

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

Alexandria Board of Architectural Review  
Old & Historic Alexandria District

**Wednesday December 17, 2014**  
7:30pm, City Council Chambers, City Hall  
301 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Members Present: Oscar Fitzgerald, Chairman  
John von Senden, Vice-Chairman  
Chip Carlin  
Kelly Finnigan  
Margaret Miller  
Wayne Neale  
Christine Roberts

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

The meeting was called to order at 7:32 p.m. by Chairman Oscar Fitzgerald.

---

**I. MINUTES**

Consideration of the minutes from the December 3, 2014 public hearing.

**BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 6-0.**

On a motion by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mr. von Senden, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review approved the minutes of December 3, 2014, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

---

**II. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**1. CASE BAR2014-00387**

Request for signage at **215 King St.**  
Applicant: Stratosphere, LLC.

**2. CASE BAR2014-00391**

Request for a revision of approved plans at **818 S Royal St.**  
Applicant: Carol Feintheil

**BOARD ACTION:** On a motion by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Cases #2014-00387 and #2014-00391, as submitted and on consent. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

---

### **III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED**

#### **3. CASE BAR2014-00378**

Request to partially demolish and capsulate at **214 South Alfred Street** and for after-the-fact demolition of a garage.

Applicant: Amy and Michael Louis

**BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Mr. von Senden, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve #2014-00378 for after-the-fact demolition of the garage, as amended. The motion carried 5-1-1, with Mr. Neale voting in opposition. Ms. Miller abstained.**

#### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

The Board directed staff to enforce applicable fines from the Zoning Ordinance for demolition without a Permit to Demolish.

This case was combined with CASE BAR 2014-00379, below, for discussion purposes.

#### **4. CASE BAR2014-00379**

Request for alterations, addition and signage at **214 South Alfred Street**.

Applicant: Amy and Michael Louis

**BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Mr. von Senden, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to defer #2014-00379 for further study of the appropriateness of demolition of the historic rear ell. The motion carried 6-0-1. Ms. Miller abstained.**

#### **SPEAKERS**

Stephanie Dimond, representing the applicant, gave an overview of the project, provided additional materials and responded to questions.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Roberts inquired about the date of construction of the garage. The Sanborn maps indicate that it was constructed between 1921 and 1931. She supported restudy to review of the inherent quality of the existing brick on the rear ell and the benefit of keeping it.

Mr. Neale supported the application as designed.

Mr. von Senden supported a deferral for further study and to work through discrepancies represented by the applicant about the age and condition of the rear ell. He also proposed that a fine be applied for the after-the-fact demolition of the garage.

Mr. Carlin supported deferral and recommended that the ell be retained and a light-well be constructed using the existing ell.

Ms. Finnigan recommended retaining the ell as a character defining feature of the historic house and supported deferral for further study. She asked if it were possible to study how many historic rear ells remain in the historic district. Staff responded that this survey information was not readily available.

The Board made and approved two separate actions for these items. Mr. Carlin made a motion, seconded by Mr. von Senden, to defer #2014-00379 for further study of the appropriateness of demolition of the historic rear ell and of an appropriate addition that limited the amount of demolition. The motion carried 6-0-1.

Mr. Carlin then made a motion, seconded by Mr. von Senden, to approve #2014-00378 for after-the-fact demolition of the garage, as amended to direct staff to apply the administrative fine specified in the zoning ordinance for not obtaining a permit. The motion carried 5-1-1, with Mr. Neale voting in opposition. Ms. Miller abstained from both actions, as she missed a portion of the discussion.

#### **REASON**

The Board found it appropriate to approve the after-the-fact demolition of the garage based on the compromised condition of the garage but recommended that staff fine the applicant as a deterrent to future applicants. The Board was concerned about the entire demolition of the historic rear ell and requested that the applicant restudy options and staff to review the condition of the rear ell.

---

#### **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

##### **5. CASE BAR2014-00388**

Request to partially demolish and capsulate at **208 S St. Asaph St.**

Applicant: Robin Roberts

This case was combined with CASE BAR 2014-00389, below, for discussion purposes.

##### **6. CASE BAR2014-00389**

Request for alterations at **208 S St. Asaph St.**

Applicant: Robin Roberts

**BOARD ACTION: On a motion made by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Mr. Neale, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2014-00388 and BAR Case #2014-00389, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.**

#### **SPEAKERS**

Stephen Kulinski, representing the applicant, was available for questions and explained the desire of the owner to have a more traditional appearance on the addition.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board had no discussion, agreeing it was an appropriate alteration.

Mr. von Senden made a motion which was seconded by Mr. Neale. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

#### **REASON**

The Board found the alterations to the windows and doors on the enclosed porch to be appropriate and consistent with the BAR's adopted *Design Guidelines*.

#### **7. CASE BAR2014-00398**

Request to partially demolish and capsule at **815½ King St.**

Applicant: 815½ King Street LLC

**BOARD ACTION: On a motion made by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Mr. Neale, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2014-00388 and BAR Case #2014-00389, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.**

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board had no discussion, agreeing it was an appropriate amount of demolition to allow for skylights that would not be visible.

Mr. Carlin made a motion which was seconded by Mr. Neale. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

#### **REASON**

The Board agreed it was an appropriate amount of demolition on the flat roof because the material being demolished was not unusual and did not exhibit a high degree of craftsmanship that could not be easily reproduced.

#### **8. CASE BAR2014-00396**

Request to partially demolish and capsule at **712 Wolfe St.**

Applicant: Tobin N. Tracey

This case was combined with CASE BAR 2014-00397, below, for discussion purposes.

#### **9. CASE BAR2014-00397**

Request for alterations and an addition at **712 Wolfe St.**

Applicant: Tobin N. Tracey

**BOARD ACTION: On a motion made by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Mr. Neale, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2014-00396 and BAR Case #2014-00397, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.**

#### **CONDITION OF APPROVAL**

- All windows must comply with the BAR's adopted Window Policy

#### **SPEAKERS**

Stephen Kulinski, applicant, was available for questions.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board had no discussion, agreeing the proposed alterations and addition were appropriate.

Mr. von Senden made a motion which was seconded by Mr. Neale. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

### **REASON**

The Board found the alterations and addition to be appropriate and consistent with the Design Guidelines.

## **10. CASE BAR2014-00399**

Request for alterations at **700 South Washington St.**

Applicant: Verizon Wireless

**BOARD ACTION: On a motion made by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2014-00399, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.**

### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

- The extension of the rooftop mechanical screening must match the existing color, texture and sheen.
- The applicant should work with staff to pursue an option at the east end featuring two brick chimney forms (two antennae per chimney) to be aligned with existing brick piers on the floor below and integrated with the overall building design.

### **SPEAKERS**

Ed Donohue, applicant, explained the options that had been studied and responded to questions.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Neale asked what screening materials were possible. Mr. Donohue responded that many materials could be used and provided an example of a brick wall version of screening.

Ms. Miller asked whether the antennae would serve just the building or a larger area. Mr. Donohue answered that it covered approximately one mile in area. She also asked about extending the overall penthouse roof form.

Mr. von Senden asked whether the wireless sector box shown in the drawings was part of the antenna or separate (separate was the answer). He favored a deferral to explore a cylindrical mount that would look like a chimney. He also asked if all four needed to be together or if they could be split into two groupings (they can be split according to Mr. Donohue).

Mr. Carlin recommended pursuing the two chimney option for the east elevation in a Colonial Revival vocabulary noting that this particular building was a contemporary building that got its design inspiration from the nearby Yates Garden development which was Colonial Revival in character and “chimney-centric.”

Ms. Roberts supported the chimney option.

Mr. Carlin made a motion which was seconded by Ms. Roberts to pursue an option for two chimneys, with final approval to be made by staff. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

### **REASON**

The Board found the alterations to extend the rooftop mechanical screen and to add two chimneys to screen the antennae at the east end to be architecturally appropriate, compatible, and consistent with the *Design Guidelines*.

### **11. CASE BAR2014-00394**

Request for complete demolition at **2 Duke St.**

Applicant: Graham Holdings Company by RTS Associates, LLC

**BOARD ACTION: On a motion made by Ms. Finnigan, seconded by Mr. von Senden, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2014-00394, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.**

### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. Digitally photograph and clearly label all interior elevations, exterior elevations, and architectural details of each building proposed for demolition and provide one digital copy each to the Department of Planning & Zoning and the Alexandria Library Special Collections prior to issuance of a demolition permit. The applicant shall also pay to make digital copies of all original construction blueprints located in City Archives so that these may be made more easily available to the public on the City’s website.
2. 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. The language noted above shall be included on all final site plan sheets involving any ground disturbing activities.
3. The applicant shall not allow any metal detection and/or artifact collection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology. Failure to comply shall result in project delays. The language noted above shall be included on all final site plan sheets involving any ground disturbing activities.

### **SPEAKERS**

Jonathan Rak, representing the applicant, explained the request for demolition and responded to questions.

Ann Shag, resident at Tobacco Quay, posed questions regarding the treatment of toxic materials as part of the proposed demolition

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Chairman Fitzgerald explained that the Board's purview regarding the demolition relate to specific criteria outlined in the zoning ordinance about determining historic significance. He noted that other City agencies handled matters relating to environmental concerns, parking and haul routes.

Ms. Finnigan recommended that the staff recommendation be amended to include the photography of any significant architectural details.

Mr. von Senden asked about LEED requirements related to the demolition of the existing buildings. Mr. Rak responded that they will be adhering to all LEED requirements as part of the City policy for DSUP application and approval.

Ms. Finnigan made a motion which was seconded by Mr. von Senden to approve the application for a Permit to Demolish, BAR Case #2014-0394, with the documentation requirements noted above. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

### **REASON**

The Board had no objection to demolition of the existing mid-20<sup>th</sup> century brick and steel warehouses.

## **12. CASE BAR2014-00395**

Request for partial demolition and capsulation at **2 Duke St.**

Applicant: Graham Holdings Company by RTS Associates, LLC

**BOARD ACTION: On a motion made by Ms. Finnigan, seconded by Mr. von Senden, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2014-00395, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.**

### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. Digitally photograph and clearly label all interior elevations, exterior elevations, and architectural details of each building proposed for demolition and provide one digital copy each to the Department of Planning & Zoning and the Alexandria Library Special Collections prior to issuance of a demolition permit. The applicant shall also pay to make digital copies of all original construction blueprints located in City Archives so that these may be made more easily available to the public on the City's website.
2. 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. The language noted above shall be included on all final site plan sheets involving any ground disturbing activities.
3. The applicant shall not allow any metal detection and/or artifact collection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology. Failure to

comply shall result in project delays. The language noted above shall be included on all final site plan sheets involving any ground disturbing activities.

#### **SPEAKERS**

Jonathan Rak, representing the applicant, explained the request for demolition and responded to questions.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Finnigan recommended that the staff recommendation be amended to include the photography of any significant architectural details.

Ms. Finnigan made a motion which was seconded by Mr. von Senden to approve the application for a Permit to Demolish, BAR Case #2014-0395, with the documentation requirements noted above. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

#### **REASON**

The Board had no objection to the partial demolition and capsulation proposed as part of the adaptive reuse of the late 19<sup>th</sup>-century brick warehouse.

---

### **IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **CASE BAR2014-00113**

A work session to discuss the proposed development project at **2 Duke St**

#### **SPEAKERS**

Bob Youngentob of EYA, applicant, introduced the project and gave an overview of the changes made since the last work session. The key areas where changes were made included: 1) building 1 as a gateway from the north promenade, 2) increased emphasis on the required transition/set back about 30 feet, 3) increased alley width to the west of 2 Duke Street, 4) increased variety among the townhouses, 5) more color variety for brick, and 6) revisions to building 3 on Wolfe Street. He requested that the Board make a finding of support for the concept plan.

Shalom Baranes, project architect, explained the changes made to the three multifamily buildings since the last work session. He showed how the waterfront elevations were more strongly articulated and how the 30' mark was expressed at the floor slab and with recessed glass above. He explained that the masts were shown at 15' and 18' above the roofline and noted that they would not make sense if they were less than 15'. Building 1 now wrapped the corner to the north and featured additional brick. He explained that for Building 3, the fourth and fifth stories were now set back farther, especially at the corner of Wolfe and South Union streets. He also showed how the 30' mandate was further emphasized on Wolfe Street.



Patrick Burkhart, project architect, explained the changes made to the townhouses to increase variety in architectural character and roof variety and changes at the loft level. He showed the additional brick samples and how the beige and gray brick would work together.

Van Van Fleet, president of the Old Town Civic Association, thought the project was inappropriate and not connected to the historic district.

Bert Ely, member of Friends of the Alexandria Waterfront, supported Mr. Van Fleet's comments. He expressed concern that the architectural renderings did not adequately illustrate the context.

Greg Hudgins, Alexandria resident and involved citizen, spoke in strong support of the project and commended the architectural team.

Jan Rivenburg, 606 South Pitt Street resident, thought the project was too massive and too tall. She said it did not support Old Town's unique character.

Albert Schlachtmeyer, resident at The Oronoco, spoke in support of the entire project and advocated looking forward rather than back for design inspiration.

Bob Wood, Union Street resident, expressed concern about the BAR concept review process.

Tim Morgan, South Union Street resident, expressed concern about the BAR process. He thought that the building 3 was too tall and out of scale.

Scott Anderson, Alexandria resident and member of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission, spoke in support of the project and found it evoked the architecture of Old Town and had a human scale.

Peter and Holly Kilcullen, residents at Harborside, noted that their thoughts were expressed in the Harborside Community Letter. They also thought that the design was not appropriate, that the project was not in conformance with the Small Area Plan and that building 3 should be reduced.

Jaime Steve, 325 North Saint Asaph Street, spoke against the character of the river side elevation of the project.

Ted Pulliam, resident, requested that the applicant include information about the proposed interpretation of the site's history.

Windsor Demaine, 6 Wolfe Street, advised taking the time to carefully study the design options and thought the proposal was a reiteration of other developments in the DC area.

Christine Sennett, Cameron Street resident and real estate agent in Alexandria, observed that people are interested in either contemporary or historic buildings but not new buildings meant to look old.

Susan Askew, 34 Wolfe Street, explained that the Harborside Community Letter represented over 100 people and 76 households, 40% of whom lived outside of Harborside but in the nearby area. She noted that she and her neighbors supported development and getting rid of the warehouses but that they were concerned about the mass and scale of building 3. She requested setbacks at the upper floors along the length of Wolfe Street. She also requested that the entire ground floor be set back as well.

Karen Devlin, 20 Wolfe Street, requested further study to have a more fitting design that would have more architectural variety. She thought the mass and scale were overwhelming.

Louise Roseman, Harborside resident, stated that there should be a significant setback from Wolfe Street, as well as a wider sidewalk and the addition of plantings.

Carl Smith, 200 Duke Street, supported the Harborside Community Letter and the previous speakers.

Hal Hardaway, 311 South Union Street, expressed concern about the architectural character, mass and scale.

Kathryn Papp, 504 Cameron Street, expressed concern about the project, finding it too radical for the Old and Historic Alexandria District.

Rob Duggar, 10 Wolfe Street, loved the design but thought the process was flawed. He wanted to see a “boat’s-eye” view of the proposal.

Hank Savage, resident at Waterford Place, said that it was too radical for Old Town and that we needed to safeguard what was here. He recommended meeting with community groups.

Michael Jennings, 10 Potomac Court, suggested dividing building 3 into two or three modules.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Chairman Fitzgerald noted that many comments had been made about mass and scale but that he thought most people were really concerned about the 50 foot height. He asked for staff to provide some background on the 50 foot height limit. Mr. Cox explained how the height limit on the waterfront had previously been 77 feet but was lowered in 1987 to 50 feet. In 1992, it was lowered to 30 feet but there was a provision that allowed for 50 feet with a special use permit and an unspecified setback transition above 30 feet.

Chairman Fitzgerald also explained that the decision to allow 50 foot buildings had already been made as part of the Waterfront Small Area Plan. Regarding compatibility in the historic district, he noted that the majority of townhouses were actually Victorian and 20-century, noting that there were very few colonial period buildings remaining. He stated that details and setbacks can be worked out.

Ms. Roberts asked whether the Development Special Use Permit (DSUP) had been issued. Mr. Cox responded that it had not but that the Waterfront Plan indicated 50 foot buildings on this site.

Mr. von Senden observed that people say “look outside the box” and then when that is done, people are chagrined. He thought that there had been a lot of good discussion about the glass. He liked the high masts, as a reflection of the maritime heritage. He thought that the north side of building 1 had been improved as had the overall color palette. He appreciated the increased width of the alley adjacent to 2 Duke Street. He favored the slate shingles on the walls of the townhouse penthouses. He thought that the townhouse schemes captured the formality of Old Town but with a modern interpretation. Regarding scale and mass, he noted that it was not out of scale with Harborside which had roof heights above 50 feet. He thought that the 30 foot transition may be too subtle and suggested that more effort be made on the transition and set back on Wolfe Street, particularly at the fifth floor. He thought that setting the entire building back would not be successful. He summarized by stating that Alexandria was not a museum and that buildings were continually being modified.

Ms. Finnigan noted that she heard three themes from the comments made by the public: building 3, glass, and roof forms. First, an appropriate compromise should be found for building 3. She wanted to see the staff sketch with a suggested upper floor setback taken even farther. She thought that glass was appropriate for the waterfront buildings and she liked the mast features. She continued to want to see more playful and varied roof forms. While she liked many of the changes proposed for 2 Duke Street she did not think that the canopy was a welcoming entry feature.

Mr. Neale noted that he had lived in Alexandria since 1977 and had absorbed a lot of Old Town’s character. He generally agreed with the proposed density, mass and scale but found that its distribution over the site to be problematic. He observed that the condo buildings had small footprints but that they were articulated as larger buildings and so recommended that the elevations be more reflective of the plans. At the Wolfe Street corner of building 3 he expressed concern about the height of the building and the articulation of the façade. He recommended sloping roofs without having to reduce density. He thought that the site plan would feel sterile with the same distance between all the buildings and recommended shifting some of the density from the upper floors to lower floors. He thought that smaller distances between lower buildings could still feel comfortable, similar to alleys between historic buildings in Old Town. He thought that some fundamental elements should be added to the scheme to better integrate with Old Town. He liked the basic organization of the project. He noted that many good comments had been made.

---

Ms. Miller stated that she was in agreement with Mr. Neale's comments and sympathetic to the concerns expressed by the community. She stated that building 3 was a concern, as it overwhelmed the site. She wanted to see it divided into two buildings or to otherwise rearrange the density on the site. She thought the majority of the site organization was fine. She recommended that the applicant study the view of building 3 from Windmill Hill Park and Ford's Landing looking north. She liked the masts for the waterfront buildings.

Ms. Roberts appreciated some of the refinements that had been made. She thought building 5 on Union Street had been improved but wanted the building to feel more natural by better integrating the loft levels. She believed Duke Street had the best blockface of the project because of its variety. She was interested in seeing a bird's eye view of the project and asked why there was not a model to show the context of the project with respect to the adjacent buildings. She also supported making building 3 into two buildings to reduce the overall mass, finding that it currently appeared too hulking and masculine. She noted that the waterfront buildings can support more glass but building 3 was not on the water and needed to reflect the adjacent residential neighborhood. She also liked taking off the top floor and reallocating the floor area to the interior of the site. She was warming up to buildings 1 and 2 on the waterfront but recommended a more defined and strengthened delineation at 30 feet. She also requested more information on historic interpretation elements for the next concept review.

Mr. Carlin supported a more playful and angular roof form in some areas, without being 1980s cliché, and noted it seemed that both the BAR and community would like that. He noted that the applicant had made substantial progress along the way. He viewed the project as having big buildings (multifamily) and little buildings (townhouses). He cautioned against the townhouses having a monolithic or institutional feel. He wanted to see more "distinguishment" for the townhouses, such as the addition of bay windows. He thought that the treatment of building 3 had progressed significantly. He recommended studying an angled, all-glass roof for building 3 because it would be contemporary but allude to forms that the community was comfortable with. Overall, he liked the treatment of building 3 from the fourth story down. He also wanted to see more landscaping and plantings on Wolfe Street. He liked the masts on the waterfront buildings and the sense of movement on the site. He also recommended varying the tops of the waterfront buildings, here and there.

Chairman Fitzgerald complimented the architect for being responsive to a range of comments but he cautioned against making too many changes to what was a generally good design. He noted that there were three options for moving forward but that people seemed to really want a final work session. He thought that the northeast and southwest corners of the site, at building 1 and 3, could be refined further. He noted that the biggest concern was the south elevation of building 3. He recommended a substantial setback on the entire top floor. He noted the applicant had some support from the BAR and community. Mr. Carlin made a motion to defer the project for restudy at a fifth work session based on BAR and citizen comments.

---

---

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:45 PM by Chairman Fitzgerald.

---

**VII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

*The following items are shown for information only. Based on the Board's adopted policies, these have been approved by Staff since the previous Board meeting.*

CASE BAR2014-0408

Request for panel antennas at 105 N Union St.

Applicant: Verizon Wireless

CASE BAR2014-0407

Request for window replacement at 801 S Pitt St #418.

Applicant: Ann Louise Mapes

CASE BAR2014-0406

Request for window and door replacement at 522 Gibbon St.

Applicant: Alabama Ave., LC

CASE BAR2014-0405

Request for stair replacement at 1301 Prince St.

Applicant: Michael Kidder

CASE BAR2014-0404

Request for sign relocation at 924 King St.

Applicant: Bloomers

CASE BAR2014-0403

Request for fence replacement at 1105 Duke St.

Applicant: Frank Fannon

CASE BAR2014-0402

Request for brick wall repair at 326 N Pitt St.

Applicant: Jim Murphy

Minutes submitted by,

Catherine Miliaras, Historic Preservation Planner  
Board of Architectural Review