

*City of Alexandria Carlyle/Eisenhower East
Design Review Board Public Hearing
Agenda*

Thursday, November 20, 2014

7:00 pm

Chet & Sabra Avery Room

Room 2000, City Hall

1. Call to order
 2. DRB #2014-0003: **Hoffman Block 2**
315 Stovall Street
Design review of an amendment to previously approved Stage 1 Development Special Use Permit #2005-0031 for increased density, height, and revised massing at a commercial office building at Hoffman Block 2.
By: Kristi Smith, The JBG Companies; Chloe Hiyu, Bill Hellmuth, HOK; Michael J. Perine, Hoffman LLC.
 3. Other Business
 4. Adjournment
-

Summary of Notes (Hoffman 2)

1. Building Design (Eastern & Western Facades): The proposed design needs further interaction between the dark and light facades, including with the ground floors and (potentially) penthouse area. The lower floors need more interaction with the site and visual interest, including: Elements extending up from the ground floors; consideration of a rooftop terrace on level two and (potentially) the penthouse; and, emphasis on the pedestrian experience from the SE corner towards the main building entrance.
2. Parking Garage / Access: The proposed design continues to show left turn movements off of Pershing Ave. westbound into the parking garage, which is prohibited in the Stage 1 DSUP conditions. Alternative design treatments for the deceleration lane off of the I-495 off-ramp have not been shown.

Additionally, vehicular access across the SE corner of the site is challenging due to the loading dock requirements (i.e. screening) and location of Dominion Power transformers at the Stovall – Eisenhower intersection (location of transformers was not verified).

3. Building Orientation & Site Design: There is considerable interest in emphasizing the pedestrian experience as occupants enter the main entrance, through a coherent architectural treatment on the ground floors as well as an increased “bridge” experience, perhaps by the extension of sunken gardens.
4. Fencing: The applicant introduced a requirement for a K-12 security fence; clearer delineation of this fence on the drawings was requested, as was the consideration of alternative K-12 barrier systems.

Transcript Notes (Hoffman 2)

Comments Key: AD = Architect/Developer; LQ = Lee Quill; RL = Roger Lewis; JC = John Chapman; AB = Alvin Boone; TC = Tom Canfield.

1. AD: K-12 fencing, min. 2400’ feet = required.
2. AB: Is a K-12 barrier, rather than a fence, acceptable?
3. TC: The fence line needs to be clarified on the site plans.
4. KS: The tenant requires security screening to enter the loading area; a delta barrier is required. The loading area is considered “expendable,” though it requires a separate HVAC system.
5. AB: It will be a building within a building.
6. RL: Tonight we need to focus on design, not security measures.
7. AD: The longer elevation faces E-W, which is not ideal from an energy perspective. The building contains precast facades in two colors, evoking two boomerangs intersecting.
8. RL: The building looks very heavy on the front side (facing East); the western side benefits from a stronger vertical grammar, but this results in a disconnect between the two sides.
9. LQ: The idea of how the front two plans work together is important. On the back, the view from the roads is important. The team should explore the planar elements to create vitality, interest.

- 10.AD: It may be helpful to disrupt the front skin at the entrance with more vertical elements [TC, too].
- 11.RL: The second story roof treatment needs to be explored more thoroughly.
- 12.RL: Should the building feature 8' concrete beams on the corner rather than office areas? The corners are very visible, maybe something should happen here.
- 13.LQ: Is there an opportunity for first floor glass to rise up the façade? It may be possible to “get more play” with the same system by extending first floor elements up.
- Also, Stovall’s one to two floors (i.e. conference area) need to liven up a bit.
- 14.TC: One opportunity is for the light skin or dark skin to grab the penthouse; it could improve the vertical/horizontal relationship.
- 15.AB: A rooftop terrace on the second level should be explored.
- 16.LQ: Green screens likely won’t work on the north side of the parking garage; considering this, what is your plan here? What is the pattern beneath that will be revealed in winter on the north side? We should not see wires.
- 17.RL: What is the program for the park on the SE corner?
- 18.AD: It may be worth considering extending the sunken garden.
- 19.TC: Let the bridge experience be a true bridge experience.
- 20.RL: The pedestrian experience can really highlight/emphasize the main entrance.
- 21.LQ: It’s important to ask “Who is this building for?” The amenities/park should speak to this.
- 22.RL: For SE corner access, could use a combination of soft- and hardscape surfaces.
- 23.AD: Dominion transformers at SE corner can’t be moved. [Applicant envisions left of off Pershing Ave. westbound into parking garage.]
- 24.TA: Per the Stage 1 DSUP conditions, has the free right from Pershing Ave.

eastbound been eliminated?

25.AD: Yes, but you can't shift building any closer due to the 50' setback requirements.