

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

Alexandria Board of Architectural Review
Old & Historic Alexandria District

Wednesday, March 5, 2014

7:30pm, City Council Chambers, City Hall
301 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Members Present: Tom Hulfish, Chairman
Oscar Fitzgerald, Vice-Chairman
Peter Smeallie
Chip Carlin
Wayne Neale
Christine Roberts

Members Absent: John von Senden

Staff Present: Planning & Zoning
Al Cox, FAIA, Historic Preservation Manager
Catherine Miliaras, Historic Preservation Planner

The meeting was called to order at 7:37 p.m. by Chairman Hulfish.

I. MINUTES

Consideration of the minutes from the February 19, 2014 public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 5-0.

On a motion by Mr. Smeallie, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the minutes were approved, as submitted, 5-0 (Mr. Neale was not yet present).

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

No items were listed on the consent calendar.

III. NEW BUSINESS

1. CASE BAR2014-0037

Request for complete demolition at **220 South Union Street**

APPLICANT: Carr Hospitality by Rust Orling Architecture

BOARD ACTION: Deferred for restudy, 5-0-1 (Mr. Neale abstained).

Discussion of this item was combined with item #2, below.

2. CASE BAR2013-0321

Request for new construction at **220 South Union Street**

APPLICANT: Carr Hospitality by Rust Orling Architecture

BOARD ACTION: Deferred for restudy, 5-0-1 (Mr. Neale abstained).

SPEAKERS

Austin Flajser, Carr Hospitality, spoke in support of the project.

Mark Orling, project architect, spoke in support of the project. He also made a brief presentation addressing the comments raised in the staff report. He presented additional information and study on the following:

1. Study of adding gable at west end (applicant did not support this);
2. Revised drawings to have same windows at corner of Duke and South Union streets (applicant supports);
3. Will provide additional details at a later time (applicant supports);
4. Study of The Strand elevation with French doors with either metal or glass railings and a study with same windows from Duke Street elevation (applicant thought French doors and railings made fenestration too busy and expressed a preference for punched windows matching Duke Street);
5. Agreed that the lanterns will read as a glass element with minimal interior conflicts;
6. Will postpone sign plan and will soon provide a lighting plan;
7. Changed brick color of Building 3 to a terra cotta color (applicant prefers two color bricks instead of three);
8. Will show vent locations at the next submission. A garage vent will be located in the courtyard;
9. Mechanical equipment will be located on roof and area will be centralized and reduced;
10. Additional comments from report:
 - a. Study of two additional options with larger panes for ground floor windows (applicant supports all three)
 - b. Loading dock door will look like warehouse board and batten door and will provide additional details
 - c. Commented that a clerestory with piers at the fourth floor results in too much fenestration and not compatible with geometry of rooms

Bert Ely, 200 South Pitt Street, expressed concern with the proposal and supported deferral. He had major issues with the design finding it too massive for the site.

Michael Jennings, 10 Potomac Court, expressed concern that the size would overwhelm nearby townhouses. He supported a deferral to coordinate with the redevelopment of Robinson Terminal South.

Kathryn Papp, 504 Cameron Street, expressed concern with the size and design, finding it too static and plain. She questioned whether the Planning Commission acted within its purview.

Poul Hertel, 1217 Michigan Court, generally supported the plan but had many concerns including the top floor on Duke Street, the French doors on The Strand, and the details of the glass lanterns.

Beth Gibney, 300 South Lee Street, expressed concern for the project and recommended looking at the Capella Hotel in Washington, D.C. for an example of a simple design with high-quality materials.

Teschia Yonkers, 801 Rivergate Place, expressed concern finding the proposal to be incompatible, cold and lacking continuity among the three elements.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Chairman Hulfish made it clear that the mass and scale of the project were already approved by City Council and that, at this time, the BAR was only reviewing architectural details and finishes. He also noted that Mr. von Senden of the BAR had submitted comments that should be included in the minutes as official record. The Chairman then noted that new information had been presented and that there was a lot for the BAR to discuss. He, therefore, recommended that the project be deferred to allow for a work session as soon as possible.

Mr. von Senden was not in attendance but submitted the following comments, which the Chairman asked be included in the minutes:

To: Chairman Hulfish and members of the Board of Architectural Review

From: John C. von Senden, AIA

Regarding: BAR Case 2014-0037 – 220 South Union Street

In my absence please consider the following comments on the above referenced case:

1. The design for the hotel continues to improve; however the application is missing all of the information needed for a Certificate of Appropriateness. The application needs a comprehensive signage plan, as well as a comprehensive lighting plan. In addition, the application should include additional drawings to show the complete exterior design. Wall sections are not shown, neither are all of the exterior elevations. And finally, the details are only conceptually shown.
2. Regarding the site plans, I'm sure there will be some paving replaced; is the intent to replace the asphalt in kind? A different pavement at the car drop-off would make sense.
3. Regarding the building mass:
 - a. The plans nicely show how the organization of the building translates to the exterior elevations. The fifth floor plan shows that the sloped section of the roof could be shallower to better reflect the historic warehouses. Rooms 507 and 512 would need to be garrets or turned into a suite with rooms 508 and 511 respectively.
 - b. Most importantly, the roof massing needs to be better developed.
 - c. The proposed screening in particular does not work aesthetically.

- d. Sheet A8: This is the elevation one will see driving down Duke Street. The HVAC screening at the roof is a distraction. Would prefer to see the gable form from the east elevation carried throughout and reflected on the west – this would be visible coming down the hill.
 - e. Sheet A9: The roof needs to slope more – to better match the “Historic Waterfront Buildings” shown in the photographic insert. (Ideally the roof should slope at a 7:12 pitch – as that doesn’t appear practical, a 12:12 slope would be acceptable; more than that would not match the historic waterfront photographic insert.
4. Regarding the building elevations:
- a. The elevations nicely show the concept. Would need to see additional detail on the following: Cornice details (insets show concept only), Window heads and sills, Canopy details, Water table details (especially the head)
 - b. The stone water table should be a consistent elevation surrounding the building. Traditionally in Alexandria, this type of water table showed the original grade when the streets were lowered to fill in the marsh at the waterfront. Also, would prefer to see the windowsill and the water table better integrated. Like the transition from dark grey brick to stone at the water table (sheet A9); also like that they are a consistent elevation.
 - c. The window pattern on the ground level should match the doors. Also, if a certain percentage of windows need to be operable, then it would make sense to have the public space windows operable rather than room windows.
 - d. The pattern of the overhead sectional doors doesn’t work. Design something that evokes the old swing-type warehouse doors, but still works with a modern overhead sectional door.
 - e. Why the dark window lintels? They read as a distraction.
 - f. The second and third level windows are successful in this elevation (Sheet A9).
 - g. The fourth level windows should be different. You have, however informally, a Florentine Palazzo type development here and the upper level windows should be smaller scaled – almost even square.
 - h. While the fifth floor roof windows work in concept, I’m not sure how they’ll work when detailed. In this case fixed glazing to match the metal roof pans seems like it would be more successful.
 - i. The roof screening is really a distraction in this elevation (Sheet A9) (that’s a polite way of saying it is ugly).
 - j. Like the green-screen on the north side (Sheet A10). The assumption is this is temporary until the adjacent building is redeveloped. What thought has been given to the future expansion of this alleyway? Should the green-screen be the same height as the adjoining structure?
 - k. Really like the horizontal pattern of the side windows. Consider using the same design for all the street side ground level windows. Consider repeating the “G1” rail at the fourth level balconies rather than the pipe rail. The pipe rail is somewhat incongruous. You appear to show windows leading to the fourth level balconies, yet show railing (and figures) in the balcony. While the doors may want to read similar to the windows, they will necessarily be different.
 - l. While this may be a minority viewpoint, I believe the double floor windows in the center are successful

- m. Why the red brick for the inset portion (Sheet A11)? I believe you would be more successful with a consistent color. If you do want to differentiate this portion, I'd suggest a simpler cornice. This would look better and have a stronger traditional precedent.
 - n. While not in BAR purview, the perspective on Sheet A12 shows the desirability for moving overhead electrical service underground. (Not to mention it is also more reliable.)
5. Regarding lighting:
- a. What lighting will be provided for the stair to the garage? How will it keep from generating a point-source glare for pedestrians?
 - b. Like the proposed lights strung across the courtyard. Look forward to a comprehensive lighting plan.
- Hope these comments are helpful to the Board. Based upon the above comments, I support deferring the case so Rust Orling Architecture can complete the development of the hotel design.

Mr. Carlin made a motion to defer the application for further study and to schedule a work session as soon as possible. Ms. Roberts seconded the motion. The BAR deferred the project 5-0-1, with Mr. Neale abstaining.

REASON

The Board agreed with the staff recommendation for deferral and found that a work session was necessary because of the amount of new information.

3. **CASE BAR2014-0036**

Request for an addition & alterations at **5 Cameron Street**

APPLICANT: Blackwall Hitch Alexandria, LLC by Duncan W. Blair

BOARD ACTION: Partial demolition and capsulation approved, by a roll call vote, and alterations and addition deferred for restudy, 6-0.

Discussion for this item was combined with item #4, below.

4. **CASE BAR2014-0035**

Request to partially demolish & capsule at **5 Cameron Street**

APPLICANT: Blackwall Hitch Alexandria, LLC by Duncan W. Blair

BOARD ACTION: Partial demolition and capsulation approved, by a roll call vote, and alterations and addition deferred for restudy, 6-0.

SPEAKERS

Duncan Blair, representing the applicant, spoke in support of the project and responded to questions.

Dennis Burns, project architect, gave a presentation of the proposal and responded to questions. He noted that he was happy to work with staff on the recommendations listed in the staff report.

Poul Hertel, 1217 Michigan Court, recommended deferral for restudy.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Fitzgerald noted that this building was located in a very prominent location. He said the submission was not developed enough. He said that if the renderings were the true colors proposed, then he found it too dark. He requested additional information including samples of materials.

Mr. Neale observed it was a radical change and stated he was not convinced he liked it yet. He requested more developed drawings, including details, and materials samples, including a mock-up sample panel at the site. He thought the all black scheme was concerning and needed more relief and balance. He asked if the new glass would be tinted. The applicant confirmed that new glass would be clear but that the only glass being replaced was at the south terrace facing the City Marina.

Mr. von Senden was not in attendance but submitted the following comments, which the Chairman asked be included in the minutes:

To: Chairman Hulfish and members of the Board of Architectural Review

From: John C. von Senden, AIA

Regarding: BAR Case 2014-0035/36 – 5 Cameron Street

In my absence please consider the following comments on the above referenced case:

1. In general, this is a very good concept design; however it has insufficient detail for a Certificate of Appropriateness.
2. Regarding the site plan:
 - a. Access from the sailboat marina on the south side to the small craft marina on the north side is already tight. How is pedestrian access to be maintained (and encouraged? between these two waterfront areas?
 - b. How is site lighting going to be developed?
 - c. This is a minor (picky) point, but it would be nice if the site plan and the other plans had the same orientation.
3. Regarding the building plans:
 - a. Is the west entrance open to the public? It appears to be the only accessible entrance; if so, it shouldn't be relegated to a secondary status.
 - b. As noted above there appears to be no public passage through the exterior decks. The northwest corner appears especially tight.
 - c. Sheet A-2 is difficult to read; the assumption is that there are no changes to the mezzanine level (other than the roof demolition).

4. Regarding the elevations:
 - a. The changes appear to improve the appearance and function of the building.
 - b. Would like additional detailing on the butt-lapped siding – how will it weather over time?
 5. Regarding building colors:
 - a. The renderings appear to show different colors; while this may be an artifact of the rendering, it confuses the design intent.
 - b. The roof should be as light as possible; both from an environmental perspective as well as an aesthetic one.
 - c. Agree with the staff question regarding the intent and extent of the polishing of the mezzanine lanterns. Please provide more information.
 6. Regarding signage: The sign plan appears appropriate.
- Based upon the above I support the staff recommendation to defer the case unit the design can be fully developed.

Mr. Neale made a motion to approve the Permit to Demolish and to defer the Certificate of Appropriateness for further study, including pursuing the staff comments, and more information. The motion was seconded by Dr. Fitzgerald and the motion carried, by a roll call vote, 6-0.

REASON

The Board agreed with the staff recommendation for deferral, requesting more information and details, including better developed drawings and materials samples.

5. CASE BAR2014-0028

Request to partially demolish & capsule at **1201 E Abingdon Dr.**

APPLICANT: 1201 Parkway Center, LLC c/o Principal Real Estate Investors, LLC (CBRE, Inc. as agent for owner by Louis Gauci, OTJ Architects)

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as amended, by roll call vote, 6-0.

Discussion for this item was combined with item #6, below.

6. CASE BAR2014-0035

Request for alterations at **1201 E Abingdon Dr.**

APPLICANT: 1201 Parkway Center, LLC c/o Principal Real Estate Investors, LLC (CBRE, Inc. as agent for owner by Louis Gauci, OTJ Architects)

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as amended, by roll call vote, 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The elevator penthouse remain unpainted red brick that matches the building;
2. The new EIFS may not exceed 15 feet in height from the top of the roof; and
3. The new screening must be painted a light grey color with final approval of the color and material finish by staff.

SPEAKERS

Lou Gauci, representing the applicant, spoke in support of the project.

Sarah Kimbrough, 529 Bellvue Place and representing the Pitt Street Station Homeowners Association, spoke in support of the project and urged that it be done quickly as the existing metal panels are a hazard when they blow off the building.

Poul Hertel, 1217 Michigan Court, found the existing panels to be ugly and supported the removal but expressed concern about the visibility of the rooftop equipment from Washington Street.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had minimal discussion on this item. Mr. Neale inquired whether the renderings were accurate and whether staff would review the color and wall finish material sample (yes, according to staff and applicant). On a motion by Mr. Smeallie, seconded by Dr. Fitzgerald, the proposal was approved as amended, by a roll call vote, 6-0.

REASON

The Board agreed with the staff recommendation.

7. CASE BAR2014-0030

Request to partially demolish & capsule at **700 S Lee St**

APPLICANT: Tyler & Caroline Schropp by Patrick Camus

BOARD ACTION: **Approved as amended by roll call vote, 6-0.**

Discussion for this item was combined with item #8, below.

8. CASE BAR2014-0031

Request for an addition & alterations at **700 S Lee St**

APPLICANT: Tyler & Caroline Schropp by Patrick Camus

BOARD ACTION: **Approved as amended by roll call vote, 6-0.**

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The statements in archaeology conditions below shall appear in the General Notes of all site plans and on all site plan sheets that involve demolition or ground disturbance (including Basement/Foundation Plans, Demolition, Erosion and Sediment Control, Grading, Landscaping, Utilities, and Sheeting and Shoring) so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements:
 - a. The applicant/developer shall call Alexandria Archaeology immediately (703-746-4399) if any buried structural remains (wall foundations, wells, privies, cisterns, etc.) or concentrations of artifacts are discovered during development. Work must cease in the area of the discovery until a City archaeologist comes to the site and records the finds.
 - b. The applicant/developer shall not allow any metal detection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

SPEAKERS

Patrick Camus, project architect, spoke in support of the project and responded to questions.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had no discussion on this item. On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the proposal was approved as amended, by a roll call vote, 6-0.

REASON

The Board agreed with the staff recommendation.

9. CASE BAR2014-0032

Request to partially demolish & capsule at **100 Quay Street**

APPLICANT: Magaly Galdo-Hirst & Thompson M. Hirst by Karen Conkey

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended by roll call vote, 6-0.

Discussion for this item was combined with item #10, below.

10. CASE BAR2014-0035

Request for an addition & alterations at **100 Quay Street**

APPLICANT: Magaly Galdo-Hirst & Thompson M. Hirst by Karen Conkey

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended by roll call vote, 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. That the dormer have a shed roof instead of a flat roof;
2. That the side windows on the dormer have two vertical muntins;
3. That the owners consider an alternate paint color than the current white.

SPEAKERS

Karen Conkey, project architect, spoke in support of the project and responded to questions.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Smeallie did not care for the all-glass dormer.

Mr. Carlin agreed with Mr. Smeallie regarding the dormer and the side windows.

Dr. Fitzgerald stated he generally did not favor shed dormers but that in this case it was fitting with the new architectural character of the project.

Ms. Roberts thought that the side windows on the new dormer need an additional muntin to be in keeping with the new style of the townhouse.

Mr. Neale spoke in support of the new architectural style and different end treatment for the end unit of this row of townhouses. He did have trouble reconciling the existing iron

security bars with the new style. He thought the flat roof dormer has too much contrast and recommended that a shed roof dormer would be a better fit with the existing building mass but supported Ms. Roberts' recommendation for muntins in the triangular side windows. He also felt strongly that the townhouse would better fit with the context of the neighborhood if it were painted a color other than white. He strongly urged the architect and applicant to consider painting the house a different color.

On a motion by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the Board voted to approved the application, as amended, by a roll call vote, 6-0.

REASON

The Board was very supportive of the new, contemporary architectural character for the fenestration in this end unit townhouse. The Board made a few suggestions for design revisions but believed that the essential side gable building form was unchanged and compatible with the surrounding late 20th century townhouses in this part of the district.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

11. BAR2013-0437

An informal work session with public testimony regarding the proposed development at **206-212 S Patrick St**

Chairman Hulfish recused himself from the discussion.

SPEAKERS

Steve Kulinski, project architect, introduced the project and gave a brief presentation.

Poul Hertel, 1217 Michigan Court, expressed concern, finding the new townhouses too tall and the historic townhouse marginalized. He advocated making the historic townhouse the centerpiece of the development.

Stephan Paul, 206A South Patrick Street, expressed concerns regarding the demolition adjacent to his property. He spoke in support of maintaining all of the historic brick townhouse.

Daniel Turney, 916 Prince Street, works at a property abutting the project site. He expressed concern with encroachment into the alley. He thought the front elevations appeared flat compared to the historic building. He also expressed concern about the modern design of the rear of the townhouses which would be seen near the alley building.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts thought the new townhouses were too tall and that the height should be pushed down. She did not support a third story addition on the historic building. She was concerned that the northernmost townhouse (206) was too big and became too much of the focal point.

Mr. Neale approved of raising the roof on the historic townhouse, noting that buildings change over time. He liked the varying setbacks of the new townhouses. He thought the stoops needed more study to be bolder and heavier. He supported the mansard style roofs but preferred a different dormer form. He found the height appropriate fronting on North Patrick Street, noting that it made the townhouses appear more stately. He stated that he disagreed with most of the staff comments, except that he agreed the upper part of the southernmost townhouse should be brick. He felt consternation about the use of fiber cement panels, particularly on the north elevation and on the rear elevations believing them not to be a high quality material for the historic district. He requested more information and study on the panels.

Mr. Smeallie liked the three new townhouses on the southern portion but had a problem with adding a third story to the historic townhouse, wanting the historic nature to be predominant. He also said that the rear elevations needed work as they looked too suburban.

Mr. Carlin agreed that there should be no modifications to the front of the historic building. He suggested looking at the cement panels more carefully. He noted that the interior parking court at the rear was a common area, more than an alley, and advised that the proposed design should consider that public view when addressing the rear elevations, fencing and landscape.

Dr. Fitzgerald did not support a third story on the historic townhouse. He thought the overall design of the project was fairly bland but keeping the roof of the historic townhouse added some variety. He favored traditional dormers instead of shed dormers.

Mr. von Senden was not in attendance but sent the following comments:

1. Strongly support the staff recommendation regarding the historic fabric at 206 South Patrick. As I've often stated before, if we don't properly maintain our existing historic fabric, then we don't have a historic district. (While the plans label 206 as restoration, the rest of the drawings show an adaptive reuse.)
2. The western elevations appear very repetitive – perhaps too much so. Maintaining the existing roofline of 206 and varying the others would be an improvement.
3. The proposed north elevation is not appealing; the vertical panels disrupt the aesthetics and the third floor transition needs to be developed.
4. I'm not opposed to the use of cement panels, but their use in the north and west needs to be carefully considered.
5. Really like the play aspect of the eastern elevation. The east elevation of 206 is substantially changed; however, such a change can be better supported here.
6. Do need to ask why the change from siding to brick on the rear portion of the south elevation of 206; it would be better to maintain the siding, especially as you appear to be maintaining the trim. If the existing siding is beyond being serviceable, then hardi-plank would be a better choice.
7. Regarding the block mass studies: they do a very good job of hiding the mass of the development; however, it would be much more useful to show such a massing study

from the street at a 6-foot eyelevel point of view. In either case the overall massing appears appropriate – keeping in mind Comment 2 above.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Hulfish adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:38 pm.

Minutes submitted by,

Catherine Miliaras, Preservation Planner
Board of Architectural Review