

**MINUTES OF THE
BROWN DEER BUILDING BOARD
HELD VIRTUALLY AT
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89377238973>
January 18, 2021**



The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m.

I ROLL CALL

Present: Mary Buckley, Will Manley, Chris Eger, Lavern Nall, Ryan Thacker
Also Present: Nate Piotrowski; Community Development Director, Beau Wynn; Detroit Architectural Group, Rachel Miller; Alrig USA

Not Present: None

II PERSONS DESIRING TO BE HEARD

None

III CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

Ms. Buckley identified a lack of clarity on the third agenda item and suggested modifications to the meeting minutes of November 18, 2021.

Ms. Buckley motioned to table approval of the minutes and Mr. Manley seconded the motion. Motion to table was unanimous.

IV OLD BUSINESS

None

V PLANS SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION

The following items were on the agenda for review:

1. Multi-Tenant Commercial Building – 5960 W. Brown Deer Road

Mr. Piotrowski provided reviewed the proposal and introduced the project architect Mr. Beau Wynn.

Mr. Wynn detailed the design of the building, showcased renderings and noted that there would be split face concrete block, horizontal metal panels, wood fiber panels near the Starbucks entrance and a 4 to 4.5' parapet to hide mechanicals.

Chairman Nall asked about the design of the dumpster enclosure. Mr. Wynn replied that it will be concrete block to match the building with cedar slat chain link fencing for doors. Mr. Piotrowski asked that a personnel door be added. Mr. Wynn indicated that change will be made.

Mr. Thacker provided comments and questions. He asked if the "Identity Wood" product was comparable in quality to Nichiha panels, if there were tie backs on the awnings, if the block color was integral and if the block could be ground face. He commented that there could be more of a reveal between tenant spaces to differentiate them, that the building could have more contrast in color and that the north and east side of the buildings were lacking in articulation. Mr. Wynn replied that the block color was integral and they could consider ground block, that there were no

tie backs for the awnings and that he has found the “Identity Wood” to be a solid and comparable product Nichiha. He added that more articulation between the tenant spaces could be investigated.

Mr. Manley commented that he wanted to see more warmth in the color palette of the building and suggested that recent trends in neighborhood architectural approvals leaned toward pitched roofs and brick material and wondered if that was possible in this design.

Chairman Nall asked how the roof drained. Mr. Wynn stated that it was internally drained with one overflow location.

Mr. Eger added that he preferred burnished block to split face. He added that he would also like to see more of a reveal between the tenant spaces. He questioned how the awnings will drain and what the patio seat wall material was since it was not displayed on the elevations. Mr. Wynn stated that the patio seat wall would match the split face on the building and this would be added to elevations.

Mr. Wynn then responded to previous comments. He noted that the design intent was to limit the number of materials on the building and provide a color palette that was complimentary, but he could see how it was somewhat “cool”. He noted that it was possible to explore a higher parapet for Starbucks or more of a reveal for that tenant space.

A discussion ensued as to how to contrast the panels on the secondary tenant space, whether to alternate type and style of block material and how to add articulation to the east and north sides of the building.

Mr. Thacker asked if more wood could be added to the building. Mr. Wynn replied that this was not possible because it was a Starbucks specific material.

Mr. Wynn stated that it was not the developer intent to include a pitched roof and asked if that would be something the Building Board required. Members of the Board stated it would not necessarily be required but noted how other nearby buildings incorporated the look. Members indicated that they wanted something complimentary to the neighborhood and a building of quality design and materials for such a prominent corner. The current design did not achieve this.

Mr. Eger moved to request a resubmittal and Mr. Thacker seconded the motion. Motion to resubmit was unanimous.

A discussion amongst committee members ensued about possible design guidelines, Starbucks architecture in the region and the extent of the committee’s authority to regulate design.

VII ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Eger motioned to adjourn; Mr. Thacker seconded the motion.

Approval was unanimous.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

The next regularly scheduled meeting is February 21, 2022.

Nate Piotrowski

Nate Piotrowski, Development Director