

For HALRB (*circle those present*): **Robert Dudka, Charles Craig, Andrew Wenchel, John Peck,**

For Arlington County (*circle those present*): **Rebecca Ballo, John Liebertz, Kyle Fisher**

Case # SP-339 Amendment Agenda Item # 2

Application Complete

Application Incomplete

Applicant(s): Regency Market Common

For Applicant(s): Matthew Allman (Walsh Colucci), Benjamin Keeney, et al, Antunovich, Numerous representatives for the applicant Clarendon Regency IV

(See attached application for applicant, address, name of property and property description, drawings, photographs, and proposed scope of work.)

Design Recommendations:

1. DRC continues to support activation of rooftop of Engraver's Building with rooftop seating.
2. DRC continues to support retention and reuse of the Conklyn's sign in a new location within the project area. Will review details at next meeting.
3. DRC members preferred Option 1, with Option 4 as a second choice. Both options borrow elements from the historic building in the given design with different emphases.
4. Some discussion on why the Iota facades are remaining as-is. The black color and chopped up nature of this building seem to be holding back the design rather than contributing. This was a minor point of discussion, but changes to the Iota facades would be welcomed and may integrate the design elements even better.
5. The massing, height, and proportions of Option 1 are appropriate.
6. Two issues with Option 1 require further work: materials and the overhang,
7. Refine Option 1 to show options: no cantilever (pushed back full width), cantilever on both corners, cantilever on front corner, as-is with two faux-columns/pilotis dropped.
8. If columns/pilotis are kept, should not be "heavy". Make steel or as light as possible.
9. If the cantilever is kept, the way that it ties into the rear wall needs more work. The cladding material may be hindering how this tie-in works. The angle and way the cantilever meets the back wall may be improved with a masonry cladding material—please examine further.
10. The greater setback on Wilson is important to maintain for streetscape.
11. Materiality of Option 1 is a greater issue. The DRC did not support the metal panels/rainscreen option. This detracts from the new construction being compatible with the historic building and there is a concern about longevity and appearance. Try different masonry options for this building instead. This will create greater compatibility with historic building. The color palette,

juxtaposing the red brick with the lighter grays of the rainscreen are good, but try to achieve this with a masonry option instead.

12. DRC unanimously does not support any window openings in the alley wall. The DRC would not support revisiting this as an option at a future date with another tenant.
13. One 3' wide door as close to the rear wall as possible could be supported given the changes to the existing rear wall of the building (it will be shortened and the rear will access the loading area with trucks instead of the alley court as it now does). Door should be solid or have a small vision panel.
14. DRC strongly supports additive options for the alley wall to achieve activity: lights, planters, screens, potentially signage, etc.
15. HPP Staff comments:
 - a. Show a closer detail of how the new building touches/interfaces with the 1990s building. This part of the "new building" should have a definite corner or some element that sets it apart from the 1990s building. Doesn't have to be very large, but should be more than a few brick courses.
 - b. Share DRC concerns about materiality. Rainscreens and metal panels often have levels of inadvertent transparency (you can see the back layers) and that would not be appropriate as this building is taking cues from a 1940s' masonry building. Explore all masonry options instead. Look back to materials from earlier options.
 - c. For Option 1 to be the preferred option it must meet compatibility of massing, height, volume, and materials. Speak to each of these levels of compatibility in future presentations.
 - d. Support all previously listed DRC positions.
 - e. Please remove alley options that show windows and focus on enhancing the options supported by DRC and HPP staff (one door, lighting, planters, trellis features, signage, etc.).

Findings:

Attend next DRC meeting

Send to HALRB

If sent to HALRB, recommended action is:

Place on consent agenda

Place on discussion agenda:

Recommend approval of CoA, with DRC design recommendations and/or additional information provided

Recommend deferral of ruling on CoA (explanation):

Recommend denial of CoA (explanation):

___x___ No recommendation.