

BOULEVARD ONE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
AUGUST 13, 2020
Video/Audio E-Conference

Attendees:

Committee: Monty Force, Steve Lane, Chuck Woodward, Kevin Yoshida
Kiddie Academy: Ken Andrews, Sarah Kia, Adam Muhleisen, Franz Von Haas

The meeting convened at 9:00 a.m.

● **Minutes Approval (7/30/20)**

A motion by Steve Lane and seconded by Chuck Woodward was passed to approve the minutes from the July 30, 2020 meeting as presented.

- **Kiddie Academy
Childcare Facility (Pontiac and First Ave)
Materials**

This discussion about materials is a contingency to Design Development approval resulting from a review of the material samples and whether the masonry standard in the guidelines is being met.

Ken Andrews stated that it appeared that the committee rescinded approval of using metal as a substitute for masonry.

Steve responded that the table presented was not clear and Kevin agreed that the submitted table was not clear that the masonry requirement was being met and he pointed out that the guidelines also ask for:

- Connection to Lowry
- Durability of materials

Kevin continued by saying that the committee needs a clear understanding or rationale for approval. Accent materials are considered as accents and then unique materials can be considered. How can there be 60% of accent materials?

Ken said that they were honest in not using masonry. There is a lot of metal in the architecture around Lowry and metal is durable. Franz pointed out that since there was approval at the schematic level in May the team assumed, they were on track.

Nick Kitaef, with Confluent, the general developer of the mixed-use site, said the he has been involved with projects at Boulevard One over the past seven years and that the BDRC is a good steward for the development. He said that it sounds like Ken and his team are making great strides toward approval, but they need to listen to the BDRC. Bob Koontz with Kelmore Development, Confluent's partner, said that they want something that fits in with the overall mixed-use architecture.

Monty presented some history of the development and stressed the importance of a pedestrian scale and experience. These materials don't rise to the quality of an acceptable substitution for masonry. Kevin suggested that perhaps a variance process should be explored.

Nick asked about the cost of metal panels and how does that factor with masonry. Ken said that metal panels are \$4/SF and the perforated metal screening is more expensive. Ken said they thought the metal screening would be considered a unique material. There are murals on the stucco, also considered as unique. The fiber cement as unique but that was excluded. There is framing behind that is invisible through the screen that was also excluded.

Bob expressed his opinion that the building is beautiful. But how do we satisfy the table showing the breakdown, which is the discussion at hand, regardless of whether it is a good design.

Steve - It is too industrial. Two stories of metal give an industrial feel, particularly at the NW corner. Could stucco be used successfully at the lower level?

Kevin – By seeing the materials and the table of percentages of materials used that new layer of information revealed the difficulty with the industrial look. Accent material is no longer an accent. Metal became primary and no longer an accent material.

Ken responded that metal siding is not an accent. The perforated metal could be considered as the accent. We don't want to add another material to the mix. Can we look at changing the patterning of the existing materials? Stucco is currently used as background for mural. Could we create a base with ground face CMU?

Steve – CMU might be more expensive than stucco. Ken responded that veneer block is not load bearing.

Kevin – There is a base, middle and top. CMU might be an option as a base. In the table, is the fencing considered as part of the building material? Ken said that yes, it is.

Sarah Kia said that all the east elevation is a stucco mural but is only seen above the metal screen. Ken suggested maybe the perforated metal screen could be broken with openings to reveal the stucco mural. Monty thought that would help.

Steve – What about the NW corner? Ken suggested maybe more articulation of the metal. Steve didn't think that would be helpful. Ken asked if the colors of the window frames helps. Kevin and Steve agreed that the playful splashes of color do help.

Monty – There is no human scale at the NE corner or on the east elevation. CMU or stucco could help.

Ken asked about the comment of how much screening wrapping along on 1st Ave was appropriate. Maybe adding some openings in the screening on the east and northeast corner. Franz said the perforation is transparent so wondered why the openings would be better.

In conclusion, the options of more use of CMU veneer or stucco was suggested to reach to the top of the windows on the ground level. Adam said that he thought stucco is probably the better choice over the CMU for cost reasons. Ken and the team will study these two options.

Ken and Adam pointed out that they will have to consider how to maintain security if the perforated screening is opened.

- **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.