

JEFF CAR 2015 Design Review Team S106 Meeting FINAL NOTES

Meeting #7: April 1, 2013 9-10:15 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	x
Advisor: National Trust	Betsy Merritt	
Facilitator	Margo Brooks	x
Facilitator	Greg Cody	x

II. Design Discussion

The Design Review Team (DRT) discussed issues arising from the review of three design packages that were presented for review. These included the schematic design package for the museum/visitor center, the schematic design package for areas 3-7, and the predesign plans for Sullivan Blvd.

Museum Schematic Design

The DRT focused on both the new and the old entrances during their discussion and minimizing the effects that the new entrance and new accessible ramps will have on the Memorial grounds. During the discussion a question was asked about the significance of the interior of the museum space. Memorial and SHPO staff replied that character defining features of concern include 1. the terrazzo floors, 2. the coffered ceilings, 3. the distinctive structural columns, and 4. the Arch loading zone areas. Other areas have been changed and/or should be open for change as part of a living museum.

Areas 3-7 Schematic Design

Areas 3-7 include the bulk of the landscaping at the Memorial with the exception of the perimeter, Luther Ely Smith Square, and the Courthouse.

Discussion focused on filling and cutting between the new entrance and the Arch legs, the proposed accessible ramps at the existing entrances, and the northern entrance. The DRT discussion about the northern entrance focused specifically on how the project may affect and interface with Eads Bridge, Lacledes Landing, and the Kiley landscape as well as the impact the removal of the parking garage may have on other historic resources.

Sullivan Blvd. Predesign

The Memorial staff explained that they asked the design team to think about materials other than the cobbles proposed in an earlier presentation to line the new retaining/security walls along the boulevard. The new material should better match the modernist design of the Memorial. No other discussion.

III. Formal Comments

Museum Schematic Design Package		
1	Entrance	The S106 Design Review Team remains concerned about the pathway around top of the new entrance and its accompanying railing. It would like this to be as inconspicuous as possible and not read as a pedestrian path. Details of the proposed railing will be needed.
2	Exit ramps to arch legs	More detail on how the existing stair, and proposed railing and ramps outside of the Museum interact is needed to judge this design. The ramp outside of the Museum should be as close to current grade as possible since Saarinen designed the angle of the existing ramp to be the same as the angle of the Arch legs. There is no comment on the ramp design within the Museum space. (Also included in the Museum SD comments).
Areas 3-7 Schematic Design Package		
1	Exit ramps to arch legs/Area 3	More detail on how the existing stair, and proposed railing and ramps outside of the Museum interact is needed to judge this design. The ramp outside of the Museum should be as close to current grade as possible since Saarinen designed the angle of the existing ramp to be the same as the angle of the Arch legs. There is no comment on the ramp design within the Museum space. <i>(Also included in the Museum SD comments).</i>
2	Grade change between Arch legs/Area 3	The proposed grade change between the Arch legs to compensate for the view is acceptable. More detail on how the grade change affects pathways and the Arch legs is needed. It should not change paths coming into this general area if possible.
3	Berm profile/accessible paths at Western Entrance/Area 3	The S106 Design Review team would like additional detail on the accessible paths that lead from the western entrance to the Arch legs with emphasis on how the berm will be shaped and look to pedestrians. The section was helpful, but did not provide enough detail.

4	Northern Entrance/Area 4	The physical interface between Eads Bridge and the Western Entrance project area needs to be detailed. What will be against to wall of the bridge, staged in the bridge, or affect the bridge and its setting? The S106 Design Review Team needs more information to better discern impacts to the NHL listed Eads Bridge.
5	Northern Entrance/Area 4	The interface between this project and road projects in Laclede Landing needs to be identified and depicted. Additionally, it would be useful if the estimated amount of traffic through the Eads Bridge now and in the future, as well as any additional changes of use patterns in Laclede Landing due to this project could be elaborated on to help determine effects both to Eads Bridge and the Laclede Landing Historic District. For example, would there be any effect to the cobble streets of Laclede Landing due to the use of the Landing district as a drop off route?
6	Parking Garage/Area 4	If it is determined that the parking garage will be going, parking solutions and connected or related projects will need to go through the DRT for review, even if they are planned separately by different entities. If these parking solutions would not have been contemplated if not for the removal of the existing parking garage, they are part of the impact of the current project.
7	Northern Entrance/Area 4 & Area 6 interface	The interface between the Western Entrance (Area 4) and the northern processional walk (Area 6) needs to be shown in better detail. The S106 Design Review Team is especially interested in seeing how the formal open landscape of the Kiley design will interface with the more natural design of Area 4, including views into this area from the south and from Eads Bridge.
8	Area 5 and landscape general comments	Park landscape advisors will provide the S106 Team with their opinions on the landscape design around the ponds and elsewhere. Additional comments may be forthcoming once these comments are received.
9	East Slopes/Area 7	Concerns were raised by others about people possibly falling into the sunken pathways. Vegetative buffers are preferable to railings in seeking solutions to this problem, if needed.
10	East Slopes/Area 7 and general landscape	Distinctive characteristics of the Kiley plan include the lack of hard edges to the landscape, and the monolithic lawn. Continue working with the park staff to soften some of the new edges, especially the barrier edges.
11	Security Barriers General	There is still concern about the permeability of security barriers. Area 7 may be understandable because of the slope and accessibility issues. Permeability should be addressed in the next set of Area 1 plans.

Sullivan Blvd. Predesign Package		
1	Border	The S106 Design Review Team understands that the proposed cobble border will be revised to better reflect the modernist architecture of the Memorial and looks forward to seeing the revised design ideas.
END of COMMENTS		

IV. Next DRT Meeting

The next DRT meeting will be scheduled as needed.