

JEFF CAR 2015 Design Review Team S106 Meeting FINAL NOTES

Meeting #24: October 21, 2014 9 AM-9:30 PM Central

I. Attendance

Role	Name	Participated
DRT Member	Tom Bradley	X
DRT Member	Maggie Hales	X
DRT Member	Vern Remiger	
DRT Member	Judith Deel	X
DRT Member	Bill Hart	X
DRT Member	Karen Bode Baxter	
DRT Member	Ann Honious	
DRT Member	Mark Miles	
Advisor: National Trust	Jennifer Sandy	
Advisor: National Trust	Betsy Merritt	
Facilitator	Margo Brooks	X
Facilitator	Greg Cody	
Trivers	Amy Huff	X

II. Old Courthouse Ramp Materials

Amy Huff from Trivers discussed their proposal for ramp materials and improvements. This proposal builds on the previous approval of ramp concepts.

Walkway materials. The team proposes to sheath the walkway in granite with a sandblasted finish. The granite panels would run the full width of the ramp. The granite would be the same as that being used at the Arch legs. It is darker grey than the building limestone, but does not have a dark black finish. The plazas leading to the ramps would also be granite or concrete with a granite-like finish that would match the color and texture of the ramp granite. This is a departure from the Historic Structure Report recommendation for a smooth concrete finish. The team believes the departure is justified to simplify the entrance materials and to provide a longer lasting surface. The design team also proposes to clad the cantilevered ramp structure in the same granite to simplify the design and address previous comments on the appearance of the structure.

Ramp connection to porch. The original design concept to bridge the gap between the ramp and the porch was to lay a boarding ramp over the gap. The boarding ramp would connect to the ramp structure and sit on the porch. Nothing would attach to the historic fabric and the design would accommodate settling in the ramp structure. As design progressed, the design team determined that the boarding ramp could wear the porch surface and would be visible to everyone on the porch.

A second design would bridge the gap with a grate that would bolt to the ramp structure and to the side of the porch. This would directly impact historic fabric where the bolts were secured.

Other updates. Trivers refined the design in response to maintenance staff comments. They

- designed a curved entrance for mowers to enter through the gate and reach the lawn more easily.

- tested the proposed glass for fingerprints and other issues that would increase maintenance and found the coating worked well to reduce issues.
- provided a LED handrail lighting sample
- chose an underfloor ice melt system to correspond with the one used at the Arch legs.
- are working on a design for a gate where the ramp meets the porch to prevent people from descending into the Courtyard grounds at night.

Discussion

The DRT questioned the color and sheen of the proposed granite. They were told that it would not be reflective and would be darker than the limestone building or the granite along the site perimeter, but that it should not call attention to itself.

Questions were asked about the LED handrail light temperature. Trivers is working with a lighting technician to create a light that is similar in temperature to the existing external lighting at the site.

DRT asked how many connections into the porch the grate would need and whether the connections could be made into the mortar rather than the stone. Bolts would be needed every few inches along the ramp width, but an exact number wasn't yet calculated. The bolts could not be fit into the mortar because the joints are very small (approximately 1/8"). Trivers has been working with Bob Moore (park historical architect advisor) to try to improve both options.

DRT Comments

The DRT agreed that the granite paving is appropriate and should be used. The granite-look concrete would be a second choice if funding were a decision factors. The DRT should be informed of the final decision for materials. A sample of the concrete should be approved if it is the chosen approach.

The DRT asked that Trivers work with Bob Moore to determine which gap bridging alternative was less impactful. They will defer to Bob in making the choice and would like to be informed of the outcome.

III. Next DRT Meetings

November 18, 9-11 CT
December 16, 9-11 CT