

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

Board of Architectural Review
Wednesday, January 19, 2022
7:00 p.m., Virtual Public Hearing
Zoom Webinar

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

Members Absent: None

Secretary: William Conkey, AIA, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Susan Hellman, 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 Ms. Roberts and seconded by Ms. Irwin, 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 January 5, 2022 meeting.

BOARD ACTION: Approved

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review approved the January 5, 2022 minutes, as submitted

III. ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED

4. BAR #2021-00655 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 322 and 324 South Lee Street.

Applicant: Avonlea LLC

5. BAR #2021-00654 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 322 and 324 South Lee Street.

Applicant: Avonlea LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended

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

voted to approve BAR #2021-00654 and BAR #2021-00655, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Submit final window and door specifications with building permit confirming compliance with the Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications in the Historic Districts; and,
2. Retain and keep all historic windows in their original/current locations; and,
3. Include the statements from Alexandria Archaeology, below, in the General Notes of all on all construction documents that involve demolition or ground disturbance (including Basement/Foundation Plans, Demolition, Erosion and Sediment Control, Grading, Landscaping, 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 to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.
 - c. The statements in archaeology conditions above marked with an asterisk (“*”) shall appear in the General Notes of all site plans and on all site plan sheets that involve demolition or ground disturbance (including Basement/Foundation Plans, Demolition, Erosion and Sediment Control, Grading, Landscaping, Utilities, and Sheeting and Shoring) so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements.

REASON

The Board supported the staff recommendations and retaining the windows.

SPEAKERS

Patrick Cooke, Architect, representing owners and available for questions.

Yvonne Callahan, 735 S. Lee St., expressed concerns about the project, advocating to keep the windows in their current locations.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke St., representing HAF, expressed concerns about the project.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts asked for clarification on field window research. Stated original locations should be retained and the ad hoc nature of windows reflects the charming historic windows patterns found in the historic district.

Ms. Ossman spoke in support of the project with staff recommendations. Believes that the fenestration pattern of the ell is not character defining.

Ms. Sennott stated that windows locations that are original should be maintained.

Ms. Irwin asked about the discrepancy on the 1999 drawings. Stated that ell is minor elevation and not critical to public understanding. Location of the windows is not character defining.

Mr. Adams stated that the process has led to a better design and that imperfect window spacing is beneficial to elevation.

6. BAR #2021-00004 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 414 North Union Street.

Applicant: David Charney

7. BAR #2021-00005 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 414 North Union Street.

Applicant: David Charney

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended

On a motion by Ms. Roberts and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00004 and BAR #2021-00005, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-2. Mr. Sprinkle and Mr. Adams opposed.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The applicant implement Option B for the north elevation.

REASON

The Board found Option B preferable to Option A.

SPEAKERS

Karen Conkey, project architect, gave a brief summary of the project.

David Charney, owner/applicant, discussed his reasons for the alterations and requested approval.

Yvonne Weight Callahan, 735 South Lee Street, expressed concern regarding the proposed elevator and rooftop kitchen area, as well as potential visibility from public rights of way.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts stated she liked the vision and the window patterns and rhythm, finding the changes a nice addition to the community.

Ms. Ossman asked Ms. Conkey why the elevator had to be on the exterior. Ms Conkey explained that an interior elevator would be in an awkward location in the house and would necessitate the removal of a bathroom.

Mr. Adams asked when these 1970s Colonial Revival designs would be considered historic. He felt there were too many windows on the north elevation and the lack of muntins gave the elevation a stark look.

Mr. Sprinkle agreed with Mr. Adams, saying that the 1970s designers deserved respect.

Ms. Irwin liked the design, felt it represented a good balance between the Colonial Revival neighborhood and adding modern aspects. She understood Mr. Sprinkle's comment but felt that

this building was not necessarily of high design worth saving. She also noted that the copper-clad elevator will disappear against the brick and the cable rails also won't be seen. She supports per staff recommendations and feels that the addition of a roof deck is appropriate; there are several in this neighborhood.

Mr. Sprinkle did not approve of the roof deck, wanted to favor the original intent of the designers.

Mr. Adams suggested that the roof deck railing be pulled further back from the front/east elevation.

Ms. Sennott and Ms. Ossman had no issues with the roof deck.

Ms. Roberts also had no issue with the roof deck. She understood Mr. Adams' concerns, but noted that the railings were already pulled far back from the front elevation.

Mr. Spencer requested an explanation and discussion of the two options for the north elevation.

8. BAR #2020-00396 PG

Request for new construction at 1413 Princess Street.

Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

9. BAR #2020-00412 PG

Request for new construction at 1415 Princess Street.

Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

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 #2020-00396 and BAR #2020-00412, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 4-3. Mr. Sprinkle, Ms. Irwin, and Mr. Adams opposed.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The final window specifications for the fire-rated windows on the east elevation of 1413 Princess St. must comply with the Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications in the Historic Districts and be submitted with the building permit;
2. The applicant work with staff to adjust the window and dormer sizes to be more proportional to the house; and,
3. The fiber cement siding must be smooth finish,
4. The applicant submit complete window and glazing specifications for all proposed windows to ensure that the proposed windows meet the performance requirements of the *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications*, and;
5. Include the statements from Alexandria Archaeology, below, in the General Notes of all on all construction documents that involve demolition or ground disturbance (including Basement/Foundation Plans, Demolition, Erosion and Sediment Control, Grading, Landscaping, 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 artifact collection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

REASON

The Board supported the application with conditions.

SPEAKERS

Ashley Klearman, representing applicant, gave presentation.

Deyi Awadallah, applicant, answered questions.

Steve Milone, 907 Prince St., questioned design of front windows and prefers common setback.

Michael Stauber, 1401 Princess St., stated that the applicant did not review the design with him and that the current design does not fit into the block.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts asked for confirmation that specifications will meet materials policies. Supports the design besides the ground floor windows. Reads as background buildings and fulfills requirements of the Design Guidelines. She also noted that the application shows grained fiber siding, and the siding must be smooth.

Ms. Ossman asked if the applicant had presented this design to the neighbors. She stated that the first-floor windows are too large, and the windowsill should be raised. The off-center middle dormer feels awkward.

Mr. Adams stated that the front building walls should be aligned and thinks raising the windowsill would look awkward. He agreed with Ms. Ossman that the center dormer should be centered.

Ms. Sennott also feels the first-floor windows are too large and agrees with Ms. Ossman regarding dormer alignment.

Mr. Sprinkle stated that the building is now 2 ½ stories and that this project is a missed opportunity for creative design.

Ms. Irwin stated that this design is her least favorite of all the submissions for this property, and doesn't speak to the district. The windows are too large, the proportions are off, and the dormer seems applied.

Mr. Spencer agreed with Ms. Roberts and stated that these are decent background buildings and supports the off-center dormers. The window proportions are big for the building and should be modified.

10. BAR #2021-00622 PG

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

Applicant: Ala Awadallah

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 #2021-00622, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 4-3. Mr. Sprinkle, Ms. Irwin, and Mr. Adams opposed.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The final window specifications for the fire-rated windows on the west elevation must comply with the Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications in the Historic Districts and be submitted with the building permit;
2. The applicant work with staff to adjust the window and dormer sizes to be more proportional to the house; and,
3. The fiber cement siding must be smooth finish, and;
4. Include the statements from Alexandria Archaeology, below, in the General Notes of all on all construction documents that involve demolition or ground disturbance (including Basement/Foundation Plans, Demolition, Erosion and Sediment Control, Grading, Landscaping, 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 artifact collection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

REASON

See #8 & 9

SPEAKERS

See #8 & 9

DISCUSSION

See #8 & 9

11. 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. Roberts, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00606. The motion carried on a vote of 6-1. Mr. Sprinkle opposed.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

On a vote of 6-1 the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral for BAR #2021-00606

REASON

The Board wanted additional views of the project from North Washington Street and modifications to the design of the north east corner of the building.

SPEAKERS

Patrick Bloomfield, applicant, introduced the project.

Lori Hall, project architect, presented the project and highlighted changes made in response to staff and Board comments.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, suggested that the public artwork aspect of the project be used to

reflect the history of the neighborhood.

Steve Davidson, 535 North Columbus Street, felt that the design is not consistent with the existing buildings in the area and invited the Board members to visit the neighborhood.

Todd Kelly, 822 North Columbus Street, stated that the Washington Street Guidelines indicate that the building should have a smaller footprint. He felt that the mass and scale of the building is too large for the neighborhood.

Steve Milone, 907 Prince Street, stated that the project would be fully visible from North Washington Street and suggested that additional views from this vantage would be helpful. He further stated that he felt that the design for the north east corner of the building is too stark.

Patrick Bloomfield, applicant, replied to comments and addressed questions. He stated that he wants to keep the public artwork as designed but would not be opposed to including an informational plaque regarding the history of the site. He further noted that the currently vacant Washington Street sites will be developed.

Mr. Spencer noted that the Board is not holding the design to the Washington Street standards but would like additional views from North Washington Street.

Ms. Roberts noted that the Board asks for views from a public right of way for all projects.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin liked the proposed design revisions and felt that the revised windows on the lower portion of the building are an improvement to the previous design. The white brick portion of the north elevation is too stark and needs further detailing. She likes the revised configuration of balconies on the east elevation and did not have an issue with the size of the proposed balconies. She noted that the ground floor door at the north east corner of the building is awkward and not organized into the building design.

Mr. Sprinkle did not agree with the configuration of the massing and the inclusion of the central courtyard. He felt that the building is too large and asked if eliminating the courtyard could allow for a smaller building. He asked if the Washington Street Guidelines should be used for this project since it is visible from Washington Street. Mr. Conkey responded that those Guidelines apply to properties fronting Washington Street.

Ms. Roberts asked for a view from North Washington Street to better understand the building in its context. She agreed with Ms. Irwin regarding the changes that were made to the design in response to BAR comments.

Mr. Adams liked the look of the lower brick portion of the building and asked if some elements of this design could be incorporated into the design for the upper portion. He felt that the main building entry could be more special.

Ms. Sennott agreed with Ms. Roberts and asked for an additional view of the project from North Washington Street.

Ms. Ossman stated that she would like to see a greater level of development of the design for the north east corner of the building.

Mr. Spencer appreciated the response to comments from the Board and agreed that additional views from North Washington Street would be helpful. He felt that the entrance canopy could be further refined to stand out more. He felt that the depth of the balconies on the east side could be

acceptable pending a review of the view from North Washington Street. He agreed with other comments that the north elevation and north east corner of the building need additional detailing.

Ms. Roberts asked the applicant if he would like a deferral in order to prepare the requested view from North Washington Street. The applicant requested a deferral.

Ms. Irwin made a motion to accept the request for a deferral.

Ms. Roberts seconded the motion and asked for discussion. She had no opinion regarding the balconies on the east elevation and asked for an option where the dark brick detailing wraps the corner to the east elevation.

Ms. Ossman asked for additional detailing on the railings.

Mr. Adams expressed no strong feelings regarding the balconies but would review their design based off views from North Washington Street.

Mr. Sprinkle noted that the balconies overlook the rear of the hotel.

Ms. Irwin asked that the revision to the north east corner include a revision to the ground floor door in that area.

The Board voted to accept the requested deferral on a vote of 6-1 with Mr. Sprinkle voting against the motion.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

12. BAR #2021-00666 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 210 Green Street.

Applicants: Daniel and Carolyn McCormack, and Kathryn McCormack Akacem

13. BAR #2021-00665 OHAD

Request for alterations at 210 Green Street.

Applicants: Daniel and Carolyn McCormack, and Kathryn McCormack Akacem

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

On a motion by Ms. Roberts and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00665 and BAR #2021-00666. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

REASON

The Board requested additional deck details.

SPEAKERS

Dan McCormack, owner, described the project and answered questions.

Chris Capistran, 214 Green Street, discussed the precedent of decks in the neighborhood and said that he thought the deck was larger than other nearby decks.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Adams asked if a smaller footprint for the deck could be explored and if some type of screening could be added for greater privacy.

Ms. Ossman felt that given the size of the deck it has taken on an architectural significance and should be carefully detailed.

Ms. Sennott noted that the Design Guidelines do not address privacy concerns.

Ms. Roberts noted that the deck is a part of the architecture of the building and asked the applicant for additional views showing the visibility of the deck from the right of way and the context of surrounding properties.

Ms. Irwin felt that the vocabulary of the deck is not consistent with the design of the house.

Mr. Spencer asked the applicant if he would like a deferral in order to address Board comments. The applicant requested the deferral.

14. BAR #2021-00662 OHAD

Request for alterations at 820 South Royal Street.

Applicants: Robert and Melissa Manaker

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle and seconded by Ms. Roberts, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00662, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The HVAC equipment screening should be painted so it does not detract from the architecture of the building, and;
2. The applicant should work with staff on the final design of the enclosure.

REASON

The Board supported the application with the additional condition that the applicant work with staff on the final design of the enclosure.

SPEAKERS

Robert Manaker, property owner, described the project and answered questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Ossman would like for the applicant to work with staff on the final design of the enclosure.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

15. Review of expiring window policy.

Staff requested deferral of this item.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 10:23 p.m.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2021-00008 OHAD

Request for signage at 300 South Washington Street.

Applicant: 300 South Washington Street, LLC

BAR #2021-00565 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 703 Miller Lane.

Applicant: Christopher Bidwell

BAR #2021-00668 PG

Request for window replacement at 325 North West Street.

Applicant: Hannah Follweiler

BAR #2021-00677 OHAD

Request for signage at 1101 King Street.

Applicant: Edwin Eta

BAR #2021-00679 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 322 South Saint Asaph Street.

Applicant: Charles Camalier and Patricia Scott

BAR #2021-00683 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 109 South Saint Asaph Street.

Applicant: Matthews James J JR. SUB TR

BAR #2022-00005 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 665 South Washington Street.

Applicant: Alexander Gayle

BAR #2022-00010 OHAD

Request for signage at 1314 King Street #1.

Applicant: Bradley Fiscus