

*******DRAFT MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review
Wednesday, December 18, 2024
7:00 p.m., City Council Chamber
City Hall

Members Present: James Spencer, Chair
Andrew Scott, Vice Chair
Michael Lyons
Theresa del Ninno
Margaret Miller
Nastaran Zandian

Members Absent: Bud Adams

Secretary: William Conkey, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Brendan Harris, Historic Preservation Planner

1 **Call to Order**

The December 18, 2024 Board of Architectural Review meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm. Mr. Adams was absent. All other members were present.

2 **Minutes**

Consideration of the minutes from the December 4, 2024, Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing.

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Scott, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review approved the minutes of the December 4, 2024 meeting as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

Unfinished Business and Items Previously Deferred

3&4 BAR#2024-00349 - OHAD
Request for alterations at 411 Prince Street. Applicant: Matthew McBrady, represented by Tatiana Rodriguez

BAR#2024-00350 - OHAD
Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 411 Prince Street. Applicant: Matthew McBrady, represented by Tatiana Rodriguez

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Scott, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to accept the applicant's request to defer the Permit to Demolish and Certificate of

Appropriateness for the garden wall. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0. On a motion by Ms. del Ninno, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to partially approve BAR#2024-00349 for window infill. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

Reason:

The Board agreed that the subject window is not historic in nature.

Speakers:

Matt McBrady, owner, introduced the project and requested a partial deferral to include the scope of work related to the removal and replacement of the garden wall in order to allow time to work with the neighboring property owner.

Discussion:

By a unanimous vote, the Board voted to approve the request for partial deferral and to approve the infill of the subject window.

- 5 Consideration of a motion to rescind the Board of Architectural Review's vote on November 6, 2024, denying the request for BAR2023-00074 and BAR2024-00083 for alterations, an addition, and partial demolition and encapsulation at 333 Green Street (OHAD).

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Scott, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review rescinded their November 6, 2024 vote to deny BAR2023-00074 and BAR2023-00083. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 1, with Ms. Zandian voting against.

Reason:

The Board elected to reconsider this project based on further understanding the operating procedures.

Speakers:

Paul O'Sullivan, owner and architect, available for questions

Discussion:

Mr. Scott clarified the reasons the Board wanted to rescind the previous motion.

- 6&7 BAR#2023-00074 - OHAD
Request for alterations and an addition at 333 Green Street.
Applicant: Paul O'Sullivan

BAR#2023-00083 - OHAD
Request for partial demolition/encapsulation at 333 Green Street.
Applicant: Paul O'Sullivan

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Scott, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2023-00074 and BAR#2023-00083 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4 to 2, with Ms. Miller and Ms. Zandian voting against.

Reason:

The Board found the revised design appropriate.

Speakers:

Paul O'Sullivan, owner and architect, available for questions
Gail Rothrock, HAF, spoke in opposition of the project.

Discussion:

Mr. Scott clarified the procedural process. He spoke in support of the application and stated the importance of the immediate neighbor support of the project. He also found the changes to the existing roof favorable.

Ms. del Ninno spoke in support of the project. Noting the similar massing of properties on the block.

Ms. Miller if there were any changes the design, since the previous hearing.

New Business

- 8 BAR2024-00406 - OHAD
Request for signage at 115 N Lee St, Unit BH205.
Applicants: VVH Lee LLC, represented by Gary Brent

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Lyons, seconded by Ms. Zandian, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2024-00406 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The lighting be dimmable.
2. The applicant work with staff to determine the brightness of the signage, performing an illumination analysis at night.

Reason:

The Board found the signage appropriate.

Speakers:

Gary Brent, authorized agent for the property owner, gave a brief introduction and was available to answer questions. He agreed with staff recommendations to install the signs in mortar joints and explained that only the white parts of the sign would be illuminated.

Discussion:

Ms. Del Ninno asked if the applicant had considered lighting from the wall. He responded that due to a nearby window, spotlighting would have a bigger effect on tenants.

Mr. Scott asked Mr. Conkey for information on the number of lumens and if staff had provided input. Mr. Conkey explained that the Design Guidelines committee had determined that it is very difficult to require a precise number of lumens due to a property's location and other variables. Mr. Harris added that proposed updates to the lighting section of the Design Guidelines will come to the Board in January, and will specify that lighting levels should be reviewed by staff in the field.

Mr. Scott then asked if the lighting would be dimmable. Mr. Brent responded that this was not proposed in the application but that it would certainly be possible.

Ms. Mitchell asked if there was a rendering of the signage in the proposed locations. Mr. Harris advised the page of the staff report where she could find those images. She asked if the size complied with Design Guidelines. Mr. Harris explained that the Design Guidelines do not specify size. Mr. Conkey explained that this case came to the Board because of the illumination; otherwise, it could have been approved administratively by staff. Ms. Mitchell expressed concern that the lighting may disturb homeowners.

9&10 BAR2024-00389 - Parker Gray

Request for alterations, an addition, and new construction at 1007 and 1007A Oronoco Street.

Applicants: 1007-1009 Oronoco Street, LLC, represented by Kulinski Group Architects, P.C.

BAR2024-00428 - Parker Gray

Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 1007 and 1007A Oronoco Street.

Applicants: 1007-1009 Oronoco Street, LLC, represented by Kulinski Group Architects, P.C.

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. del Ninno, seconded by Mr. Scott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2024-00389 and BAR#2024-00428 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The primary elevation of the existing building be clad in wood.
2. The applicant follows the recommendations of Alexandria Archaeology
3. The applicant work with staff to refine the rear/north elevation at the alley to better differentiate the two buildings.

Reason:

The Board overall liked the design, but felt that the rear/north elevation looked too much like one large building instead of two separate buildings.

Speakers:

Steve Kulinski, project architect, represented the applicant, gave a brief introduction to the project, and was available to answer questions.

Discussion:

Ms. Del Ninno asked if the alley bounding the north property line was public or private. It is public.

Mr. Scott then asked how much of the building/project would be visible from a public right of way. Mr. Conkey advised that all of it would be. Mr. Scott then noted that the siding on each building would have a different reveal and asked if Mr. Kulinski intended to continue that differentiation to the rear of the house. Mr. Kulinski responded positively and indicated that the older existing house siding has a 5" reveal and the new house siding will have a 7" reveal. Mr. Scott asked if Mr.

Kulinski considered extending the muntin style from the front of the house to the rear of the house. Mr. Kulinski explained that he is keeping all of the existing windows except for one, which must be removed to comply with egress issues. The rear of the house will have 1/1 windows, which are preferred for the design aesthetic.

Mr. Lyons asked if Mr. Kulinski agreed with the staff recommendation to have wood cladding on the primary/south elevation. Mr. Kulinski replied that he agreed with all staff recommendations.

Ms. Zandian requested that Mr. Kulinski clarify the usage and layout of the garages to the rear of the property, which he did.

Ms. Del Ninno noted that the original house has a standing seam metal roof and asked why Mr. Kulinski proposed a TPO roof for the rear. Mr. Kulinski explained that TPO is easier and less expensive, and it will not be visible from a public right of way.

Ms. Mitchell stated that she likes Mr. Kulinski and his work.

Ms. Zandian echoed Ms. Mitchell's remark.

Mr. Lyons stated that he was fully supportive of this application.

Mr. Scott noted that this is a beautiful design which he tends to support.

Ms. Del Ninno supported the project but asked that Mr. Kulinski work with staff to slightly modify the rear/north elevation. As designed, it looks like one large building. She would like for the elevation to be modified to provide better differentiation between the two buildings and made some suggestions as to how to do so. Mr. Kulinski said that he would be glad to work with staff.

Mr. Spencer agreed with Ms. Del Ninno.

11&12 BAR2024-00404 - OHAD

Request for alterations and an addition at 114 Princess Street.

Applicant: Sharon Dow and Louis Alefantis

BAR2024-00405 - OHAD

Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 114 Princess Street. Applicant: Sharon Dow and Louis Alefantis

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Lyons, seconded by Mr. Scott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR#2024-00404 and BAR#2024-00405. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

Reason

The Board members wanted to see an updated east elevation that keeps some of the details of the existing entry door and creates a more organized window configuration.

Speakers

Sharon Dow, the property owner, was available to answer questions.

Discussion

Ms. Dow stated that her preference is to whitewash the brick, not paint it.

Mr. Lyons stated that it is a great project and that he supports it.

Mr. Scott said that the proposed east elevation has lost some of the house's regal presence as well as the focal point of the door. He recommended emphasizing the entry door more, and said that the window above the door should keep some of the details of the existing door. He also stated that because windows F, G, and H have different sill levels, the applicant should consider making window G shorter or putting a decorative element on top. He said that he believes the proposed window configuration looks too modern and the elevation needs a more classical window configuration.

Ms. Zandian said that window F on the east elevation should be lined up with the lower windows, and that the east elevation should be more symmetrical and organized.

Ms. Del Ninno said that the house currently blends in with the neighbors, and she prefers that the applicant match the existing brick and not paint it. She also recommended updating the east elevation, particularly by emphasizing the center door.

Ms. Miller said she believes a limewash would look good on this house.

Mr. Spencer said he would like to see a different roof material, such as faux slate, to show a different texture.

13&14 BAR2024-00412 - OHAD

Request for alterations at 206 N Washington St, Unit 100.

Applicants: Liberty Construction, represented by Huyen Nguyen, TD Design Consultants

BAR2024-00411 - OHAD

Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 206 N Washington St, Unit 100.

Applicants: Liberty Construction, represented by Huyen Nguyen, TD Design Consultants

BOARD ACTION: On motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Ms. Zandian, the Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR#2024-00412 and BAR#2024-00411. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

Reason:

The applicant requested a deferral for restudy of the project.

Speakers:

John Sanati, Liberty Construction, presented project and was available for questions, Mojde Bahremand, representative of property owner, available for questions

Discussion:

Ms. Miller is concerned with the symmetry of the existing windows and the proposed entrance. She also stated that the overall elevation is not balance and prefers a single prominent entrance.

Ms. Zandian stated the proposed opening is too large.

Ms. del Ninno stated that the opening should be narrower, and the surround should be precast.

Mr. Scott stated that the proposed third entrance should be consistent with existing entrances.

Mr. Spencer stated that a third entrance is no needed on the building.

15&16 BAR2024-00425 - Parker Gray

Request for alterations and an addition at 418 N Patrick Street.

Applicants: Thomas & Summer Hunt, TR, represented by Stephen Kulinski, Architects

BAR2024-00424 - Parker Gray

Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 418 N Patrick Street.

Applicants: Thomas & Summer Hunt, TR, represented by Stephen Kulinski, Architects

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Scott, seconded by Ms. Del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2024-00424 and BAR#2024-00425 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6- 0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The applicant considers an optional 5” siding exposure on the new addition to match the main building siding exposure.

REASON

The Board found the project appropriate and agreed with staff recommendations.

SPEAKERS

Steve Kulinski, the project architect, introduced the project and was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Scott stated that he understood the reason for the architect to choose a different siding reveal on the new addition, however he thinks that by keeping the same exposure of 5” would look better and that the differentiation between the old and new portion of the building is already implied by the use of the synthetic siding versus wood. He suggested the applicant to consider a 5” siding exposure on the new addition. There was no further discussion.

Other Business

17 BAR2024-00435 - OHAD

Request for BAR Concept Review I for the Pump Station at 1A Prince Street.

Applicant: City of Alexandria

BOARD ACTION: The Board of Architectural Review received a presentation and heard public testimony on the proposed concept plan for development of a pump station at 1A Prince St.

SPEAKERS

Mathew Landes, City of Alexandria Department of Project Implementation, introduced project

Mr. Scott noted that the Strand Street location may be the less intrusive of the two submitted options in terms of the impact on views of the river, he asked if the team had studied these views. Mr. Landes reviewed the views that the design team had created, including ones showing this view.

Mr. Lyons asked why the Option 2 location is the preferred option. Mr. Landes noted that this option allows for the activation of Strand Street.

Ms. del Ninno asked if the City had considered re-grading the park to counteract flooding. Mr. Landes noted that re-grading the entire park was not being considered but that the east edge of the park would be re-configured.

Ms. del Ninno asked about which functions could take place below grade and about the size and function of the generators. Mr. Landes reviewed the requirement for equipment in the structure, noting clearance and elevation requirements. He further noted that the generators will be nine feet tall and would only be used for emergency functions.

Ms. del Ninno asked how the proposed design would meet the green building requirements. Mr. Landes discussed the inclusion of portions of green roof, stormwater mitigation and the use of low voltage lights.

Mr. Spencer asked for clarification regarding which portions of the structure would have a roof.

Ms. Miller asked how the current proposal varies from the approved waterfront plan. Mr. Landes stated that in the approved plan, there were two pump stations, one in Waterfront Park and one in Founders Park. Given the current design requirements, it is not economically feasible to move forward with this option and instead, a single pump station design is being pursued.

Ms. Miller asked about the proposed construction timing. Mr. Landes stated that the intention is to begin construction in late 2025.

Ms. Miller asked about the amount of noise that will be created by the equipment in the pump station. Mr. Landes explained that the pumps would be functioning within a concrete vault filled with water which would deaden the sound of the equipment. With the exception of emergency situations, the generators would only be run while they are being exercised.

Ms. Zandian asked if the entire structure could be located below grade. Mr. Landes explained that some critical equipment must be located out of the flood plain and that this is driving the size of the structure.

Al Cox, 311 N Alfred Street, reviewed the Olin plan adopted for the waterfront, highlighting the priorities of the design. He noted that while it may not be possible to implement the entire plan at this time, no action should be taken that would preclude the ability to move forward with the approved design.

Paul Beckman, 214 East Mt. Ida Avenue, presented a video showing renderings of the design being proposed by the City and including potential alternatives to this design.

Yvonne Calahan, OTCA, noted that the Founders Park location for the pump station had been determined not to be feasible based on conservation concerns. She noted that the Waterfront Park location has a height limit of fifteen feet for any structure, per agreement with the Federal Government. She asked that the design progress be paused while the legality of the proposal is determined.

Gail Rothrock, HAF, yielded her time to Al Cox so that he may continue his presentation.

Al Cox, 311 N Alfred Street, continued to review the Olin plan, highlighting the design concepts for this portion of the waterfront. He further noted that as a part of this plan, the electrical lines in the area are to be relocated below grade and that this is not included in the proposed scope of work. He indicated that if the waterfront parks were elevated by six feet, much of the tidal flooding would be eliminated.

Gina Baum, 432 N West Street, stated that the City should not be proposing construction on the limited green space available and should consider alternate locations.

Andrea Smith, 721 N Fayette Street, indicated that she is an owner of the Misha's coffee shop located at 6 Prince Street and that she is concerned that the location of the pump station within Waterfront Park would damage nearby businesses by taking away from the river views and overall integrity of the park.

Melissa Kuennen, 525 Montgomery Street, asked about the notation in the submission regarding the stakeholder preference for the Prince Street location, noting that in previous public hearings, no such preference has been expressed. She expressed a preference for the Strand Street location and asked that the design for the building be a background design with an integral stage attached.

At this time, the public comment period was closed

Ms. del Ninno asked if Point Lumley Park or other locations were considered for the pump station. Mr. Landes stated that this location along with 1 Prince and 110 S Union were all considered for the pump station. While Point Lumley Park is technically feasible, complications with property ownership in this area make it impossible. Similarly, technical and ownership challenges made other locations impossible. She further asked if, in the Strand location, the structure could be moved further west. Mr. Landes explained that in this option, the structure would be located as close to Strand Street as possible.

Ms. del Ninno stated that she prefers the Strand Street location because it locates the structure as far from the river as possible. She asked that the design include variation in the roof height with portions lowered where possible.

Mr. Lyons stated a preference for the Strand Street location, noting that the Prince Street location is too intrusive in the park. He prefers the more modern design motif, but it requires additional development.

Ms. Miller does not support either location and would prefer to see the structure at Point Lumley Park or Founders Park. If it must be in Waterfront Park, then it should be in the Strand location, as close as possible to Strand Street. She expressed a preference for the brick design but asked that some porosity be included in the design.

Ms. Zandian stated her preference for the Strand Street location and that the building be as small as possible. She asked for site sections and additional views of the site showing views along the waterfront.

Mr. Scott expressed support for the Strand Street location noting that the Prince Street location creates a visual wall and blocks the view of the waterfront. He suggested that the proposed design should include an integral stage. He supports the more modern design option but that the design needs further development to become viable.

Mr. Spencer agreed with colleagues that the Strand Street location is preferred and asked that the pump station be located as far from the river as possible. Regarding the proposed design, he noted that neither design is adequate and asked for a design that includes variation in height and massing. When the project returns for another Concept Review, more detailed drawings showing the station itself should be included. He noted that the Old Dominion Boat Club successfully references historic architecture while clearly being a modern design.

Election of Officers

BOARD ACTION: On a nomination by Ms. del Ninno, seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to elect Mr. Scott as Chair for a term of one year. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 0. Ms. Miller was absent from the vote.

On a nomination by Mr. Scott, seconded by Mr. Lyon, the Board of Architectural Review voted to elect Ms. Zandian as Vice Chair for a term of one year. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 0. Ms. Miller was absent from the vote.

18 Adjournment

The December 18, 2024 Board of Architectural Review meeting was adjourned at 10:41 p.m.

Administrative Approvals

BAR2024-00422

Request for fence at 403 N Fayette St.

Applicant: Drew Newton

BAR2024-00426 Request for roof repairs at 210 Wilkes St.

Applicant: John Weaver

BAR2024-00429 Request for door alterations at 500 Bashford Ln.

Applicant: Bonnie Swanson

BAR2024-00430 Request for a sign at 115 S Columbus St.

Applicant: Caitlin Van Sant