

BOULEVARD ONE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
August 20, 2020
Video/Audio E-Conference

Attendees:

Committee: Jamie Fogle, Monty Force, Steve Lane, Carla McConnell, Kevin Yoshida
CK Signage Team: Branden Bird, Mike Doody, H McNeish
Kiddie Academy: Ken Andrews, Sarah Kia, Adam Muhleisen, Franz von Haas
Developer-KA review: Nick Kitaef, Bob Koontz, Celeste Tanner

The meeting convened at 9:00 a.m.

● **Minutes Approval (8/13/20)**

A motion by Carla McConnell and seconded by Steve Lane was passed to approve the minutes from the August 13, 2020 meeting as presented.

- **CK Development**
Commercial Anchor (Corner of 1st Ave and Quebec)
Comprehensive Signage Plan

Comprehensive Signage Plan: (H McNeish)

H McNeish started by explaining that the submittal included both the signage plan and the photometrics. He apologized that the photometrics plan and backup materials were not as coordinated as they should be so the lighting plan will be presented at the 9/3 BDRC meeting and today's presentation will cover the signage only.

H said that the signage plan for Target is consistent with the architectural plan that has been approved by the BDRC.

Mike Doody introduced Branden Bird (aka "Bird") who will present the signage plan, which follows the layout that was first presented for the entire mixed-use site in December 2018. They will then focus on the Target signage.

Bird summarized the overall principles for the signage types

- Wall Sign – Retail Tenant, Office Tenant, Anchor Tenant, Project ID, Directory
- Projecting Sign – Tenant, Garage
- Canopy Sign – Tenant
- Arcade Sign – Tenant, Garage
- Ground Sign – Joint Tenant, Project Wayfinding (auto & pedestrian), Project ID Banner, Parking Wayfinding, Parking Beacon
- Window Sign – 20%

CCD has limits on the total number of signs, but the signage plans for each building show more than the allowable as option locations for various types of signage with flexibility for choosing a mix of types.

Bird went into more specifics on the sizing of the different signs and potential locations for each building.

- Ground signs for joint tenant ID will be double-sided and have interchangeable panels for ease of updating as needed. Located at entry points from 1st and Poplar and at the two corners on Quebec.
- Parking Beacon will only be used for Target near the store entry for customer merchandise pick up purposes.
- Window signs will be vinyl on glass.
- Allowable wall sign sizing is shown on the plan as a dashed outline as the maximum size. Total sizing is dictated by a formula per square footage occupied by tenant.

Committee comments/questions, **with responses in bold:**

Kevin – 1) Are random elements such as bollards, furnishings considered as part of signage plan? **No, they are not considered as part of the signage plan.**

2) Are the banner signs independent of the lighting plan? **Yes, that is correct.**

Jamie– Will the ground sign on the corner of 1st and Quebec interfere with traffic visibility for drivers? **There is a limited designation for placement to meet CCD requirements.**

Monty – Concerned about how the tenant ground signs will look, blend with architecture, especially the ones located on Quebec. **Rendering perspectives can be produced. Much taller ground signs are allowed but keeping them shorter in this plan.**

Carla – 1) Will there be parking lot signs designated for Target? **No, other than the merchandise pick up location for Target.**

2) Will signage for the office tenants be outside or an inside directory? **Good question. The signage team will need to regroup on that since it has been awhile since that was talked about. It might be a developer determination.**

H said they are seeking approval of the signage plan, but he understands that some better information is needed on a few points. He requested a focus on the Target piece for approval if the BDRC is comfortable with that, with follow up on the other outstanding comments on the overall comprehensive signage plan.

Target Signage Plan:

- Target is allowed only five signs per CCD regulations.

- Best guess of the five signs Target might choose are three wall signs: NE corner on 1st (Target logo) NE corner on Quebec (Target logo and name), logo at NW corner at dock area all in white; two canopy signs, one at Quebec entry and one on south side.
- Appropriate signage is important to Target since this is not the typical architecture that would ID a Target store.

Steve – Has the white color for the logo and name been agreed to by Target? **Yes.** Kevin and Monty pointed out that the architectural approval for Target by the BDRC was based on the visual presented, which was white name and logo.

A motion by Kevin Yoshida and seconded by Steve Lane was passed for approval of the Comprehensive Plan for the commercial/retail development at Boulevard One, with follow up on renderings of the ground signs for tenants and the details of office tenant wall signs and contingent that the Target name and logo are white as approved in the architectural submittals.

- **Kiddie Academy
Childcare
Materials Response to Comments**

Ken Andrews said that they took the comments to heart and are now proposing:

- Stucco base on the north side
- Metal screen has been pulled back
- Smooth metal accents replacing some of the metal paneling.

Committee comments/questions **with responses in bold**

Steve – More reveals in the stucco? **Looking at the entirety, more reveals became too busy. It is a unique way of application, but the design team felt it best to limit reveals to the window breaks.**

Carla – Has the play screening been lowered and any changes made to the base of the screening? **No, the screening was not lowered. Concrete curbing has been added that will be 6” to 1.5’ in height based on the topography.**

Monty – Still not seeing the pedestrian scale of the east elevation. Carla agreed that the east elevation translates to an auto scale and not for a pedestrian to relate to. It had been suggested that punching openings in the screening might help. **There is a balance with the scale of the rest of the building. There are also safety requirements that make it difficult to scale the screening down. The screening is transparent so the play equipment and activity of the children will help with the pedestrian experience. The perforated screening material offers a visual through it. The screening that wraps on the north side will have some transparency with light from the windows shining behind it. Have rejected the idea of punching openings that create danger points for children depending on the size of the openings and there will still be plenty of visibility through the screening.**

Kevin – Is the screening material considered as “fencing” in the material breakdown evaluation? **No, the screening is integral to the building use and structure so was considered as a “unique” material.**

The team's interpretation of the BDRC comments made them focus on stripping off some of the metal paneling and replacing it with stucco to help meet the "masonry" and other "unique" materials standard. Monty interjected that fencing vs screening vs integral to building opens issues with height restrictions. **Ken responded that CCD is considering the play structure as "rooms" because they are "enclosed".**

Steve – What finish will be used on the stucco? **A light sand or a quality hard trowel finish to keep it simple and avoid that busyness that was previously mentioned.**

Kevin – Hearts of the design team are in the right place reflected in the work that has been done. However, his "gut" checking feels like a deeper conversation needs to take place about whether the spirit of the design guidelines is being met. Kevin said he respects the opinions of the other committee members and not just his hesitations. **Franz expressed his disappointment and asked how long is needed for the DRC to determine if the design meets the guidelines. Each time there is another iteration of the design and DRC review it is another \$10K spent. Soon it will be financially unfeasible to continue amidst the uncertainty of what is expected.** Kevin responded that some of the design paths are not currently following the guidelines and the DRC wants to work with the team to keep moving the process forward. The DRC has had only 24 hours to review the response to the changes in materials in preparation for today's meeting.

Monty – Kevin's comments were well stated. The DRC appreciates the frustration but needs some time to look at those areas that are outside the guidelines and the best path forward. There is a lot of discomfort with the design on the part of the DRC members. Carla commented that the DRC must look at the context of residential, library, Target and the rest of the commercial development and determine how that all blends together. **Franz pointed out that the playground on the side of the building has been reviewed several times since March with a conditional Design Development approval more recently. They have deadlines looming to be able to open in August 2021. Maybe this project needs to be on hold while they explore other locations being considered.** Monty replied that the DRC is not advocating or asking that this project be put on hold. The uniqueness of the materials and not fully following the guidelines makes it difficult to acknowledge the unique material as a substitute to the masonry requirement. The condition of review of materials is integral to the process and can't be discounted. Kevin added that it is the job of the DRC to meet or exceed the intent of the guidelines and the community demands. He needs to span that bridge in his mind and in answer to the board of director's expectations of the DRC to uphold certain standards.

Monty stressed that the DRC wants to give the team direction but doesn't want to cross over into the realm of the designer. Maybe a narrative from the design team addressing those areas that don't meet the guidelines but do perhaps meet the intent of the guidelines because of the uniqueness of materials and the screening that is incorporated into the structure of the building. **Ken stated that if the stucco is used and with the other unique materials (perforated screening, Kalwall translucent panel system) the 60% masonry standard is met. What sections of the design guidelines should be referenced for the narrative?** Kevin responded that Section 3.6 is one area, but other guidelines are also relevant that are not being met and should be addressed. Kevin will provide other sections to look

at. Steve said that he is fine with the stucco substitution for the base on the north, but for him, there is also an issue with the amount of verticality.

Bob Koontz asked if the stucco eases the heartburn of all the metal paneling. It seemed last week that the comments about materials has now been addressed and the remaining issue is dealing with breaking up the mass of the screening on the east end. Monty said that it is the east pedestrian scale, visual through the screening and how to justify accepting certain materials as dominant. Bob said they had to do a narrative for Target and suggested that H could offer some assistance.

Jamie – The freestanding planters seems stark at the NW corner. **Geotech disallows irrigation within 5' of the building so they are limited with ground plantings. There was seating in the plan at one time, but the DRC thought seating wasn't necessary so was removed.** Jamie will talk to David Lane off-line to explore some landscape options that will enhance the north and west sides and at the NW corner at an entry point to the commercial/retail site.

Monty concluded by laying out a dual path over the next few days:

BDRC – Meet separately to determine what is expected and to relay that information to the design team.

Design Team – Work on the narrative and the east end pedestrian scale. (Jamie will talk to David regarding landscaping options)

- **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m.