

Beauregard Design Advisory Committee (BDAC) – Meeting Summary

October 24, 2022

7:00 p.m.

Patrick Henry Recreation Center
(4653 Taney Ave, Multipurpose Room C)

Committee Members in Attendance:

Donna Fossum
Gus Ardura
Fatimah Mateen
Christine Hoeffner
Abed Benzina
Bud Jackson

Absent Committee Members:

Jill Phaneuf
Samantha Moore

City Staff:

Maya Contreras, Principal Planner, P&Z Dev.
Bill Cook, Urban Planner, P&Z Dev.
Maggie Cooper, Urban Planner, P&Z Dev.
Tom Canfield, City Architect, P&Z
David Lanier, Assistant City Attorney

Applicant Team:

Bill Krokowski, Mark Center Residential,
LLC
Tom Glatzel, WMH Development
Thomas Dinneny, DCS Design
Travis Brow, Walter L Phillips, Inc.
Jeffery Stuchel, Walter L Phillips, Inc.
Adam Steiner, J2 Engineers, Inc
Adam Rogers, J2 Engineers, Inc
Chris Turnbull, Wells + Associates
Ken Wire, Wire Gill LLP
Megan Rappolt, Wire Gill LLP

Community

Rebecca Hierholzer

Agenda Items:

1. Call To Order
2. FOIA presentation
 - a. City Attorney's Office staff
3. Hilton MF Design Discussion
 - a. Applicant introduction of design matrix for the Hilton site (CDSP2022-00013)
 - b. Staff-lead BDAC discussion with questions for the applicant
 - c. Public questions and comment
4. Confirm 12/5/22 meeting
5. Motion to adjourn

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

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

Call to Order & Responsibilities:

Chair Donna Fossum called the meeting to order. Committee members introduced themselves. Bud Jackson returns to the Committee as business community representative after being reappointed.

Mr. Jackson moved to accept the summary of the September 26, 2022 minutes, seconded by Ms. Mateen, with corrections as suggested by Mr. Benzina. (6-0-0)

Staff Presentation

David Lanier, Assistant City Attorney, gave an overview of FOIA requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act. Topics included public records maintenance pertaining to committee members, meeting requirements, and various matters related to communication and assembly.

Maya Contreras gave an overview of the governing documents and principles pertaining to BDAC as well as the Committee's purview and focus. She also presented some of the context and activity in the vicinity of the evening's applicant presentation.

New Business

Ken Wire representing the applicant introduced the applicant team. This was the second applicant presentation to BDAC. Wire reiterated the site conditions and constraints that informed such decisions as building entrance, parking location, and site access. Mr. Benzina expressed his thoughts that a small area of surface parking is acceptable as a "motor court" if thoughtfully designed. The design continues to develop. Expanding on inquiries from Ms. Mateen, Wire described the design challenge of the single vehicular entrance, which then separates residential traffic to the parking garage, from pick-up/drop-off and delivery traffic and parking near the building entrance. In response to Ms. Hoeffner's question, Wire explained that the final design will have pavement, plants, and other design elements to treat and manage stormwater, as well as storm infrastructure that surpasses the existing pond. Mr. Jackson wanted to know the barriers to internal pick-up/drop-off space. Wire responded that parking space is at a premium in the below-grade levels. While Uber and delivery traffic is not internalized, the plan does internalize much of the loading functions so these will not be visible nor conflict with pedestrians and traffic.

Thomas Dinneny, project architect, presented updated architectural elevations to better convey the grade and how the access and building program responds to site conditions. He explained that the concept for the building was of two primary masses with a glassy link. The façade on Mark Center Avenue is challenging because of the length of the façade and consideration of the proximity of the bus bays. Dinneny later stated that first floor residential entrances along Mark Center Avenue were not contemplated because of the bus terminal, nor could they be provided elsewhere due to topography, however there will be keycard access to the building at that level so that residents can easily use the bus terminal. In response to comments from the last meeting, updated renderings of the pool area were provided to explain the relationship of the pool to the site and adjacent grade.

Wire highlighted some of the expected deviations from the Beauregard Urban Design Guidelines and Standards that will be requested to facilitate the design, as outlined on slide 13 of the presentation. In response to Mr. Jackson's question about retail, applicant Bill Krokowski noted that discussions with prospective tenants found the location less than ideal, and that certain basic amenities were located on the hotel property and nearby. Ms. Contreras noted that some questions from members during the presentation were contemplated by staff and the applicant in earlier concept phases and provided an overview of some of those discussions. She added that many on-site activities contemplated today were not a consideration of the design guidelines and small area plan, such as increased food and package deliveries, and ride-share pickup and drop-off areas. Ms. Contreras responded to questions about bike share and the expected project timeline.

The next meeting will include Committee review of the design guidelines and standards matrix, building sections, and more developed plans for the landscape and entry court. The applicant noted the project will include 300+ units, with 25 units deemed affordable in accordance with City policy. Additional project details will be provided as it evolves from the concept phases. Ms. Mateen commented that the façade on this section is concerning and needs additional articulation and detail. She also expressed concern about the height of the parapets and the perception of blank space at the top. Mr. Benzina concurred that additional height differentiation was needed.

Additional Committee Discussion

Mr. Jackson asked for clarification of why changes sometimes happen after a project is approved, or why some elements recommended by the Committee were not accepted and news of such actions not relayed back to members. He cited trash collection at the Blake, which he did not think was being implemented as approved in the DSUP. Ms. Contreras said that staff can research specific issues, but in some cases reporting the issue via 311 is the best path if something is known to be contrary to development conditions. Ms. Rebecca Hierholzer, who lives in the community, commented that the Seminary Park has been communicating with the Blake property, and the current trash collection arrangement was stated to be temporary.

The next meeting will be December 5, 2022.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:50 PM.