

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

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, March 2, 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
Purvi Irwin
John Sprinkle

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.

1 A. 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 7-0.

II. MINUTES

2. Consideration of minutes from the February 16, 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 16, 2022 minutes, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0. Ms. Irwin and Mr. Sprinkle abstained.

III. ITEMS DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING

3. BAR #2021-00329 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 105 North Alfred Street.
Applicants: Bruce and Thelma MacGregor

4. BAR #2021-00324 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 105 North Alfred Street.
Applicants: Bruce and Thelma MacGregor

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request the deferral of BAR #2021-00324 and BAR #2021-00329.

5. BAR #2022-00041 OHAD

Request for alterations at 1600 West Abingdon Drive.

Applicant: Unit Owners Association of Potowmack Crossing Condominium

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request the deferral of BAR #2022-00041.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

6. BAR #2022-00044 OHAD

Request for alterations at 1 Pioneer Mill Way (Robinson Landing Promenade).

Applicant: City of Alexandria

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Ms. Irwin, and seconded by Ms. Roberts, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2022-00044, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

V. ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED

7. BAR #2020-00076 OHAD

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

Applicant: The Campagna Center, Inc.

8. BAR #2020-00077 OHAD

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

Applicant: The Campagna Center, Inc.

BOARD ACTION: Partially Approved, Partially Deferred

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, and seconded by Ms. Ossman, the Board of Architectural Review voted to partially approve, and partially defer BAR #2020-00076 and BAR #2020-00077, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused himself.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The applicant submit complete window and glazing specifications to ensure that the proposed windows meet the performance requirements of the *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications* and that the applicant work with staff regarding the final color selection for the aluminum clad windows.
2. The applicant work with staff on details for proposed entry canopy on east elevation

- ~~3. The applicant work with staff to identify an “historically appropriate” roofing material to be used to replace the existing roof.~~
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.
5. The ground floor windows are not enlarged
6. The windows on the west elevation are to be single glazed wood to meet the *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications*.
7. At the north and south elevations, the applicant may use aluminum clad windows above the first floor but those on the first floor should be single glazed wood windows.
8. The applicant should return to the Board for approval of the design for the front entry door.

REASON

The Board opposed the enlargement of the ground floor windows and wanted the windows on the west elevation and those closest to grade to be single glazed wood windows.

SPEAKERS

Michael Winstanley, project architect, presented the project and noted that the applicant is no longer planning to replace the existing roof

Yvonne Callahan, 735 South Lee St, expressed concern about the use of aluminum clad wood windows on the building and preferred that the paint be left in its current condition.

Steve Milone, 907 Prince St, appreciated the changes made to the design in response to previous comments. He was concerned about the use of the butt glazed door and sidelights at the main entry and would prefer a wood door that re-uses the existing jamb posts. He further expressed concern about the revised size of the windows on the ground floor.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, representing HAF, would like to see the paint remain in its current condition. She inquired as to whether the existing window sills could be saved and re-used and expressed a similar opinion to Mr. Milone regarding the entry door.

Tammy Mann, representing the Campagna Center, thanked the Board and gave a background to the current plan.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts asked the applicant for the height above grade at the east and west sides of the building for the third floor windows. The applicant responded that they are 38’ on the west and 25’ on the east.

Ms. Irwin asked for a clarification on the drawing of the transom. The applicant noted a drafting error.

Mr. Adams asked about the relationship between the window sill and grade at the north end of the west elevation. The applicant noted that they would need to raise the sill by 12"-18".

Ms. Ossman expressed concern that raising the sill on those windows would result in minimal change to the windows while resulting in the loss of historic fabric.

Ms. Irwin noted that the Board can not mandate that the applicant not paint the previously painted masonry. She suggested that the ground floor windows on the west elevation be wood and aluminum clad elsewhere.

Mr. Adams suggested that the applicant explore alternatives for the front entry door and suggested that the ground floor windows remain their current height.

Ms. Sennott stated that the entry door appears to contemporary and would prefer a wood door. She did not have any problem with lowering the sills on the ground floor windows but felt that if only the ones on the north side of the west elevation were raised the building would look asymmetrical.

Ms. Roberts expressed concern about the departure from the Window Design Guidelines and stated that this could become a precedent for other large buildings. She asked why this building should be treated differently than residential properties.

Ms. Ossman noted that the current Guidelines do not allow for the proposed windows and the revision to the height of the ground floor windows. She asked the applicant to work with staff on the selection of the proposed paint product to avoid damage to the existing brick.

Ms. Roberts acknowledged Mr. Winstanley who had a suggestion on a possible motion. Mr. Winstanley suggested that they not enlarge the ground floor windows and be allowed to use wood windows on the west elevation and aluminum clad wood windows on other elevations.

Ms. Roberts made this motion and included a condition that asked for the applicant to defer the design for the main entry door. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ossman.

Ms. Sennott noted that the ground floor windows on the north and south elevations are highly visible from the sidewalk. Ms. Ossman agreed that the ground floor windows on the north and south elevations should be single glazed wood.

Ms. Irwin amended the motion to include wood windows on the ground floor of the north and south elevations. The amendment was accepted and the motion was passed.

9. BAR #2022-00008 OHAD

Request for re-approval of partial demolition/ encapsulation at 709 South Lee Street.

Applicants: Clare and Jen Little

10. 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 Mr. Sprinkle, 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 7-0.

REASON

The Board had doubts about the amount of historic fabric (roof) being demolished on the main historic block and the visibility of the proposed addition from a public way.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Kurt West, the project architect, was available to answer any questions.

Ms. Gail Rothrock, resident at 209 Duke Street, clarified that she had spoken on the 2020 proposal which was more reasonable and size appropriate than this new proposal. She said that she is concerned about the “apartment look” massive addition. She also brought up that staff dated the construction of the main historic building to circa 1902, but the building is shown in 1877 Hopkins Atlas Map, therefore, a better and in-depth research should be done to determine an accurate history of the building. Furthermore, she had doubts about the addition’s visibility, since the roof of the addition will be taller than the main block roof ridge (about six feet higher), and she thinks that the addition will be very noticeable from both, Lee and Fairfax streets. Even though the addition is not on a street facing elevation, the neighborhood promotes garden tours, and this proposed addition will visually impact the gardens’ settings. She required the Board to ask for the project to be deferred for re-study.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts asked staff to go over the visibility of the building’s rear. Mr. Conkey showed the only angle that the rear of the subject building is visible from Fairfax Street on a map and picture. Ms. Roberts stated that the existing building is barely visible, but the proposed addition will be more noticeable. Mr. Conkey clarified that without a visibility study is difficult to predict what portion of the addition will be visible.

Ms. Irwin had doubts about which window staff recommended to be wood which Mr. Conkey clarified.

Mr. Adams asked staff if there was a Guideline to determine the percentage of massing allowed for an addition. This proposal seems to him to be too large and out of scale and it will overwhelm the main historic building. Mr. Conkey explained that the project complies with zoning requirements and that the BAR only has purview over the visible portions from a public way.

Ms. Ossman asked for clarification on the part of the building seen from Fairfax Street, Mr. Conkey explained that the little portion visible in the picture is the existing second story of the ell’s west elevation. Mr. West stated that he thinks that what was shown in the picture is the rear of the ancillary building at the rear end of the lot. Mr. Conkey clarified that it was very difficult to determine what portion is visible without transpassing.

For clarification, Ms. Hellman explained that indeed staff erroneously stated that the main building was constructed ca. 1902 since the main block first appears in the 1877 Hopkins Atlas Map, and that no building is shown in that block in the 1862 Coast Guard Map, which makes staff believe

that the building was constructed between 1862 and 1877 to be more accurate. Mr. Conkey added that the ell with the notch first appears in the 1920 Sanborn Map and has been altered throughout the years.

Ms. Roberts stated that she was not thrilled about the size of the proposed addition, but there is nothing in the Guidelines that gives the Board purview over the small portion visible from an oblique angle from Fairfax Street. Mr. Spencer said that the top of the proposed addition might be visible even from Lee Street since the proposed addition is taller than the main block building. Furthermore, he stated that without a visibility study showing the sight lines, it will be very difficult to make that determination. Ms. Roberts clarified that she does not think it will be visible from Lee Street due to the width of the street but agreed that a visibility study would help the visualization.

Mr. Adams stated that to his knowledge, additions must be respectful to the character and scale of the main historic building, and this proposed addition is way out of scale regardless its visibility. The proposed roof deck could be appropriate if overlooking the river, but not other people's gardens and homes which is an invasion of privacy. He said that he is not comfortable with the precedent that this project can set and would like to see a lower addition. Mr. Sprinkle agreed with Mr. Adams comments.

Ms. Roberts asked staff the square footage of the main block roof being demolished. Mr. West said that he did not know the exact amount but roughly 1/3 of the main building's roof will be demolished. Ms. Roberts said that it seems to be more than 1/3 and that she was not comfortable approving the demolition of half of the main block building's roof, building which is apparently much older than stated in the staff report. She stated that she would like to see a better connection between the addition and the main block where the addition will lightly touch the historic building.

Mr. Spencer asked Mr. West if he would like to ask for deferral, which was accepted.

11. 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. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2022-00022. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None. The Board requested that the applicant ask their engineers to find the least obtrusive area in which to place the antennas. They also requested that the applicant come up with a less damaging method to install the antennas.

REASON

The BAR expressed concern over the potential damage of installing the cell antennas, plus the high visibility of these antennas on this iconic building.

SPEAKERS

Shea Beltran and Don Bart of Network Building and Consulting represented the applicant. Mr.

Beltran gave a presentation. Both answered questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin expressed concern over the multiple connections to the building and asked why the antennas could not be shifted westward where they would be less visible. (Mr. Bart responded that moving the antennas would make them ineffective).

Ms. Ossman explained that the building is constructed of concrete, not limestone, and wanted the applicant to install the antennas in a way that would cause minimal damage. She also requested alternatives to the proposal, noting that because the antennas are changed so frequently, they cause excessive damage to the building. She recommended they be freestanding on the roof instead of attached to the penthouse.

Ms. Roberts suggested placing the antennas on the smokestack, if that was feasible. She also advocated for a creative installation solution to minimize damage and visibility.

Ms. Sennott also requested a less visible location.

Mr. Sprinkle noted that the application requires a restudy, and he likes Ms. Roberts' idea regarding the smokestack.

Mr. Adams agreed with the foregoing comments.

Mr. Spencer also agreed with the foregoing comments and noted that the smokestack is brick so attaching there may not be possible. He also liked Ms. Ossman's idea that the antennas be freestanding.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 9:23 p.m.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2021-00552 OHAD

Request for signage at 110 North Royal Street.

Applicant: Aptive

BAR #2022-00027 OHAD

Request for alterations at 815 King Street.

Applicant: Old Town #1, LLC

BAR #2022-00036 PG

Request for window replacement at 1115 Cameron Street #214.

Applicant: Sarah Blumberg

BAR #2022-00046 PG
Request for window repairs at 114 North Alfred Street.
Applicant: Eric Olson

BAR #2022-00049 OHAD
Request for alterations at 329 North Washington Street.
Applicant: Hershel Kleinberg, Lisa Cohen

BAR #2022-00050 PG
Request for roof replacement at 1022 Oronoco Street.
Applicant: Michael and Heidi Ford

BAR #2022-00052 OHAD
Request for roof replacement at 207 Wilkes Street.
Applicant: Mike Garrison

BAR #2022-00054 OHAD
Request for gas meter at 315 South Lee Street.
Applicant: John Neary

BAR #2022-00056 PG
Request for alterations at 1116 ½ Princess Street.
Applicant: Peter and Karen Cerka

BAR #2022-00068 OHAD
Request for door replacement at 212 South Fayette Street.
Applicant: David Roberts

BAR #2022-00073 OHAD
Request for signage at 211 South Royal Street.
Applicant: Rochelle Newman

BAR #2022-00075 OHAD
Request for front door replacement at 510 Cameron Street.
Applicant: Laurie Fulton

BAR #2022-00076 OHAD
Request for door replacement at 900 Franklin Street.
Applicant: Dallas McVicker

BAR #2022-00077 OHAD
Request for sign replacement at 1229 King Street.
Applicant: Bonitt Builders Inc.

BAR #2022-00080 OHAD
Request for fence replacement at 803 Church Street.
Applicant: Mindy Harrison

BAR #2022-00081 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 9 Franklin Street.

Applicant: Dale Church

BAR #2022-00082 OHAD

Request for chimney repairs at 609 Queen Street.

Applicant: Russell Shearer

BAR #2022-00085 PG

Request for alterations at 319 North Alfred Street.

Applicant: Harold and Amy White

BAR #2022-00088 OHAD

Request for alterations at 514 South Fairfax Street.

Applicant: Charles C Habliston IV and Ann Morton Y Habliston