

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

Meeting #20: June 4, 2014 11 AM-12:30 PM 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	
DRT Member	Mark Miles	X
Advisor: National Trust	Jennifer Sandy	
Advisor: National Trust	Betsy Merritt	
Facilitator	Margo Brooks	X
Facilitator	Greg Cody	
JEFF	Kathryn Thomas	X
NPS	Susan Dolan	X
CAR2015	Anna Leavey	X
MVVA	James Smith	X
Trivers	Joel Fuoss	
Trivers	David Lott	
Trivers	Amy Huff	X
Randy Burkett Lighting		X
Cooper Robertson	Tom Wittrock	
Cooper Robertson	Jason Cadorette	

### II. Old Courthouse Ramp Additional Review

A Trivers representative presented material studies for the exterior Old Courthouse ramp walls. These included cables, metal mesh, glass, and metal pickets and were based on the DRT response to the last set of design ideas. At that time, Trivers was asked to further explore cable options that blend better with the building and to make the stem wall less prominent. Trivers also strived to keep the design as simple and uncluttered as possible and find solutions with easy maintenance.

#### Discussion

Trivers determined that the cables were not feasible. They required many posts to keep the cables taught and made the ramps appear busy rather than blend in. The DRT agreed.

Metal mesh was more visible than anyone had believed that it would be and was rejected by the DRT as too solid looking.

Glass seemed appropriate, especially a self-cleaning glass that Trivers found, but the DRT had concerns over how it would reflect light. Susan Dolan suggested several design elements that could reduce maintenance costs. These included a mow strip of either concrete or gravel that would keep grass cuttings from sticking to the glass and shortening the glass walls so they did not reach the

lawn. The DRT also discussed the appropriate opacity of the glass, be it done via film or etching to cut down on glare. This would need to be worked out in the design process. A question was also asked about eliminating walls completely on the lower portion of the ramp. The design team did not recommend this because it would entail extra posts to carry the handrail and take away the simplicity of the design.

Modern metal pickets, not replicating the replicated historic pickets around the property, were also shown. These very modern style of pickets was not appropriate, although several DRT members thought that with sufficient design time something could be found that would be acceptable.

CAR2015 reiterated points from the last meeting: i.e. that the cantilevered design of the ramps was very modern and distracting. The design team said that they could work on ways to blend that structure into the surrounding with color and texture, as well as by extending the ramp wall panels down to cover more of the structure.

#### DRT Comments

The DRT agreed that glass was an acceptable material, with the provision that the design team continue working on ways to reduce glare and reflection off the glass while maintaining the qualities of openness that makes it seem to disappear in the landscape. As design progresses, the design team should also work on ways to lower maintenance costs and make the supporting concrete structure blend better with the building. The next set of Old Courthouse design plans is expected to show some of these details.

### **III. Luther Ely Smith Square**

James Smith of MVVA pointed out the location of the flagpole and a change in location of a statue. Susan Dolan agreed that these changes were appropriate and the design direction was appropriate. The DRT agreed as well.

#### DRT Comments

The DRT had no comments on the Luther Ely Smith Square plans. The plans appear appropriately designed.

### **IV. Park Over the Highway Lighting**

The DRT were shown several views of how the light poles would look between the museum and the Old Courthouse.

#### Discussion

Two SA type lights (i.e. L-shaped poles that have already been picked for around the park perimeter) of previous concern are located in the Luther Ely Smith Square lawn corners. The park had requested that consideration be given to removing these in the future. After seeing the views, Susan Dolan commented that they did not obstruct views as much as had been feared. Instead the four SP type lights (three-foot wide circular lights on 17-18-foot poles) to be located at the edge of the lawn by the museum entrance are much more visible than previously thought.

The DRT asked if it were necessary to have the larger poles and light fixtures in this area, or if they could be swapped out for the SA type. The design team

replied that they could be swapped out, but that more lights would be needed in the center if this happened.

#### DRT Comments

The DRT reiterated that the moonlighting was the preferable solution for lighting the park over the highway since it provided no visual obstructions, but that the current lighting plan was acceptable if the moonlighting was not feasible.

### **V. Old Cathedral Path Lighting**

The design team looked at two options for lighting the path behind the Old Cathedral leading into the park. This is a secondary path that intersects with the paths around the southern ponds. Alternative A would have the SA (L-shaped) lights that line the perimeter of the park used on this path to distinguish it from the processional paths where SP (circular lights on taller poles with brackets and a pointed covering) lights are used.

Alternative B would use SP lights on this path to conform to all other interior path lighting.

#### Discussion

The park preferred Alternative B. Their advisors felt that the Old Courthouse path, although not Keeley designed, was in that location as long as the park has been completed and should be treated as an historic path. Therefore, there is no reason to differentiate it from other interior paths. Also, they believed that the design of the SP lights, even though they are larger and taller, was more relatable and intimate for people.

CAR2015, SHPO, and Missouri Preservation all preferred Alternative A. They agreed with what the park said, but they believed that the shorter poles would be more in scale with the smaller path and thus would be more appropriate in the landscape and more relatable for visitors.

#### DRT Comments

The park will revisit this issue internally and return to the group.

### **VI. Drinking Fountain Fixtures**

New drinking fountains are proposed for Leonor K. Sullivan Blvd. and the drinking fountains in the park are proposed to be replaced with a metal fountain with two bowls at standard and wheelchair heights. At least two fountains (in Luther Ely Smith Square) would have pet bowls.

#### Discussion

The historic fountains at the park were sheathed in aggregate concrete similar to the aggregate concrete walk ways, however they are not handicapped accessible. The proposed metal replacement fountains do not have the same sort of design affinity with the pathways, but are simple in design and non-distracting. A mat finish instead of glossy finish is recommended. MVVA is already looking into such a matt finish.

#### DRT Comments'

The DRT approved the locations and types of water fountains to be used in the park. A matt finish is preferable on the fountains.

**VII. DRT Procedures**

Margo Brooks asked the DRT whether or not changes in procedures were necessary to 1. Limit the number of people at decision-making meetings and 2. to provide the park CRM team with enough information to review design packages in advance. For example, would adding another presentation time separate from the DRT be useful, or just adding one for the CRM team? Is it ok for the design team to be on the phone while the DRT deliberates?

The DRT responded that they thought the current call went very well and that they were appreciative of having Susan Dolan and Kathryn Thomas (park advisors) on the line. They felt that it was important to have the CRM team feedback, but gave no opinion on how to improve that process. Margo Brooks will discuss with Ann Honious how to better incorporate CRM team viewpoints into the discussion and will reiterate to the design team the importance of having information to review well in advance of meetings.

No objection was made to having the design team on the calls to answer questions.

**VIII. Next DRT Meeting**

The next DRT meeting is anticipated to be the week of July 21, 2014. Details and an agenda will be provided at a later date.