

BOULEVARD ONE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
November 19, 2020
Video/Audio E-Conference

Attendees:

Committee: Jamie Fogle, Monty Force, Steve Lane, Carla McConnell, Kevin Yoshida
CK Target team: Andy Baldyga, David Lane, Alaina Marler, H McNeish
CK Signage Team: Mike Doody, H McNeish
Developer: Bob Koontz

The meeting convened at 8:30 a.m.

● **Minutes Approval (11/5/20)**

A motion by Carla McConnell and seconded by Steve Lane was passed to approve the minutes from the November 5, 2020 meeting as presented.

● **CK Development**
Target
Final – Construction Drawings

H introduced the presentation saying that they will point out the minor modifications that have occurred in preparing the construction drawings.

Andy pointed out the development boundaries of the Target site on the east at the property line, the easement on the north, the parking lot on the west and the below grade garage wall on the south.

Architectural Elevation Updates (Andy Baldyga)

East:

- o CMU at the base is now smooth-rubbed concrete fronted by landscape
- o Adjusted for consistent spacing of 8' and 2' of the northern panels and centering of the Target logo
- o Store entry with double auto-open doors
- o Better alignment of the mullion windows

North:

- o Continued consistency of spacing of the panels that wrap from the east elevation
- o Centering of one larger green screen instead of two allowing for a stronger steel framing
- o The man-door from the dock area was slightly shifted to the west (this is a required emergency egress)
- o Height of the wainscoting was adjusted to align with the other vertical elements

West:

- o Transom window near the dock was removed due to structural demands
- o Door and columns shifted due to interior programmatic layout

South:

- o Adjusted material patterning for consistency
- o Some glazing shifted to the west
- o Maintained overall intent of pedestrian scale by lowering the height on a portion of the wood paneling that is now topped with a metal panel as used elsewhere in the design

Color and Materials:

No changes to the previously presented and approved materials and color scheme.

Committee comments/questions:

Kevin – how are the roof-top mechanical units screened? **Most of them are to be in the central portion of the roof and will not be seen from any ROW. One unit will be positioned close to the eastern parapet and should be screened by the parapet.**

Kevin – Some information is missing from the sheets for finishing details for windows, channels and soffits that should be noted since this is considered a Final review of the construction drawings. **H responded that they could update the detail sheets that can be distributed to the DRC. They are also planning to have a mockup on site that can be reviewed by the committee.**

Carla – A curiosity question about the consideration of solar and is the roof built to support that potential? **At the present time Target is not considering solar as an option. However, the roof structure could support solar if desired in the future. H added that studies were conducted to look at all scenarios and there are more economic ways to support “green building” with design solutions.**

Kevin – Will RTU’s for the freezers be part of the developer scope of services or by Target? **Target does their own interior design, but the design team is meeting regularly to assure all specs are met.**

Kevin – Regarding some open question on the photometrics there were some double-headed light fixtures and some hot-spots. Have there been any adjustments? **H that there is only one remaining double-heading light fixture at the access lane at the garage entry and the hot-spots have been corrected. An updated photometric was sent to the DRC with no further comment.** Kevin thanked H for the reminder and agreed that updates were seen.

Landscaping Updates (David Lane)

South:

- o The size of the planter as a visual buffer at the west end of the paseo is larger
- o Number of planters along the rest of the south façade was increased from two to three and spread out for heat mitigation

North:

- o Spacing of the planters was adjusted with the condensing of the green screen

Committee comments/questions:

Steve – The path from the man-door emergency egress on the north side needs to be connected to the sidewalk. **David Lane will make that correction in the plans.**

Jamie – Caution that the planter at the west end of the paseo is far enough from the parking space to avoid damage from vehicular overhang at the curb.

Civil Updates (Alaina Marler):

- o The floor was lowered a couple inches.
- o Connections for a drainage structure were adjusted for existing conditions and a change from the Lucky’s to the Target plan. It will be plated with no pedestrian obstruction.

Committee comments/questions:

Carla – Will there be a pedestrian crossing at either Pontiac or Poplar on 1st Avenue? Monty explained that the LRA is working with CCD on all crossing improvements, but he will have to check on the status of the plans.

Carla – Noticed the “bike fixit station” on the plan. What does it contain? **David said that they have an air pump and other attached tools suitable for emergency bike repairs.** Jamie Fogle said that there is also a bike fixit station in the Boulevard One community park.

Monty – Who is responsible for the roof top screening, the developer or Target if there is a deficiency? **H said that the developer would be responsible if the parapet screening is not sufficient. He asked Andy if he has enough data to know if the parapet will screen the planned mechanical unit. Andy replied that they do have the spec on the unit to coordinate with the height of the parapet. H assured that they will continue to monitor for adequate screening and recognize that further screening would be added if necessary.**

H said that they are asking the committee for approval of the 2.0 - Construction Drawings at this prescribed Final step of review process.

A motion by Steve Lane and seconded by Carla McConnell was passed for Final approval of the Target plans with the following stipulations: submittal of the updated detail sheets by Dec 2; monitoring of eastern roof top screening with adjustments made if necessary; mock up available on site by January 15 with communication of a new schedule if the contractor needs additional time.

A break was taken at 9:35 a.m. until logging into the next session starting at 10:00.

- **CK Development
Office Signage
Pending Item to the Comprehensive Signage Plan**

H McNeish explained the intent of this presentation is for detailing and understanding of the office tenant signage resulting from comments at the previous meeting that discussed the CSP.

Mike Doody pointed out that the office tenant signs being referred to in the plans are shown as W.2 defined as exterior wall-mounted signs featuring signs of tenants on upper levels. These signs are located above the ground floor that are integrated into the architecture. Only two buildings (2SE and 4NW) will have W.2 signage.

Building 2SE (corner of Quebec/Lowry Blvd)

South: One on the upper level

West: One on upper level

East: Two opportunities – one on upper level, one on 3rd level

North: One sign on upper level

Carla – Suggests centering the W.2 signs on the north and south of the building. **Mike agreed that they will pursue centering those signs.**

Mike asked if there were any comments on the quantity and locations of the W.2 signs. Carla opined that there are too many W.2 signs

Building 4NW (daycare facility at 1st/Pontiac

Three opportunities for W.2 signage with one each on the W, N and E elevations. On the S elevation will be A.1 and C.1 signage at the building entry.

Signage criteria will be spelled out, but the actual design is up to the tenant.

H pointed out that the signage plan that is developed by signage specialists, has input by the developer, and must be reviewed and approved by CCD. Kevin added that the BDRC is also in the line of review and approval.

Page 8 of the CSP describes the criteria for the W.2 wall signs for office tenants. There was a discussion of using stricter language for the “color and finish” descriptive of W.2 signage criteria. Rather than White or Black “encouraged” it might be better to use the term “should”. The desire for flexibility is understood, but stricter language might prevent debates in the future. The flexible language might open doors in the future for demands of color that could be handled on a case by case basis or through a variance process. **Bob asked what happens with a less flexible rule and no BDRC.** Monty responded that the BDRC is remaining in place and there will still be a review process through the BOCA appointed BDRC. **H said that the developer does not want to be so inflexible that the use of colors for corporate identity was absolutely prohibited. However, there is a desire for consistency and do understand the idea of better representation in the language. H pointed out with only a total of 8 of this type of sign on two buildings there is limited impact. Bob said that his 40 years of experience with commercial leasing has shown that some flexibility for corporate identity is crucial.**

Kevin said that he sees the point of corporate identity, but there are examples of conformity to strict signage standards at centers all over the city. Monty suggested approval of a motion to accept the

tenant signage with the inclusion of language allowing for a variation for color with a review by the BDRC with a variance process. **H thought that would only open more doors for a change to color, number of signs, location, etc. and only cause more contention in the future.** Monty said the BDRC has a responsibility to comport the design with the vision of Boulevard One, but balancing so as to not be too restrictive.

Mike asked if there was comfort with the number and location of the signs with the only concern over the language of color. There was agreement by the BDRC members with the exception of only two W.2 signs for the daycare building rather than three.

H concluded the discussion saying that his inclination is to table any further discussion so that he can regroup with the full team to explore a thorough understanding of impacts.

Office tenant signage is continued to a future meeting.

- **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.