the design of the residential (apartment) tower above.
 - b. Daycare/Petcare potential tenant storefronts developing on this frontage. Road diet could accommodate drop-off areas, and would allow more generous sidewalk and landscape.
6. Street sections, Road Diet
- a. T&ES Staff has developed a Road Diet concept for Mandeville Lane and Mill Road (Exhibit 3). This would allow relocations of the curblines to afford more generous sidewalk area.
7. Amenities: Rooftop & Other
- a. Staff requests concepts for rooftop amenities on both the podium and towers.
 - b. Landscape Plan concepts for the site should be provided in the next submission.