

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

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, December 1, 2021

7:00 p.m., Virtual Public Hearing

Zoom Webinar

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

Members Absent: None

Secretary: William Conkey, AIA, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Marina Novaes, Historic Preservation Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was called to order at 7:00 p.m. All members were present at the meeting by video conference.

2. Resolution Finding Need to Conduct the Board of Architectural Review Electronically.

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the resolution. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0

II. MINUTES

3. Consideration of minutes from the November 3, 2021 meeting.

BOARD ACTION: Approved

On a motion by Ms. Sennott and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the November 3, 2021 meeting, as submitted.

4. Consideration of minutes from the November 17, 2021 meeting.

BOARD ACTION: Approved

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the November 17, 2021 meeting, as submitted.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

5. BAR #2021-00602 OHAD

Request for alterations at 610 South Lee Street.

Applicant: Cayley E. Tullman

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00602, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

6. BAR #2021-00604 OHAD

Request for alterations at 1315 Prince Street.

Applicants: Karel and Ashley Malinovsky

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00604, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

IV. ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED

7. BAR #2021-00197 PG

Request for alterations at 1321 Cameron Street.

Applicant: ZNB, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00197, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Signage be affixed through mortar joints, not into the brick.

Applicant must work with staff to ensure the proposed entry doors comply with *Design Guidelines*.

REASON

The Board agreed with staff recommendations in regards to the signage.

The application did not include sufficient details on the proposed doors. As staff can administratively approve door replacement, the Board felt that staff could ensure that the doors comply.

SPEAKERS

Ben Adada, applicant, was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin requested clarification as to which portions of the balusters would be removed. Mr. Adada and Mr. Conkey explained.

Ms. Ossman asked if the design for the proposed doors had been selected yet. Mr. Adada noted that he would install the first option, based on staff recommendation.

Ms. Roberts noted that the applicant needs to provide manufacturer specifications for the doors and that any motion to approve should approve the requirement that staff review the specifications.

Mr. Sprinkle had a question regarding procedural errors on the part of the City. Mr. Conkey explained the background on this property.

8. BAR #2021-00235 PG

Request for new construction at 1117 Queen Street.

Applicants: Robert and Kathy Bunn

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00235, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The application was approved with staff recommendations and the recommendations of Alexandria Archaeology.

REASON

The Board agreed with staff recommendations

SPEAKERS

Duncan Blair, attorney for the applicant was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin asked for a clarification regarding the extent of the proposed fence along the east property line. Mr. Conkey explained that a condition of the zoning approval indicated that the fence is not to extend south of the rear of the adjacent building.

Mr. Sprinkle pointed out the comments from Alexandria Archaeology and asked the applicant to comply with these comments, the applicant agreed.

V. NEW BUSINESS

9. BAR #2021-00606 OHAD

Request for new construction at 805, 809, 811, 815 and 823 North Columbus Street.

Applicant: PT Blooms, LLC, contract purchaser

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Ossman, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for the deferral of BAR #2021-00606.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

At the request of the applicant, the Board accept the request for a deferral to address comments from staff and the Board.

REASON

The applicant requested a deferral in order to address design comments from the Board.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Sprinkle asked the applicant if the upper level massing could be pushed further to the east. Mr. Bloomfield explained that the design for the building includes a courtyard on the east side of the site to allow views for units on this side of the building.

Mr. Sprinkle asked if the upper levels could be above this courtyard. Mr. Bloomfield responded that he was not comfortable moving the building this far to the east.

Ms. Roberts asked where the main entry doors for the building are located. Mr. Bloomfield indicated the location in the recessed black metal portion of the building at the rear of the entry courtyard. Ms. Roberts pointed out that the main entrance should be readily identifiable and prominent on the elevation.

Mr. Spencer asked for clarification on the balconies on the east elevation. Mr. Bloomfield explained that the top balcony on the north side of the elevation is a roof terrace. He further explained that the balconies would not feature tiebacks.

Todd Kelly, 822 Columbus, stated that the massing of the building is not consistent with the houses on the west side of Columbus Street, he noted that the building faces Columbus Street and Not Washington Street so the design should be consistent with these structures. He further indicated that he is concerned about the impact of the proposed development will have on parking in the area.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, representing HAF, expressed concern about the size and mass of the project. She appreciated that the massing of the building is broken up and that the lighter color of the upper levels helps to diminish the perceived size. She noted that all of the windows on the building are the same with the only differentiation in the muntin configuration on the lower levels. She suggested that the applicant consider the introduction of a historic interpretive element to the courtyard to explain the history of the area and the Parker-Gray school which was located nearby.

Steve Milone, 907 Prince Street, stated that the building is too massive and should be broken up similar to the multi-family building in the block to the north.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin noted that the main entrance to the building is not easily recognizable on the proposed design. She commented that the storefront section could potentially extend one additional bay to the south and that the entry in the white section of the building at the rear of the courtyard could be eliminated. Mr. Bloomfield suggested that potentially adding a curved canopy above the main entry would make it stand out in contrast to the surrounding rectilinear elements.

Mr. Adams agreed on the potential of adding a curved canopy and expressed support for the addition of curves elsewhere on the building. Ms. Sennott and Ms. Ossman agreed that this could be an effective approach.

Mr. Sprinkle suggested that the applicant look to the historic precedence of the Parker-Gray school for an entrance language.

Ms. Irwin stated that she approves of the proposed masonry colors but would prefer to see a glazed or smooth brick to the distressed look of the white brick.

Ms. Roberts agreed that the distressed look for the white brick was not appropriate and felt that it looked like a limewash.

Ms. Ossman agreed that the white brick should be a smooth texture and approved of the more textured brick for the lower section.

Mr. Sprinkle suggested that the applicant provide more bricks at the next hearing to better understand the range of colors and textures.

Mr. Adams agreed with other comments regarding the white brick and asked if there could be a variety of colors on the lower portion.

Mr. Spencer approved of the textured brick on the lower portion and felt that a glazed brick on the upper level could be too much contrast. He preferred to see a smooth white brick in this area.

Ms. Ossman expressed concern that the same window module was being used throughout the building. She asked the applicant to introduce some variation in the windows.

Mr. Sprinkle supported the square windows on the upper levels and asked if the windows on the lower portion could become rectangular. Mr. Spencer and Ms. Sennott agreed that changes to the windows on the lower level could be beneficial.

Mr. Spencer noted that a simple cornice element such as a soldier course at the top of the upper portion of the building could help to define the top. Mr. Adams, Ms. Irwin, Mr. Sprinkle, and Ms. Ossman agreed with this approach.

Mr. Spencer noted that the railings at the top of the recessed black storefront sections at the lower levels appeared to be in front of the storefront. Ms. Hall noted that this is a mistake in the rendering and that the railing would be aligned with the storefront below.

Ms. Ossman noted that the railings on the balconies on the alley side seemed perfunctory. She asked if the applicant could introduce more design and variation to the railings.

Mr. Sprinkle asked the applicant to provide a cubic foot area for the courtyard at the east side of the site.

Ms. Roberts stated that the design for the east elevation appeared to be less developed than other areas of the building and requested that the applicant refine this elevation.

Ms. Sennott noted that the door on the ground floor of the north side of the east elevation seemed to be out of scale and not aligned with the rest of the elements on this elevation.

Mr. Adams asked the applicant to provide additional views of the building from Washington Street and Madison Street to gain an understanding of how the east elevation will look in the context of the hotel that is currently under construction.

Ms. Irwin felt that the grouping of three balconies on the east elevation seemed applied and asked the applicant to develop a scheme for these that was better integrated into the overall design.

Mr. Spencer agreed that potentially including an alternating rhythm to the balconies on the east elevation could help to make them seem intentional.

Mr. Sprinkle noted that the canopies and planters along Columbus Street were over the property line and asked for greater detail on the design of these elements.

Ms. Ossman inquired as to whether the north wall of the building could be a location for public artwork.

Ms. Irwin asked the applicant to provide floor plans for the building with subsequent submissions.

Mr. Wire requested a deferral of the project to allow the applicant to address comments from staff and the Board.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

BAR Elections

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve Mr. Spencer as Chair. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve Ms. Roberts as Vice-Chair. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2021-00462 PG

Request for window replacement at 105 North Alfred Street.

Applicant: Bruce and Thelma MacGregor

BAR #2021-00583 PG

Request for window replacement at 1607 Princess Street.

Applicant: Mark Smith

BAR #2021-00595 OHAD

Request for alterations at 322 South Lee Street.

Applicant: Avonlea LLC

BAR #2021-00623 OHAD

Request for siding replacement at 315 South Lee Street.

Applicants: John and Kerri Neary

BAR #2021-00626 OHAD

Request for signage at 833 South Washington Street.

Applicant: Kari Blanco