

## JEFF CAR 2015 Design Review Team S106 Meeting FINAL NOTES

Meeting #18: April 4, 2014 10-11:30 AM Central

### I. Attendance

Role	Name	Participated
DRT Member	Tom Bradley	X
DRT Member	Maggie Hales	X
DRT Member	Vern Remiger	X
DRT Member	Judith Deel	X
DRT Member	Bill Hart	X
DRT Member	Karen Bode Baxter	
DRT Member	Ann Honious	X
DRT Member	Mark Miles	X
Advisor: National Trust	Jennifer Sandy	
Advisor: National Trust	Betsy Merritt	
Facilitator	Margo Brooks	X
Facilitator	Greg Cody	X
JEFF	Frank Mares	X
CAR2015	Ann Leavey	X
MVVA	James Smith	X
Randy Burkett Lighting Design	Rich Fisher	X
Trivers	Joel Fuoss	X
Trivers	David Lott	X
Cooper Robertson	Tom Whitrock	X

### II. Luther Ely Smith Design Development Plans

Postponed until after April 22.

### III. West Entrance Alternative Lighting Plan

The design team presented an alternative to the moonlighting over the highway plan discussed during the last meeting. The new lighting plan includes six poles, four 16-foot tall located at the west entrance and two 14.8-foot tall at the edge of the lawn across from the west entrance where the entrance plaza begins. The lighting would be dim in the center of the plaza and light levels would not be controllable. The view from the Old Courthouse to the Arch is preserved in this alternative; however, the view from the museum to the Old Courthouse is somewhat more cluttered by the new light poles. Electrical connections to the light fixtures would be built and the poles only placed should the moonlighting not be feasible or another system be needed later.

The DRT felt that this was an acceptable solution. The light poles visually relate to the design of the rest of the park and the visual intrusion, while unfortunate, is at acceptable levels. However, the moonlighting has fewer impacts on the view scape and setting.

Additional discussion continued about possibly removing the two shorter light poles, which would reduce light levels even further, or centering a flag pole in the plaza to provide the light. A flag pole is currently proposed for somewhere to the

left of the west entrance. The flag pole is proposed to be 66-feet high, but if it is used as a light source, it would need to be nearer to 100-feet high and have a proportionately larger flag. It was unclear whether lights on top of a flag pole would be acceptable and how many poles would be needed.

A concern was raised during this discussion that the more light and flag poles in the view shed, the greater the cumulative impact on the views.

It was proposed that the DRT consider the design of the west entrance and Luther Ely Smith Square as a unit, including the light and flag poles, when the Construction Documents are available on April 22. A view from the museum toward the flag pole showing any new clutter in the view should be included.

#### DRT Comments

The DRT felt the impacts to the view scape were acceptable should moonlighting not be implemented or be taken out of commission in the future. The park asked that should that happen, that additional analysis be conducted to determine if the visibility of the two shorter light poles can be lessened. The DRT will review the issue again when more information about the flag pole location is available.

#### **IV. Arch Legs**

The DRT previously approved, in concept, accessibility plans for exiting the museum at the Arch legs. As further design warrants a review of the original plan because it could impact character-defining features of the Arch. Three alternatives were presented.

Alternative A was most close to what was previously approved in concept. The entire exit ramp would be accessible and handrails added down the center of one of the paths past the Arch legs. Because the entire exit area would be raised to accommodate landings, impacts would include: 1. minimal grade rises by the Arch legs; 2. possible cross slope changes; 3. covering or removal of portions of the stairs on either side of the exit plaza. This last change would change the intentionally designed line of the stair edges from straight, mimicking the line of the Arch legs, to curved.

Alternative B keeps the plane of the exit plaza the same, but builds a raised accessible ramp through the center of one side of the exit plaza. It preserves the exit plaza features, but is a very visible new feature.

Alternative C would make the exit ramps inside the museum accessible, but accessibility would stop at the exit plaza. Although the current slope of the plaza conforms to a 1:12 ratio, the required platforms and handrails would not be built. This alternative preserves the most historic fabric, but people needing accessibility features would need to exit the way they came in. Additional screening may be needed to screen those who want to touch the Arch legs, but then need to reenter the building to exit via the west entrance.

The park requested additional design information for the park cultural resource advisors to review. Discussion was tabled until that information is available. The next call will include Joanne Cody (NPS) and Gina Hilberry (consultant), accessibility specialists who have been working on this project. The goal will be

to discuss both accessibility issues and concerns and preservation concerns at the same time.

**V. Next DRT Meeting**

The next DRT meeting will be scheduled for April when additional information on the Arch leg exits is available.