

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

Board of Architectural Review
Wednesday, December 15, 2021
7:00 p.m., Virtual Public Hearing
Zoom Webinar

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

Members Absent: Robert Adams
John Sprinkle

Secretary: William Conkey, AIA, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Susan Hellman, Historic Preservation Planner
Amirah Lane, Historic Preservation Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Sprinkle and Mr. Adams were absent. All other 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 Ms. Roberts and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the resolution. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

II. MINUTES

3. Consideration of minutes from the December 1, 2021 meeting.

BOARD ACTION: Approved

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review approved the December 1, 2021 minutes, as submitted.

III. DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING

4. BAR #2021-00622 PG

Request for alterations to previously approved plans at 1417 Princess Street.

Applicant: Ala Awadallah

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request the deferral of BAR #2021-00622.

IV. ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED

5. BAR #2021-00457 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 105 Queen Street.

Applicant: Bilgehan Yalcin

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended

On a motion by Ms. Roberts and seconded by Ms. Ossman, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00457, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Door sidelights comply with BAR window glazing specifications: clear, non-reflective, and without tint.

Applicant work with staff on final review of door canopy details.

Door sidelights consists of a solid lower panel with clear glass above.

REASON

The Board felt that the solid lower panel with clear glass above would be more appropriate and functional than the proposed reeded glass.

SPEAKERS

Karen Conkey, project architect, represented the applicant and gave a brief explanation of the project.

Robert Walker, 112 Queen, spoke in opposition to the project, citing Board comments on the Heritage project as precedent.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts asked for a definition of reeded glass.

Ms. Irwin felt that the westernmost dormer looked slightly off center and urged the applicant to ensure that it will be centered between the second-floor windows. She did not have an issue with the reeded glass in the sidelights.

Ms. Ossman asked for details on the metal and glass door canopy and recommended that staff provide a final review. She also recommended that the lower panel of the door sidelights be wood, which is historically appropriate and will better serve the purpose of the reeded glass, which was to obscure outdoor motion from the residents' dog.

6. BAR #2020-00396 PG

Request for new construction at 1413 Princess Street.

Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

7. BAR #2020-00412 PG

Request for new construction at 1415 Princess Street.

Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request the deferral of BAR #2021-00396 and BAR #2021-00412. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00396 and BAR #2020-00412.

REASON

The Board felt that the new design should be updated based on the following recommendations:

1. Height of the 1415 Princess St. to be reduced
2. 1415 Princess St. should be pulled forward at least 2'
3. Simplify the trim
4. Simplified bay form and explore lowering it
5. Submit specifications
6. Align all windows
7. Align and adjust 1415 Princess St. transom and bay.

SPEAKERS

Ashley Klearman, presented project and available for questions

DISCUSSION

Ms. Ossman asked for all the windows to be aligned.

Ms. Sennott stated that the design doesn't fit and was very chunky. She suggested the middle unit be moved forward and that the parapet height be reduced.

Ms. Irwin was surprised by the design changed and preferred the previous design. She's not sure if the design fits and that the proposed façade should be highly simplified.

Ms. Roberts agreed that the middle building should be moved forward, and that the height of the buildings should be aligned. She also recommended that the use of siding instead of PVC paneling on the bay windows.

Mr. Spencer suggested that the negative chunk be removed and that the bay windows be capped with a standing seam roof. He also requested the specifications for the proposed exterior lights.

V. NEW BUSINESS

8. BAR #2021-00615 OHAD

Request for partial demolition at 111 South Alfred Street.

Applicant: Old Town #1 LLC

9. BAR #2021-00614 OHAD

Request for alterations at 111 South Alfred Street.

Applicant: Old Town #1 LLC

BOARD ACTION: Denied

On a motion by Ms. Roberts and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review

voted to deny BAR #2021-00615 and BAR #2021-00614. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The Board denied the application but endorsed the Department's direction to remedy the siding violation on the south elevation by removing the existing fiber cement siding and acquiring old-growth wood and have siding milled and planed to match the original historic siding. On the east elevation, the applicant must remove the existing fiber cement siding and replace it with wood siding in a size and profile similar to the previously removed siding. The Board also recommended that the Department issue the highest fine possible for this unapproved work.

REASON

The applicant removed the existing siding and installed new fiber cement siding without consulting with staff as to its condition

SPEAKERS

Christopher Smith, the applicant, introduced the project and was available to answer questions.

Ms. Roberts asked the applicant if he had reviewed the staff report and agrees with staff recommendations. The applicant responded that he had not reviewed the staff report. Staff shared the report with the applicant, he did not agree with the recommendations.

Ms. Sennott asked the applicant to describe how the work was completed after the issuance of the Stop Work Order. The applicant responded that they had failed a fire inspection report and thought that the order was issued related to that work.

Ms. Sennott asked why the applicant had not gotten the proper approvals. The applicant responded that they had hired a siding subcontractor who indicated that they performed work in the historic district and that they were following the required guidelines.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, representing HAF, was concerned about this proposal for after the fact approval of work that was completed without the proper approval. She appreciated the recommendations in the staff report and asked that the Board adopt these recommendations.

Steve Milone, representing OTCA, was in favor of the Board adopting the recommendations included in the staff report and expressed frustration that the work continued after the issuance of the Stop Work Order.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin expressed disappointment with this work being performed without approval and agreed with the staff recommendations expressed in the staff report.

Ms. Ossman agreed with Ms. Irwin and the staff recommendations.

Mr. Spencer asked staff about the fines that are related to the work that was performed. Mr. Conkey reviewed the violation that was issued to the applicant and indicated that the issuance of fines is at the discretion of the Department and must be within the bounds of the Zoning Ordinance, but that the Board could make a recommendation regarding the issuance of fines.

Ms. Sennott indicated that the property owner also owns multiple other properties within the historic district and has previously worked on these properties in accordance with the regulations of the historic district.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

Information session on permanent economic recovery initiatives associated with the closure of the 100 block of King Street to vehicular traffic and commercial parklets.

Staff: City of Alexandria, Department of Transportation & Environmental Services and Planning & Zoning

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 9:11 p.m.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2021-00627 OHAD

Request for door replacement at 917 Duke Street.

Applicant: Michelle Roeser

BAR #2021-00629 PG

Request for window replacement at 408 North Alfred Street.

Applicant: Justin Osgood

BAR #2021-00639 PG

Request for roof replacement at 819 Oronoco Street.

Applicants: Jacob and Stephanie Schwartz

BAR #2021-00641 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 705 Miller Lane.

Applicant: Joseph Rosal

BAR #2021-00642 OHAD

Request for stair replacement and railings at 307 Wolfe Street.

Applicant: Mark Weatherly

BAR #2021-00647 PG

Request for fence replacement at 509 North Alfred Street.

Applicant: Joe Wiggs

BAR #2021-00650 OHAD

Request for signage at 1314 King Street.

Applicant: 1314 King Street, LLC

BAR #2021-00652 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 705 Ford's Landing Way.

Applicant: Leslie Beavers

BAR #2021-00653 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 310 Franklin Street.

Applicant: Daniel Bradfield