

**\*\*\*\*\*DRAFT MINUTES\*\*\*\*\***

Board of Architectural Review  
**Wednesday, February 2, 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. Irwin, and seconded by Ms. Roberts, 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 19, 2022 meeting.

**BOARD ACTION: Approved**

On a motion by Ms. Ossman, and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review approved the January 19, 2022 minutes, as submitted.

**III. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**This item was removed from the consent calendar.**

**4. BAR #2022-00012 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 1 Pioneer Mill Way.  
Applicant: City of Alexandria

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted**

On a motion by Ms. Roberts and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2022-00012, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

## **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

The railing design be administratively approved along the waterfront as part of the common elements guidelines approved in 2015.

## **REASON**

Ms. Roberts removed the item from the consent calendar since she finds that the railing design can be considered for administrative approval as part of the Waterfront Common Elements guidelines approved in 2015.

## **SPEAKERS**

None

## **DISCUSSION**

There was no discussion.

## **IV. ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED**

### **5. 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: Approved, as Submitted**

On a motion by Ms. Roberts and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00606, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-1. Mr. Sprinkle opposed.

## **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. The applicant work with staff on the design and detailing of the building entry doors.
2. The applicant work with staff on the size and design of the balconies on the east elevation.
3. As the design progresses, the applicant work with staff on the final detailing for the black metal clad portions of the building.
4. The applicant work with staff to introduce a reveal or other change in plane at the east elevation where the red brick portion of the building changes to the fiber cement portion to allow the material change to occur at an inside corner.

## **REASON**

The Board supported staff recommendations.

## **SPEAKERS**

Patrick Bloomfield, applicant, introduced the project

Lori Hall, Project Architect, presented the changes made to the design since the last hearing.

Steve Milone, 907 Prince Street, thanked the applicant for providing the view requested by the Board.

## **DISCUSSION**

Ms. Ossman asked the applicant if any changes had been made to the metalwork in response to her previous comments. The applicant responded that they intend to work with staff on these

modifications.

Ms. Roberts noted that the Board had twice requested modifications to the design of the metalwork.

Mr. Sprinkle asked the applicant for the location of the camera in the new rendering. The applicant showed the location on a map.

Ms. Irwin noted the staff recommendation that a change in plane be added to the intersection of the dark brick and fiber cement panels at the northeast corner of the building. She asked about a door that was shown on the plans but not on the east elevation. The applicant noted this as a drawing error and stated that the door would be similar to the exterior door at the northeast corner.

Ms. Sennott liked the changes to the north and east elevations and agreed with staff recommendations.

Mr. Sprinkle noted previous comments that had not been addressed and expressed continued concern regarding the design of the courtyard.

Mr. Adams liked the proposed modifications to the design and noted the recommendation that the applicant work with staff on the final design of the entry canopy.

Ms. Roberts asked staff about the design direction for the entry canopy. Mr. Conkey responded that the intention is to make the undulating portion of the underside of the canopy more dramatic to be visible from the sidewalk.

**Applicant has requested deferral for this item.**

**6. BAR #2021-00329 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 105 North Alfred Street.

Applicants: Bruce and Thelma MacGregor

**7. BAR #2021-00324 OHAD**

Request for addition and alterations at 105 North Alfred Street.

Applicants: Bruce and Thelma MacGregor

**BOARD ACTION: Deferred**

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.

**V. NEW BUSINESS**

**8. BAR #2020-00076 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 418 and 418 A South Washington Street.

Applicant: The Campagna Center, Inc.

**9. BAR #2020-00077 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 418 and 418 A South Washington Street.

Applicant: The Campagna Center, Inc.

**BOARD ACTION: Deferred**

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00076 and BAR #2021-00077. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused himself.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

On a vote of 6-0, the Board of Architectural review accepted the request for deferral for BAR 2021-00076 & BAR 2021-00077

**REASON**

The Board requested additional study of the status of the existing windows and modifications to the proposed design.

**SPEAKERS**

Michael Winstanley, Project architect, presented the project.

Steve Milone, 907 Prince Street, representing OTCA, presented photos of the existing structure. He indicated that he supports the enlargement of the ground floor windows. Based on his observations, he stated that the windows appeared to be early if not original and encouraged the applicant to retain them and install storm windows. He further stated that the entry transom and framing in addition to the stone sill are original and should be maintained.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, stated that the proposed design is an improvement over the previously proposed addition. She urged the applicant to install interpretive panels to document the history of the site and building. She further supported the statement of Mr. Milone and suggested that the existing paint be retained.

Yvonne Callahan, 735 South Lee Street, agreed with the statements of Ms. Rothrock and Mr. Milone. She went on to expand on the history of the Amidon School.

Michael Duchesne, 415 & 421 South Washington Street, supported the proposed renovation.

**DISCUSSION**

Mr. Spencer asked the applicant if they had read and agree with the staff recommendations. Mr. Winstanley agreed to those recommendations.

Ms. Sennott asked about the height of the proposed retaining wall at the north side of the patio. Mr. Winstanley responded that the wall would be 6' tall.

Ms. Ossman asked what the proposed roofing material would be. Mr. Winstanley clarified that this would be asphalt shingles being replaced in kind.

Ms. Ossman noted concerns about the paint removal process and asked that the process be reviewed by staff.

Ms. Ossman asked if the proposed patio would be at the same grade as the sidewalk and if this could be used as an accessible entry. Mr. Winstanley noted that there will be steps down from the sidewalk to the patio but that the patio would be accessible from inside the building. Mr. Winstanley pointed out that the main building entrance for visitors is at the west elevation, the entrance from the parking lot is intended to be for employees.

Ms. Roberts asked about the extent of demolition proposed at the main building entry. Mr. Winstanley responded that the intent is to remove the doors, framing, steps, and railings. He stated that they could look at retaining portions of the door framing but that the steps need to be removed to create an accessible entrance.

Ms. Irwin asked for clarification on the staff review of the existing windows. Mr. Conkey reviewed the observations made during a site visit.

Ms. Irwin asked if any tests had been made on the potential removal of the existing paint. Mr. Winstanley replied that tests had not been conducted but initial estimates seem to make the work too expensive for the project.

Ms. Irwin noted that per the concept of universal design, it is important to allow for an accessible entrance at the main building entry point.

Mr. Spencer asked about the original roofing material. Mr. Conkey noted that historic maps showed the building with a non-combustible roof, presumably metal.

Ms. Ossman expressed concern regarding the proposed enlargement of the ground floor windows, saying that this represents a loss of historic fabric. She was less concerned about modifications to secondary elevations than to this primary, street facing elevation. She expressed concern regarding the potential loss of historic windows and the removal of the transom framing at the main entrance. She did not support the re-painting of the brick.

Ms. Irwin asked for the retention of the transom and framing at the main entry door as well as the relocation of the granite sill to a lower level. She stated that the new proportion of the ground floor windows is reflective of the proposed use for the area and was comfortable with the proposed modification. She noted the subtle but effective differences in the proposed head treatment at the ground floor openings. She discussed the possibility of reusing some portion of the existing windows if they are found to be original.

Ms. Roberts noted that the presence of cylinder glass does not necessarily reflect the age of the window assembly, older glass was sometimes used in newer frames. She asked staff for a discussion regarding the age of windows and what was presented by Mr. Milone. Mr. Conkey noted that without knowing where a specific photo was taken it is difficult to judge the entirety of the windows. He raised the possibility of working with the applicant to identify any historic material.

Ms. Roberts suggested that the framing and transom above the main entry be kept and that the existing sill be lowered. She suggested a frameless door and sidelights below the historic transom to clearly define it as modern.

Ms. Sennott agreed with her colleagues regarding the retention of historic parts of windows and regarding the framing and transom at the main entry.

Ms. Roberts stated that she did not have a problem with the enlargement of the ground floor windows because their location and width remain the same, keeping the overall rhythm consistent.

Mr. Adams agreed with previous comments regarding the main building entry. He suggested that it may be possible to harvest parts from windows to allow the west elevation to be made up entirely of historic windows.

Mr. Spencer suggested that the transom and framing at the building entry be kept and that a butt glazed system be used below. He expressed a comfort with the proposed enlargement of the ground floor windows and stated that any replacement windows should be wood in lieu of the proposed aluminum clad windows proposed.

Ms. Roberts asked the applicant if they would request a deferral. Mr. Winstanley asked for a deferral and noted that they would work on options to address comments from staff and the Board.

## **VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **10. Review of expiring window policy.**

On a motion by Ms. Roberts and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review moved to extend the January 6, 2021 provisional approval of the updated version of the Alexandria new and replacement window performance specification in historic districts through the next 180 days.

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 9:01 p.m.

## **VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

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

BAR #2021-00682 PG

Request for alterations at 1604 Sutter Street.

Applicants: Bradley Rawls and Felicia Rogers

BAR #2022-00001 OHAD

Request for fence replacement at 610 Gibbon Street.

Applicant: Lisa Lu

BAR #2022-00016 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 309 Jefferson Street.

Applicant: Robert Sisson, Jr.

BAR #2022-00018 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 620 South Royal Street.

Applicant: Andrea Bridgeman

BAR #2022-00029 OHAD

Request for antenna replacement at 520 King Street.

Applicant: Network Building and Consulting

BAR #2022-00030 PG  
Request for alterations at 110 North Columbus Street.  
Applicants: Tom Amantree and Fred Sherman

BAR #2022-00031 OHAD  
Request for signage at 300 South Washington Street.  
Applicant: Truist

BAR #2022-00032 OHAD  
Request for signage at 104 North Union Street.  
Applicant: Valerie Ianieri

BAR #2022-00034 OHAD  
Request for alterations at 119 North Fairfax Street.  
Applicant: A.L. Freed Railroad Development LLC

BAR #2022-00035 OHAD  
Request for shutter replacement at 220 North Union Street.  
Applicant: Matt Wise, City of Alexandria

BAR #2022-00038 OHAD  
Request for roof replacement at 1009 King Street.  
Applicant: Carolina Santos