



## **MEMORANDUM**

**To:** Design Review Board

**From:** Angela Ruggeri, AICP, Senior Planner

**Date:** December 18, 2009

**Subject:** **DESIGN RESPONSE CONFERENCE #11**  
**TOUCHSTONE (PARKPLACE)**  
**FILE DRC09-00002**

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Touchstone's proposal is for design review of a 1.8 million sq. ft. mixed-use project that includes 1.2 million sq. ft. of office space and an additional 300,000 sq. ft. of retail. Other uses include a hotel and athletic club.

The approved Master Plan has established the building and open space locations, access points and grid for the internal road system. The Zoning specifies building heights, setbacks and other development parameters. The Design Review Board is now in the process of working with the applicant on the design of the buildings and open spaces. The approved Design Guidelines for Parkplace will be used by the DRB to guide this process.

*\*\*Please bring your copy of the Master Plan and Design Guidelines for Parkplace to the meeting on 1/4/10. We will be working with them in reviewing Buildings B and C.*

### **II. PREVIOUS DESIGN RESPONSE CONFERENCES**

At the December 7, 2009 meeting, the DRB reviewed and commented on buildings B and C. The applicant gave the DRB additional drawings at the meeting to help explain how the 2 buildings fit into the surrounding area and the rest of the Parkplace project (see Attachment 1). A comparison to the Adopted Design Guidelines was made and the applicant was given the following comments on the proposed design. These issues are to be addressed at the DRB meeting on January 4, 2010.

#### **Street between Buildings B & C:**

- DRB expressed concern that the Development Standards represent a 66' minimum street with some cantilevering into the space while the proposal shows a 67' street with only 49' between buildings due to extensive cantilevering. Although the applicable development

standards pertain to street dimensions, not specifically separation of buildings, the DRB was concerned that building cantilevering not compromise the quality of the pedestrian space.

- Portal/gateway into the site needs to be improved.
  - Consider raising soffit up to create two stories of pedestrian volume, take cues from what makes the Building A portal successful
  - Pedestrian space should not always be below a cantilever, explore moving pedestrians outside the column line too
- Massing should open up to the plaza
  - Consider making the space between buildings wider in the west than in the east to draw pedestrians into the heart of the project
- Pedestrian scale - mitigate vertical mass of building
  - Explore horizontal modulation to mitigate a narrow canyon-like space
- DRB affirmed that it is not a “zero sum game.” – The mass lost in one area does not necessarily need to be accommodated elsewhere. .The Board’s role is to assure that the development complies with the adopted design guidelines.
- DRB would welcome successful examples for similar spaces and sections showing street width to building height relationships

**South side:**

- Generally ok with massing concept – how it is landscaped and the skin of the building will be important
- Generally ok with minimum setbacks prescribed by Master Plan and Guidelines if that helps relieve massing issues between B & C

**West side:**

- West end of Building B is an important landmark/vista. Breaking up the mass with additional elements may be ok
- Gaskets at Buildings A & B ..... Concerned that retail be as successful as it can be.

Attachment 1: Applicant’s drawings of Buildings B and C presented at 12/7/09 DRB meeting



**Buildings C & B from Southeast (6th Avenue)**



Building C from Southwest







