

**Carlyle/Eisenhower East Design Review Board  
September 18, 2007**

**REQUEST:** Exemption from DRB condition requiring treatment of north wall of parking structure

**LOCATION:** 2321 Mill Road (Eisenhower East)

**APPLICANT:** Eisenhower Mill Properties, LLC

**STAFF:** Thomas Canfield, City Architect, Planning & Zoning  
Katy Parker, Urban Planner, Planning & Zoning

---

**BOARD ACTION:** On a motion by Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Quill, the Carlyle Design Review Board voted to require the applicant to explore treatment options for the wall and return to the Board at a later date with possible solutions. The Board agreed that this outstanding issue should not delay issuance of a permanent Certificate of Occupancy for the parking structure. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

**I. REQUEST**

The applicant is requesting exemption from the DRB condition to treat the precast wall on the north side of the parking structure at the Eisenhower Center III site. This condition was made at the June 30, 2005 DRB when the Board reviewed the design of the office building and parking structure. The intent of requiring treatment for this wall of the parking garage was to make the color of the precast a less stark contrast to the brick of the garage.

**II. PROJECT FACTS AND FIGURES**

*Project Location:*

The parking structure for Eisenhower Center III is located at 2321 Mill Road, which is on the eastern portion of the lot that extends from Mill Road to Elizabeth Lane. The six story office building is currently under construction to the west of the garage and the Federal Courthouse is located immediately north of the site. The portion of the garage under discussion is the north wall along the property line adjacent to the Courthouse.

*Project Details:*

The Eisenhower Center III project was reviewed by the DRB on June 30, 2005. At that meeting, the treatment of the north wall of the parking structure was discussed (see attached minutes). Former DRB member Mr. Rust brought up his concerns with the pre-cast wall and suggested that it would be visible enough to merit it being constructed with brick. DRB member Mr. Lewis agreed and suggested one alternative could be to have the color of the precast more closely replicate the color of the brick in the building. While the applicant noted that the wall would typically be in shadow and

not very visible from the street, and that the precast had been selected to match the building, he agreed that less of a contrast of color between the brick and the precast would be acceptable. With a 5-0 voted, the Board approved the parking structure as proposed, with modifications to the color of the precast to provide a less stark contrast to the brick.

Since the DRB hearing, construction of the garage has finished and the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Occupancy. However, the north wall of the parking structure has not been treated as required by the DRB. The applicant has requested that this requirement be waived and has provided a letter from their architect, Luther Blair, Jr. of Wisnewski Blair and Associates, Ltd., that provides a professional opinion for why this condition is unnecessary (see application materials). In the letter, Mr. Blair cites the architectural language of the structure (i.e., articulation through reveals), the high quality of the precast material, and the fact that the wall is not on street frontage as justification for not treating the precast wall to match the brick color.

#### **IV. STAFF ANALYSIS**

As previously stated, the issue of treating the north wall of the parking structure was first discussed at the June 30, 2005 DRB meeting. At this meeting the Board expressed concerns about leaving the pre-cast wall untreated. Now that the parking structure has been constructed and the wall is still untreated at this point in time, the applicant has asked the Board to reconsider this condition.

Staff has been to the site to examine the wall in its built state and has also reviewed the pictures and letter from the architect supplied by the applicant. From the site visits and review of the pictures, it appears that the surface of the pre-cast is slightly uneven and in some light the finish of the wall appears blotchy or inconsistent in contrast to the high quality finishes on the remainder of the building. Additionally, the corner condition where the brick wall meets the precast wall is disconcerting and appears unresolved. While Mr. Blair identifies some valid points in his letter, staff still sees value in treating the garage wall to create less of a contrast between the precast and the brick, as previously directed by the DRB.

#### **V. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Board reaffirm its original decision and **deny** the applicant's request to leave the garage wall untreated.



*Elizabeth Lane frontage of parking structure*



*North side of parking structure*