

\*\*\*\*\***FINAL MINUTES**\*\*\*\*\*

Alexandria Board of Architectural Review  
Old & Historic Alexandria District

**Wednesday January 21, 2015**

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

Members Present: Oscar Fitzgerald, Chairman  
Chip Carlin  
Kelly Finnigan  
Margaret Miller  
Wayne Neale  
Christine Roberts

Members Absent: John von Senden, Vice-Chairman

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

The meeting was called to order at 7:33 p.m. by Chairman Oscar Fitzgerald.

---

**I. MINUTES**

Consideration of the minutes from the January 7, 2015 public hearing.

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

On a motion by Mr. Neale, seconded by Ms. Finnigan, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review approved the minutes of January 7, 2015, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

---

**II. NEW BUSINESS**

**1. CASE BAR2014-00427**

Request to partially demolish and capsulate at **418 Gibbon St.**  
Applicant: Jennifer Shoup

This case was combined with CASE BAR 2014-00428, below, for discussion purposes.

**2. CASE BAR2014-00428**

Request for alterations at **418 Gibbon St.**  
Applicant: Jennifer Shoup

**BOARD ACTION:** Chairman Fitzgerald called the question for approval with staff recommendations. The Board voted to approve BAR Case #2014-0427 and 428, as amended, by a roll call vote of 6 - 0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. Include the following statements on all construction documents involving any ground disturbing activities, so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements:
  - a. The applicant/contractor 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/contractor shall not allow any metal detection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

**SPEAKERS**

The applicant's architect, Rachel Cowen of Kulinski Group Architects, was present to answer questions.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board had no issues with the proposal and limited discussion. The Chairman called the question with the staff recommendations, which passed, 6-0.

**REASON**

The Board found the proposal to be appropriate and consistent with the *Design Guidelines* and Criteria for a Permit to Demolish.

**3. CASE BAR2014-00426**

Request for new construction at **606 S Fairfax St.**

Applicant: Michael Dyke

**BOARD ACTION:** On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Ms. Finnigan, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2014-0426, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. The final brick selection, bond pattern and mortar joints must be coordinated and approved by BAR staff to ensure that this new construction is clearly differentiated from the existing historic buildings in the district;
2. The south elevation of the two-and-a-half story main block must be clad with brick and not fiber cement siding;
3. Staff review and approve the proposed AZEK lattice as part of the building permit process;
4. Staff may administratively approve any future fences/gates; and,

5. The statements below shall appear on final site plan sheets involving any ground disturbing activities so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements:
  - a. The applicant/contractor 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/contractor shall not allow any metal detection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

### **SPEAKERS**

Michael Dyke, applicant, spoke in support of the application and staff recommendations and responded to questions.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board made a point to note that it was important that new construction be clearly differentiated from nearby historic buildings to prevent replication and respect the historic fabric in the district. Ms. Finnigan expressed concern for the proposed replicated historic brick and suggested modern painted brick, and made a motion with this amendment. It was seconded by Mr. Carlin. The motion failed, 3-3. Ms. Roberts then made a motion proposing an amended condition requiring the use of a modern brick, bond pattern and mortar joints to ensure differentiation, in addition to the staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Ms. Finnigan. The application was approved as amended, unanimously.

### **REASON**

The Board found the proposal to be appropriate and consistent with the *Design Guidelines* and Criteria for a Permit to Demolish.

---

## **III. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Comment on George Washington Masonic National Memorial National Historic Landmark Nomination.**

The Board considered the proposed National Historic Landmark nomination for this building located at 110 Callahan Drive. On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Finnigan, the nomination was endorsed unanimously by the BAR.

### **CASE BAR2014-0113**

**Work Session to discuss the proposed development project at 2 Duke Street.**

## **SPEAKERS**

Bob Youngentob, EYA, applicant, introduced the project and the process. He also reminded the BAR that the project continues to be significantly under the Floor Area Ratio permitted by the Waterfront Small Area Plan.

Patrick Burkhart, project architect, gave a brief presentation of the revisions to Building 3 and its adjacent context, including discussion of the additional set backs at the fourth and fifth stories and the division of the building into “townhouse scale modules” on the west end and a small “apartment building” scale form at the east end.

John Long, President and CEO of the Alexandria Chamber of Commerce, spoke in support of the project design and waterfront plan.

Ann Dorman, 2724 Kenwood Avenue, spoke in support of moving the current proposal forward.

Rick Dorman, 2724 Kenwood Avenue, spoke in support of the project and the applicant.

Daniel Crowe, 1023 North Royal Street, spoke in support of the design.

Sherry Schiller, 524 South Pitt Street, expressed concerns about the design of Building 3 and thought the BAR should enforce more stringent standards for it.

Van Van Fleet, 26 Wolfe Street, President of the Old Town Civic Association, expressed concern about the entire project and the revisions to Building 3. He recommended further study.

Peter Kilcullen, 464 South Union Street, spoke against the project finding the design did not belong in Old Town.

Lynn Hampton, 215 Park Road, spoke in support of the revised proposal.

Greg Hudgins, 1128 Colonial Avenue, spoke in support of the project team and the current proposal.

Hal Hardaway, 311 South Union Street, advocated for an increased setback at the fourth and fifth stories, particularly on South Union Street.

Tim Morgan, 319 South Union Street, spoke against the project, finding the style not attractive and requesting additional upper story setbacks on South Union Street.

Elizabeth Todd, owner of The Shoe Hive and co-founder of the Alexandria Boutique District, spoke in support of the entire RTS project.

Aimee Houghton, 1410 Cameron Street, noted that the community review process was very beneficial and supported the project. She said it was important to have a large southern anchor at RTS and an opportunity to combine old and new.

Danielle Romanetti, 603 Russell Road and owner of Fibre Space, spoke in support of the project.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street and member of the Historic Alexandria Foundation, stated support for the preservation and adaptive reuse of 2 Duke Street but was extremely concerned about the current design and contemporary approach.

Bonnie Rideout, 5 Potomac Court, spoke against the project and recommended starting over with the design.

Nancy Cady, 3731 Ingalls Avenue, spoke in support of the project and noted the merits of EYA's design. She noted that this project will make the waterfront much more accessible.

Susan Askew, 34 Wolfe Street, explained that she had coordinated the group of about 130 nearby and adjacent residents who had concerns. She stated that they were not commenting on architecture at this time but that there was remaining concern about additional setbacks on South Union Street, similar to what was provided at Wolfe Street. She thanked EYA for their efforts to work through the design with the neighbors.

Bert Ely, 200 South Pitt Street and member of Friends of the Alexandria Waterfront, spoke against the project.

Charles Trozzo, 209 Duke Street, spoke against the project, noting that it was unrelated to the rest of Old Town.

Albert Schlachtmeyer, 601 North Fairfax Street, spoke in support of the project and recommended moving it forward.

Yvonne Weight Callahan, 735 South Lee Street, spoke against the flat roofs in the project and expressed concern about the overall height.

Robert Atkinson, 1009 Pendleton Street, spoke in support.

Emily O'Connell, 525 North Fayette Street, spoke in support and recommended moving forward.

Stephen Saperstone, 100 ½ Duke Street, supported waterfront redevelopment but objected to the contemporary design.

Mariam Creedon, 815 North Patrick Street, spoke in support of the project and waterfront redevelopment.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Chairman Fitzgerald asked the applicant whether they'd be willing to have additional upper floor setbacks at the west end along South Union Street. Mr. Youngentob responded that he thought they had accomplished that already and that it was not feasible for the project to allow for any additional setback in that location. Chairman Fitzgerald also expressed concern about making the Wolfe Street façade look like separate buildings.

Ms. Roberts appreciated the changes made and the model. Regarding the eastern third of Building 3, she expressed concern about how it read and recommended giving it its own separate identity so it was not part of the larger composition. She suggested changes to make it read as its own distinct building, such as by having its own entrance. She supported the project and recommended these changes be pursued for the Certificate of Appropriateness. Overall, she liked the project's amount of open space and lower overall floor area.

Ms. Miller supported many of the comments made by Ms. Roberts. She said the applicant has listened to the Board's comments over the past work sessions and returned with workable solutions. She would like to see more variety in Building 3, such as making the four "townhouses" each have a different color brick. She also supported a different look for the "apartment building" section. She wanted to continue to see work with the upper level setbacks.

Mr. Neale had several questions for the project architect. He inquired as to whether the distance from the face of the curb to the face of the building was relative to other buildings in Old Town. Mr. Burkhart responded that it generally was and noted that South Union Street had only a 50 foot right-of-way. Mr. Neale stated his ongoing support for the site overall plan but asked the applicant to demonstrate why moving Building 3 to the interior of the site was not feasible. Mr. Youngentob explained that, due to the garage location and elevator access, it would be very challenging to make the project work with such a change and also that the multifamily building would be most successful with the views to the river down the wider aperture of Wolfe Street.

Mr. Neale liked the setbacks and breaking off of the east end into a separate "building." He recommended adding a physical 10 foot wide "alley" break at Building 3 to break down the scale and possibly shift the smaller portion of Building 3 a few feet toward the east. Mr. Youngentob explained that a 10 foot break would be challenging because those alley walls would not be able to have windows and Mr. Burkhart explained that such a shift would affect the character of the north-south pedestrian connection through the site to The Strand. Mr. Neale thought that the four "townhouses" all looked the same and that they need additional refinement, such as by changing the brick color or introducing different water table materials, etc. He recommended more variety to make them more contextual. He also thought that the two Union Street rows of townhouses needed more variety and "randomness". He wanted the waterfront buildings to look like separate buildings that evolved over time. He thought the entire project should have more variety and randomness.

Ms. Finnigan inquired if shadow studies for South Union Street to illustrate how the townhouses on the west side might be affected by the new construction had been completed. Mr. Youngentob explained that they had completed some studies which showed minimal sun blockage. Ms. Finnigan stated that the project has found a way to honor the history of the site with a new development. She stated she was comfortable with the mass and scale.

Mr. Carlin noted that he appreciated Ms. Askew's input and her ability to bring together so many neighbors. He stated that the common concerns expressed by the public and the Board at the work session, so far, included:

- 1) the setbacks on the South Union Street elevation of Building 3;
- 2) more differentiation for the east end of Building 3; and
- 3) architectural variety to reflect the historic district.

Mr. Carlin accepted Mr. Youngentob's explanation of the difficulty with additional setbacks at the west end of Building 3.

Mr. Carlin then made a motion, seconded by Ms. Roberts, to endorse the scale, mass and general architectural character of the Robinson Terminal South project with the following recommendations to be pursued with staff before returning to the BAR for Certificates of Appropriateness:

1. Increase the architectural differentiation on the east end of Building 3 through changes such as a revised fenestration or a change in brick;
2. Incorporate additional interpretation of the site and waterfront history into the plan;
3. Continue to explore multiple brick colors and architectural details to maximize variety and randomness throughout the project.

The Board adopted the motion on a vote of 6-0.

---

## **V. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:00 PM by Chairman Fitzgerald.

---

## **VI. 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 BAR2015-0001**

Request for railing replacement at **702 Lyles Lane**.

Applicant: Greg Rothwell by Harold Leff Contracting

**CASE BAR2015-0003**

Request for chimney repair/replacement at **921 S Columbus St.**

Applicant: Aaron Witherspoon

**CASE BAR2015-0005**

Request for siding replacement at **1213 Prince St.**

Applicant: Peter Pennington by Harry Frazier, Jr.

Minutes submitted by,

Catherine Miliaras, Historic Preservation Planner  
Board of Architectural Review