



citycentric

Parker Place – 2598 and 2600 Shattuck Avenue

**DRC Comments from Meeting of December 17, 2009 and
Project Team Responses**

DRC Meeting January 21, 2010

The last five months of collaboration with the DRC have yielded important results for the Parker Place project. The DRC discussion and project team responses have now been incorporated back into the drawings packet. The comments provided at the December DRC meeting have been addressed per the responses, below. Comments are grouped as they relate to one another. Following each comment is the design team response.

It is our desire to garner the DRC's favorable recommendation at their January meeting. The project team believes that with the incorporation of the DRC comments have made the design stronger. It is important to the project team to move forward for ZAB consideration.

General

1. We still need to talk about the colors, those that are proposed seem trendy (CO). I still like the dark brown (JG).

Response

The design team has provided an additional color palette. In this version the base (retail) is a medium brown, the second floor is off white and the upper stories are grey. The balcony treatment has been modified as well so that the accent colors are more demure.

2. Many details are still needed (CO). Window details are needed and are very important now (All).

Response

The windows at 2600 provide a 3" inset and the windows at 2598 have a 2" reveal with a steel reveal that has a slight downward bend to allow water to drip off. The store front glass is a butt-joint system with aluminum channel around the perimeter.

3. Show all roof top equipment in plan and elevation (outlines fine) (CO).

Response

All equipment has been shown in plan and in elevation.

4. Verify cell phone co-location equipment and placement needs (All).

Response

The revised plans provide for up to three potential locations for wireless telecommunications providers on the roof portion of 2600.

5. Stop the stucco boxes, but if 2600 needs to be a stucco box then it should be a “gutsy box.” Stucco should be as thick as possible, (BA). Need to see a stucco detail (JG).

Response

Heavier window treatments, deeper reveals, columns instead of fin walls at the podium level, and a new color palette all combine to make the current design proposal a stronger architectural statement.

6. Is perforated metal the right balcony railing material for this building? (perhaps.) Consider a heavy glass railing (JG). A wood frame building with thin metal railing could start to look cheap (BA).

Response

The design team has chosen aluminum for the perforated metal railing material.

7. Don't like the roof rail change. The top rails of both buildings need to be thicker with lighter supports, like a halo as before (2600), now it looks like a safety rail (JG). The top rail is important (BA).

Response

The roof rail has been revised back to the previous rendition (halo) and has been strengthened.

8. The stair towers don't appear to have room for vertical landscaping (JG). Consider wood slats on the stair towers, use heavy dimensions (BA, JG).

Response

The stair towers will not incorporate interior landscaping because of their configuration. The horizontal slats will be metal.

Landscape Program

There seemed to be a general consensus that the landscape program is in good shape. The rainwater retention plan is excellent and well thought out. In fact, the proposed project's public improvements are exemplary (CM) and should be used as the model for setting policies for future development projects (CM, BA, DS). Members of the DRC have already met with staff of the Public Works Department to this effect.

1. There is a nice aesthetic value to planters where the ground plane drops (confirm ADA) (CM).
2. Be wary of thin/small planter walls. Make them thick and make some of them seat height, especially along the sidewalk (CM).

Response

The landscape plans and pedestrian improvement plans have been changed to show planter box seat walls at various locations.

3. Show podium planter details.

Response

Provided.

2598 – Parker Place North

There was general consensus that the move of the Macro cottage and 2598 building's residential entries to face Parker Street was a good idea. The changes to the mews are well done as is the plaza of 2598.

1. Encouraged by the windows (BA, JG). Provide a window detail, and consider setting them in, instead of protruding (BA). The horizontal fins could hold dirt/grime which will wash down the side of the building and cause streaks (CO).

Response

The windows at 2598 have a 2" reveal with a steel reveal that has a slight downward bend to allow water to drip off. The store front glass is a butt-joint system with aluminum channel around the perimeter.

2600 - Parker Place South

2. The "float" is not as strong, maybe it needs more glass but the effect is diminished, bring it back (JG, with some affirmation by BA).

Response

The design team has replaced the fin walls with thin posts and color has been used to accentuate the podium level in a different way.

3. Provide window details (BA). Black frames are oppressive from the interior (BA). The windows need to be as deeply set as possible, provide a big sill (BA). Where will the doubles (maybe some triples?) go?

Response

The windows at 2600 provide a 3" inset. The interior window frames will be coated metal. The store front glass is a butt-joint system with aluminum channel around the perimeter.

4. The plaza façade bridge works well (BA, JG). Consider making it the full width of the leftover band (BA). I don't like the façade bridge (GW).

Response

The design team looked at making the façade bridge the full width of the remaining façade. As such it appears too heavy and somewhat confining for the plaza space. The design team has chosen to keep it at reduced width.

5. Think about the loss of the stairs (DS). Glad the stairs are gone (JG). What would it look like if the plaza were moved to the corner (CM)?

Response

The plaza includes further design refinements in this current version. Moving the plaza to the corner would require a significant change in the overall program of the project.