

\*\*\*\*\*DRAFT MINUTES\*\*\*\*\*

Alexandria Board of Architectural Review  
Old & Historic Alexandria District

**Wednesday, March 6, 2013**  
7:30pm, City Council Chambers, City Hall  
301 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Members Present: Tom Hulfish, Chairman  
Oscar Fitzgerald, Vice Chairman  
Chip Carlin  
Wayne Neale  
John von Senden  
Peter Smeallie

Members Absent: Art Keleher

Staff Present: Planning & Zoning  
Al Cox, FAIA, Historic Preservation Manager  
Catherine Miliaras, Historic Preservation Planner

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Hulfish.

---

**I. MINUTES**

Consideration of the minutes of the public hearing of February 20, 2013.  
**BOARD ACTION:** Approved as submitted, 6-0.

On a motion by Dr. Fitzgerald, seconded by Mr. von Senden, the minutes were approved, as submitted, 6-0.

---

**II. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**1. CASE BAR2013-0026**

Request for new accessory structure at **226 S Fairfax St.**  
**APPLICANT:** Peter and Amy Young by Steve Kulinski  
**BOARD ACTION:** **Approved as amended, 4-2.**

This item was removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion.

---

**III. NEW BUSINESS**

**1. CASE BAR2013-0026**

Request for new accessory structure at **226 S Fairfax St.**

**APPLICANT:** Peter and Amy Young by Steve Kulinski

**BOARD ACTION:** **Approved as amended, 4-2.**

On a motion by Dr. Fitzgerald, seconded by Mr. von Senden, the Board voted to approved the application as amended with the conditions noted below, 4-2 (Chairman Hulfish and Mr. Smeallie voted in opposition).

#### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. That the applicant use a flat lintel for the proposed arch over the garage door or revise to be a more visually prominent and structurally true arch than presently proposed, with staff to approve the final details;
2. That the applicant may use any window material consistent with the Board's adopted Window Policy;
3. The statements in archaeology conditions below shall appear in the General Notes of all site plans and on all site plan sheets that involve demolition or ground disturbance (including Demolition, Basement/Foundation Plans, Landscaping, Erosion and Sediment Control, Grading, Utilities and Sheeting and Shoring) so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements:
  - a. The applicant/developer 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.
  - b. The applicant/developer shall not allow any metal detection or other artifact collection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.
  - c. It is illegal to disturb human remains without obtaining appropriate legal authorization. If burials are found during the project and need to be moved, the burials will be removed archaeologically, and appropriate legal authorization will be obtained, including a permit from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources for the archaeological removal of burials.

#### **SPEAKERS**

Steve Kulinski, architect for the applicant, spoke in support of the application and responded to the Board's questions.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. von Senden first stated that the first staff recommendation should require, rather than recommend, a flat lintel in place of the arched opening.

Mr. Neale noted that in traditional architecture a larger opening often utilized an arch. He found it acceptable to be an arch or a lintel and suggested letting the architect decide. If an arch is used, he suggested that it be deeper, 1 ½ brick tall.

Mr. Carlin observed that the front of the townhouse had flat lintels and that it would be more compatible to continue that, perhaps utilizing cast stone. However, he also noted that the proposed arch could be modified to have a more true structural representation.

Mr. von Senden suggested that adding a course and a half of brick flush to the wall could make the arch appear more structurally realistic.

Mr. Smeallie pointed out that the project was a garage, set well back from the street, and noted that the Board had given the applicant several alternatives to consider.

Dr. Fitzgerald stated that he was initially ambivalent as to whether there should be a flat lintel or an arch but after the Board's discussion thought it should either be flat or a more pronounced arch.

## **REASON**

The Board agreed that the proposed garage was generally compatible and historically appropriate for the townhouse and surrounding buildings. However, several Board members found that the arch needed to be either more pronounced or a flat lintel to read as structurally authentic.

## **2. CASE BAR2013-0020**

Request for signage and alterations at **210 S Union St.**

APPLICANT: Coco Blanca

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as amended, 6-0.**

On a motion by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mr. von Senden, the Board approved the application, as amended, with the conditions noted below, 6-0.

## **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. That the projecting hanging sign be relocated to the south of the arched entrance on South Union Street;
2. That all three awnings were permitted but "Home and Fashion" was only permitted on the valance of two of the awnings; and
3. That the wall sign could be pin-mounted through the mortar joints and set off of the wall with the downspout running behind the sign if the downspout could not be relocated.

## **SPEAKERS**

Elizabeth Squire, applicant and co-owner of Coco Blanca, spoke in support of the application and responded to the Board's questions.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Chairman Hulfish noted that this building was challenging for tenants due to its distance from King Street and therefore supported the submitted application with three awnings.

Mr. Smeallie generally found the application to be appropriate and recommended the applicant work with staff to determine final location of signs. He noted that there was no need to repeat "Home and Fashion" three times.

Dr. Fitzgerald stated that overall the proposal looked appropriate but asked when the downspout was removed, as he had recently visited the site and it was still there. He said that the proposed

sign location was in conflict with the downspout. He also expressed concern that the drawing was not to scale and that the hanging sign would be awkward under an awning.

Mr. von Senden found the additional awning to be acceptable. He noted that the application showed installing the signs through the brick and added that the holes should only be through the mortar joints. He also noted that the downspout has a scupper through the wall and therefore could not be easily removed without affecting the entire roof drainage system.

Mr. Carlin noted that he had worked on the construction drawings for this building when it was designed in the 1970s and that it was a plain brick building with little to distinguish it. He asked what this approval would imply for the other tenant spaces and whether the Board would find future non-matching awnings on the eastern portion to be acceptable. He stated that they should defer to staff on the downspout issue. He suggested relocating the hanging sign adjacent to the South Union Street entrance for better visibility.

### **REASON**

The Board found the proposal to generally be appropriate for this building though found that the downspout issue should be further studied and worked out with staff.

3. **CASE BAR2013-0027**  
Request alterations at **123 Cameron St.**  
**APPLICANT:** Richard W. Graber  
**BOARD ACTION:** **Approved, as amended, 6-0.**

On a motion by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Mr. Neale, the Board voted to approve the application with the conditions noted below by a vote of 6-0.

### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

Staff recommends approval of the fiberglass, SDL insert windows and the aluminum-clad window and door with the condition that the final window specifications are approved by BAR staff and the windows should still meet all other applicable requirements of the Board's *Window Policy* and the Alexandria Replacement Window Performance Specifications #2-9.

### **SPEAKERS**

Representatives from The Window Man spoke in support of the application and provided samples of the proposed Marvin Infinity window to be installed.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Dr. Fitzgerald noted that the majority of heat loss in a building is through the roof and that replacing windows will not significantly improve heat loss but he had no objection to the use of these windows on this building in this location.

### **REASON**

The Board had minimal discussion on the application finding it to be appropriate and consistent with the *Design Guidelines*.

#### **IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. South Washington Street streetscape improvement project update.
2. Information on the King & Union bike corral project.

---

#### **V. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

The following items are shown for information only. Based on the Board's adopted policies, these have been approved by Staff since the previous Board meeting.

##### **BAR2013-0054**

Request for signage at **632 N Washington St.**

APPLICANT: Kathleen Bell

##### **BAR2013-0056**

Request for signage at **115 S Union St.**

APPLICANT: Richard Badwey for Museum Framing

##### **BAR2013-0057**

Request for a roof replacement at **517 Prince St.**

APPLICANT: CJ Reeder

##### **BAR2013-0058**

Request for a storm door at **101 Franklin St.**

APPLICANT: Amy Fries

##### **BAR2013-0061**

Request for a vent at **906 King St.**

APPLICANT: Red Rocks Napoletana in Old Town

---

#### **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Hulfish adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:30pm.

Minutes submitted by,

Catherine K. Miliaras, Historic Preservation Planner  
Boards of Architectural Review