

BOULEVARD ONE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
March 18, 2021
Video/Audio E-Conference

Attendees:

Committee: Jamie Fogle, Monty Force, Steve Lane, Carla McConnell, Kevin Yoshida
MoonStar: Scott Axelrod, Josh Thomas, Doug Van Lerberghe

The meeting convened at 8:05 a.m.

● **Minutes Approval (2/4 and 2/16/21)**

A motion by Carla McConnell and seconded by Jamie Fogle was passed to approve the minutes from the February 4, 2021 meeting and the February 16 site meeting as presented.

- **MoonStar
Townhomes (Oneida Ct and Lowry Blvd on Block 6)
Schematic (1.2 Review)**

Josh Thomas reported that while this review with the BDRC is at the Schematic level, the plan review with CCD is at approximately the 50% level.

Scott Axelrod said that they appreciated the comments from the last review and focused on the Oneida/Lowry corner and moved out from there with some other adjustments.

- In response to the “austerity” comment regarding the corner unit most of the stucco was replaced with brick and wood accent separating the ground and 2nd floor windows. Corner windows now have stand-off framing to give weight to anchor the corner. Stucco remained to lighten the top with added railing to accentuate the roof top patio.
- As requested, a perspective showing the view down Oneida Ct was included in the submittal.
- Front terraces have been extended.
- Nine of the eleven units have two-car garages, with the remaining three units having one-car garages.
- The landscape is not fully developed, but the submittal depicts the intent.
- Entry side lights have been added to increase transparency.
- Utility meters are on the ends of buildings with tree screening.
- On the front to the K Unit on Oneida Ct some of the brick was replaced to create a vertical line of stucco for added architectural interest and to further break up the massing.

Committee Comments/Questions with **developer responses in bold:**

Monty – Initial impression is that the northern end of the building facing the alley is very visible but seems rather austere. The same condition also exists on the eastern end adjacent to the grocer. Not yet. Can provide at the next review. Carla liked the columnar trees, but she and Steve agreed that the ends of the buildings need more attention. Steve suggested maybe more glass or incorporating some of the wood accent.

Carla – 1) Is the wood product in panel or tile form? **It is a wood-like prefab siding material.**
2) Would utilizing the wood material at the 1st and 2nd levels provide more warmth to the design? **The design team had done some depictions using the wood on both levels, but it was rejected as too much and gave it a “ski lodge” feel so was limited to the front of the 2nd floor.**
3) There have been some good enhancements to the corner unit. Are the windows operable and to provide more privacy for the residents, could the window shapes be swapped, and Spandrel glass be used on the lower portion? **Yes, there are operable windows. Swapping the shapes would interfere with emergency egress. The privacy issue is somewhat mitigated through the type of landscaping fronting the corner.**

Steve – 1) The possibility of bringing the corner windows closer together was mentioned at the last meeting. Any response to that suggestion? **It was looked at. However, it detracted from the proportion and balance of the design and there was a loss of usable wall space for furniture layout.**

2) Will there be a sprinkler room? **No sprinkler room is required.**

Kevin – 1) There needs to be more development and enhancements to the three-floor high walls at the north and east ends as previously mentioned. **The grocery building will block a full view of the east end.** In that case the suggestion would be to spend more effort and funds on the north enhancements. There is no need to place trees on the east end that is hidden and plant trees that wouldn't get much light. The same would hold true for the use of the columnar trees in the gap between the buildings. That is a high cost for a low visual impact.

2) Don't think the trees shown are adequate to screen the utility meters. Depending on Jamie to offer suggestions if there are other choices. On future depictions show the utility placements. Jamie pointed out that the trees are columnar birch that would be bare in the winter months and not offer much screening. He would suggest something in the evergreen family for the north end screening.

3) Without knowing the height and width of the units it is difficult to give a reality check to functionality. Also seeing the height and width in context will help with a thorough understanding of how the broader picture comes together. **Building 1 is 42' high x 96' long; Building 2 is 42' high x 101' long; the gap between the two buildings is 15'.**

4) There are two outstanding variance issues (3:1 ratio and parking variance for not meeting the 2/unit requirement) that need to be resolved before delving too much deeper into design efforts. Don't want to get too far ahead in planning without that process of getting approvals. Monty pointed out that his reading that the 3:1 ratio is not a requirement so the only variance would be for the minor parking deficiency. Kevin looked up the design guideline language and

agreed that the 3:1 ratio is desired but is not a requirement. There will need to be public notice of the variance hearing regarding parking.

Monty - What is across Oneida Ct from these townhomes? Jamie responded that the northern most unit is across from open space. The other units will face onto the sides of one single-family home and one townhome.

Carla – The desire has been mentioned at previous meetings for a walking path on the south side of the detention pond. However, the open space pathway through the residential area leading to the Exchange will terminate at cutting through an alley and the grocer parking lot with the pedestrian experience losing its appeal. Monty pointed out that a stepped wall with a path along the top on the southern edge of the pond was looked at, but it was determined that it would detract from the required volume of the pond. There is a walkway on the southern edge of the KUH project to the north but is probably not the route that most residential area pedestrians would follow. Carla asked if more trees could be added north of the pond to enhance that path? Jamie thought trees could be planted after construction is complete.

Jamie – There is a 3' high utility box on the corner of Lowry/Oneida Ct and a light pole on Lowry Blvd that should be depicted in the drawings. Landscape patterning continuity with the rest of Lowry Blvd. should be followed. Monty interjected that it is his understanding that CK is doing the landscape design to the Oneida Ct corner and the LRA is building the tree lawn. Jamie asked that MoonStar contact CK and show CKs design on the MoonStar plan to provide a complete and accurate picture.

Kevin – The grading plan shows some very steep garage aprons of 14-16%. Is that accurate?
Will check with the civil engineer and make any corrections necessary.

Monty – The landscaping to the west of the grocery loading dock has a steep grade. Need to check on any impact to the MoonStar site and coordinate the grading to the rear of the townhomes with CK to avoid any draining issues.

Steve - Provide a perspective of the rear corner with slope consideration.

Carla – Garage door glazing might be a homeowner desired element to provide some natural lighting in the garages. Not required but offered as a suggestion.

Summary of outstanding follow up items from this meeting:

- Ends of buildings – enhanced architectural elements (mainly the north end)
- Screening materials
- Indicate transformers, light poles, mail kiosk, etc.
- Landscaping coordination on Lowry Blvd
- Grading coordination at rear

Next Steps Discussion/Options:

Comeback with refinements at same time as the variance hearing (option dates 4/15, 22, 29 - DRC is willing to meet out of sequence of regularly scheduled meetings).

Scott preferred, and DRC was agreeable, to having the variance hearing sooner as a stand-alone meeting (potentially 4/15) with refinements at an out of sequence meeting (4/22 or 4/29) to complete the Schematic review.

Schematic approval was put on hold. Scott or Josh will stay in touch with how MoonStar decides to move forward with the variance hearing and timing of the next meetings.

- **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m.