



Design Review Board Case #2016-0001
Carlyle Plaza Two – South Residential Building

Application	General Data	
<p>Project Name: Carlyle Plaza Two – South Residential Tower</p> <p>Location: 340 & 350 Hooff’s Run Drive (ultimately will have a Bartholomew Street address)</p> <p>Applicant: Alder Branch Realty Limited Partnership, LLLP; represented by JM Zell Partners</p> <p>Architect: Arquitectonica</p>	DRB Date:	September 28, 2017
	Site Area:	~ 2 acres
	Zone:	CDD#11
	Proposed Use:	Residential
	Dwelling Units:	366 units
	Gross Floor Area:	~ 505,625 sf (400,795 sf res + 104,830 sf parking)
<p>Purpose of Application:</p>		
<p>Design refinements of the first phase of the Carlyle Plaza Two development (south residential tower).</p>		
<p>Staff Reviewers: Robert Kerns, AIA, robert.kerns@alexandriava.gov Thomas H. Canfield, AIA, tom.canfield@alexandriava.gov Gary Wagner, RLA, gary.wagner@alexandriava.gov Nathan Imm nathan.imm@alexandriava.gov Stephanie Free, ASLA, LEED GA, stephanie.free@alexandriava.gov Bill Cook, AICP, william.cook@alexandriava.gov</p>		
<p>DRB ACTION, SEPTEMBER 28, 2017: The DRB voted unanimously to approve the design of the pilotis (change from approved round to rectangular and different spacing) at the base of the east and south facades adjacent to the pool terrace. The Board agreed with Staff’s recommendation to continue further design development of other design details as outlined in the staff report. The Board favored clear vision glass throughout the façade and was concerned that other techniques to cover the vertical and diagonal columns would disrupt the façade design. Balcony design overall is ongoing and the applicant will continue to work through details. Staff was concerned with balcony privacy conflicts on the south façade and between private and public areas on the two sky terraces. The Board noted the unique design challenge and opportunity of the garage entrance at Limerick Street and suggested further study regarding illumination and ceiling design, as well as measures to screen the high section of exposed garage along the north edge of the drive. The applicant will present architectural and landscape material selections at the next meeting.</p>		

DRB ACTION, MARCH 23, 2017: The DRB voted unanimously to **approve** a 4'-0" increase in the overall building height. The DRB agreed with staff's recommendations to support the relocation of the trash loading area, and the elimination of the rooftop amenity space; applicant will instead explore providing a rooftop amenity space on one or both of the projecting roof terraces at the 16th or 26th floor. The DRB also voted unanimously to **approve** two possible options for revised balcony design: 1) Outboard balconies with glass railings that protrude from the north and south building façades contained by the inside edge of the large façade panel; or 2) No balconies. This approval is subject to the condition that the applicant continue to work to enhance the actual and/or perceived depth of the building slots, and work with Staff on the overall aesthetic, materiality, and detailing for the selected option to develop a façade and balcony solution that meets the intentions of the Eisenhower East and Carlyle Plaza Design Guidelines. The Board will review the final building façade and balcony design through electronic coordination and continued staff-applicant meetings (as required) and provide comments.

DRB COMMENTS, JANUARY 19, 2017: The DRB concurred with the Staff recommendation to defer a decision or action on the rooftop plans until the plans are further developed and provided in concert with the other conditions of approval. The rooftop amenity space as provided by the Applicant was seen as limited in utility and aesthetic appeal.

DRB WORK SESSION, JULY 21, 2016: On a motion by Mr. Lewis, and seconded by Councilman Chapman, the DRB voted to **approve** the massing, form, scale, and general architectural character of the tower and low-rise residential liner for Phase 1 of the Carlyle Plaza Two development, subject to the conditions below to be addressed prior to final site plan submission. The motion passed 5-0.

1. Applicant will provide a Roof Plan identifying mechanical equipment and amenity areas, if any, and detail Terrace Levels on Floors 16 and 26.
2. Applicant will provide more setback depth between front and back planes for low-rise units (between 12-16" total difference).
3. Applicant will work to minimize visibility of the mullions to reduce contrast between metal and glass.

DRB WORK SESSION, JUNE 23, 2016: The DRB continued to review the concept for the tower, tower top, and liner units. The Board directed the applicant to submit a final package for review and approval of the tower massing, liner units, parking and landscape deck at the next DRB meeting. The DRB stated that materials and other details would most likely need to be fleshed out in subsequent DRB meetings.

DRB WORK SESSION, APRIL 21, 2016: The DRB continued to review the concept for the tower and liners units. The DRB will continue to review the plans for this development at future work sessions, requesting that the applicant to provide alternative designs for review.

DRB ACTION, MARCH 17, 2016: The DRB reviewed the initial concept for Phase 1 and provided feedback on the tower massing and liner units. The DRB will continue to review the plans for this development at future work sessions and official meetings.

I. SUMMARY

A. General Project Description & Summary of Issues

Alder Branch Realty Limited Partnership LLLP, represented by JM Zell Partners, is requesting Design Review Board (DRB) review for the revised Phase 1 of the Carlyle Plaza Two development in South Carlyle (Block 32). The phase includes the southern residential tower and liner units along Bartholomew Street, a portion of the parking garage to support this building, the related open space on top of the garage, and the terraced deck between the garage and the Alexandria Renew tank/field.

Although this phase was previously approved by the DRB in July 2016, the applicant wishes to modify the building design and was last before the DRB in March 2017. At the March meeting the applicant was directed to continue developing the balcony design and the building slots. The proposed design alterations as submitted on August 28, 2017 are listed below in the Analysis section.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Project Evolution

With the Carlyle Plaza Two approval in 2012, the City Council approved the general site configuration, design guidelines, and infrastructure, and allowed the Design Review Board (DRB) to review and approve the final design of each of the buildings. In April of 2013, the Carlyle DRB approved the original design by FxFowle for the South Residential Tower. Prior to approval, the DRB reviewed the design several times at meetings in November 2012, December 2012, and February 2013. In July 2016, the DRB approved the massing, form, scale, and general architectural character of the residential tower and low-rise residential liner as designed by Arquitectonica. Prior to approval, the DRB reviewed the design several times at work sessions in March, April, and June of 2016. In March 2017, the DRB approved an increase in building height, relocation of the trash loading area, elimination of rooftop amenity space, and gave approval of two options for revision of the balcony designs.

B. Site Context

The entire Carlyle Plaza Two site includes about 6 acres of land located south of Eisenhower Avenue, between Holland Lane to the east and John Carlyle Street and Bartholomew Street to the west. The Alexan Carlyle, an existing five-story residential building is west of the southern portion of the site, and the future Carlyle Plaza One office building will be west of the northern portion of the site. The Alexandria Renew

expansion site is immediately south of this property and is an integral piece of the overall development.

Phase 1, where the south residential tower will be located, is on the southwestern portion of the overall Carlyle Plaza Two site. It is bounded by Holland Lane to the east and Bartholomew Street to the west. The future extension of Savoy Street marks the northern boundary of the phase. The future extension of Limerick Street is the southern boundary of the applicant's property, and this phase will include a connection to a portion of the terraced deck on the northeast portion of the Alexandria Renew site. Today, the Alexandria Renew building and multipurpose field construction is complete.

C. Overall Project Description

The south residential building has been designed as a 34-story high-rise tower with a 4-story low-rise residential building along the west side to provide an active-use buffer between the garage and Alexan Carlyle on the west side of Bartholomew St. The tower is oriented so the long facades face east and west. The tower and the liner units together provide a total of 483,310 gross square feet and 366 units (tower: 354 units; low-rise component: 12 units) with 105,590 square feet of parking garage space. The proposed building would reach a total height of approximately 359' above average finished grade to the top of the roof.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

As part of the original Development Special Use Permit (DSUP) approval, the Design Review Board (DRB) worked with the applicant to develop a set of design guidelines that are specific to the Carlyle Plaza Two development. This document provides guidance on the architectural intent for the buildings, the overall building massing, parking/service/loading areas, and interim conditions.

The main focus of the DRB meetings and work sessions in 2016 had been on the significantly modified architectural style of the new proposal for the South Residential Tower, and reconciling that design with guidelines that were written for a markedly different concept. The applicant continued to refine the proposal to address comments from both staff and the DRB for approval in July of 2016.

The Applicant has made a number of changes to these proposals through discussions with City Staff to bring many of these alterations back in line with the approved building design.

The proposed building alterations submitted for review at the March 2017 meeting did not meet many of the key design guidelines that were previously approved. Among the modifications was a reconfiguration of the balconies, and the associated impact upon the overall architectural design. Two balcony options presented at the March meeting were approved, subject to future review. The DRB also approved an increase in overall building height, agreed with Staff recommendations to relocate the trash loading area,

and to provide amenity space on the projecting roof terraces at the 16th or 26th floors rather than on the roof top.

The current submission package is a continuation of efforts to develop specific design issues and address feedback from the March 2017 meeting.

Facade Elevations

The façade design is characterized by a strong grid pattern and a series of vertical recessed slots on each façade. Another distinctive feature is a cantilevered shift in building mass at the mid-section of the tower. This device is best seen in the East/West elevations and creates dramatic terraced spaces as a resident amenity.

In reviewing the various drawings submitted for DRB review, and in comparison to the Final Site Plan submitted for the project, the glass type, color and contrast varies significantly and it is unknown what the proposed solutions entail.

There are several concerns raised by these changes shown on some elevations: the greatest is that the insertion of continuous vertical “stripes” runs counter to the primary design theme of offset masses. Also, the addition of a number of different glass types confuses what was put forth as a pristine geometric concept. To understand the visual implications of what is being shown, the DRB and staff would need complete samples of all proposed materials, including all types of glazing being proposed, and photorealistic day and night renderings of the building to show how these glass types read, and how window coverings at night would affect the visibility of structural additions.

Staff has concerns about the change in expression from horizontal to vertical for the glazing in the north and south elevations, and whether the accent slots on all four sides will contrast sufficiently with their surroundings to read strongly. The variation of different glass types in many areas of the building requires resolution.

Balconies

The original approved balcony design featured balconies located within a recessed “slot” on the north and south facades. While Staff and the Board found the original design to be the best incorporation of balconies within the clean and geometric overall architectural statement, this arrangement had impacts to the interior floor plans and market positioning of the units.

The proposed balcony configuration was presented at the DRB meeting of March 23, 2017 and conditionally approved by the Board, in addition to an option of no balconies. This design features outboard balconies with glass railings located on the north and south facades.

Garage Entrance at Limerick Street

A four-story, above-grade parking garage is proposed, and permitted per the DSUP due to environmental constraints and other issues that preclude underground parking. The garage is designed to accommodate a green roof which will be open to the public as open space.

The covered entrance bay from Limerick Street is more than three levels high, with the ends of the parking decks on the north side exposed and overlooking the garage entrance and covered right of way. The proposed design incorporates a suspended ceiling feature in a grid pattern of varying depths. The design is similar to the stepped exterior façade pattern used on the East/West facades of the tower. This is a change from the approved design featuring decorative angled metal chevrons on the south side of the entrance bay wall and ceiling.

Amenity Areas

Amenity areas shown in plan include projecting terraces on the 16th and 26th floor projections on the high-rise tower, and roof decks atop the garage and four-story residential liner building.

High-Rise Terraces

In response to previous DRB comments, the applicant has provided concept plans of the terraces found on the high-rise tower. The 16th and 26th floor terraces show common terrace space and private terrace space separated by screen walls, railings, and/or planters shown in a variety of configurations. The common terrace space is accessed via adjacent amenity rooms accessible to residents.

Pool Terrace

The amenity space above the garage features terraces, grills, bar, pool, bath house, landscaping, and a “front porch” created by the building overhang at the east façade. Compared to the approved plan, the shape of the pool terrace area has changed slightly in the proposed submission. The “front porch” area adjacent to the east side of the high-rise tower has undergone changes concerning the pilotis that support the structure and enclose the space under the “front porch.” The July 2016 approved design had a total of 17 round columns framing the east and south sides of the front porch. The design in the current submission shows eight (8) rectangular columns.

Adjacent Interim Open Spaces

An open area is shown north of the site in the block located south of Eisenhower Avenue and east of John Carlyle street. The approved plan of July 2016 identifies the area as “interim landscape” with a small surface parking lot, while the current submission shows a lawn, “future staging area,” and enlarged interim surface parking lot. Both plans also show a potential interim parking area east of the garage and elevated park.

IV. ANALYSIS NARRATIVE

Based on the variety of solutions shown, Staff offers the following comments and recommendations to provide direction to the applicant.

Status of Outstanding Conditions of Approval

Three conditions of approval were stipulated at the March 23, 2017 hearing before the DRB which were carryover comments from the July 21, 2016 approval.

“1. Provide a Roof Plan identifying mechanical equipment and amenity areas, if any, and detail Terrace Levels on Floors 16 and 26.”

A roof plan was provided, however Staff encourages continued development of the terrace space as described previously in this report. Additional Staff comments have been made requesting clarification of the glazing at the top of the slots that would screen the rooftop equipment. **[RESOLVED]**

“2. Provide more setback depth between front and back planes for low-rise units (between 12-16” total difference).”

This has not been addressed. The sections shown on pages 11-12 do not differ from the renderings in the July 2016 submission. The depth between the planes is labeled as six inches as shown between “DUPLEX D” and “APT.” on page 12.

Provide minimum required depth (12-16”) between front and back planes of low-rise units. **[NOT RESOLVED]**

“3. Applicant will work to minimize visibility of the mullions to reduce contrast between metal and glass.”

Conditional Approval was given by the DRB for the balcony design, but directed Staff to continue working with the applicant to minimize visibility of the mullions of adjacent windows and to reduce contrast between metal and glass within the stepped grid pattern. **[NOT RESOLVED]**

Staff Direction

1. Utilize vision glass as presented in approved renderings, except for the portion concealing penthouse mechanical spaces.
2. Staff continues to have concerns that the East/West slots are not sufficiently visually distinct from the surrounding architecture.
3. Adjust balconies or units to eliminate privacy conflicts and the use of physical barriers within balconies.
4. Resolve privacy issues between public and private terraces on 16th and 26th floors. Provide details requested (see above).
5. Return pilotis design to the approved version incorporating circular columns with consistent spacing.
6. Provide architectural lighting in the garage and provide visual barriers where the parking levels overlook the street.
7. Identify the soffit material, patterning and any lighting used beneath the 16th and 26th floor projections.

8. Provide a timeline for use of the “future staging area,” describe and show screening provided.
9. Show the overhangs of the building that create the “front porch” at the pool level in plan view by using a dotted line or other graphic convention.

V. CONCLUSION

Staff recommends the applicant continue to work on the building design subject to the comments and analysis narrative provided above. The main issues of concern include:

- Visually reinforce the slot on each façade
- Address outstanding conditions of approval
- Resolve glass types
- Resolve balconies

Eisenhower East / Carlyle Blocks

