

BOULEVARD ONE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
July 21, 2022
Video/Audio E-Conference

Attendees:

Committee: Jamie Fogle, Monty Force, Steve Lane, Kevin Yoshida
MoonStar: Scott Axelrod, Josh Thomas
CK Development: Nick Kitaeff, Bob Koontz, H McNeish

The meeting convened at 8:30 a.m.

● **Minutes Approval (4/21/22)**

A motion by Steve Lane was passed to approve the minutes from the April 21, 2022, meeting as presented.

● **MoonStar**
Oneida Townhomes (Cadence Product)
Final

Josh Thomas provided introductory remarks that the SDP and the building permit have been approved and gave a summary of changes since the last review.

1. There was quite a lot of back and forth with the fire department wanting improved access between the buildings. There is now a distinct concrete path combined with crusher fine and modified landscaping. Electrical meters will remain between the buildings and the mail kiosk remains between the buildings at the western end. The newer CCD reviews added access around the property and acts as a drainage channel.
2. The north end sky deck is more open, enhancement of the wood on the north end and the landscaping.

Scott estimated that construction could start in about 6 weeks, but an outstanding item is an amendment to the SSPR.

General Discussion

Confirming that the SDP review process affordable housing did not apply. **That is correct.**

Checking on potential exterior lighting fixture hot spots. Editorial note: After the meeting, Josh provided a marked photometric plan and cut sheets with the exterior fixtures. Neither fixture has upward light associated with the Candela Curve design.

Jamie commented that trees were added at the north end per previous discussions and no trees are between the buildings due to electrical constraints. He approves of the landscaping plan.

Monty asked for clarification on CK requesting modification to the alley. Scott said that he knows CK wanted to widen the ally, but about a week ago CCD denied that request. CK had also asked if Scott could accept encroachment of the alley at the NE corner. Scott cannot decrease setbacks and he is close to finalizing his review process and cannot absorb additional cost and review time to redesign. The larger alley opening and configuration was needed for accommodation for 60' delivery trucks due to a change in suppliers. Clark's has since found a supplier with 48' trucks. Scott is not sure if they are still planning to widen or modify the alley to the north or not. Monty commented that he did not believe that commercial delivery traffic is allowed on Oneida so don't know if CK or Clark's could plan for access from that alley. CCD reviewers might need to be reminded that commercial traffic may not be allowed on Oneida.

Monty also asked on the status of the sanitary sewer modification. Scott answered that he will check with civil engineering but thinks it will be approved relatively quickly since it is an improvement of one cut into the main rather than eleven.

Architecture Discussion

Kevin referred to detail sheets 7.19 and 7.20 asking about the brick ledge with insulation at some areas and none at others and how the insulation will be protected. **There will be break metal flashing that is inserted into the ground to protect the insulation. Flashing will match the color of the background material. Sheet 7.20 will use the same flashing into the ground.** Sufficient gauge of the metal is important to prevent oil canning. Kevin agreed that there will be foundation visibility until the landscaping matures so the metal gauge and color is a key factor. **There has been coordination on the grading for a consistent 8" of exposed foundation above grade.**

There was discussion of the window trim and sills with transitions to the various surrounding materials. Kevin and Steve agreed they were comfortable with the detail sheets in that regard.

Roof deck drainage is concealed with the use of scuppers that are open commercial type with seamless box gutters.

Is venting all organized and placed where needed? **Yes, there is coordination with the engineer.**

Is the supply chain stable right now? Scott responded that the last he checked, supplies are available for shipment. The biggest issue is with garage doors.

A motion by Kevin and seconded by Steve was passed to approve the CD plans for the MoonStar Oneida townhomes.

This portion of the meeting adjourned at 9:10 a.m. Due to the e-format with two presenting groups there was a break. The meeting resumed at 9:30 a.m.

- **CK Development**
Amendment to the Comprehensive Signage Plan for Block 7
Continuance from the 4/21/22 meeting

Monty admitted his naivete in understanding which of the various editions were being compared. H responded that the starting point is the tracking sheet to guide to the changes. Since the comparison documents were sent to the committee, H did some “red-line bubbling” around the changes corresponding to the pages indicated in the tracking sheet. H’s presentation began by going to the first of the page numbers.

Kevin paused the page-by-page review by saying he appreciated the bubbling but asked if there was an overarching statement that would cover what was sent to the committee. H said there was a breakdown in communications with the January 2021 CSP that was approved by the BDRC. Then there was the February 2022 document approved by CCD, which failed to be presented and approved by the BDRC. Today’s document dated 7-21-22, is compared with the January 2021 BDRC approved document. If this document is approved by the BDRC it will go back to CCD for approval.

Kevin commented that operationally there has a great deal of difficulty in assuring that signage submittals from tenants were abiding by the most accurate document. Some approvals were given in favor of the tenant because there was unclear or conflicting language from the original BDRC approved document to the next CCD approved amended version, which had not been approved by the BDRC. There needs to be agreement on one document.

Monty added that at some point soon the LRA will cede oversight and control of the BDRC process to Boulevard One Community Association (BOCA) so he would like that hand off to be as clean as possible with accurate documentation going forward. He is not sure of how BOCA will formulate the design review process, either by the BOCA Board or a combination of community volunteers and hired professionals.

H agreed that a cleaned-up version and the outcome of today’s analysis, would be sent to CCD for their approval and if they had any further modifications, that version would come back to the BDRC for another review and approval.

Kevin asked if there was any mechanism in place or if there is an aggregate of total signage or is it just on a one-by-one basis. H responded that he’s not aware that CCD does an aggregate, but they did keep interjecting code language into the CSP. Kevin asked if the intention of the BDRC review of tenant signage for compliance to the CSP is not for purposes of an aggregate analysis. H said that if each tenant stays within the guidance of the CSP then the overall allowances of location and sign sizing will be met. H commented that the BDRC also has the Design Guidelines that can be more restrictive if they apply to certain circumstances, so a tenant can’t go to CCD and get a more lenient ruling.

Monty said he is not sure if maximum signs permitted is being met. Kevin agreed that it is confusing when only looking at individual submittals. H responded that the maximum is based on a maximum tenancy and “Quantity” language for each sign type helps to clarify. Monty wondered if there is a backup to a total number of signs for the project. H referred to page 23 of the CSP to show the maximum in conjunction with the elevations of buildings for opportunities. Monty recalled that there was discussion that “opportunities” are options, but not all opportunities can be used and who is keeping track of the tally so maximum is not exceeded. H said that Nick would be doing that informally as the landlord’s responsibility before a signage submittal gets to the BDRC or CCD.

One important item noted by Kevin was the directory sign on the north side of the Target building. H explained that the G.1 directory ground sign in the ROW needed a variance from the BDRC and was denied by CCD so the proposal was abandoned. As an alternative, placing a directory on the north face of the Target building was added to the CSP. The committee said that they would need to look at the proposed directory from an architectural viewpoint. It is one thing to see a description on paper and another to know how it will look on the building. There is a need to be clear on following the circumstances that involves more than signage but how it affects the look of that corner and on the building. H said that he will see what can be produced to show the imagery. He also said that a directory is critical to tenant leasing advancement. Kevin commented they the committee understands CK’s desire BDRC’s objective is to look at the bigger picture. A question was asked about the determining factor of how many businesses are on the directory and the size of font. H said that those guidelines will be controlled in the CSP.

The discussion about the Amended CSP will be continued to an agreed date of July 28 from 9:30-11:00. H will set up a Zoom connection for distribution to the committee.

- **Miscellaneous**

There have been several negative comments and questions from the LRA Board and the BDRC about the Torchys signs. They are much bolder than expected and as compared to the context of other signs. There is also the question to what extent it might impact thinking about the CSP language. H replied that he hears the concern but not sure how to address but will leave it open for further discussion.

- **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 a.m.