

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

Board of Architectural Review  
**Wednesday, December 21, 2022**  
7:00 p.m., City Council Chamber  
City Hall

Members Present: James Spencer, Chair  
Robert Adams  
Andrew Scott  
Margaret Miller

Members Absent: Theresa del Ninno, Christine Sennott, Michael Lyons

Secretary: Bill Conkey, AIA, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Marina Novaes, Historic Preservation Planner

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**II. MINUTES**

2. Consideration of minutes from the December 7, 2022 meeting.

**BOARD ACTION:**

On a motion by Ms. Miller, and seconded by Mr. Scott, the Board of Architectural Review approved the December 7, 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:** On a motion by Ms. Miller, and seconded by Mr. Adams, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2022-00501 with staff recommendations. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

**REASON**

The Board found the design appropriate and agreed with staff recommendations.

**SPEAKERS**

Cathy Puskar with Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, represented the applicant, gave a brief summary of the project, and was available to answer questions.

Jason Louis, Construction Manager for the Catholic Diocese of Arlington, was available to answer questions.

## **DISCUSSION**

Ms. Miller asked several questions about the height of the proposed columbarium. Otherwise, there was no discussion.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **4. BAR#2022-00521 OHAD**

Request for Alterations at 130 Prince Street

Applicant: Greg Wilson and Kathleen Cummings

**BOARD ACTION:** On a motion by Mr. Adams, and seconded by Mr. Scott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2022-00521. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

## **REASON**

The Board found the proposal appropriate and agreed with staff's recommendation.

## **SPEAKERS**

Mr. Greg Wilson, the property owner, gave a brief explanation about the project and was available to answer any questions.

## **DISCUSSION**

Mr. Spencer was concerned that the new proposed door with transom would be higher than the existing and, therefore, more visible from the public way. Mr. Wilson explained that the existing window, which is being replaced with the door/transom, also has a transom and the overall height will be the same.

Mr. Scott had a question about the proposed reclaimed window, asking Mr. Wilson to assure that it will match the original. Mr. Wilson explained that he had replaced all the windows on the house and had salvaged several; he is planning to reuse one that matches the ones on that elevation. There was no further discussion.

### **5 & 6. BAR#2022-00529 OHAD**

Request for demolition/encapsulation at 329 North Washington Street

Applicant: Hershel Kleinberg and Lisa Cohen

### **BAR#2022-00530 OHAD**

Request for Alterations at 329 North Washington Street

Applicant: Hershel Kleinberg and Lisa Cohen

**BOARD ACTION:** By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR#2022-00529 and BAR#2022-00530.

## **REASON**

The Board felt that the design needed a bit more refinement as well as documentation as to how the design would fit into the Washington Street streetscape.

## **SPEAKERS**

Teri MacKeever with CARNEMARK represented the applicant, gave a brief summary with background information, and was available to answer questions.

Dan Covey, also with CARNEMARK, was also available to answer questions.

Gail Rothrock represented the Historic Alexandria Foundation and expressed the opinion that the proposed metal cladding does not fit into the design of the building, which has an HAF plaque. She recommended that metal only be used on portions not visible from Washington Street. She also disliked the casement windows, but appreciated that they differentiate old from new.

## **DISCUSSION**

Mr. Spencer asked about the current condition of the later addition. Mr. Conkey explained the situation.

Ms. Miller asked questions regarding the age of the addition, its visibility from a public right of way, and the color of the proposed metal cladding. Mr. Spencer noted that the proposed metal cladding would match the previously-approved cladding for the elevator shaft.

Ms. Miller asked about casement windows and Ms. MacKeever explained that they would tie in with the existing and would provide egress, which double hungs do not.

Mr. Scott praised the design and the fact that it distinguishes the new addition from the original.

Mr. Adams noted the importance of Washington Street and expressed a preference for something more residential that would fit in better with neighbors. He felt that the metal would be too contemporary for the site, suggested using metal on the first floor only.

Mr. Scott asked to see the Washington Street Standards, explaining that metal siding has ample precedent. He found the design to be beautiful and liked the color and contrast to the color of the original building. He suggested that the applicant point to some precedent on Washington Street to strengthen the argument for approval, as the Washington Street Standards discourage “untried approaches.” Mr. Conkey suggested studying the Cotton Factory, approved by the BAR.

Mr. Adams pointed out that the 300 block of North Washington was more residential with finer buildings than the Cotton Factory, which is more industrial.

Mr. Spencer had no concerns with the minimal approach. He liked the design and felt that Mr. Scott made good points. He mentioned a historic building on North Washington Street with a metal bay which indicated that metal on this street is not new and untried. He felt that the proposed addition is set back and therefore less prominent. He stated that it is an excellent design.

Ms. Miller suggested finding more common elements with the existing portion of the house. She mentioned a home at Gibbon and South Lee with a modern addition approved by the BAR. This addition has the same color brick as the original portion of the house and therefore blends better. Mr. Spencer explained that additions should not match brick in color, that it doesn’t work. Mr. Scott and Mr. Spencer both greatly prefer the 329 N. Washington proposed addition to the one at Gibbon and South Lee.

7. **BAR#2022-00534 PG**  
Request for Alterations at 319 North Alfred Street  
Applicant: Harold White

**BOARD ACTION:** By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR#2022-00534.

**REASON**

The Board expressed concern regarding the after the fact approval of the installation of piping on the building exterior and asked the applicant to explore options.

**SPEAKERS**

Harold White, applicant, presented the proposal

Gail Rothrock, representing HAF, was opposed to the after the fact approval of the piping installed on the exterior and was concerned about the impact of the appearance on the building. She also expressed concern regarding the damage to the existing brick from the wall penetrations.

Steve Milone, representing OTCA, noted that the Design Guidelines make reference to the concealment of electrical conduits at the building exterior. He noted that when the work on the building interior was completed, the piping could have been installed inside the building.

**DISCUSSION**

Mr. Scott asked the applicant to explain what drives the location of the piping. The applicant noted the location of the interior units. Mr. Scott asked if an option to install the piping within the building had been explored. The applicant noted that this option had not been presented to him by the installer. Mr. Scott stated that he was not concerned regarding the after the fact nature of the project but was instead concerned about the adherence to the Design Guidelines.

Ms. Miller stated that the policy of the BAR has been that HVAC equipment should be concealed and agreed with the staff recommendations that the piping should be relocated.

Mr. Spencer asked the applicant if he had spoken to contractors regarding the relocation of the piping to the interior. The applicant stated that contractors had cautioned against this installation. Mr. Spencer stated that he agreed with staff recommendations.

At this time the Chair took a straw poll of the Board members. All members present indicate that they would not approve the application.

The applicant indicated that he would like a deferral in order to explore options.

A motion to approve the request for deferral was made by Mr. Scott, seconded by Mr. Adams, and approved unanimously.

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

The Board of Architectural Review adjourned at 8:40 pm.

**9. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

BAR #2022-00536 OHAD

Request for removal of existing antennas and replacement CBAND antennas at 501 Slaters Lane Unit: 101

Applicant: AT&T/ New Cingular Wireless PCS LLC

BAR #2022-00546 OHAD

Request for window replacements at 516 Oronoco Street

Applicant: Stella Kim

BAR #2022-00547 OHAD

Request for door replacement at 516 Oronoco Street

Applicant: Stella Kim

BAR #2022-00545 OHAD

Request for entry stoop existing brick repair at 516 Oronoco Street

Applicant: Stella Kim

BAR #2022-00544 OHAD

Request for shingle roof replacement at 516 Oronoco Street

Applicant: Stella Kim

BAR #2022-00538 OHAD

Request for removal of leasing banner at 110 N Royal Street

Applicant: Metro Sign and Design, Inc.