

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

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

Members Present: James Spencer, Chair
Robert Adams
Theresa del Ninno
Michael Lyons
Margaret Miller
Christine Sennot

Members Absent: Andrew Scott

Secretary: Bill Conkey, AIA, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Amirah Lane, Historic Preservation Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. MINUTES

2. Consideration of minutes from the November 16, 2022 meeting.

BOARD ACTION:

On a motion by Ms. del Ninno, and seconded by Ms. Miller, the Board of Architectural Review approved the November 16, 2022 Meeting minutes, as submitted.

III. ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED

3. BAR #2022-00501 OHAD

Request for Certificate of Appropriateness at 1001 S Royal Street
Applicant: Catholic Diocese of Arlington

BOARD ACTION:

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for the deferral of BAR #2022-00501.

4 & 5 BAR #2022-00498 OHAD

Request for Certificate of Appropriateness at 227 S Fairfax Street
Applicant: Errol De Montille

BAR #2022-00516 OHAD

Request for Demolition/Encapsulation at 227 S Fairfax Street
Applicant: Errol De Montille

BOARD ACTION:

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for the deferral of BAR #2022-00498 and BAR #2022-00516.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR**BAR #2022-00495 OHAD**

Request for Certificate of Appropriateness at 400 Wolfe Street

Applicant: Elizabeth Gorman

BOARD ACTION: By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for the deferral of BAR #2021-00495.

REASON

The Board was concerned about the use of fiber cement siding on the south elevation and asked the applicant to explore additional options.

SPEAKERS

Elizabeth Gorman, property owner, introduced the proposed siding replacement

Steve Milone, 907 Prince Street, expressed concern regarding the use of fiber cement siding to replace the wood siding, noting that current siding has a unique profile. He further asked the Board that if they choose to allow the replacement, to require an exposure that is more similar to that of the existing.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Del Ninno asked the applicant how the transition between the new fiber cement and the existing wood siding on the west elevation would occur. The applicant noted that the existing corner board trim would remain.

Mr. Spencer asked the applicant how the siding installation would occur. The applicant stated that the neighbor to the south has expressed a willingness to allow the replacement work to be undertaken.

Mr. Adams noted that wood siding located adjacent to the property line is a condition that exists throughout the historic district and that the approval of the use of fiber cement in this location could be a precedent. He also noted that the existing profile is one found throughout the district and that replacement wood siding to match the existing could be acquired.

Mr. Lyons questioned whether the fiber cement siding would be discernable given the visibility of the area proposed to be replaced. He stated that he supports the proposed replacement of wood siding with fiber cement siding.

Ms. Sennott agreed that the limited visibility of the area of work would make it difficult to perceive a difference in the two materials.

Ms. Miller stated that she supports the approval of the submission with staff recommendations. She noted that in previous projects, the Board had approved the use of fiber cement siding in limited areas where the original siding remained intact elsewhere on the structure. She stated that the significant changes to the building included in the staff report indicate that the building has already been heavily modified over time.

Ms. Del Ninno said that she would support the replacement of the wood siding in kind but was concerned about the precedent of allowing the use of fiber cement siding to replace wood siding.

Ms. Miller made a motion to approve the application with staff recommendations, that the corner board remain in place, and that the applicant work with staff to determine the correct exposure of for the siding. The motion was seconded by Ms. Sennott and failed on a vote of 3-3.

Mr. Spencer noted that he was concerned about the precedent of allowing the use of fiber cement as a replacement for wood siding in OHAD.

Ms. Sennott again noted that the difference in material would be difficult to discern given the visibility of the area in question.

Ms. Del Ninno noted that modern wood siding, if properly installed, would require less maintenance than the existing wood siding.

Mr. Adams noted that the guidelines specifically do not allow the use of fiber cement siding on structures within the historic district and did not support this as an exception.

Mr. Spencer asked the applicant if she would request a deferral to allow for a full Board to be in attendance. He further asked staff for a clarification as to the procedures when the Board is deadlocked.

At this time Mr. Spencer held a straw poll of the members to determine their position on the proposed siding replacement. The straw poll indicated that four members would vote not to allow the replacement with two voting for approval of the application.

The applicant requested a deferral to allow for the exploration of possible alternatives.

7&8. NEW BUSINESS

BAR #2022-00505 OHAD

Request for Certificate of Appropriateness at 704 King Street
Applicant: First National Bank of Pennsylvania

BAR #2022-00506 OHAD

Request for Demolition/Encapsulation at 704 King Street
Applicant: First National Bank of Pennsylvania

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Sennott, and seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2022-00505 and BAR #2022-00506, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

REASON

The Board agreed with staff recommendations and with the recommendation of Mr. Milone.

SPEAKERS

Daniel Robinson, architect and Senior Manager with BHDP, represented the applicant and was available to answer questions.

Steve Milone, 907 Prince Street, made observations regarding the project. He liked having the ATM off the street behind clear glass and expressed a preference for retaining the gooseneck lights. He also noted that the hanging sign is too high and recommended that it be installed in the fascia in order to lower it without making any new holes in the masonry.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Sennott asked if the applicant intends to retain the all -glass front. Mr. Robinson verified that and explained that the main change is to reconfigure the primary elevation to have one single door instead of two doors.

Mr. Spencer asked for the location of the ATM. Mr. Robinson indicated its location on the plan.

Ms. Del Ninno asked about paint color.

Ms. Miller noted that having the ATM in the vestibule, off the street, would be good for security. She also expressed a preference for keeping the gooseneck lights.

Ms. Sennott appreciated Mr. Milone's suggestion that the hanging sign be installed in the fascia instead of in the masonry and incorporated that condition into her motion.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

9. Charging Station Policy

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Sennott and seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the Charging Station Policy, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

REASON

The Board supported the proposed administrative policy with amendments that the height of the stations do not exceed a handle height of 4'-6" and the conduits be painted to match the adjacent structure.

SPEAKERS

Steve Milone, 907 Prince Street, made comments and asked clarification questions.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Spencer asked questions regarding installation at fences and if the stations could be limited to the number of allowed parking spaces. He is recommended the height limit be changed to a handle height of 4'-6" and the conduits be painted to match the adjacent structure.

Ms. Miller asked if the policy could be revised and if a permit is required for installing the charging stations.

Ms. Del Ninno asked if the height could be lowered to 4' and if the number of chargers are limited.

Mr. Lyons asked questions about charging in the public right of way.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review adjourned at 8:25 pm.

11. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

BAR #2022-00510 OHAD

Request for new wood trellis at 604 South Fairfax Street

Applicant: Marci Bonner

BAR #2022-00511 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 717 Ford's Landing Way

Applicant: Summit Roofing Contractors Inc.

BAR #2022-00517 OHAD

Request for Double entry door demolition at 1400 King Street

Applicant: Kien Tran

BAR #2022-00515 OHAD

Request for front door replacement at 305 Duke Street

Applicant: Candace E. Clary

BAR #2022-00527 OHAD

Request for front door replacement at 116 North Patrick Street: Unit 4

Applicant: James Nellis

BAR #2022-00528 PG

Request for James Hardie house wrap, corners and lap siding at 1007 Queen Street

Applicant: Kiley Arthur – Impact Remodeling LLC

BAR #2022-00525 OHAD

Request for sign approval at 605 Franklin Street

Applicant: Wanida Neal