

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

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, March 16, 2022

7:00 p.m., Virtual Public Hearing

Zoom Webinar

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

Members Absent: Christine Sennott

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. Sennott was 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 Mr. Sprinkle, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the resolution. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

II. MINUTES

3. Consideration of minutes from the March 2, 2022 meeting.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

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

III. ITEMS DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING

4. BAR #2021-00329 OHAD

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

Applicants: Bruce and Thelma MacGregor

5. 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 for deferral of

BAR #2021-00324 and BAR #2021-00329. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

Removed from the consent calendar.

6. BAR #2022-00069 OHAD

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 1011 North Washington Street.

Applicant: AT&T Mobility

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 #2022-00069, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused himself.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board found that the argument brought up in the letter of opposition received was not applicable since there are several other “industrial” look structures at the location and throughout the Historic District.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Brian Taylor, representing AT&T, was available to answer any questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts asked Mr. Conkey if there were other modern structures in that location and if this antenna was any different from others that the Board has already approved in the Historic Districts, Mr. Conkey stated that the proposed antenna is similar to all antennas approved in the City and that there are a stop light, a traffic light, a crosswalk to name a few modern structures nearby the pole location. There was no further discussion.

V. ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED

7. BAR #2021-00470 OHAD

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

Applicant: EAHG Alexandria LP

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00470. The motion carried on a vote of 5-1. Mr. Adams opposed.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. That the applicant work with staff to ensure that the stain is translucent with a uniform color.

REASON

The Board supported the alterations to the windows and the staining of the building; however, they conditioned their approval on the applicant working with staff to use a more translucent, uniform stain .

SPEAKERS

Danny Smith, 401 S. Lee and HARC, said that HARC recommended denial of the request to paint or stain the building finding it to be inappropriate.

Yvonne Callahan, 735 S. Lee, said that painted or stained brick was not compatible with the historic district.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Sprinkle said that he did not consider this an important historic resource, so he supported the proposed painting and building alterations. Ms. Roberts said that she agreed and that the changes fit within the context which has few historic resources. Ms. Irwin said that the brick on this building was not character defining and that she was in support of the other alterations. She requested a more transparent stain so the underlying brick variation would be visible. Mr. Adams said that the building will be monolithic with the dark stain and that he would prefer a vertical muntin in the windows. Ms. Sennott agreed with Mr. Adams with respect to the proposed windows. Ms. Ossman was concerned that the building would appear monolithic with a single color and suggested contrasting sections, and that because the building was not historic and the immediate context was more recent buildings, she could support the application. Chair Spencer said he supported the window alterations but was concerned that the stain would obscure the brick patterning.

8. BAR #2022-00024 OHAD

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

9. BAR #2022-00023 OHAD

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

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 #2022-00023 and BAR #2022-00024, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. That the applicant work with staff on the final design of the railing.

REASON

Some Board members felt that the design of the railing should be refined in coordination with staff.

SPEAKERS

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

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts said that she preferred the previously designed railing while Mr. Adams said that he liked the proposed end posts but suggested that final details be up to staff.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

10. BAR #2022-00083 OHAD

Request for re-approval of expired partial demolition/ encapsulation at 10 Duke Street.

Applicant: 10 Duke Street Owners LLC

11. BAR #2022-00057 OHAD

Request for re-approval of expired certificate of appropriateness plans at 10 Duke Street.

Applicant: 10 Duke Street Owners, LLC

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 #2022-00057 and BAR #2022-00083, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. All required archaeological preservation measures shall be completed in compliance with Section 11-411 of the Zoning Ordinance. The Final Site Plan, Grading Plan, or any other permits involving ground disturbing activities (such as coring, grading, filling, vegetation removal, undergrounding utilities, pile driving, landscaping and other excavations as defined in Section 2-151 of the Zoning Ordinance) shall not be released until the City archaeologist confirms that all archaeological field work has been completed or that an approved Resource Management Plan is in place to recover significant resources in concert with construction activities. * (Archaeology)
2. Work closely with City staff to develop a plan to document, label, carefully remove, protect from weather and store the masonry wall material, floor framing and roof truss system on site or a nearby location, approved by staff, for the duration of the project to ensure that they are not damaged.
3. Work closely with BAR staff in the field to ensure that historic fabric that may not currently be known or visible is not lost during the rehabilitation.
4. Submit historically appropriate mortar samples for final approval by BAR staff.
5. Match the cantilevered deck material of the cantilevered balconies of the adjacent townhouses.
6. Provide a glass and steel awning above the south entrance to the Market, similar to the previously approved awning at the north building entrance, with final details to be reviewed and approved by staff.
7. Lower the steel lintel above below the north masonry gable approximately one foot.
8. Incorporate historic interpretation in the form of a plaque or marker that relates specifically to this historic warehouse, using the same design and materials as the approved Robinson Landing historic interpretation.

REASON

As the applicant had made no changes to the previously approved design, the Board approved of the proposed scope of work.

SPEAKERS

Jim Palmer, project architect, presented the project

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, stated that based on the public letter, she was concerned about the design for the north elevation.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Spencer asked the applicant if any changes had been made to the proposal. The applicant indicated that no changes had been made.

Mr. Sprinkle asked the applicant if they had applied for federal tax credits. The applicant indicated that they have not yet applied for the tax credits.

Ms. Ossman noted that the north elevation dated from 1989 and that the original fabric had been previously compromised. She stated that the proposed design is elegant proposed the project.

Mr. Sprinkle stated that given the level of reconstruction, the subject building is no longer historic and supported the proposed design.

Ms. Sennott started that the north elevation should not be restudied and that she was concerned about revisiting a design that was previously approved and has not been modified.

12. BAR #2022-00065 OHAD

Request for permit for demolition/ encapsulation at 628 King Street.

Applicant: Jemal's Gap Corner King, LLC

13. BAR #2022-00064 OHAD

Request for alterations at 628 King Street.

Applicant: Jemal's Gap Corner King, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Partially Approved, Partially Deferred

On a motion by Ms. Irwin, and seconded by Ms. Ossman, the Board of Architectural Review voted to partially approve, and partially defer BAR #2022-00064 and BAR #2022-00065, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused himself.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Applicant will return to the BAR with a restudy of the rhythm and size of the proposed second floor windows.

REASON

The Board felt that the proposed windows were too large and out of scale for the building.

SPEAKERS

Jeff Whitman of GTM Architects gave a brief introduction to the project and was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin felt that the monolithic nature of the second-story brick was a character-defining feature and removing that large an amount of brick would cause the building to lose its character. She supported the first-floor renovations.

Mr. Spencer agreed with Ms. Irwin and noted that he would prefer more rhythm to the pattern, with the upper windows aligned with those on the first floor.

Mr. Adams agreed, noting that the scale of the windows was too large for the Colonial Revival style.

Ms. Roberts liked the proposed windows, as she felt that the lack of second-story windows made the building look unfinished. She asked the architects to explain their position, then suggested that the applicant request a deferral.

Dr. Ossman liked the addition of the second-story windows, but understood the architects' points of view. She supported studying an alternative fenestration pattern for the second floor.

14. BAR #2022-00071 OHAD

Request for permit for demolition/ encapsulation at 411 North Fairfax Street.
Applicant: Philip and Elizabeth Reeder

15. BAR #2022-00070 OHAD

Request for alterations at 411 North Fairfax Street.
Applicant: Philip and Elizabeth Reeder

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Ms. Ossman, and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2022-00070 and BAR #2022-00071, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-2. Mr. Adams and Mr. Spencer opposed.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board, in general, agreed with staff's recommendation to approve the project as submitted.

SPEAKERS

Ms. Rebecca Bostick, the project architect, explained that they were required by the Homeowners Association to match the adjacent home's dormer in size, materials, and design. Ms. Bostick was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Adams stated that he would prefer a different design approach than matching the neighbor's dormer which is too heavy for the townhouse, but he understands that by mimicking the dormer will give some kind of design continuity to the neighborhood.

Mr. Spencer stated that the requirement to match the next-door dormer is a miss opportunity to refine the design, but he agrees with Mr. Adams and Ms. Irwin that the dormer will be minimally visible from a public way and by copying the next-door dormer will give some sense of continuity.

Ms. Roberts agreed that the dormer will be minimally visible and said that, in her opinion, the neighborhood was designed with an architectural vocabulary and that the repetition of features is part of the language, so she thinks that mimicking the next-door dormer is appropriate and acceptable. Mr. Spencer disagreed and said that previous design mistakes should not be repeated. There was no further discussion.

16. BAR #2022-00060 OHAD

Request for permit for demolition/ encapsulation at 426 South Lee Street.
Applicants: Leslie and William Golden

17. BAR #2022-00059 OHAD

Request for alterations and a waiver of fence height at 426 South Lee Street.
Applicants: Leslie and William Golden

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Ms. Sprinkle, and seconded by Ms. Roberts, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2022-00059 and BAR #2022-00060, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The pergola remains 80 percent open and uncovered by any material other than plantings.

REASON

The Board agreed with staff's recommendation to approve the project as submitted.

SPEAKERS

Lynette Camus, Architect, presented project on behalf of the applicant.

DISCUSSION

With minimal discussion the Board approved the project.

18. BAR #2022-00079 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 615, 615A and 621 King Street.
Applicant: King Street LLC, 621-623 King Street LLC, 621-623 King Street II
LLC d/b/a The Silverman Group

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2022-00079. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board requested that the applicant explore ways in which the existing South façade may be kept in place.

SPEAKERS

Cathy Puskar, attorney representing the owner, introduced the project
Leejung Hong, project architect, presented the project

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin asked if the upper portion of the 615 King Street façade had been in place since the original construction. Ms. Hong responded that the windows have been changed over time but that the window openings have remained the same.

Ms. Ossman asked the applicant if the central arched opening at the ground floor of the 621 King Street building was original. Ms. Hong indicated that this feature appears to be original to the building.

Ms. Ossman stated that she felt that the 615 King Street building had been significantly compromised from its original condition and was less concerned about the demolition in this area. She expressed an interest in retaining the central arched opening at the ground floor of the 621 King Street building.

Ms. Roberts indicated that the second floor of the 615 King Street building should be retained.

Ms. Irwin noted that she would like to retain the arched opening at the ground floor of 621 King Street and that the upper portion of the 615 King Street façade has some historic value.

Mr. Sprinkle asked the applicant to re-study the need to demolish the upper portion of the 621 King Street façade.

Mr. Spencer agreed with his colleagues that the arched opening at the 621 King Street façade and the upper portion of the 615 King Street facades should be retained.

Ms. Irwin asked the applicant for additional information on the second floor windows at the 621 King Street elevation.

Ms. Roberts asked the applicant for additional historic information regarding the north façade.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

19. BAR #2022-00078 OHAD

Request for concept review at 615, 615A and 621 King Street.

Applicant: King Street LLC, 621-623 King Street LLC, 621-623 King Street II LLC d/b/a The Silverman Group

Cathy Puskar, attorney representing the owner, introduced the project

Leejung Hong, project architect, presented the project

Mr. Sprinkle complemented the applicant on the presentation of the proposed design.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, appreciated the proposed height and shared a photo of the Ice House on Lee Street as a potential design precedent for the project.

Mr. Sprinkle indicated that he supports the proposed height, mass, and scale for the project and would defer a discussion of the architectural character of the 615 King Street façade until the demolition proposal was settled.

Mr. Adams supported the proposed height and setting back the upper level floors from the façade.

Ms. Irwin supported the proposed height, mass, and scale and would defer a discussion of the architectural character of the 615 King Street façade until the demolition proposal was settled. She supported the idea that the fenestration on the two building do not need to align.

Ms. Ossman supported the height and scale of the proposed design. She asked for there to a variation in the design and height of the two parts of the fourth floor section. She noted that if the 615 King Street façade were to be removed, the design for the new façade should reference the original design for the building

Ms. Roberts supported the proposed height, mass and scale while waiting for the demolition of the 615 King Street façade to be settled before discussing the architectural character. She liked the idea of greater variation in the fourth floor section of the building.

Ms. Spencer supported the height, mass, and scale of the proposed design. He asked that the applicant consider the design for the 621 King Street façade with the arched ground floor opening retained. He agreed with other Board members that the upper levels should include greater variation.

Ms. Roberts noted that differentiation in the floor levels or window heights could lead to a more successful project.

Mr. Sprinkle agreed with the comment of other Board members that the upper level requires additional variation.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

IX. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2022-00055 OHAD

Request for shingle replacement at 1100 Duke Street.

Applicant: Jill Eicher

BAR #2022-00066 OHAD

Request for signage at 109 Cameron Mews.

Applicant: Cameron Mews Ltd HOA

BAR #2022-00074 OHAD

Request for alterations at 210 Thompsons Alley.

Applicants: Ali and Susan Baharmast

BAR #2022-00084 PG

Request for alterations at 319 North West Street.

Applicant: Allyson Ruzicka

BAR #2022-00085 PG

Request alterations at 319 North Alfred Street.

Applicants: Harold and Amy White

BAR #2022-00088 OHAD

Request for fence replacement at 514 South Fairfax Street.

Applicants: Charles C. Habliston and Ann Morton Y Habliston

BAR #2022-00090 OHAD

Request for fence replacement at 518 South Fairfax Street.

Applicant: Ann Morton Y Habliston

BAR #2022-00091 OHAD

Request for patio replacement at 626 South Saint Asaph Street.

Applicant: Laura Herron

BAR #2022-00094 PG

Request for window replacement at 205 North Columbus Street.

Applicant: Robert Agnor

BAR #2022-00096 PG

Request for roof replacement at 200 North Columbus Street.

Applicant: Ivan Sindell

BAR #2022-00099 OHAD

Request for garage door replacement at 28 Alexander Street.

Applicant: Joe Baroudi

BAR #2022-00102 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 1120 Prince Street.

Applicant: Timothy Shaheen