

*******DRAFT MINUTES*******
Board of Architectural Review
Old & Historic Alexandria District
Wednesday, November 15, 2017
7:30pm, Council Chambers, City Hall
301 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Members Present: Christina Kelley, Chair
Robert Adams
Slade Elkins
John Sprinkle
John Goebel
Margaret Miller
Christine Roberts

Members Absent: None

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Board of Architectural Review, Old and Historic Alexandria District, hearing was called to order at 7:32pm. All members were present.

II. MINUTES

2. Consideration of the minutes from the **October 18, 2017 & November 1, 2017** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved

By unanimous consent, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review separately approved the minutes of both the October 18, 2017 & November 1, 2017 meetings 7-0.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

3. **BAR Case #2017-00397**
Request for alterations at 608 S Fairfax Street
Applicants: April Ponnuru

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0

On the motion by Ms. Roberts and seconded by Ms. Miller, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2017-00397, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

REASON

The Board agreed with the staff recommendation and found the proposed shutters and garden wall to be appropriate and consistent with the Design Guidelines.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Miller removed this item from the consent docket to ask why the panels of the shutters were a 20/40/40 proportion rather than the more common 50/50. The applicant responded that they were referencing the proportions of the Federal style front door. The Board questioned the shutter design, specifically whether solid or louvered shutters were more appropriate. Staff responded that both solid and louvered were used in the mid-Atlantic region. It was noted that, as this was new construction, there was more flexibility in the shutter design so long as the shutters were sized to fit the opening and operable. Mr. Goble commented that the shutter on the north side of the first floor window would not be able to open back flat against the wall but would, fortunately, at least partially screen the electric meter.

SPEAKERS

April Ponnuru, applicant, and her father, responded to questions and spoke in support.

4. BAR Case #2017-00401

Request for signage at 106 N Lee Street

Applicant: Founders Hall LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0

On the motion by Ms. Miller and seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2017-00401 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The pin mounted building identification sign must be installed in the mortar joints and not through the masonry units.

REASON

The Board agreed with the staff recommendation and found the proposed sign to be appropriate and consistent with the Design Guidelines.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Miller removed this item from the consent docket to ask about the location of the building identification sign. The applicant said they preferred to mount it on the brick wall rather than on the beam above the entry. The BAR had no objections to this location because the brick had been significantly altered on this modern building.

SPEAKERS

Paul Beckmann, project architect, presented the application and responded to questions.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED

5. BAR Case #2017-00344

Request for partial demolition at 1101 North Washington Street
Applicant: Toll Mid-Atlantic LP, Inc.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 6-0-1

On the motion by Ms. Miller and seconded by Mr. Goebel, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2017-00344 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0-1 by roll-call vote. Mr. Sprinkle recused himself from this case.

REASON

The Board agreed with the staff report and found that the serpentine wall was not historic and did not meet any of the criteria for denying a Permit to Demolish in the zoning ordinance.

DISCUSSION

The Board complimented the applicant for the thorough response to the previous comments but agreed that the wall was not historic and that it conflicted with the proposed townhouses and the proposed public sidewalk and landscape plan. However, some BAR members pointed out that the existing wall was a strong urban design element at the memorial circle and this function should be expressed in a robust way at the southwest corner of the townhouses in the new plan.

SPEAKERS

Ms. Cathy Puskar, land use attorney, presented the application and responded to questions.

Ms. Christa Waters, 1186 N Pitt Street, representing the owners at Canal Way, stated that the serpentine wall is not historic and the neighbors do not believe it needs to be retained.

V. NEW BUSINESS

6. BAR Case #2017-00354

Request for alterations at 100 King Street
Applicants: ARP 100 King

BOARD ACTION: Withdrawn

The OHAD Board of Architectural Review acknowledged the applicants request to withdraw BAR Case #2017-00398.

7. BAR Case #2017-00400

Request for alterations at 201 Cameron Street
Applicant: Elizabeth Davey

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0

On the motion by Ms. Miller and seconded by Mr. Adams, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2017-00400 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The applicant must work with the Transportation and Environment Services department to ensure that the swing of the gate complies with the City regulation not to obstruct the public right-of-way.
2. The applicant must remove the vinyl lattice attached to the existing metal fence.

REASON

The BAR found that the design of the gate complied with the BAR's Design Guidelines, as discussed in the staff report.

DISCUSSION

The BAR confirmed that the existing lattice screening would be removed. Staff noted that the BAR was only being asked to approve the design of the gate and not its operation.

SPEAKERS

Brian and Elizabeth Davey, owners, presented the application and responded to comments.

8. BAR Case #2017-00402

Request for signage and windows replacement at 106 N Saint Asaph Street
Applicant: Salt Vault LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 5-2

On the motion by Ms. Roberts and seconded by Mr. Goebel, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2017-00402, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-2. Ms. Miller and Mr. Adams were opposed.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Approval of new fiberglass replacement windows on the side and rear elevations and denial of the barrel-awning with signage with the following conditions:

1. Replacement windows must comply with the Alexandria Replacement Window Performance Specifications;
2. Work with staff on the design of a stylistically appropriate shed-style awning at each end of the façade to maintain the building symmetry, with signage that complies with the *Design Guidelines*, prior to submitting for building permits;
3. The awnings must be placed so that the bottom of the awning is at least 8 feet above the public sidewalk, and;
4. The applicant has the option to also install a hanging sign that may not exceed 7 square feet, with final details approved by staff.

REASON

The BAR found that the symmetrical architectural composition of the two flat lintels over the door at each end of the façade with two arched windows in the center would be disrupted by a bullnose awning at the south end. The BAR had no problem with the fiberglass composite SDL replacement windows on the side and rear elevations facing the alley.

DISCUSSION

The majority of the BAR felt that the arched awning would visually compete with the arched first floor windows and that these were character defining features that should remain prominent. They noted that arched awnings were on this particular building were architecturally forced and inappropriate above a flat lintel. Because of the symmetry of the historic façade, some members thought an arched awning would be acceptable if it was repeated at both ends of the façade. All BAR members acknowledged that better visibility from King Street was needed for this store and recommended an illuminated projecting hanging sign and, perhaps, a flag on the central flagpole. They agreed that a shed awning could have sides with signs and directed the applicant to work with staff on a final design that incorporates a shed style awning at each end of the façade and a prominent hanging sign.

SPEAKERS

Alicia McCaslin spoke for the owner in support of the application.

Mr. Andrew Slatonstall, owner, noted the number of bullnose awnings in Old Town.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

9. BAR Case #2017-00345

Request for an informal concept review work session for proposed development at 1101 North Washington Street. This item is open for public comment. Applicant: Toll Mid-Atlantic LP, Inc.

BOARD ACTION

The OHAD Board of Architectural Review conducted a straw vote and endorsed the height, scale, mass and general architectural character of the project by a vote of 6-0-1. Mr. Sprinkle recused himself.

REASON

The BAR believed that the completed project will comply with the Washington Street Standards and the BAR's adopted Design Guidelines.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Rust described the changes that had been made in response to BAR comments at the previous hearing. The BAR members were highly complimentary of the overall project and felt that it now complied with the Washington Street Standards and was an appropriate gateway building at the Memorial Circle. Several members had concerns about the visibility of the top floor from the Parkway and not wanting these to look like the top floor of the townhouses at James Bland but to be more architecturally integrated. There was a recommendation for additional sight line studies and to push the top floor further back from the façade and/or to raise the parapet and to use a dark material like slate on the west wall of that level. There was also concern that the about the townhouse at the southwest corner not having an angle, chamfer or curve to compliment the Memorial Circle.

SPEAKERS

John Rust, presented and answered questions from the Board.

Ms. Christa Waters, 1186 N Pitt Street, represented the Canal Way homeowners and spoke in support.

Ms. Elizabeth Chimento, 1200 N Pitt Street, had submitted a letter and spoke in support, though she expressed concern about the visibility of the top floor facing the Parkway.

10. BAR Case #2017-00399

Request for informal concept review of new construction at 2, 6 Queen & 1A
Prince Street
Applicant: City of Alexandria

BOARD ACTION

The BAR unanimously deferred the case for restudy of smaller buildings that are background elements in the park.

DISCUSSION

The BAR asked why it was necessary to locate the pumps here. Mr. Gammon responded that these were the two low points on the waterfront plan area and that these were necessary elements of the nuisance flood mitigation program approved by City Council. He also noted that these were discussed extensively during the waterfront plan and flood mitigation public process. Mr. Gammon explained that the pumps and the emergency generators and fuel needed to be above the 100 year flood level.

The BAR found the supplemental drawings in the presentation to be extremely helpful to put the size of the proposed buildings in context with their surroundings and noted how these renderings demonstrated that the pavilions and trellises are far too large for their environment. The Board asked for additional pedestrian level views and site sections, noting that their purview was not from the upper floors of private buildings but from the surrounding public spaces. Several members felt that the rooftop mechanical screening was much larger than necessary for one rooftop generator and contributed to the

massiveness of the project. The Board also noted that the two locations did not need to be identical and that each site may have a different solution. The Board unanimously found that the proposed architectural character and materials were not appropriate on the Alexandria waterfront and that these were trying to be iconic buildings rather than background buildings in a park setting within a historic district.

While taking no position on the engineering need for pump stations in these locations or the uses contained in the buildings, all of the BAR members strongly opposed the proposed height, scale mass and architectural character and asked for a restudy.

SPEAKERS

Tony Gammon, from the Department of Project Implementation, presented the project and answered questions from the Board.

Mr. Paul Beckmann, Beckmann Architects representing Monarch Row, the owners of 110 S Union, spoke in opposition. He noted that the design direction is a clash of Prairie style meets Brutalism and does not recall the early commercial buildings on the Alexandria waterfront. He noted that these buildings will not only be viewed in the round but from above, as well.

Mr. Dennis Burns, Architect, representing Blackwall Hitch restaurant as well as the owner of the Blackwall Hitch and Chart House buildings and the Torpedo Factory Associates, submitted a letter and spoke in opposition, citing the location, mass and height.

Andrea Bertrand, a member of the Blackwall Hitch restaurant owner's group, spoke in opposition to the height and mass.

Lonnie Rich, attorney with Rich, Rosenthal, Bricefield, representing the Alexandria Waterfront associates, spoke in opposition to the height and mass and views that will be blocked from adjacent businesses. While acknowledging the technical need to have the flood mitigation pumps located at the low points on the waterfront, he asked why the park maintenance storage, bathrooms, offices, concessions and emergency generator needed to be located in this same structure.

11. National Register Nomination Review of the Oakland Baptist Church Cemetery

Staff reminded the OHAD Board of Architectural Review that a National Register Nomination has been made for this site and that the Virginia Department of Historic Resources has asked the BAR to comment as a participant in the federal Certified Local Government (CLG) program. Staff also answered questions from the Board on the topic.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The OHAD Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 10:41 pm.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

BAR Case #2017-00395
Request for re-roofing at 906 S Saint Asaph St.
Applicant: Patrick Bennett

BAR Case #2017-0094
Request for repointing at 817 Prince St.
Applicant Timothy Mertz

Bar Case #2017-00396
Request for siding and shutter replacement at 323 S Columbus St.
Applicant Anthony Sinclair