

**Beauregard Design Advisory Committee (BDAC) – Meeting Summary**

December 9, 2024

7:00 p.m.

Del Pepper Community Center

**Committee Members in Attendance:**

Erick Adams  
Gus Ardura  
Abed Benzina  
Kayleigh Creswell  
John Goebel  
Bud Jackson  
Neil Snyder

**Absent Committee Members:**

Jim Wilmot

**City Staff:**

Maya Contreras, Principal Planner, P&Z Dev.  
Maggie Cooper, Urban Planner, P&Z Dev.

**1900 N Beauregard Applicant Representatives**

Frank Craighill, Monday Properties  
Evan Maizlish, Monday Properties  
Megan Rappolt, Wire Gill LLP  
Ken Wire, Wire Gill LLP

**Agenda Items:**

1. Call To Order
2. Responsibilities
3. Returning Business
  - a. 1900 N Beauregard Street
4. Staff Updates
5. Motion to adjourn

*Meeting presentations, materials, and recordings are archived on the BDAC webpage at:*  
<https://www.alexandriava.gov/74981>

**Call to Order & Responsibilities:**

Gus Ardura called the meeting to order at 7:00pm. Maya Contreras outlined the agenda for the evening. The committee approved the October 28, 2024 meeting summary.

**Applicant Presentation**

**1900 N Beauregard Street**

Ken Wire, representing the applicant Monday Properties, introduced the applicant team and gave a brief overview of the changes since the last meeting and the specific modifications from the Standards and Guidelines they are requesting. He also mentioned that they would be holding a meeting in early 2025 to discuss all aspects of the project with the community.

The main changes they made were: they recessed the loading dock farther into the building, added a seven-foot tall fence near the loading and arrival plaza to buffer from the neighbors, and made some changes to the SW corner to make the area look more cohesive and to the “B” façade to improve the dormers. He also gave more information on the buffer between the building and the neighbors. He said they had originally proposed a mural on the exterior of the west courtyard but are agnostic to what goes on the interior or exterior of the corridor.

Ms. Cooper did a brief overview of the matrix which consists of the standards and guidelines. She mentioned that some of the guidelines and standards are now inconsistent with the Alex West plan, but the project itself is consistent with the Alex West plan.

Bud Jackson asked if there were lights on the balconies facing the neighbors. Mr. Wire said they would have lighting, but they would meet the City standards. Ms. Cooper said they would share the lighting plan.

Ms. Cooper expanded on the six areas that the project deviates from the guidelines and standards and highlighted them on-screen:

1. “The Adams neighborhood shall be principally developed as office uses, with some retail and/or hotel uses”
  - Ms. Cooper said that this standard is now inconsistent with the Alex West SAP and a CDD amendment will be going before Council in early 2025 requesting an update to allow residential uses.
2. “Facilities for flexible community functions should be considered as part of the DSUP process”
  - Ms. Cooper said the BRT and trail will be used by the public. At the time that the guidelines were created, there was a need for community space. Since then, several community spaces have been added to the West End (a new school and the Del Pepper Community Center). Ms. Contreras explained that most of the recent projects in the area did not have community facilities as it can be difficult to have space in a 100% residential building.
  - Mr. Ardura asked if there were plans for improved indoor and outdoor community spaces. Ms. Contreras gave a brief overview of the plans for the new park space

within the Adams neighborhood and the retail town center that is included in the Alex West plan.

3. “Each block shall conform to the building height specified in Diagram 3.e.2.”
  - The heights specified in the diagram have been replaced by the Alex West SAP. The proposed heights are consistent with the SAP and are lower than the 110 feet that was previously allowed heights for the south portion of the building.
4. “Ground floor residential uses shall have a finished floor height above average sidewalk grade of a minimum 12 inches if setback a minimum of 5 feet. All other ground floor residential uses shall have a finished floor height above average sidewalk grade of a minimum 18 inches. Exceptions shall be allowed for ADA/FHA compliance.”
  - To address the 9-foot change in elevation from the southeast to the southwest corner of the building, the applicant proposes to include some two-story loft units that will have access directly to the sidewalk. To accomplish this, the applicant had to make the landing between six inches to two feet below grade.
5. 6a)i(2) “Each building is required to provide a minimum of one level of parking below the building”
  - The applicant has requested an above-grade, screened garage that is not visible.
6. 6c)i(2) “Surface parking lots for new development other than parallel on-street parking and surface parking for interim uses or public buildings shall be prohibited”
  - The applicant has included a drive-court to allow for leasing, deliveries, and ride-share, which is consistent with other projects that have been reviewed by BDAC in the past.

Erick Adams asked if there was a requirement for a certain number of ADA-accessible units. Mr. Wire said it was a code requirement and he believes it is two percent.

Mr. Jackson said he was disappointed in the project and feels like the project falls short despite repeated requests for changes from BDAC and the community. The community had pushed back on the additional traffic along Mark Center Drive and preferred a new curb cut on the west side of the project. He said the community also objected to patios and balconies on the rear. Mr. Jackson said if there is a Mark Center Drive entrance and balconies, he will not support the project. He said the developer could have come forward with different proposals, including townhomes, instead of a multiunit building and the community is against the number of units at this location.

Abed Benzina said his comments were based on the guidelines and that the six ways that the project deviates from the guidelines have all been properly addressed.

Kayleigh Creswell asked if Mr. Jackson was against both the patios and the balconies. He said he was against the balconies but would defer to the community on the patios.

Ms. Contreras said staff supported no balconies on the Blake because of the proximity to the residents. Because of the increased setback of 1900 N Beauregard (45 feet) versus the Blake (67 feet) and because of the buffer, staff are supportive of the balconies.

Beauregard Design Advisory Committee (BDAC)

Meeting Summary

December 9, 2024

Mr. Jackson asked why staff is supportive of balconies. Ms. Contreras said they provide light and air, provide opportunity for outdoor space and provide additional eyes on the trail. Mr. Jackson said there were already noise problems with the Blake so they expect the balconies would increase noise.

Mr. Wire explained the height of the building was 85 feet, including the amenities space on the roof, but the building was 67 feet from ground to top of the building at the rear of the building and the height of the balconies on the rear is roughly 62 feet.

Mr. Ardura said the building was a sound piece of architecture and it may meet the Alex West criteria, but the building is on the wrong site as it is too small and too tight for this building.

Mr. Wire said the applicant would remove the balconies on the rear.

Richard Jones, president of the Seminary Heights Unit Condo Association, said he was concerned that the garage was not providing enough parking for the number of units.

Ms. Contreras said the proposed parking was consistent with parking that staff has seen throughout the city and that staff works hard to right-size the parking.

Several community members said there were issues with people parking in the neighborhood and cutting through on Stevens.

Ms. Contreras reiterated that the private streets could not be managed by the City, but staff would share the concerns with the lack of enforcement on the public streets.

A community member that lives directly next to the property line thanked the applicant for removing the balconies. She said the property is too small for a building of this size. She also asked about the lighting plan along the trail. Ms. Contreras said the City's standard of one candle foot at the property line.

Community members asked for clarification on the bike ped trail. Ms. Cooper explained the long-term plan for the bike connection in the Adams neighborhood.

Manuel Hernandez said his main concern was how close and tall the building will be to his townhouse and said they want to make sure they have some ability to contact the management if/when they have noise issues.

Mr. Wire and Frank Craighill said they will have a manager that lives on-site and can address any security or noise issues at the site. That contact information will be shared with the residents.

A community member asked about concerns with wind tunnels. Ms. Contreras said they was not an expected issue at this site, but City staff would look into that.

Neil Snyder asked if the excess parking at the Blake could be leased to the new building. Mr. Wire said that was a possibility they could explore.

Nelson Hernandez said he did not support the building as it would take away positive aspects of the community without indemnification. He also expressed concern with wind gust issues.

A question was asked about construction hours and Ms. Contreras clarified that it was Mon-Fri 7am-6pm, and Saturday 9am-6pm (but the type of allowed construction is limited).

A community member asked about the parking reduction and said that there were not enough spaces per unit. Mr. Craighill said the parking was slightly over one parking space per unit. Ms. Cooper explained that the city typically approves parking reductions similar to this as the location is along the planned West End Transitway but encouraged community members to voice their opinions on the parking reduction at Planning Commission and City Council.

A community member asked for some clarifications on the bike ped trail and the bus rapid transit and about construction. Ms. Cooper showed a map of the locations and routes for both and said they would have a pre-construction meeting prior to any construction beginning on the site.

A community member asked if anyone in the city was charged with taking the existing residents' concerns as seriously or more serious than the developer or future residents as they have no idea who will be moving into these units. Ms. Contreras explained that there was a two-year engagement process for the Alex West plan that took into consideration the concerns and needs of the existing residents. Mr. Jackson said the community can reach out to Planning Commission and City Council.

Mr. Snyder asked for clarification about the road between 1800 and 1900 N Beauregard. Mr. Wire said they were debating with staff if that would be a road or a path and it would continue to be discussed as the other parcels are being developed.

Mr. Jackson asked Mr. Wire to explain who the owners for the project are. Mr. Wire said Mr. Craighill and Evan Maizlish were there representing Monday Properties, which owns the land. Mr. Jackson said the owners are investors, not Alexandria people that own the property.

Mr. Wire said that the applicant had been working with City staff for nearly two years on this project and the current proposal was where they landed after considering many possible developments. He said they believe they have created a good project that has enough positives with open space and contributions to balance the impacts and they had only six deviations from the 150+ standards.

Mr. Jackson said he did not want to take a vote as the community should have more time to consider the changes and provide input to the committee.

He asked staff if there would be later changes to re-add the balconies. Ms. Contreras said that staff was fine with the applicant's statement that they would remove the balconies on the rear of the building and keep the walk-out units.

Mr. Benzina said the BDAC purview was the standards and the six modifications were reasonable. Mr. Jackson said the enabling language gives them the ability to consider the small area plan. Mr. Benzina said the small area plan is already approved and this complies with it.

Ms. Contreras outlined the possible next steps. She said they could have another meeting in early 2025 if BDAC was not ready to take a vote, but there would likely be few changes to discuss at the next meeting. She also said that there were community concerns that were better suited for discussions at Planning Commission and City Council.

Mr. Ardura said he did not feel that the building is compatible with the neighborhood. Mr. Abed said that was not their purview. Mr. Jackson said they could vote to not recommend because it was not compatible. Ms. Contreras said if they vote to say the project is not compatible, they would need to explain how it is not compatible.

Mr. Wire said they would hold a community meeting in late January/February. He said they were looking for a vote tonight as the project will have few changes if they come back.

Ms. Contreras said the committee needed to discuss if they wanted to take a vote. Mr. Jackson said they could poll the community at this time if they wanted to and he wanted to go back to the community to get their feedback on the removal of the balconies. He said the applicant still had not addressed his issues with the Mark Center Drive and that he wanted to poll the audience to see what they thought or to have another meeting.

Mr. Adams said he would be willing to come to another meeting to get feedback from the community.

John Goebel said he did not think the project will change or that there is a solution that will make everyone happy. He said the project has to work for the applicant, applauded them for conceding the balconies, and said he would vote tonight.

Mr. Benzina said he would vote this evening.

Ms. Creswell said she also did not think another meeting would result in much change to the project.

Mr. Ardura said he thinks another meeting is needed.

Mr. Wire said that the applicant is requesting a vote tonight. Mr. Jackson moved to adjourn, Mr. Adams seconded, and the meeting ended at 9:05 PM.