

## **Beauregard Urban Design Advisory Committee (BDAC) - Meeting Minutes**

October 23, 2017

6:30 pm

Northern Virginia Community Campus, Bisdorf Building  
(5000 Dawes Avenue, Room 196)

**\*\*Approved by BDAC on 2.26.2018\*\***

### **Committee Members in**

#### **Attendance:**

Pete Benavage, Chair  
Donna Fossum, Co-Chair  
Abed Benzina  
Carolyn Griglione  
Fatimah Mateen

#### **Absent Committee Members:**

Ben Jehle

#### **City Staff:**

Tom Canfield, City Architect, P&Z  
Maya Contreras, Principal Planner,  
P&Z  
Sara Brandt-Vorel, Urban Planner,  
P&Z  
Ashley Labadie, Urban Planner, P&Z  
Eric Keeler, Division Chief, Office of  
Housing

#### **Applicant Team:**

John Welsh, AHC Inc.  
Haley Norris, ACH Inc.  
Lee Quill, Cunningham | Quill  
Architects  
Robin McGrew, Cunningham | Quill  
Architects  
Bob Hruby, Campion Hruby  
Landscape Architects  
Kevin Gaughan, Campion Hruby  
Landscape Architects  
Duncan Blair, Land Carroll & Blair

### **Agenda Items:**

1. Welcome & Introductions (5 Minutes)
2. Responsibilities (5 Minutes)
  - a. Review and Approval of Draft  
September 25, 2017 Meeting Minutes
3. New Business:
  - a. Applicant Presentation of  
DSUP#2016-0044: Church of the  
Resurrection Architecture Update
    - i. Presentation by Applicant (20  
Minutes)
    - ii. BDAC Questions for Applicant  
(30 Minutes)
4. Questions & Public Comments (30 -45  
Minutes)
5. BDAC Debate and Vote on Application for  
DSUP #2016-0044: Church of the  
Resurrection (25 Minutes)
6. Next Steps (5 Minutes)
  - a. Overview of Next Steps by Staff on the  
Development Review Process for  
DSP#2016-0044

### **Welcome and Introductions:**

Mr. Benavage commenced the meeting and provided an overview of the meeting agenda and procedures.

### **Responsibilities:**

The Committee unanimously approved the minutes from the June 19, 2017 meeting.

### **New Business:**

#### ***Applicant Presentation of DSUP#2016-0044: Church of the Resurrection Architecture Update***

Ms. Contreras stated the applicant team would provide a brief presentation with updates to the proposed building architecture based on the comments provided by BDAC and the community at the previous meeting, to be followed by a brief presentation of new images by the applicant, a discussion of the design by BDAC members and then public comments.

Reverend Belser of the Episcopal Church of the Resurrection welcomed attendees and stated they were hoping to vote this evening. Reverend Belser stated the design tonight represented several design revisions based on feedback received on the design and that she hoped there was sufficient information provided to enable a vote.

Mr. Quill commenced the applicant presentation and stated his intent to cover the design issues brought up by members of BDAC and Goodwin House at previous meetings. Mr. Quill then stated his intent to share updated images of a potential façade which had been developed within the past few days which addressed design and issues of economics. Issues addressed included:

- The location of powerlines in front of the church and multi-family building will continue to be addressed and discussed in light of project finances. Mr. Quill showed images of the potential alignment of the powerlines if they were to remain above ground.
- Rearranging and aligning of the ground-floor windows along N. Beauregard Street.
- Grouping of the loading dock and adjacent doors on Fillmore Avenue.
- Venting along the building façade has been arranged to work in conjunction with the windows and within the overall patterning of the building.
- Maintaining the horizontal striped and ribbed pattern of the internal courtyard while refining the widths of the courtyard panels.
- Discussing the views of the proposed project from Goodwin House, as seen from the ground-floor circle, the 5<sup>th</sup> floor of the tower and the 15<sup>th</sup> floor of the tower.
- Discussing the roof to confirm a grey roof color and the arrangement of mechanical equipment in an orderly manner to create a nicer view of the roof.

Mr. Quill presented an additional design consideration for the building façade, with the goal of introducing additional brick to the building façade; namely:

- Replacing fiber cement bays of the buildings with additional brick façade; though the top two floors of some bays will be clad in fiber cement;
- Introducing a second color of brick;
- Continuing the use of rusticated brick along the base of the building and utilizing brick to turn the corner of the building;
- Changing to the building façade facing Goodwin House to full brick façade; and
- Maintaining fiber cement horizontal panels in the courtyard.

Mr. Quill highlighted additional design considerations which were addressed by the applicant team and carried forward into the updated building design, including:

- Window syncopation and utilizing different sized windows for the bedrooms versus living rooms;
- Utilizing ribbing and rustication between windows and on the building façade to create visual interest between windows;
- Simplifying the art screen along the parking level to a floating panel with little articulation to be smaller and quieter within the building design;
- Continuing refinements to the interior courtyard to work on the verticality with refinements made to the sizes of the banding in the courtyard and aligning the window sills within the horizontal panels;
- Increasing the verticality of the interior windows by making the width narrower but maintaining the existing height;
- Reviewing the color of the proposed bricks;
- Assessing the courtyard design to ensure the safety of children playing on site; and
- Maintaining the church design, with no changes made to the previously seen church design.

Mr. Hruby provided an overview of the proposed landscape design, including:

- Reviewing the locations for pedestrian, vehicular and handicap accessible access to the site and building;
- Describing the upper courtyard, middle courtyard, and central gathering places;
- Reviewing precedent images for the landscaping as seen from N. Beaugard Street and the internal courtyards;
- Discussing the selection of natural plantings and indigenous plants that work year-round to enhance the site;
- Providing an overview of the landscaping along N. Beaugard Street;
- Reviewing the design compliance with the Beaugard Urban Design Standards and Guidelines for the streetscape;
- Discussing the functional overview of the courtyard, emphasizing a flexible design to enable a wide range of uses and activities; and

- Reviewing safety features of the proposed retaining wall including the introduction of a guardrail, which will be a cast-in-place retaining wall.

At the conclusion of the applicant presentation, Mr. Benavage recommended switching the meeting agenda to allow public comment to proceed prior to committee discussion. Mr. Benavage's recommendation was agreed upon and Public Comment commenced.

### ***Public Comment***

Mark Drake, an architect and member of the Church of the Resurrection, stated the church had heard complaints that the building design did not look like Goodwin House, however the intent of the proposed multi-family building design was to develop a contemporary design that complied with the Small Area Plan guidelines. Mr. Drake stated their desire to be accommodating to the needs and mission of the adjacent building. Iterating that when Goodwin House requested a tall, 15 story building that would tower over the Church of the Resurrection, the church allowed the building to proceed and support the mission of Goodwin House and would recognize the validity of the Church's current mission.

Ms. Lee Fowley, a resident of Newport Village and member of the Church of the Resurrection spoke to address the playground issue. Ms. Fowley was surprised that there was no playground intended for the site but after reviewing the plan and speaking with the redevelopment team at the church, felt comfortable that many children would be enrolled in after school programs or supervised by parents to play in the large interior courtyard. Ms. Fowley was not concerned that children would run across the church's access road, which would have a low traffic volume.

Mr. Connie Ring, a resident of Goodwin House and a former City Council Member provided a written analysis of the legal requirements for reviewing the development proposal. Mr. Ring reiterated that the legal requirements of the process was through the Coordinated Development District, which would require the Church and Goodwin House to collaborate on the design. Mr. Ring began outlining the six standards required for approval of the CDD. Mr. Ring submitted a written copy of his comments for consideration by BDAC, the Planning Commission and City Council. Mr. Benavage stated that a copy would be submitted as an enclosure to the BDAC recommendations to the Planning Commission and the City Council.

Mr. Carl Miller, a resident of Goodwin House, stated his concern over the potential traffic flow for the proposed design, especially when considering the number of cars proposed for the multi-family building. Mr. Miller inquired if Fillmore Avenue could be a non-parking area to better facilitate traffic.

Ms. Laura Lawson, a resident of Goodwin House was concerned over the unconfirmed requirement of undergrounding of utilities along N. Beauregard Street as this would not comply with the design standards of the Beauregard Small Area Plan and Design guidelines. Ms. Lawson also iterated to ask the committee to indicate the location of stormwater and site drainage and if surface parking would be permitted for the church if the church is deemed an existing use within the parameters of the guidelines.

Ms. Natalie Rooney, a resident of Goodwin House, stated she was delighted there would be affordable housing but that the compatibility of the design with the neighborhood and the visual impact of the design upon Goodwin House was a critical aspect of the review. Ms. Rooney stated a majority of the view shed from Goodwin House was that of brick buildings and inquired if more brick could be allocated to the courtyard instead of along Fillmore Avenue so the view from Goodwin House saw additional brick. Ms. Rooney also stated she disliked the lack of symmetry and the two colors of brick seen in the design.

Ms. Barbara Bancroft, a resident of Goodwin House, stated that while the design of the project was a little different than others in the neighborhood, she welcomed the project and stated the need for affordable housing in the community.

Mr. Bob Arnett, a resident of Goodwin House and a member of the Church of the Resurrection, inquired if the parking lot barrier between Goodwin House and the Church was appropriate and conformed with the Fire Marshall's design requirements. Mr. Arnett iterated that there should be pedestrian access to the church and the memorial garden that can accommodate people with limited mobility.

Ms. Susan Weber, a resident of Goodwin House and a member of the Church of the Resurrection, stated her support of the project and that she likes the building design and commended the applicant team for responding to design suggestions from the community.

Mr. Al Tiedemann, a member of the Church of the Resurrection, stated that based on the current attendance of the Church, the design of the new church would accommodate parking demand and complied with the parking requirements for City Code. Furthermore the Church had submitted a parking management plan to address on- and off-site parking strategies for events with additional traffic. Mr. Tiedemann iterated that the church would not ask Goodwin House for any parking assistance.

Mr. Robert Reeves, a member of the Church of the Resurrection, stated his understanding that the proposed multi-family parking complies with the City's parking standards and was consistent with the parking ratios utilized by AHC, Inc. for their properties across the region.

Ms. Louise Bennett, a resident of Goodwin House and a member of the Church of the Resurrection, stated that concerns at the last meeting included the visibility of mechanical equipment on rooftops. However, many buildings have mechanical equipment on their roof, including Goodwin House.

Ms. Cathy Parnell, a member of the Church of the Resurrection, stated her excitement to see the new landscape plan that would remove the invasive species along N. Beauregard Street and open up the Church of the Resurrection to all those who would pass by.

Mr. William McBeth, a federal employee and former resident of Alexandria, stated he now lives in Woodbridge as the City has become unaffordable, even to those with well-paying jobs. Mr. McBeth stated there was a need for affordable housing and many city employees, such as teachers and firefighters are being forced out of the City to find affordable housing.

Ms. Betty Cranwell, a resident of Goodwin House, stated her opposition to affordable housing at the proposed location as there is not enough space for both Goodwin House and the Church of the Resurrection on site. Ms. Cranwell also stated her concern about traffic; the amount of parking provided for the multi-family building; the location of the loading dock; the compatibility of the building design with Goodwin House; and the possible location of bus loading and unloading for school-aged children.

Mr. Pierre Shostal, a resident of Goodwin House, stated his appreciation of the design revisions which were made by the applicant team and stated it was a definite improvement. Mr. Shostal stated his concern about the possible play areas for children and potential safety issues. Mr. Shostal requested additional information on the design of the proposed play area.

Ms. Morney Keleher, a resident of Goodwin House, agreed with Pierre's concerns but was more concerned about the traffic from Goodwin House combining with the potential traffic patterns with the multi-family building and the impact on the surrounding roadways.

Mr. Bill McCulla, a resident of Goodwin House, stated the proposed location of the brick on the multi-family building would be obscured by the church building and some of the brick should be relocated. Furthermore, this was the first prominently located building within the Beauregard Small Area Plan and the overall design will set a tone for other buildings in the area.

Mr. Mike McCafflee, a resident of Goodwin House, was concerned that the design of the building was deviating from the tenants of the Beauregard Small Area Plan, including the appearance of the building and its lack of uniform brick application; the design's compatibility with the neighborhood; and the undergrounding of the utilities. Mr. McCafflee was also concerned about the possible traffic impacts, roadway capacity, location of loading docks, and the color of brick for the building. Mr. McCafflee recommended limiting the design to one color of brick.

Mr. Bernard Glenn, a resident of Goodwin House, inquired about the durability of the roof panels and the color of the church roof and stated he was not opposed to the project as affordable housing is a good idea. Mr. Glenn also iterated his concern over parking and that affordable housing in other jurisdictions may have better public transportation options such as bus lines, car sharing, and bike share.

Mr. Allen Barnes stated his belief that 113 units of housing with 82 parking spaces would not work as Fillmore Avenue is the only place with on-street parking and it's already lined with cars.

Ms. Betsy Faga, a member of the Church of the Resurrection, stated her desire to address the design portion of the church as it relates to the Beauregard Small Area Plan. Ms. Faga stated that modern designs, which are becoming more popular, may be unsettling to some but are bringing the City up to date. Ms. Faga stated the design of the church was more modern and that the use of newer materials enabled the building to be more sustainable, economic, and require less maintenance.

Reverend Jo Belser inquired about the ownership of the Fillmore Avenue Bulb [*Street adjacent to the Church of the Resurrection building*] to which Ms. Contreras responded it was a public street.

Ms. Laura Lawson stated there was little street or overflow parking on Fillmore Avenue and stated her observation that current church parking needs would overwhelm the proposed number of parking spaces for the new church building. Ms. Lawson stated that perhaps the smaller church building would result in a lower parking demand, but reiterated her belief that the new church building would not provide enough parking.

Ms. Barbara Eversman, a member of the Church of the Resurrection, iterated that the Church believes in being a good neighbor and inquired how many members of Goodwin House park on the Church property on Sundays, along with Goodwin House trucks during the week.

Ms. Dorris Stayson, wanted to state her assurance that the parking issue would be a problem. In Ms. Stayson's experience living in a condominium building would require a higher parking ratio.

Ms. Cathy Puskar, of Walsh Colucci, attorney for Goodwin House Incorporated, stated that her client had been hosting town hall meetings with residents of Goodwin House and had compiled written feedback and concern on behalf of the Goodwin House community. Ms. Puskar iterated Goodwin Houses' desire for the proposal to comply with the Small Area plan and design standards. Ms. Puskar stated that her following comments would contain both design and operational concerns. Ms. Puskar:

- Thanked the applicant team for the addition of brick to the rear of the building and stated the addition was an improvement to the design, however there still may be too much fiber cement on the interior courtyard;
- Stated the desire to avoid pure white fiber cement on the church structure as it could create a strong glare and that the color selection would be important to the overall design;
- Requested further refinement of the brick to be used in the designs;
- Further refinement of the proposed barrier in the parking lot between Goodwin House and the Church of the Resurrection for a more substantial barrier;
- Concern over the number of parking spaces proposed for the multi-family building and given the less urban location of the affordable housing, without alternative transportation options and a street grid for on-street parking, the number of parking spaces provided is inadequate;
- As the redeveloped church building would not be an existing use per the guidelines of the small area plan, and should have one level of below-grade parking, Goodwin House therefore did not support the request for tandem parking spaces;
- Reiterated the constant comments for the need for a playground for children at the multi-family building;
- Posited concern that the trees shown in the rendering will not be achievable on site;
- Requested additional assurances that the existing trees on site could be saved, especially those trees along the proposed new road;
- Requested information on how loading and unloading operations would occur; and

- Requested that should relief be afforded to the applicant in the form of developer contributions and undergrounding contributions, then Goodwin House would request and should be afforded the same relief in forthcoming phases of development.

Ms. Contreras responded to a few comments heard during the presentation and comments.

- Storm water was being reviewed by the City's Department of Environmental Quality and the project would meet all existing requirements, including the Chesapeake Bay Standards, through a combination of plantings and underwater stormwater capture.
- The applicant's proposal meets the City's parking requirements for affordable housing and is requesting a technical parking reduction for the church as the spaces are tandem. Staff will continue to work with the applicant to ensure parking can serve the demands of the church.
- While the project is in an advanced stage of design, the *final* design process will occur after final legislative approval by City Council. Staff will include a comment that during the Final Site Plan process the applicant will provide enough information to determine the proper course of action for undergrounding, as the City continues to support the undergrounding of utilities at this location.
- Staff will continue to review the playground request and will include a condition in approval requiring age appropriate playground design, if deemed necessary.
- If the project is approved, staff and the applicant team will work closely with Alexandria City Public Schools to ensure there are safe routes to school, walk routes, and bus areas for pick-up and drop-off functions.

### ***Committee Discussion***

Mr. Benavage thanked the community for attending the meeting and those who provided comments. Mr. Blair indicated there would be a community meeting, held by the applicant, in December, to provide updates on the project.

Mr. Benavage provided an overview of the committee's role to review the design in light of the Beauregard Small Area Plan and design guidelines and make recommendations to City Council. However, Mr. Benavage iterated that BDAC is not the final arbiter and does not rule on the viability of a project, just the design compatibility.

Mr. Benavage suggested the committee entertain a motion regarding the application. Ms. Fossum moved to approve the application. Mr. Benzina seconded. Formal discussion and debate by the Beauregard Design Advisory Committee was opened.

Ms. Fossum began the discussion by stating her desire to make all sides of the multi-family building feel consistent in design quality and that it still seemed there was a back door facing Goodwin House. Ms. Fossum supported the addition of brick, but suggested that using one type of brick may reduce overall costs. Ms. Fossum inquired if additional brick could be added to the courtyard which was visible to Goodwin house.



Mr. Benzina commended the applicant and the design team on the revised design and for the addition of brick which Mr. Benzina appreciated as the two colors of brick further broke down the massing of the overall building. Mr. Benzina suggested a few revisions to the color of the siding in the multi-family building to better integrate the two buildings together as a campus. Mr. Benzina iterated that the burden of the City parking ratio was for City Council and the Department of Transportation & Environmental Services as the appropriate venues for the parking and traffic concerns and it was unfair to place the burden of existing roadway conditions upon the applicant. In conclusion, Mr. Benzina stated his review of the Design Matrix with hundreds of design requirements and that the applicant was only deviating on two requirements which were addressed at the previous meeting. Mr. Benzina found the overall design to be very positive.

Ms. Mateen stated the positive changes in the overall design since the first BDAC meeting and was also pleasantly surprised with the new rendering. Ms. Mateen agreed that the City of Alexandria was moving towards a more modern design aesthetic and that this project was part of that process. Ms. Mateen also inquired if there was an opportunity to add more brick to the courtyard as an accent and to increase the visual diversity of the space. Ms. Mateen concluded her comments by stating that the façade was relatively flat and inquired if there was an opportunity to add some depth, such as window pop-outs that would add interest to the building.

Ms. Griglione started by thanking the design team and said that after reviewing many buildings in the area, noticed that there was sometimes a lighter band of color at the top of structures which reduces the presence of the building and if a similar technique could be applied in this instance. Could fiber cement be moved from the courtyard to the top of the building and transfer brick from the top of the building to the courtyard. Ms. Griglione also stated the landscape design was making progress and that it would be a great improvement along N. Beauregard Street.

Mr. Benavage concluded the discussion with his comments and thanked the design team for listening to BDAC and the community and incorporating many design changes over the past few meetings. Mr. Benavage also commented that:

- Traffic has always been challenging in the City and there are always opportunities to improve the circulation. Having heard many comments about pick-up and drop-off, Mr. Benavage requested that the City connect with ACPS and find out the location of pick-up and drop-off for children at Newport Village and see if a location on Fillmore Avenue could be identified;
- Consideration be given to add artwork or molding in the courtyard to create an artistic effect; and
- As approximately 80 individuals may reside on each floor, Mr. Benavage was concerned that there may not be enough washing machines for residents, and that careful study be made to ensure there were adequate hours of access and enough machines provided for the residents.

Mr. Benavage moved to make a formal amendment on the motion:

1. The applicant, with respect to the Church of the Resurrection, to make a good faith effort to negotiate with Northern Virginia Community College or a similar entity, for use of their parking garages during peak times, such as Sundays or major religious holidays, especially as classes tend not to be in session during such periods. (This would be recommended as a condition to the Planning Commission and City Council.)
2. That a recommended condition of approval be the retention of as much of the existing tree canopy as possible, especially between Goodwin House and the Church of the Resurrection.

These motions were seconded by Ms. Fossum. Ms. Contreras stated these motions should be added to the formal letter to be submitted by BDAC to the Planning Commission and City Council.

Mr. Benavage recommended that the playground and recreation items should be further reviewed by staff, and that the undergrounding of the utilities should be further item of discussion. Ms. Fossum added that the fire department should further review the site access and the turn-around questions, especially as the movements related to loading and unloading at the multi-family building. Ms. Contreras responded that Fire and Life Safety have been reviewing the application with staff since the project conception. Fire Access for the multi-family building will be provided from North Beauregard Street.

Mr. Benavage moved to inquire if the proposed amendments in regard to parking and the trees could be considered together. Ms. Griglione moved approval and seconded Mr. Benavage. A unanimous vote of approval was taken on the two amendments.

Mr. Benavage inquired if there was any further debate. Hearing no response, Mr. Benavage called the question. The Beauregard Design Advisory Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval of the project by Planning Commission and City Council.