

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

Board of Architectural Review
Old & Historic Alexandria District
Wednesday, November 16, 2016
7:30pm, City Council Chambers, City Hall
301 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Members Present: Slade Elkins
Christina Kelley
Christine Roberts
Robert Adams
Kelly Mechling
Margaret Miller
John von Senden, Chair

Staff Present: Al Cox, Historic Preservation Manager
Catherine Miliaras, Preservation Planner

The Board of Architectural Review, Old and Historic Alexandria District, hearing was called to order at 7:30pm.

I. MINUTES

Consideration of the minutes from the **November 2, 2016** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0.

On a motion by Ms. Mechling, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. CASE BAR #2016-00369

Request for alterations at **821 S Washington Street**
Applicant: Mattress Firm

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Mechling, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00369 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED

2. CASE BAR #2016-00343

Request for alterations and an addition at **317 S Lee Street**
Applicant: 317 S Lee St. LLC

Items #2 & #3 were combined for discussion purposes.

3. CASE BAR #2016-00342

Request to partially demolish and capsule at **317 S Lee Street**

Applicant: 317 S Lee St. LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 6-0

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00343 and 00342 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0. Mr. Adams recused himself.

REASON

The Board agreed with the staff analysis, finding that the proposed partial demolition/capsulation was appropriate and that the revised design for the minimally visible rear addition was consistent with the Design Guidelines and the historic development pattern of rear ells on this block-face.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The BAR appreciated the neighbors' testimony and concerns but noted that their purview was limited to architectural features visible from a public way and could not address some of the important issues about which the neighbors commented, such as use of the private alley for construction access or building code requirements for egress from a sleeping room. The BAR found that the proposed second floor addition would be in character with the historic development pattern of ells on this block-face and that this addition in the middle of the block would be very minimally visible from a public way. The BAR, therefore, found the revised plans to be appropriate.

SPEAKERS

Scot McBroom, project architect, spoke in support of the revised application and responded to questions. He noted that the drawings had been enlarged to read more clearly, as the BAR requested, and that the roof of the proposed addition had been lowered significantly.

Hattie Barker, 321 South Lee Street, also speaking on behalf of neighbor Elizabeth Noyes at 317 South Lee Street, requested a deferral. She also provided a copy of a letter by Dr. Carl Smith of 200 Duke St. in opposition of the project.

Beal Lowen, 321 South Lee Street, expressed concerns with the project and the process.

Edwin Brown, 315 South Lee Street, made comments regarding the noticing requirements and expressed concern over light and air at his house, should the addition be constructed.

Sally Z. Harper, 106 West Rosemont Avenue, expressed concern about the addition.

Mary Palmer, 315 South Lee Street, spoke in opposition to the project due to significant adverse impacts the addition would have on her adjacent property.

4. CASE BAR #2016-00362

Request for signage at **1504 King Street**

Applicant: Namaste

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Kelley, seconded by Ms. Miller, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review

voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00362 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The sign in the center of the awning be removed and replaced with graphics located on the front of the awning valance;
2. The two signs on the side of the awning be deleted; and,
3. The changeable content sign box be reduced in size by half, so that it is no larger than six square feet.

REASON

The Board agreed with the staff recommendations and suggested that the applicant work with staff on the final design based on the conditions of approval.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board found that the staff recommendations were appropriate and consistent with the Design Guidelines.

SPEAKERS

The applicant/owner of Namaste spoke in support and agreed to the staff recommendations.

5. CASE BAR #2016-00361

Request for signage and alterations at **726 King St.**

Applicant: Nicecream Factory

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 5-2

On a motion by Ms. Kelley, seconded by Ms. Miller, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00361 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-2 with Ms. Mechling and Mr. von Senden voting against the approval.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the wall and projecting signs, provided the LED light strip is integrated into the sign band trim and the lights bulbs are not visible to pedestrians.
2. Approval to lime wash the unpainted first floor masonry wall.
3. Hanging bracket should be straight and not have a decorative flourish.

REASON

The BAR generally supported the lime wash of the small area of unpainted brick adjacent to the building entrance as the brick was from the mid-20th-century and had been patched over the years. The BAR also preferred a simple straight bracket as opposed to a more decorative metal bracket. The BAR thought the alterations were an appropriate and comprehensive sign/storefront design.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The majority of the BAR agreed that painting of unpainted masonry was rarely appropriate but several of the BAR members found that applying a lime wash to the brick was appropriate in this particular instance because the brick was not from the first period of construction but rather from the middle of the 20th-century, did not match the pressed brick on the second floor of the façade, was not particularly noteworthy in color, shape or bonding pattern, and it had also been altered/patched over the years. Additionally, applying the lime whitewash rather than paint would still allow the brick wall to breathe while differentiating this brick from the historic

19th-century brick at the second story. The BAR made it clear that there were very few instances where such treatment would be appropriate but thought it was a good compromise in this location.

SPEAKERS

The applicant/owner of Nicecream Factory spoke in support and responded to questions.

6. CASE BAR #2016-00370

Request for re-approval of expired plans for partial demolition and capsulation at **111 S Payne Street**

Applicant: Casa Rosada Artisan Gelato

Items #6 & #7 were combined for discussion purposes.

7. CASE BAR #2016-00371

Request for re-approval of expired plans for an addition at **111 S Payne Street**

Applicant: Casa Rosada Artisan Gelato

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Ms. Mechling, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00370 and 00371 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The new siding on the north elevation of the existing one-story building is installed such that the wall appears as if it was clad at one time;
2. That the paired windows on the new addition may be constructed of a modern material, such as aluminum clad wood or fiberglass, provided that the windows are consistent with the Board's Window Policy;
3. The reconstruction and repointing of the chimney, which should be the same size as the existing chimney, utilize the historic bricks to the extent possible, and that any new materials match appropriate size, color, and texture of the historic material;
4. The BAR staff will be notified a minimum of 24 hours prior to the demolition and reconstruction of the chimney, so that they may be on site to ensure that the original bricks are carefully dismantled and reused to the maximum extent possible;
5. The applicant/contractor shall call Alexandria Archaeology immediately (703-746-4399) if any buried structural remains (wall foundations, wells, privies, cisterns, etc.) or concentrations of artifacts are discovered during development. Work must cease in the area of the discovery until a City archaeologist comes to the site and records the finds; and,
6. The applicant/contractor shall not allow any metal detection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

REASON

The Board found it appropriate to reapprove the previously approved application with the same conditions.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no discussion.

SPEAKERS

David Umansky, applicant, spoke on behalf of the application.

- 8. CASE BAR #2016-00363**
Request for partial demolition and capsulation at **412 Wolfe Street**
Applicant: Brian Klotz & David Terry

Items #8 & #9 were combined for discussion purposes.

- 9. CASE BAR #2016-00364**
Request for alterations and an addition at **412 Wolfe Street**
Applicant: Brian Klotz & David Terry

BOARD ACTION: Deferred, 7-0

On a substitute motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Ms. Mechling, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR Case #2016-00364. The substitute motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

REASON

The Board deferred the project for restudy of the following elements:

- The porch column design (should not have different size bases and traditional column order design should be adhered to if pursuing a more formal approach)
- Material and treatment of the rear two-story addition

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had an extensive discussion on various elements of the proposed design and found that a few items needed further refinement. It was identified that the proposed gate and northern column at the first floor presented a design conflict. The Board did not find it appropriate to have a short column on top of the garden wall when the remaining first floor columns were taller and placed on a low brick plinth. This design was visually incongruous and resulted in three different column sizes on the two-story porch. It was also suggested that since the round columns introduced a formality to the design, that a simpler order (Tuscan) could be used at the second story with a different order (Doric) at the first floor. Alternately, it was discussed that instead of the formality of column orders, the applicant could use more substantial and vernacular square columns, such as a 6” square post, with or without chamfered corners.

Regarding the second story rear addition, the Board agreed with staff that the scheme appeared unfinished and recommended that a simple design, such as clapboard siding, could be applied. It was also recommended that the rooftop HVAC enclosure should read as a railing. It was suggested by at least one member that the front door warranted refinement although it was noted that the door was minimally visible due to its location beneath the side porch.

SPEAKERS

Erin May, project architect, spoke in support and responded to questions.

- 10. CASE BAR #2016-00324**
Informal work session for a concept review of proposed development at **301 S Alfred Street**.
This item was open for public comment.
Applicant: Alfred Street Baptist Church

BOARD ACTION: Supported as amended, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural

Review was polled and agreed unanimously to support the Concept Plan as amended.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board supported the concept design for the proposed expansion of the Alfred Street Baptist Church, finding that the proposed height, scale, mass and general architectural character were appropriate subject to the future refinements noted below. They noted that each elevation of the project was specifically designed to relate to the existing block face across the street and that the relationship to those contexts were generally successful. The Board also provided guidance as to refinements that should be made as the design develops. The Board complimented the design team on the submission materials, including the rendered perspectives.

The Board was very supportive of the steeple as a defining architectural element signifying the church use and as an entry gateway into Old Town from the south that establishes a sense of place. The BAR favored the traditional character of the steeple's architectural form with some suggesting that the proportions needed refinement to avoid a squat appearance. The Board applauded the rehabilitation of and emphasis on the historic chapel structure as a design feature. The Board did note that the site plan lacked the alleys and courtyards that give a typical Old Town block its visual porosity and recommended that the applicant work to increase either the physical porosity or the perception of porosity by pedestrians walking around the block. The Board also wanted to see a more defined building entrance, particularly on South Alfred Street. The Board discussed the new classroom section of the building facing Alfred and Wolfe streets. Several BAR members complimented the open space and setbacks but discouraged a false townhouse appearance for Alfred Street while emphasizing the need to respect the rhythm, scale and materials of the townhouses across the street. The Board supported the scale and forms of the Wolfe Street elevation. The Board was confused about the proposed form of the new sanctuary roof, particularly the northern portion above the balcony where a triangular roof/wall element extended vertically above the brick side walls. The Board found this unusual element to be jarring and recommended restudying it to be more graceful and integrated with the rest of the sanctuary roof. The Board did not oppose demolition of the existing, late 20th century townhouses on the site.

In summary, the Board supported the height, scale, mass and general architectural character as submitted with direction to the applicant to continue to work on the following:

- Increase the site's physical and/or visual porosity, building on the design part of a collection of separate buildings on the site.
- Emphasize a sense of entry on Alfred Street and also refine the townhouse character on South Alfred Street.
- Restudy the roof form at north end of the sanctuary above the balcony to eliminate the vertical, triangular roof/wall.

SPEAKERS

Mary Catherine Gibbs and Bud Hart, land use attorneys representing the Alfred Street Baptist Church, introduced the project and responded to questions.

Pastor Howard John Wesley, Pastor of Alfred Street Baptist Church, gave a brief overview of the church and its history within the community for the past 213 years.

Tom Kerns and Andrew Cheng, project architects, gave a joint presentation on the design and the context of the proposed ASBC expansion.

James McNeil, 1 Wharf Street, Chairman of the ASBC Board of Trustees, spoke in support.

Peter Glaser, 827 Wolfe Street, expressed concern with the proposed size and scale. He also submitted a letter.

Joe Clancy, 804 Wolfe Street, expressed concern.

Pamela Zetron, 807 Wolfe Street, expressed concern with the proposed size.

Carolyn Alexander, 911 Franklin Street, spoke in support of the project.

Masharia Holman, 3307 Cortell Lane, spoke in support.

Dr. Scott Leaf, 814 Duke Street, expressed concerns.

Mike Leonard, 805 Wolfe Street, gave a brief presentation outlining his concerns.

Mary Nokes, 318 South Alfred Street, expressed concern.

Jennifer Jones, 1115 Cameron Street, spoke in support.

William Doying, 817 Duke Street, was proud of the church's history but expressed concern.

Al Pierce, 320 South Alfred Street, expressed concern with the mass and scale.

Yvonne Callahan, president of the Old Town Civic Association, spoke in opposition.

Brigitte Maxey, 2701 Park Center Drive, spoke in support.

Nicole Barranco, 820 Duke Street, expressed concern about the scale.

Stephen Milone, 907 Prince Street, provided handouts and expressed concern with the proposal.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

11. Consideration of amendments to the OHAD By-Laws recommended by the By-Laws Committee to reflect the format of other City Board and Commissions.

BOARD ACTION: Deferred for restudy, 7-0

BOARD DISCUSSION

Christine Roberts, chair of the By-Laws Committee, explained the proposed changes and highlighted the key differences between the new and old By-Laws. She noted the following proposed changes: 1) change the start time of BAR hearings to 7pm, to be consistent with other City boards and commissions, 2) retains the election of officers in December of each year, and 3) removes term limits for the Chair.

Ms. Roberts responded to questions and noted that an updated version (using Track Changes from the 11/16 version) would be provided at the next meeting to respond to the Board's

comments.

SPEAKERS

Charles Trozzo, 209 Duke Street, requested that applicants not be allowed to introduce new material after the public hearing was closed.

12. Distribution of materials for the policy for Concept Review to the OHAD Board.

The Board received the materials for the policy for Concept Review to the OHAD Board.

13. Consideration of amendments to the *Criteria & Standards for Administrative Approval of Commercial Signs with the Historic Districts* in response to recent changes to the Sign chapter of the Alexandria zoning ordinance.

This item was deferred prior to the hearing.

14. Ms. Mechling noted that she was moving from Alexandria and that this would be her last meeting. The Board thanked Ms. Mechling for her service. Staff noted that a replacement for Ms. Mechling was now needed for the BAR's Design Guidelines Committee.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The OHAD Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 11:15pm.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

CASE BAR #2016-00393

Request for Gate Replacement at **217 S Columbus Street**
Applicant: Catherin Way

CASE BAR #2016-00398

Request for Window Replacement at **211 Wolfe Street**
Applicant: Dale Gibb

CASE BAR #2016-00390

Request for Repair of siding and fence at **921 Duke Street**
Applicant: Ann Samuel

CASE BAR #2016-00384

Request for signage at **604 S Washington Street**
Applicant: Sa-Sah Salon

CASE BAR #2016-00389

Request for Repointing at **412 Duke Street**
Applicant: Tom Dabney

CASE BAR #2016-00386

Request for Fence Replacement at **605 N Alfred Street**

Applicant: R. Tilerino

CASE BAR #2016-00385

Request for Signage at **116 King Street**

Applicant: KST Pop-up, LLC

CASE BAR #2016-00380

Request for replacement lantern & sec. cameras at **428 N Washington Street**

Applicant: Chris Cox

CASE BAR #2016-00383

Request for Window & Patio Door Replacement at **547 S St. Asaph Street**

Applicant: Renewal by Anderson, LLC

CASE BAR #2016-00378

Request for Roof Replacement at **607 Princess Street**

Applicant: Charles Fones

CASE BAR #2016-00379

Request for Window Replacement at **304 Princess Street**

Applicant: Victoria Doran

CASE BAR #2016-00388

Request for Siding Replacement at **209 Wilkes Street**

Applicant: Jeremy & Whitney Emch