

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

Board of Architectural Review

Thursday, May 5, 2022

7:00 p.m., City Council Chamber

City Hall

Members Present: James Spencer, Chair
Christine Roberts, Vice Chair
Laurie Ossman
Purvi Irwin
John Sprinkle

Members Absent: Christine Sennott
Robert Adams

Secretary: William Conkey, AIA, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Amirah Lane, Historic Preservation Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Ms. Sennott and Mr. Adams were absent. All other members were present.

II. MINUTES

2. Consideration of minutes from the April 20, 2022 meeting.

BOARD ACTION:

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Dr. Ossman, the Board of Architectural Review approved the April 20, 2022 minutes as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4 – 0, with Ms. Roberts abstaining.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

3. BAR #2022-00197 OHAD

Request for bollards at both ends of 100 Block of King Street.
Applicant: City of Alexandria

4. BAR #2022-00172 PG

Request for waiver of fence height requirement at 220 North Alfred Street.
Applicants: William Rydell and Ellen Rydell

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Ms. Roberts and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the consent calendar as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

IV. ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED

5. BAR #2022-00104 OHAD

Request for new construction at 116 South Henry Street.
Applicant: Galena Capitol Partners

BOARD ACTION, Approved with conditions:

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Dr. Ossman, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the application with the following conditions. The motion carried with a vote of 5 – 0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The applicant use Option 1 for the EIFS pattern
2. The comments from Alexandria Archaeology be adopted as a condition
3. The applicant work with staff to identify a masonry color used elsewhere in the project and use it for the EIFS.

REASON

The Board agreed with the applicant’s suggestion that minimal patterning for the EIFS would be preferable and that the stark white was too striking, preferring a toned down color used elsewhere on the project.

SPEAKERS

Leejung Hong, project architect, gave a presentation and answered questions.
Omar Abdul-Baki, with Galena Capital, assisted with the presentation and answered questions.
Anna Smith Lacey, 414 Prince, asked how this building would fit into Old Town.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts asked about the Dryvit warranty and requested that the applicant work with staff to install the Dryvit with the highest possible warranty.

Dr. Ossman asked about air circulation, ventilation, and interior lighting; and asked why the applicant chose such a closed/sealed building. Per the applicant this relates to the functionality of the building and advice they had received from the previous Preservation Architect.

Mr. Sprinkle felt that all options looked the same in the photos taken from the streets and asked what the width of Dryvit joints and the size of slabs would be. He also asked why the applicants prefer option 1; they noted it was due to easier maintenance.

Ms. Irwin felt that option 4 appeared too busy and expressed a preference for option 1.

Mr. Spencer asked if the lighting would be LED and if it could be changed. The applicant replied yes.

Dr. Ossman expressed concern over a potential monolithic look, noting that a white color would make the elevation more prominent and that the contrast between the darker lower level and the white upper level would be too stark. She asked if the joints would be a different color. The applicant responded that the joints would be a different color.

Ms. Roberts agreed with Dr. Ossman about the stark appearance of a white wall, recommending a gray instead. She preferred option 3; option 2 was her least favorite. She recommended working with staff to ensure an extended warranty.

Mr. Spencer liked the idea of this building being a relief between the adjacent buildings and the white color. He appreciated that the design does not look like a garage and supported the concept of working with staff on the final color. He preferred options 1 and 4.

Mr. Sprinkle appreciated the ability to inscribe any pattern on the wall.

The Board then took a straw poll regarding the 4 options. Dr. Ossman preferred 1 & 4; Ms. Irwin preferred 1; Mr. Spencer preferred 1 & 4; Ms. Roberts preferred 1, 3, & 4; Mr. Sprinkle preferred 4. Colors and textures were also discussed.

V. NEW BUSINESS

6. **BAR #2022-00161 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 719 South Lee Street.
Applicants: Leonard Swyer and Allison Hall

7. **BAR#2022-0160 OHAD**

Request for alterations and addition at 719 South Lee Street.
Applicants: Leonard Swyer and Allison Hall

BOARD ACTION, Approved as submitted:

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Roberts, the Board of Architectural Review **approved** the project as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5 – 0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board agreed with staff's recommendation.

DISCUSSION

None

SPEAKERS

Bill Cromley, the project architect, was available to answer any questions.

8. **BAR #2022-00144 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 628 South Pitt Street.
Applicants: Stephen Paul and Chantelle Nicole Dilorenzo

9. **BAR #2022-00147 OHAD**

Request for alterations and addition at 628 South Pitt Street.
Applicants: Stephen Paul and Chantelle Nicole Dilorenzo

BOARD ACTION, Approved as submitted:

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle and seconded by Ms. Roberts, the Board of Architectural Review approved the application. The motion carried 4 – 0 with Ms. Irwin in opposition.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board found the project appropriate.

SPEAKERS

Nathan Moore, builder, was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin felt that the existing roofline was a defining characteristic and expressed concern over changing it. She noted that the design itself was fine but did not like changing what she saw as a character-defining feature.

Ms. Roberts did not object to changing the roofline.

Mr. Sprinkle enjoyed the appreciation of 1980s architecture but also noted that this is not necessarily an historic building, that the Board has never precisely determined what is/is not an historic building.

Mr. Spencer agreed with Ms. Irwin’s viewpoint but found no reason to deny the proposed changes.

10. BAR #2022-00041 OHAD

Request for alterations at 1600 West Abingdon Drive.

Applicant: Unit Owners Association of Potowmack Crossing Condominium

Note that Ms. Roberts recused herself from this case.

BOARD ACTION, Approved with conditions:

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The applicant installs inoperable shutters that are constructed of wood or a solid-through-the-core, millable composite material with a smooth finish. The replacement shutters should also be sized to fit the opening and match the existing design. Updated material specifications must be submitted to confirm compliance with the *BAR Policies for Administrative Approval*; **OR**,
2. The applicant removes of the existing shutters without installing new replacement shutters.

REASON

Generally, the Board agreed with staff recommendations and added that the replacement shutters should be slated with a flat top if the applicant decides to replace them. Mr. Spencer voted in opposition.

SPEAKERS

Chris Kelly, represented the applicant, introduced the project.

Lisa Barnes, represented HOA, gave statement of support and available for questions.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Sprinkle stated that he doesn't believe the shutters are original and since the windows have been changed the shutters are not needed.

Ms. Ossiman supported the use of inoperable shutters and stated that wood or composite are more appropriate materials.

Ms. Irwin stated that the shutters should be replaced with composite or removed. She also preferred the louver shutter design.

Mr. Spencer preferred for the shutters to be removed.

11. BAR #2022-00185 OHAD

Request for alterations at 116 Gibbon Street.

Applicant: Jolynn Scotch

BOARD ACTION, Continued to next meeting:

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Roberts, the Board of Architectural Review voted to **continue** the application. The motion carried on a vote of 5 – 0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

N/A

REASON

The applicant or representative was not present

SPEAKERS

None

DISCUSSION

None

12. BAR #2022-00079 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 615, 615A and 621 King Street.

Applicant: King Street LLC, 621-623 King Street LLC, 621-623 King Street II LLC d/b/a The Silverman Group

BOARD ACTION, Approved with conditions:

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Hire an archaeological consultant to complete a Documentary Study and an Archaeological Evaluation.
2. The footprints of both 615 and 621 King St. currently contain basements. If left in place, no archaeological oversight would be necessary for this project. However, the applicant proposes to demolish the basement slab and lower the floor at 621 King St. to align with the existing basement slab at 615 King Street (see Sheet 14, 2022 02 14_Demolition Permit Revised 3.3.22 (A1023763)_v1). To mitigate any possible adverse impacts that basement lowering may cause

to archaeological resources, the applicant must hire an archaeological consultant to develop and implement an Archaeology Monitoring Plan. The Monitoring Plan must outline how the archaeological consultant will identify, record, and report any archaeological resources that are encountered during basement work. If significant resources are discovered, the consultant shall complete a Resource Management Plan, as outlined in the City of Alexandria Archaeological Standards. Preservation measures presented in the Resource Management Plan, as approved by the City Archaeologist, will be implemented.

3. The Monitoring Plan must be completed and approved by the City Archaeologist prior to submission of the Final Site Plan, and before any ground disturbing activities (such as basement lowering, coring, grading, filling, vegetation removal, undergrounding utilities, pile driving, landscaping and other excavations as defined in Section 2-151 of the Zoning Ordinance) begin.
4. The Final Site Plan, Grading Plan, or any other permits involving ground disturbing activities (such as basement lowering, coring, grading, filling, vegetation removal, undergrounding utilities, pile driving, landscaping and other excavations as defined in Section 2-151 of the Zoning Ordinance) shall not be released until the City archaeologist confirms that all archaeological fieldwork has been completed or that an approved Resource Management Plan is in place to recover significant resources in concert with construction activities.
5. Certificates of Occupancy shall not be issued for this property until interpretive elements have been constructed, interpretive markers have been erected, and the final archaeological report has been received and approved by the City Archaeologist.***
6. 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. The language noted above shall be included on all final site plan sheets involving any ground disturbing activities.
7. The applicant shall not allow any metal detection and/or artifact collection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology. Failure to comply shall result in project delays. The language noted above shall be included on all final site plan sheets involving any ground disturbing activities.

REASON

The Board appreciated the revised scope of demolition and noted the Archaeology comments.

SPEAKERS

Leejung Hong, project architect, presented the project

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts stated that she appreciated the revised design scope and was supportive of the project.

Ms. Ossman agreed with Ms. Roberts and supported the proposed scope of demolition.

Mr. Sprinkle asked the applicant to clarify if the existing floor plates were to be removed. The applicant stated that they would be removed.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

13. BAR #2022-00078 OHAD

Request for concept review at 615, 615A and 621 King Street.

Applicant: King Street LLC, 621-623 King Street LLC, 621-623 King Street II LLC d/b/a The Silverman Group

SPEAKERS

Leejung Hong, project architect, presented the project

DISCUSSION

Ms. Ossman asked for clarification regarding the proposed treatment of the existing brick at 615 King Street. The applicant noted that it would be painted a dark red color.

Ms. Ossman asked if the fritting material is available in a variety of colors. The applicant noted that a variety of colors are available but that they are intending to use white.

Ms. Ossman noted that she liked the proposed design and that this project is an example of the appropriate use of fritted glass as it is subservient to the more prominent architectural features. She was concerned about the use of white fritting.

Ms. Roberts appreciated the revisions to the design and endorsed the height, mass, scale, and general architectural character of the project.

Mr. Sprinkle appreciated the revision to keep the existing façade at 615 King Street intact and endorsed the height, mass, scale, and general architectural character of the project.

Ms. Irwin noted that since the fritting material is located on an interior glass surface, reflections on the glass will help to mask the fritting. She also endorsed the height, mass, scale, and general architectural character of the project.

Mr. Spencer expressed concern regarding how the rear portion of the existing façade which will become an exterior surface in the proposed design, will be protected from exposure to the elements. He also endorsed the height, mass, scale, and general architectural character of the project.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

The following projects were administratively approved since the last BAR meeting:

BAR #2022-00176 OHAD

Request for fence replacement at 125 South Pitt Street.

Applicant: Patricia Petkosek

BAR #2022-00195 OHAD
Request for window replacement at 420 North Lee Street.
Applicant: Walter Howell III and Christine Howell

BAR #2022-00199 PG
Request for roof replacement at 209 North West Street.
Applicant: Beyond Exteriors LLC

BAR #2022-00162 PG
Request for window replacement at 1115 Cameron Street #304.
Applicant: Karlen Murray

BAR #2022-00181 PG
Request for window and door replacement at 629 North Alfred Street.
Applicant: Brian Mackey

BAR #2022-00200 OHAD
Request for door replacement at 501 South Royal Street.
Applicant: Heidi Gomez

BAR #2022-00201 OHAD
Request for signage at 704 North Washington Street.
Applicant: Madabolic

BAR #2022-00209 PG
Request for window replacement at 629 North Alfred Street.
Applicant: Brian Mackey

BAR #2022-00203 PG
Request for siding repair at 532 North Columbus Street.
Applicant: Navarro Construction Services

BAR #2022-00213 OHAD
Request for fence replacement at 1311 Prince Street.
Applicant: Rachel Sheedy

BAR #2022-00217 OHAD
Request for chimney repair at 1303 Duke Street.
Applicant: Joshua Tchaou

BAR #2022-00219 OHAD
Request for window replacement at 1307 Duke Street.
Applicant: Aaron Jones

BAR #2022-00220 OHAD
Request for signage at 917 King Street.
Applicant: Scott McGhee

BAR #2022-00221 OHAD
Request for signage at 6 Prince Street.
Applicant: Scott McGhee