

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

Board of Architectural Review
Wednesday, February 16, 2022
7:00 p.m., Virtual Public Hearing
Zoom Webinar

Members Present: James Spencer, Chair
Christine Roberts, Vice Chair
Christine Sennott
Robert Adams
Laurie Ossman

Members Absent: Purvi Irwin
John Sprinkle

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. Ms. Irwin and Mr. Sprinkle 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 February 2, 2022 meeting.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review approved the February 2, 2022 minutes, as submitted.

III. ITEMS DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING

4. BAR #2022-00022 OHAD

Request for antennas at 105 North Union Street.

Applicant: Network Building and Consulting

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2022-00022. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

5. BAR #2021-00329 OHAD

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

Applicants: Bruce and Thelma MacGregor

6. 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 Ms. Roberts, and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00324 and BAR #2021-00329. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

7. BAR #2022-00009 OHAD

Request for alterations at 1319 Prince Street.

Applicant: Commerce Prince West LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2022-00009, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

8. BAR #2022-00015 OHAD

Request for alterations at 512 Queen Street.

Applicants: Todd B. Catlin and Daniel W. Lee

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2022-00015, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

V. ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED

9. BAR #2021-00236 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 413 North Washington Street.

Applicant: Anne Toth

10. BAR #2021-00261 OHAD

Request for alterations at 413 North Washington Street.

Applicant: Anne Toth

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00236 and BAR #2021-00261. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board expressed concern regarding the proposed east elevation, the recessed roof deck, and the replacement of existing windows on the north elevation, they asked the applicant to return with a revised design to address their comments.

SPEAKERS

Robert Cole, project architect, presented the design for the project

Gail Rothrock, 207 Duke Street, representing HAF, expressed pleasure that the front and a portion of the north elevation were being retained. She was concerned about the proposed east elevation and the proposed joining of the two front door leaves. She asked that the existing second floor windows on the north elevation be retained and that the applicant re-study the proposed roof deck. Gail Hoffman, 426 N St. Asaph, stated that she was concerned about the view of the east elevation from the nearby residences and adjacent streets.

John Pike, 426 N St. Asaph, noted that the proposed tall window would produce a glare during the day and an increase in ambient light at night. He stated that the proposed design is not in keeping with the existing context.

Yvonne Callahan, 735 S Lee Street, noted that the east elevation will be visible from surrounding streets and was concerned about the view of the window at night. She asked if the structural evaluation of the east wall could be revisited.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Sennott asked the applicant to describe the pattern on the proposed east window. The applicant described the ceramic fritting material.

Mr. Adams asked if the demolition of a portion of the roof creates a roof deck. The applicant provided a description of the proposed recessed roof deck.

Ms. Roberts asked for an example of the use of ceramic frit on an historic building. The applicant agreed to provide an example for a future hearing.

Ms. Roberts asked how window 2 would be inserted into the overall storefront system on the east elevation. The applicant described how the Wausau window would be inserted into the window wall system.

Ms. Sennott noted that she was having difficulty understanding the construction of the window on the east elevation.

Mr. Spencer asked for a clarification regarding the location of the frit on the glazing system. The applicant noted that it is on the interior face of the exterior glass pane.

Ms. Roberts asked if the proposed window complies with the Replacement Window Guidelines. Mr. Conkey noted the guidelines require clear glazing.

Ms. Ossman asked how the frit would appear at night. The applicant responded that it would obscure visibility into the structure from outside but that there would be a glow from the window.

Ms. Roberts asked if there was a structural reason that the wall could not be rebuilt in the same configuration as currently exists. The applicant responded that it could be rebuilt.

Mr. Spencer asked the applicant if he would be requesting a deferral. The applicant responded affirmatively.

Mr. Adams stated that the proposed submission is an innovative design but that he did not feel that it is appropriate in the historic district. He noted that the front doors should not be modified.

Ms. Roberts stated that the proposal should follow the Design Guidelines regarding the proposed solid to void ratio and glass transparency. She did not support the proposed modification to the front door. She asked that the work on the east wall be treated as a repair instead of an addition.

Mr. Spencer expressed concern about the proposed recessed roof deck and noted that he would need additional information about its construction in order to determine its appropriateness.

Ms. Sennott expressed concern about the recessed roof deck and noted that the east elevation is not appropriate for the historic district.

Ms. Ossman agreed with the sentiments expressed by other Board members and stated that while the proposal was innovative it was less successful in practice.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

11. BAR #2021-00471 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 625 First Street and 510 Second Street.

Applicant: EAHG Alexandria LP

12. BAR #2021-00470 OHAD

Request for alterations at 625 First Street and 510 Second Street.

Applicant: EAHG Alexandria LP

BOARD ACTION: Partially Approved, Partially Deferred

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00471, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00470. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None.

REASON

The Board wanted to see a sample of the proposed color on the hotel and more details on the proposed window and supported the applicant's request for deferral. They approved the applicant's request for a Permit to Demolish.

SPEAKERS

Bob Brant, attorney, presented the project and answered questions.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street and HARC, stated that HARC members were opposed to painting the brick and said it was discouraged in the design guidelines. She also said there were maintenance concerns.

Carol Black, Alexandria resident, said that brick buildings in the historic district shouldn't be painted.

Steve Milone, 907 Prince Street and OTCA, said that the building had architectural merit and painting brick causes maintenance issues.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Adams said that the oldest part of the building is 52 years old and would be considered historic. He also said that he preferred the existing window configuration and asked the applicant to consider a new window with muntins similar to the existing windows.

Chair Spencer asked staff to explain the Board's history with reviewing the painting of unpainted masonry. Mr. Conkey described some recent requests for painting that were approved as well as examples of where the color and texture of certain brick was considered character defining. He said that staff considered this building to be a contemporary building with brick that was not character defining.

Ms. Sennott said she appreciates the contemporary architecture of the building but didn't think that painting the brick was necessary and thought it would make the already large building appear more monolithic.

Ms. Roberts agrees that the brick was not character defining but is sensitive to concerns about maintenance and the age of the early part of the building being greater than 50 years old. She said that she would like to see a large mockup of the colored brick on the hotel.

Mr. Brant said that he meant to describe the color as a stain, rather than a paint which preserved the texture and porosity of the brick. He also said that the stain would have a matt finish.

Chair Spencer said that his concerns had to do with long term maintenance and thought that the brick was an important element of the building. He said he thought the dark color would make the building appear monolithic and that there were opportunities beyond paint to activate the building.

13. BAR #2022-00004 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 208 South Saint Asaph Street.

Applicants: Virginia Bennett and Scott Sekerke

14. BAR #2022-00003 OHAD

Request for alterations at 208 South Saint Asaph Street.

Applicants: Virginia Bennett and Scott Sekerke

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, and seconded by Ms. Ossman, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2022-00003 and BAR #2022-00004, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0. Mr. Adams recused.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board was comfortable with the proposed modifications

SPEAKERS

None

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts noted that she did not have any objections to the proposed modifications to the building and made a motion to approve the application as submitted.

15. BAR #2022-00006 OHAD

Request for alterations at 1120 Prince Street.

Applicants: Timothy Shaheen and Meaghan Foran

BOARD ACTION: Denied

On a motion by Mr. Adams, and seconded by Ms. Roberts, the Board of Architectural Review voted to deny BAR #2022-00006. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board agreed with staff's recommendation to deny the proposed aluminum clad windows but recommended the applicant to keep working with staff to find a practical solution for the windows.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Timothy Shaheen, the property owner, explained that he worked extensively with staff to have the windows approved administratively, but the proposed material, aluminum clad wood, was denied. Therefore, he decided to go through the process of requiring Board's approval at a public hearing because he believes that aluminum windows are more durable.

Mr. Spencer asked if he agreed with staff's recommendation to deny the application. Mr. Shaheen explained that he understands the requirements but believes that for the reason that the windows are on the rear elevations, facing an alley and parking, and not on the building's façade he could try to get the material approved. He said that wood windows as the existing require more maintenance, and no, he did not agree with staff's recommendation.

Ms. Gail Rothrock, resident at 209 Duke Street and representing the Historic Alexandria Foundation, spoke in support of staff's recommendation to deny the application. She added that the existing wood windows, if original, should be repaired rather than replaced. If replacement is

required, they must be in-kind.

Mr. Steve Milone, resident at 907 Prince Street, spoke on behalf of the Old Town Civic Association in support of staff's recommendation to deny the application. He said that the proposed aluminum windows will compromise the integrity of the building. He also explained that when Parker-Gray was created it was determined that the policies for the district would be different than for Old and Historic Alexandria District and that's why a separate ordinance was created. In addition, when the districts' Boards were combined, it was made clear that the policies and ordinances were going to be kept separated. Mr. Milone also stated that he does not agree with the unification of policies for administrative approval for both districts.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Spencer asked Mr. Conkey if the windows were original, Mr. Conkey clarified that staff believes they are not since there is an approval for windows replacement from 2014.

Mr. Adams wanted to make clear for the applicant that if the application was denied, he would not be able to return before the BAR with a new proposal for a year. Mr. Conkey explained that the applicant can get complying windows approved administratively. Mr. Adams, then, suggested the applicant to work with staff to find a solution that complies with the policy. The suggestion became a motion to deny the application.

Mr. Spencer added that there are several options for the rear windows that comply with the policy, and he should contact staff to find the best option. There was no further discussion.

Applicant has requested deferral for this item.

16. BAR #2022-00008 OHAD

Request for re-approval of partial demolition/ encapsulation at 709 South Lee Street.
Applicants: Clare and Jen Little

17. BAR #2022-00007 OHAD

Request for alterations to previously approved plans at 709 South Lee Street.
Applicants: Clare and Jen Little

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2022-00007 and BAR #2022-00008. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

18. BAR #2022-00024 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 410 North Union Street.
Applicants: Stephanie Salek and Thomas Fogarty

19. BAR #2022-00023 OHAD

Request for alterations at 410 North Union Street.
Applicants: Stephanie Salek and Thomas Fogarty

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

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

accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2022-00023 and BAR #2022-00024. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None.

REASON

The Board stated that they needed additional images of the proposed dormers showing a broader context.

SPEAKERS

Christine Kelly, architect, spoke in support of the application and answered questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Ossman and Ms. Sennott had a number of questions for the architect related to materials, particularly expressing concern about the use of siding between the two windows on the rear elevation. Ms. Roberts said that the dormer on the front seemed out of proportion on the roof, located higher than the adjacent dormer and requested additional perspective. Mr. Adams said that he appreciated the details on the dormers but needed more refinement. Mr. Spencer said he felt that the dormer appeared to be too heavy and that he does not believe many of the existing dormers are successful. The architect requested a deferral, which the Board approved.

20. BAR #2022-00026 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 315 South Lee Street.

Applicants: Kerri and John Neary

21. BAR #2022-00019 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 315 South Lee Street.

Applicants: Kerri and John Neary

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, and seconded by Ms. Ossman, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2022-00019 and BAR #2022-00026, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Removal of staff recommendation #1.

REASON

The Board supported the applications submitted.

SPEAKERS

Bill Cromley, architect, representing applicant and gave presentation.

DISCUSSION

With minimal discussion the Board approved the application as submitted.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2022-00037 PG

Request for window replacement at 414 North Fayette Street.

Applicant: Raj Sood

BAR #2022-00038 OHAD

Request for alterations at 1009 King Street.

Applicant: 1009 King Street LLC

BAR #2022-00039 OHAD

Request for alterations at 819 South Lee Street.

Applicant: John Charalambopoulos

BAR #2022-00040 OHAD

Request for alterations at 212 South Saint Asaph Street.

Applicant: Leah and Ben Williams

BAR #2022-00048 OHAD

Request for gas meter relocation at 508 North Washington Street.

Applicant: 508 North Washington Owners LLC

BAR #2022-00051 OHAD

Request for signage at 212 South Washington Street.

Applicant: Downtown Baptist Church