

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

Board of Architectural Review  
**Wednesday, April 20, 2022**  
7:00 p.m., City Council Chamber  
City Hall

Members Present: James Spencer, Chair  
Christine Roberts, Vice Chair  
Laurie Ossman  
Purvi Irwin

Members Absent: Christine Sennott  
Robert Adams  
John Sprinkle

Secretary: William Conkey, AIA, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Amirah Lane, Historic Preservation Planner

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Ms. Sennott, Mr. Adams and Mr. Sprinkle were absent. All other members were present.

**II. MINUTES**

2. Consideration of minutes from the April 6, 2022 meeting.

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted**

On a motion by Dr. Ossman, and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review approved the April 6, 2022 minutes, as submitted.

**III. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**3. BAR #2022-00108 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 801 Wolfe Street.  
Applicant: Shana Edwards

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended**

Removed from the consent calendar.

On a motion by Dr. Ossman, and seconded by Ms. Roberts, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2022-00108, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

That the applicant work with staff to determine the appropriate color of grey to paint the HVAC screening.

**REASON**

The Board felt that the proposed white screening fence would be too noticeable and instead recommended a more neutral color.

#### **SPEAKERS**

Shana Edwards, applicant, spoke in support of the project and answered questions.

#### **DISCUSSION**

The Board members discussed what grey color would be the most appropriate for the screening but ultimately recommended that the applicant work with staff on the best grey color.

### **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

#### **4. BAR #2022-00134 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 101 Queen Street.

Applicants: Sean and Jill Milliken

#### **5. BAR #2022-00135 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 101 Queen Street.

Applicants: Sean and Jill Milliken

#### **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 #2022-00134 and BAR #2022-00135, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

#### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

The applicant work with staff to determine the limewash translucent level that may be applied to the building's unpainted masonry instead of the proposed opaque paint.

#### **REASON**

The Board found that an opaque paint cover will diminish the architectural intent of the development which was designed with a variety of brick colors and patterns. However, the Board agreed that a limewash treatment could disguise the building's renovations scars and keep the brick texture evident.

#### **SPEAKERS**

Karen Conkey, the project architect, briefly explained the project and was available to answer questions.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Ms. Roberts asked Ms. Conkey if she considered the brick color and pattern on this townhouse an architectural feature since, it appears to her, that the townhouses in this development had deliberately different brick colors and patterns. She also noted that if the subject building is painted in a cream color as being proposed it will look the same as the house across the street. Ms. Conkey explained that the house behind the subject property is painted in a gray color and that the house across the street is in another development which houses are more Modern/Victorian than Neo Colonial. She also explained that the houses in the subject property development have different

types of brick that may differ from each other giving the impression of different colors and patterns.

Dr. Ossman asked Ms. Conkey if they have considered other type of coating systems such as staining or limewash, which are more breathable materials. Ms. Conkey explained that they haven't discussed the type of coating yet, just colors.

Ms. Roberts asked Ms. Conkey if they were open to consider the limewash approach since she thinks that the brick color differentiation in this development was the architect intent and, in her opinion, a limewash will be more in line with the development's characteristic and less intrusive. Ms. Conkey clarified that she is open to a heavier limewash rather than a light/translucid coating approach since one of the reasons to paint the house is to disguise the scars left by not so skilled masons in past renovations. Ms. Roberts stated that she opposes to the opaque paint but will be in favor to the limewash approach.

Dr. Ossman agreed that the proposed design is an improvement to the property, but she is not in favor of the proposed impermeable cover of the masonry, she would support the limewash or stain treatments instead. Ms. Roberts stated that staining coats can have a negative affect since the treatment will make the mortar joints unperceivable and she considers the brick texture to be an architectural feature of the townhouse.

Ms. Irwin agreed that the limewash is the most appropriate treatment to cover the past and new renovations scars. There was no further discussion.

**6. BAR #2022-00130 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 427 North Saint Asaph Street.

Applicant: Henry M TR and Ann K TR Handler

**7. BAR #2022-00125 OHAD**

Request for addition and alterations at 427 North Saint Asaph Street.

Applicant: Henry M TR and Ann K TR Handler

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended**

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, and seconded by Dr. Ossman, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2022-00125 and BAR #2022-00130, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. There are slight inconsistencies in the plans showing the measurement of the chimney projection. Per Section 7-202(A)(4), chimneys cannot reduce the width of the side yard to less than 5.00 feet. The plans must be revised when submitting for building permit to show that the chimney is at least 5.00 feet from the south side yard property line.
2. The applicant use wood siding in lieu of the proposed stucco for the exterior finish.

**REASON**

The Board was concerned about the use of stucco as the exterior cladding material.

**SPEAKERS**

Hank Handler, applicant, was available for questions.

## **DISCUSSION**

Ms. Roberts asked the applicant about the choice of stucco for the exterior cladding material. The applicant indicated that it was being used to differentiate the addition from the historic structure. Ms. Roberts stated that she was concerned about the longevity of stucco. The applicant indicated that he would be happy to use wood siding and would make custom trim for the addition.

Dr. Ossman noted that the project was well designed and indicated her preference for the use of wood siding.

Ms. Sennott agreed with her colleagues regarding the use of wood siding.

Ms. Irwin stated that she could approve either wood siding or modern brick that is differentiated from the historic brick. The applicant expressed a preference for wood siding.

### **8. BAR #2022-00131 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 424 North Washington Street.  
Applicant: NK Washington Street LLC

### **9. BAR #2022-00126 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 424 North Washington Street.  
Applicant: NK Washington Street LLC

## **BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted**

On a motion by Dr. Ossman, and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2022-00126 and BAR #2022-00131, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

## **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

None

## **REASON**

The Board found the changes appropriate.

## **SPEAKERS**

Victoria Wallace, project architect with Cedar Architecture and Design, provided a brief overview and was available to answer questions.

## **DISCUSSION**

Ms. Roberts said the project was appropriate, did not include major changes, and did not touch on the Washington Street standards. She felt that the proposed minor changes fit into the *Design Guidelines* and standards.

Ms. Irwin agreed with Ms. Roberts and especially liked the railing detail. She felt that this was a nice change to make the space usable.

Dr. Ossman agreed, commending the light touch.

**10. BAR #2022-00137 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 115 South Washington Street.  
Applicant: Douglas Development

**11. BAR #2022-00136 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 115 South Washington Street.  
Applicant: Douglas Development

**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 #2022-00136 and BAR #2022-00137, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. The applicant must submit updated window specifications that comply with the *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications* with the building permit application; and,
2. The mortar used for the infill area must match the mortar color and texture, as well as the joint profile of the existing elevation.

**REASON**

The Board supported the application with staff recommendations.

**SPEAKERS**

Kade Sheridan, project architect, was available to answer questions.  
Theresa Connaughton, 709 Prince St., expressed concerned about portions of the project.  
Jim Stanley, 707 Prince St., expressed concerned about portions of the project.

**DISCUSSION**

Ms. Irwin asked for clarification of the prior approvals and if the windows were original.

Ms. Roberts asked for clarification on how often the proposed loading door will be accessed.

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 7:46 p.m.

**VI. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

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

BAR #2022-00150 OHAD

Request for signage at 102 North Fayette Street.  
Applicant: Ian MacGrath

BAR #2022-00154 OHAD

Request for door replacement at 1307 Prince Street.

Applicant: H/F Count Cameron LLC

BAR #2022-00156 OHAD

Request for stucco replacement at 410 South Fairfax Street.

Applicant: Chris and Lauren Bishop

BAR #2022-00166 PG

Request for signage at 805 Cameron Street.

Applicant: Brett Bruen

BAR #2022-00167 OHAD

Request for mortar repointing at 313 Queen Street.

Applicant: Martha Kubik

BAR #2022-00168 OHAD

Request for mortar repointing at 1208 Prince Street.

Applicant: Johnathan Baron

BAR #2022-00167 OHAD

Request for mortar repointing at 313 Queen Street.

Applicant: Martha Kubik

BAR #2022-00169 OHAD

Request for mortar repointing at 224 South Lee Street.

Applicant: Melissa Reading

BAR #2022-00180 OHAD

Request for shed replacement at 323 South Fairfax Street.

Applicant: Old Presbyterian Meeting House

BAR #2022-00183 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 214 Green Street.

Applicant: Christopher and Courtney Capistran

BAR #2022-00167 OHAD

Request for door replacement at 1223 Portner Road.

Applicant: Richard and Laura Graham

BAR #2022-00186 OHAD

Request for signage at 311 North Washington Street.

Applicant: Elmer Robinson

BAR #2022-00187 OHAD

Request for fence replacement at 121 Princess Street.

Applicant: Daniel Bernstein

BAR #2022-00192 OHAD

Request for new shed at 512 Queen Street.

Applicant: Todd Catlin