

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

Board of Architectural Review  
**Wednesday, May 17, 2023**  
7:00 p.m., City Council Chamber  
City Hall

Members Present:

Andrew Scott  
Michael Lyons  
Theresa del Ninno  
James Spencer  
Bud Adams  
Nastaran Zandian  
Margaret Miller

Members Absent:

Secretary: Bill Conkey, AIA, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Brendan Harris, Historic Preservation Planner

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**II. MINUTES**

Consideration of minutes from the May 4, 2023 meeting.

**BOARD ACTION:** On a motion by Mr. Lyons, and seconded by Ms. Miller, the Board of Architectural Review approved the May 4, 2023 Meeting minutes, as submitted.

**Deferrals Requested**

**3**

**BAR #2023-00163 OHAD**

Request for signage at 108 N Fairfax Street  
Applicant: Sheila McGraw

**BOARD ACTION:** On a motion by Mr. Lyons, and seconded by Mr. Scott, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2023-00163. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

**4**

**BAR #2023-00185 OHAD**

Request for signage at 111 S Pitt Street  
Applicant: Sheila McGraw

**BOARD ACTION:** On a motion by Mr. Lyons, and seconded by Mr. Scott, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2023-00185. The motion

carried on a vote of 7-0.

5.

**BAR #2023-00186 OHAD**

Request for signage at 220 N Union Street

Applicant: Sheila McGraw

**BOARD ACTION:** On a motion by Mr. Lyons, and seconded by Mr. Scott, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2023-00186. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

6.

**BAR #2023-00174 OHAD**

Request for signage at 700 King Street

Applicant: MG Permits – Gary Brent

**BOARD ACTION:** On a motion by Mr. Lyons, and seconded by Mr. Scott, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2023-00174. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

## Items Previously Deferred

7&8

**BAR#2022 – 00524 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/encapsulation at 424 S Lee Street

Applicant: Charles Enoch

**BAR#2022-00526 OHAD**

Request for addition and alterations at 424 S Lee Street

Applicant: Charles Enoch

**BOARD ACTION:** On a motion by Ms. Miller, and seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2022-00524 and BAR#2022-00526 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

**CONDITION OF APPROVAL**

1. The windows and doors on the proposed second story addition comply with the *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications in the Historic Districts*.
2. The applicant work with staff to allow a window on the proposed frontal gable.

**REASON**

The Board felt that either option presented by the architect is appropriate and left to the owner's discretion to opt for one or another.

**SPEAKERS**

Cathleen Curtin, the project architect, was available to answer any questions.

Bonnie Rideout, resident at 5 Potomac Ct, stated that she did not have any issue with the project design, however she was concerned with the construction phase of the project blocking the pedestrian pathway existing between the properties and the possible damage of

construction vehicles. Mr. Conkey explained that construction oversight is done by the Code Administration and Transportation and Environmental Services departments. He would be glad to give Ms. Rideout their contact information.

### **DISCUSSION**

Ms. del Ninno stated that she did not have a preference for any of the two roof line options. Ms. Curtin stated that the owner prefers option number two with the gable roof over the new addition.

Mr. Adams agreed that either option (1 or 2) is fine, he stated that the gable roof is more compatible with residential buildings in his opinion. Mr. Adams also stated that he did not have a problem with the proposed decorative vent being replaced with a window as the owner requested.

Mr. Scott stated that he would support either option, suggesting leaving it at the owner's discretion. There was no further discussion.

**9**

### **BAR#2023-00143 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 115 King Street

Applicant: Landini Restaurant, Inc./ Noe Landini

**BOARD ACTION:** On a motion by Ms. Miller, and seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2023-00143 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

### **REASON**

The Board stated that with a limited intrusion into the public right of way, the proposed mechanical ductwork would not detract from the overall block face.

### **SPEAKERS**

Duncan Blair, attorney and Meghan Scott, project architect discussed potential options and were available to respond to questions.

### **DISCUSSION**

Mr. Scott noted his appreciation for the additional options provided by the applicant. He asked the applicant if the proposed ductwork would extend to the ground. The applicant responded that it would stop above the sidewalk.

Ms. del Ninno asked the applicant why the ductwork needs to extend lower than the first floor ceiling. The applicant described how the ducts enter the first floor space.

Mr. Scott asked if the ductwork could be routed through the second floor. The applicant noted that this would require the removal of historic fabric at the second floor.

Ms. del Ninno asked if the duct work could be redesigned to allow for less projection from the wall. The applicant stated that they would explore all potential options.

Ms. Zandian pointed out that when the proportion of the ductwork changes it should remain

between the existing windows.

Ms. Miller stated that she preferred the most recent option and asked that the applicant consider painting the duct work.

Mr. Lyons appreciated the exploration of possible options and noted that this is a service alley and that the focus for the building is from King Street.

Ms. del Ninno expressed her disappointment that an option routing the ductwork through the second floor is not feasible. She noted her preference for the least possible projection from the exterior wall and the highest possible entry point at the exterior wall.

Mr. Adams agreed that it would be preferable for the duct work to enter the building at the highest point possible above the sidewalk.

Mr. Scott stated his preference for an option that reduces the overall depth of the duct work. He noted that the interior information on the second floor that was provided by the applicant helped him to understand the possible routing of the duct work.

Ms. Zandian noted her preference for option D.

Ms. Miller stated that if the duct work is painted, the painting should stop at the roofline.

Mr. Spencer told the applicant that he appreciates the inclusion of a variety of options in this submission. He noted that this is a service alley, and the installation of exposed duct work does not change the character of the alley. He expressed a preference that the ductwork not be painted in order to limit the maintenance requirements.

Mr. Scott referenced a recent case where a homeowner was required to removed exposed coolant lines on the exterior of their structure and stated that this case is different because of the architectural context.

Ms. Miller made a motion that the application be approved with staff recommendations and that the applicant work with staff in the field on the final placement of the ductwork. She noted that the painting of the ductwork be left to the discretion of the applicant.

Ms. del Ninno added a condition that the ductwork be limited from protruding into the alley any more than 24".

## **New Business**

### **10&11 BAR#2023-00177 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 114 N Alfred Street

Applicant: William Cromley

### **BAR#2023-00178 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/encapsulation at 114 N Alfred Street  
Applicant: William Cromley

**BOARD ACTION:** On a motion by Ms. Miller, and seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2023-00177 and BAR #2023-00178 with staff recommendations. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

### **REASON**

The Board found the design appropriate and in conformance with the *Design Guidelines*.

### **SPEAKERS**

William Cromley, project manager, represented the homeowners. He summarized the project and was available to answer questions.

### **DISCUSSION**

Mr. Scott asked if Mr. Cromley had considered not adding a pediment to the proposed east entry door. Mr. Cromley explained that they had considered various options and felt that the entry would look too plain without a pediment. They explored various plain and elaborate door options and found this to be the best option. Mr. Scott found the overall design to be lovely.

Mr. Adams wondered if Mr. Cromley could use plinths or pots to demarcate the front door instead of adding a pediment, or perhaps a flattened version of the pediment. Mr. Cromley noted that the entry must read as a front door, and that they had considered that option as well. He stated that as a former Board member he understood that the project meets the *Design Guidelines* and that design decisions should be made by the owner and designer, not redesigned by Board members.

Ms. Zandian asked if the applicant had considered mimicking the second-floor windows with a keystone instead of a pediment. Mr. Cromley said they considered that, but it was too plain and the owner didn't want it.

Ms. Miller praised the project and felt that the front door needed the proposed improvement.

Mr. Spencer discussed with Mr. Conkey whether or not creating a door in this window opening could be considered a restoration. They agreed that it is a restoration, as it returns the opening to a previous condition.

Ms. Del Ninno expressed support for returning the front entry to its previous location. She found the new elevation to be appropriate and balanced, improving the appearance of the elevation.

Mr. Lyons completely supported the project as submitted.

Mr. Spencer thanked Mr. Cromley for another nice design. He felt that this is how the design should have been all along. His only concern was that this new feature would look original, competing with the historic fabric, but he still had no issue with the design.

Ms. Miller motioned to approve the case with staff recommendations: Window glazing must be clear, non-reflective, and without tint. Alexandria Archaeology must be contacted if any structural remains or artifacts are found, and the developer may not permit any metal detection on the property or allow independent parties to collect or excavate artifacts.

**12**

**BAR#2023-00179 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/encapsulation at 220 S Fairfax Street

Applicant: Addison and Greg Perkins

**BOARD ACTION:** On a motion by Mr. Lyons, and seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2023-00179 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

**REASON**

None of the Board members objected to the project.

**SPEAKERS**

None.

**DISCUSSION**

Ms. Miller asked how old the rear wall of the rear ell is. Mrs. Conkey responded that the exact age is unknown but it is likely from the 1970s and will be encapsulated, not demolished.

**13&14**

**BAR#2023-00181 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 625 First and 510 Second Street

Applicant: EAHG Alexandria LP

**BAR#2023-00183 OAHD**

Request for partial demolition/encapsulation at 625 First and 510 Second Street

Applicant: EAHG Alexandria LP

**BOARD ACTION:** On a motion by Mr. Adams, and seconded by Ms. Zandian, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2023-00181 and BAR #2023-00183 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

**REASON**

The Board supported the application as submitted.

**SPEAKERS**

Cathy Puskar, attorney, introduced the project.

**DISCUSSION**

The Board approved the project without discussion.

**BAR#2023-00161 OHAD**

Request for demolition/encapsulation at 301 N Fairfax Street

Applicant: 301 N Fairfax Project Owner LLC

**BOARD ACTION:** On a motion by Ms. del Ninno, and seconded by Mr. Scott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2023-00161 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-2.

**REASON**

The Board found that none of the criteria listed in the zoning ordinance regarding the proposed demolition of a structure were met and that the approval to demolish should be granted.

**SPEAKERS**

Cathy Puskar, the attorney for the applicant, introduced the proposal and was available to respond to any questions.

Michael Maibach, 325 Queen Street, expressed that he does not support the proposed demolition because the existing building does not negatively impact the neighborhood and the proposed construction will cause parking issues.

Virginia Agee, 314 Queen Street, stated that the existing building increases property values by providing additional parking.

Tom Lubnow, 314 Queen Street, asked the Board not to consider the demolition of this building without considering the design for the replacement. He was concerned about the potential demolition of other nearby buildings and that the demolition will result in an empty lot.

Michael Treptow, 111 Queen Street, asked the Board to consider the proposed design when considering the demolition.

Pamela Callahan, 317 Queen Street, expressed concern that the proposed demolition will cause damage to existing historic structures.

Scott Corzine, 300 Queen Street, expressed concern that the demolition activity will be disruptive and asked for a bond to pay for damage to neighboring structures.

Anna Bergman, 300 Queen Street, noted concerns about the existing cable and internet service and asked that any demolition be coordinated with service providers.

Tom Foley, 315 Queen Street, noted that the proposed demolition will cause traffic issues, damage property and has the potential for hazardous materials to be released. He stated that criteria 5 applied since the existing structure is better than the proposed.

Cathy Puskar, attorney for the applicant noted that the public comments were not related to the criteria listed in the zoning ordinance and were instead related to the proposed design to be considered in the concept review.

## **DISCUSSION**

Mr. Scott thanked the neighbors for their attention to the project but noted that many of their concerns were related to topics that are not within the purview of the BAR. He had not heard any argument that the building is historic and meets the specific criteria in the zoning ordinance. He expressed support for the application.

Ms. del Ninno stated that the building does not contribute to the historic district and supports the application.

Ms. Miller noted the size of the existing building and requested a deferral to allow for additional study.

Ms. Zandian stated that the existing building is not historic and supports the application.

Mr. Adams understood the concerns of neighbors and asked if an adaptive reuse of the building could be possible.

Mr. Lyons appreciated the concern of the neighbors but found no reason to deny the application.

Mr. Spencer expressed sympathy with the neighbors regarding the construction activity but noted that this is not within the purview of the BAR and supports the proposed application.

## **Other Business**

**16**

### **BAR#2023-00162 OHAD**

Request for concept review at 301 N Fairfax Street

Applicant: 301 N Fairfax Project Owner LLC

### **SPEAKERS**

Cathy Puskar, attorney for the applicant, introduced the project.

Michael Winstanley and Leejung Hong, project architects, presented the design for the project.

Ellen Mosher, 324 North Saint Asaph Street, stated that the scale and massing of the proposed building is not appropriate for the historic district. She shared photographs of buildings that she felt were more appropriate.

Virginia Agee, 314 Queen Street, was concerned about the effects of the proposed project on parking in the vicinity.

Allen Krinsmen, 314 North Fairfax Street, asked the Board to compare the proposed design to the height and scale of nearby properties. He noted that this design should be compatible



with the architecture of Old Town North.

Tom Foley, 315 Queen Street, noted the Zoning Ordinance requirement for compatibility between proposed structures and the existing fabric and stated that the proposed design is not compatible with the historic district.

Michael Maibach, 325 Queen Street, reviewed the historical significance of the vicinity of the proposed building, noting that the submitted design is not in keeping with this notable history.

Scott Corzine, 300 Queen Street, stated that the proposed design does not include a classical base-middle-top design and that it should include additional setbacks.

Aaron Szablo, 317 Queen Street, stated his concern about the lack of notification for the project and the limited public outreach.

Andrew Dabranky, 335 North Pitt Street, described the style of the proposed design as industrial and stark. He asked if this building would ever acquire its own historic significance.

Greg Golubin, 2015 Scroggins, noted that the design includes limited landscaping and no visual interest.

Ann Shack, 501 Tobacco Quay, described the recently complete Bus Barn building as an unsuccessful design and compared the proposed design to this building, noting that it is also not compatible with the historic district.

Sean Hanel, 226 North Union Street, asked the Board to consider the context for the proposed building when considering the design.

Cathy Puskar, attorney representing the applicant, appreciated all of the public comments and noted that the applicant had followed all of the zoning requirements regarding notification. She noted the recent projects in the historic district that have been completed by the architect.

## **DISCUSSION**

Ms. Miller thanked the applicant for the presentation and noted that the submitted drawings do not reflect the character of the design as presented. She stated that the perception of the presented design is that of a four story building with a setback at the upper level, not a three story massing with a significantly recessed upper level. She asked the applicant to clarify the uses on the ground floor. The applicant noted the ground floor residential units facing North Fairfax and the Lobby/Amenity spaces facing Queen Street.

Ms. Miller noted that the open parking area on the ground floor of the existing building gives it the appearance of being shorter than it is. She asked for clarification regarding the

size of the building and whether it is two discrete buildings or a single building. The applicant stated that the building is approximately 62,800 square feet and that it is one building broken into two massings. The applicant noted that the proposed building has a larger footprint than the existing and has a slab to slab height of eleven feet with an overall height of fifty feet.

Ms. Miller asked the applicant for clarification on the proposed tracery. The applicant described this as a decorative element that has not yet been fully designed.

Ms. Miller stated that the design could use an additional hyphen to break down the massing. She agreed with staff recommendations regarding patterns at the north elevation and limiting the use of fiber cement panels.

Mr. Scott suggested that the applicant explore ways in which the Queen Street façade could be set back more or reference the building at the south east corner of the intersection. He also suggested that the garage entry be relocated to the east elevation.

Mr. Scott noted that the building has both strong horizontal and vertical elements that are competing with one another and recommended that the composition be simplified. He also repeated the concern for the extensive use of fiber cement panels.

Mr. Lyons expressed concern that the proposed design is not compatible with the existing buildings in the next block of Queen Street.

Ms. del Ninno asked the applicant to describe the height of the proposed building relative to the neighboring buildings and to explain the location of any rooftop equipment. The applicant stated that the building to the east of the site is five stories with an approximately ten foot drop in elevation over the course of the block. All rooftop equipment will be placed at the center of the site to limit visibility from a public right of way.

Ms. del Ninno stated that the height and massing as submitted is too large and that the proposed building should be compatible with the nearby context.

Mr. Adams expressed support for the basic design of the elevations but asked that the south west corner of the building be modified to more compatible to the buildings across the street. He further asked for greater variation in the design of the North Fairfax Street elevation.

Mr. Spencer approved of the basic design parti and recommended that the hyphen separating the two masses be more dramatic and include a variation in height to further separate the parts of the building.

Mr. Spencer noted that because of the visibility of the site, the building does not have a side elevation and that the east elevation should be considered as carefully as the two street facing elevations. He suggested that the south elevation should have a reference to the unique building across Queen Street and asked the applicant to explore options for the south

west corner of the building and how it relates to the adjacent sidewalk.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Board of Architectural Review adjourned at 11:05 pm.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

BAR#2023-00167 PG

Request for front window replacements at 916 Princess Street

Applicant: Mark Zavack

BAR#2023-00169 OHAD

Request for in kind tuckpointing mortar at 619 N Columbus Street

Applicant: Renaissance Development

BAR#2023-00194 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 512 N Columbus Street

Applicant: Alexandria Roofing Company

BAR#2023-00195 OHAD

Request for front step metal railing installation at 1112 King Street

Applicant: Jennifer J Park

BAR#2023-00196 OHAD

Request for full frame window replacements at 725 S Alfred Street

Applicant: Tim Riley / The Neher Group

BAR#2023-00197 OHAD

Request for existing wood siding and trim replacement at 113 S West Street

Applicant: 113 S West Street Condominium Unit Owners Association

BAR#2023-00198 OHAD

Request for steel lintel replacements and masonry repair at 610-688 S Columbus Street & 627-655

Applicant: Kim Kendrick