

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

Alexandria Board of Architectural Review  
Old & Historic Alexandria District

**Wednesday, February 18, 2015**  
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

Members Absent: Christine Roberts

Staff Present: Planning & Zoning  
Al Cox, Historic Preservation Manager  
Michele Oaks, 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 February 4, 2015 public hearing.

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

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Finnigan, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review, approved the minutes of February 4, 2015, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

---

## **II. CONSENT CALENDAR**

### **1. CASE BAR2015-0007**

Request for alterations at **730 S Royal St.**

Applicant: Mary Clarity

*This item was removed from the consent calendar for discussion by Ms. Finnigan.*

### **2. CASE BAR2015-0017**

Request for alterations at **1201 King St.**

Applicant: Churchill and Prior, LLC

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as submitted, 5-1.**

On a motion by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Mr. Neale, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approved BAR Case #2015-0017, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

### **3. CASE BAR2015-0018**

Request for alterations at **723 S Lee St.**

Applicant: Arthur Fox

#### **BOARD ACTION: Approved, as amended, 5-1.**

On a motion by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Mr. Neale, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approved BAR Case #2015-0018, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

#### **CONDITION**

That the applicant has the option for the fireplace to be fabricated from brick rather than stone.

---

## **III. NEW BUSINESS**

### **1. CASE BAR2015-0007**

Request for alterations at **730 S Royal St.**

Applicant: Mary Clarity

*This item was removed from the consent calendar.*

#### **BOARD ACTION: Approved, as submitted, 5-1.**

On a motion by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Mr. Neale, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0007, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 1, Ms. Finnigan voted against the motion.

#### **SPEAKERS**

The applicant, Mary Clarity, was present to answer questions.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Finnigan expressed concern with using varying materials on the front and rear roof slopes, especially when the original material is known for a building. She believes the Board should support only approve in-kind replacement in cases where the original material is known.

The applicant noted, for the record, that her neighbor at 732 S Royal Street was approved for the same request two years prior by the BAR.

Mr. Neale noted that the applicant is proposing to install a standing seam metal roof on the rear roof slope, which has been identified in the Board's policy as a historically appropriate material for use within the district.

Staff reminded the Board that in previous cases they have supported greater flexibility on roofing materials where the roofs were minimally visible from the public right-of-way. It was also said that the Bangor slate used on the Yates Gardens development is now approximately 75 years old and is at the end of its useful life, so this type of case may be presented more frequently in the future.

Prior to a vote, Ms. Finnigan expressed, for the record, that she objected to treating the roof of the same building with two different materials.

On a motion by Mr. von Senden seconded by Mr. Neale, the Board voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0007, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-1 with Ms. Finnigan voting against the motion.

## **REASON**

The Board found that the using different roofing materials on the front and rear roof slopes on a side gable roof on the interior of a block was appropriate because one cannot see both roof slopes from the ground at the same time, so these could be treated as two separate contexts. Additionally, the proposed metal roofing is a historically appropriate material for this period house and the rear roof slope of the building is minimally visible from a public way.

## **4. CASE BAR2015-0002**

Request to partially demolish and capsulate at **724 S Royal St.**

Applicant: Gina Matrass

*This case was combined with CASE BAR 2015-0004, below, for discussion purposes.*

## **5. CASE BAR2015-0004**

Request for alterations at **724 S Royal St.**

Applicant: Gina Matrassi

## **BOARD ACTION: Approved, as amended, 5-1.**

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Mr. Neale, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0002 and #2015-0004, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to1, Ms. Finnigan voted against the motion.

## **CONDITIONS**

1. That the aluminum-clad wood windows proposed on the addition are consistent with the Window Performance Specifications – including putty profile muntins.
2. That BAR approval is subject to compliance with the Zoning Ordinance. Applicant must submit FAR and open space calculations for the bay window bump-out for zoning approval prior to the release of Building Permits.

## **SPEAKERS**

The applicant and the window contractor, Bob Pullman from Old Town Windows and Doors, were both present and noted the additional information provided in the Board's packet requested at the last hearing. The present application showed the inoperable shutters at the front door being removed and the operable shutters on the second floor windows being retained.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Neale commended the applicant's revised drawing and the inclusion of Mr. Neale's suggestion of the cornice detail.

Mr. Carlin made a motion to approve the application. Mr. Neale seconded the motion.

Ms. Miller continued the discussion. She inquired whether the transom window above the door illustrated in the drawing was original to the building. The applicant confirmed that the transom was existing and was not being altered as part of this application.

The Board voted by roll call to approve BAR Case #2015-0002 and #2015-0004, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 1, with Ms. Finnigan voting against the motion.

## **REASON**

The Board found that the proposed bay window installation was historically appropriate and typical of Yates Gardens Colonial Revival style homes.

### **6. CASE BAR2014-0378**

Request to partially demolish and capsulate at **214 S Alfred St.**

Applicant: Amy and Michael Louis

*This case was deferred by the Applicant prior to the hearing.*

### **7. CASE BAR2014-0379**

Request for an addition and a waiver of rooftop HVAC screening requirement at **214 S Alfred St.**

Applicant: Amy and Michael Louis

*This case was deferred by the Applicant prior to the hearing.*

### **8. CASE BAR2014-0392**

Request to partially demolish and capsulate at **601 S Saint Asaph St**

Applicant: Windmill Hill, LLC

*This case was combined with CASE BAR2014-0393, below, for discussion purposes.*

### **9. CASE BAR2014-0393**

Request for alterations and an addition at **601 S Saint Asaph St**

Applicant: Windmill Hill, LLC

## **BOARD ACTION: Approved, as amended, 6-0.**

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Mr. Neale, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2014-0392 and #2014-0393, as amended, and waived the rooftop HVAC screening requirement. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

## **CONDITIONS**

1. That the new window on the north elevation of the historic house be a painted wood, simulated-divided-light window which complies with the Board's Window Policy;
2. That the Board waive the rooftop HVAC screening requirement but that the condensing unit be located as far to the south and to the east on the flat roof as possible;
3. That the windows on the addition comply with the Board's adopted window policy;
4. That shutters be installed only on the street facing elevations of both the main building mass and the addition;

5. That a storm door will not be installed on the front entry door;
6. That the panel below the first floor windows on the addition be eliminated; and
7. That the cornice and window hoods be simplified and approved by BAR staff.
8. The following archaeology comments shall be included on all construction drawings that relate to ground disturbing activity, so that all 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 or artifact collection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

### **SPEAKERS**

The applicant, Mike Dameron, showed a sample of the vinyl windows to be installed in the building and offered to answer any questions for the Board.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Carlin stated support for shutters on the north elevation of the building.

Mr. von Senden expressed opposition to the window panels and the shutters on the addition.

Ms. Finnigan concurred with Mr. von Senden, noting that the addition should be visually subservient to the main block.

Mr. Carlin made a motion to approve the application with the added conditions that:

1. Windows on the addition comply with the Board's adopted window policy;
2. Shutters be installed only on the street facing elevations of both the main building mass and the addition;
3. A storm door will not be installed on the front entry door;
4. Eliminate the panel below the first floor windows on the addition; and
5. Cornice and window hoods be simplified and approved by BAR staff.

Mr. Neale seconded the motion.

The Board voted by roll call to approve BAR Case #2014-0392 and #2014-0393, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

### **REASON**

The Board found that the proposed demolition/capsulation was appropriate and the new addition met the *Design Guidelines* and would be compatible with the surrounding streetscape.

### **10. CASE BAR2015-0014**

Request to partially demolish and capsule at **700 S Pitt St**

Applicant: Tom Campbell

*This case was combined with CASE BAR2015-0015, below, for discussion purposes.*

## **11. CASE BAR2015-0015**

Request for alterations and an addition at **700 S Pitt St**

Applicant: Tom Campbell

### **BOARD ACTION: Approved, as amended, 6-0.**

On a motion by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Mr. Neale, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0014 and #2015-0015, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

### **CONDITIONS**

1. That the new wood windows comply with the Board's Window Policy;
2. That staff approve the details of the proposed steel-frame and retractable wood doors prior to submission of the building permit;
3. That staff approve the proposed metal balustrade around the roof deck prior to submission of the building permit; and,
4. The following archaeology comments must be included on all construction documents related to ground disturbance, 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 or artifact collection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

### **SPEAKERS**

Frederick Taylor, architect, noted his agreement with the staff report and its recommended conditions and offered to answer any questions for the Board.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. von Senden stated he supported the proposed design, including the shed dormers. He noted that the shed dormers provided a subtle differentiation, in this case, from the historic portion of the house.

Mr. Neale and Ms. Miller concurred with Mr. von Senden's comments.

Chairman Fitzgerald appreciated that the original façade was not being touched as part of the proposal.

Ms. Finnigan inquired about the amount of setback being proposed for the addition and asked whether an offset of 9" was sufficient for differentiation between the addition and the existing structure. She also wanted clarification on the amount of demolition being proposed for the rear (south) wall of the original building after it is capsulated for the proposed one story dining room.

The architect confirmed that the rear wall of the historic structure had already been significantly penetrated with modern openings for French doors, so there were only small portions of the original

historic wall remaining in this location but that no additional wall area would be disturbed for the proposed addition. With this clarification, Mr. von Senden made a motion for approval, which was seconded by Mr. Neale. The OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted by roll call to approve BAR Case #2015-0014 and #2015-0015, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

## **REASON**

The Board found that the proposed addition and alterations to this Federal dwelling complied with the *Design Guidelines* for the reasons outlined in the staff report.

### **12. CASE BAR2015-0012**

Request to partially demolish and capsulate at **222 S Fairfax St**

Applicant: Chris and Nancy Marzilli

*This case was combined with CASE BAR2015-0013, below, for discussion purposes.*

### **13. CASE BAR2015-0013**

Request for alterations and an addition at **222 S Fairfax St**

Applicant: Chris and Nancy Marzilli

## **BOARD ACTION: Approved, as amended, 6-0.**

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Mr. von Senden, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0012 and #2015-0013, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

## **CONDITIONS**

1. The historic windows on the side elevation shall be retained and repaired, including the cylinder glass. Should any of the historic windows require replacement, the applicant must prepare a window condition inventory and meet with staff on-site to determination which windows may be replaced.
2. The front windows shall be one-over-one instead of two-over-two. The applicant shall submit specifications for final approval by staff in conformance with the BAR's adopted Window Policy.
3. The applicant shall submit specifications for the replacement front door for final staff approval, to confirm conformance with the BAR's adopted policy.
4. The front stoop shall be revised to only encroach four feet into the public right-of-way, or the owner may obtain an encroachment from City Council prior to issuance of a building permit for a greater encroachment.
5. Include the following archaeology comments on all construction documents relating to ground disturbing activity, 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 or artifact collection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

## **SPEAKERS**

Patrick Camus, architect, noted his agreement with the Staff report and its recommended conditions and offered to answer any questions for the Board.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Without discussion, Mr. Carlin made a motion for approval of staff recommendations which was seconded by Mr. von Senden. The Board voted by roll call to approve BAR Case #2015-0012 and #2015-0013, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

## **REASON**

The Board found that the proposed addition and alterations to this Victorian dwelling complied with the *Design Guidelines*, as outlined in the staff report.

### **14. CASE BAR2015-0019**

Request to partially demolish and capsulate at **116 King St**

Applicant: Monarch Row, LLC

*This case was combined with CASE BAR2015-0020, below, for discussion purposes.*

### **15. CASE BAR2015-0020**

Request for alterations and an addition at **116 King St**

Applicant: Monarch Row, LLC

## **BOARD ACTION: Approved, as amended, 6-0.**

On a motion by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve portions and defer portions of BAR Case #2015-0019 and #2015-0020, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

## **CONDITIONS**

1. That the windows on the east (side) elevation be replaced with six-over-six, simulated divided light, wood windows that meet all criteria in the *BAR Window Policy*, and;
2. That the two windows on the east and two windows on the west side of the front (north) elevation be replaced with six-over-six, single-glazed wood windows that are consistent with the *BAR Window Policy*.
3. The center window on the front elevation was deferred for restudy.

## **SPEAKERS**

Paul Beckman, architect, said they supported the staff recommendations except that the owner did not want to create the hoist door in the center of the front elevation because of the poor condition of the brick and the construction disruption to the first floor tenant. He said the front elevation had fundamentally changed since the earliest photographs.

Gail Rothrock, representing the Historic Alexandria Foundation, supported the recreation of a hoist door on the front and inquired whether the original trusses would be exposed on the interior. (Mr. Beckmann confirmed that the rafters would be retained and exposed.)



## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Carlin suggested that the central window on the front elevation could be enlarged without adversely affecting the first floor tenant.

Mr. von Senden noted that the existing elevation without the hoist door has been this way since approximately 1955 and may have acquired historic importance in its own right.

Mr. Neale moved to approve the staff recommendation except for the new hoist door at the center window. Mr. von Senden seconded the motion. The motion failed on a tie vote of 3-3.

Mr. Carlin moved to approve with a panel on the exterior below the central window to give the illusion of an operating jib window. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Mr. von Senden then moved to approve staff recommendation for all of the windows except for the central window on the second floor of the front elevation, which would be deferred for restudy. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carlin and passed 6-0.

## **REASON**

The Board supported the window replacement on all windows except the second floor center window on the front (north) elevation. The deferral was requested in order for the architect to study alternate design options to recall (but not necessarily restore) the original door shown in the 1936 photo.

---

## **IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **16. CASE #2014-00296**

A work session to discuss the proposed development project at **0 Prince St,**

Michael Winstanley, architect, presented the proposal and responded to questions.

There were no public comments.

Ms. Finnigan supported the project and said it should be given a green light. She liked the proposed solution for the hyphen.

Mr. Carlin echoed Ms. Finnigan and said the stair and hyphen issues had been resolved. He recommended a light and warm color palate that remained simple as the project moved forward. He liked the artful use of oars and signs on The Strand elevation.

Mr. von Senden concurred with the previous comments about the hyphen but missed the bell tower on the water side of the site. He suggested that it could be replaced with nautical flags on the river. He liked the signs proposed on The Strand and suggested that these be considered art.

Mr. Neale supported the project but preferred the larger, horizontal window panes shown previously, as they he believed they were more ship-like. He noted that the stairs also supported the nautical

appearance and suggested that these could be covered by a roof. He, too, preferred a lighter color palate for this project.

Ms. Miller felt the project was very well done.

Chairman Fitzgerald stated that he has liked the project from the beginning and that it has gotten better and better. He noted the consensus for a lighter color palate and pointed out that the BAR's policy on fiber cement siding was that it have a smooth surface and not wood grain. He believed the largest challenge remaining was to continue to make the rooftop mechanical equipment and screening as small as possible.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Mr. von Senden, the BAR endorsed the scale, mass and general architectural character of the proposal, in concept, by a vote of 6-0.

## **17. BAR CASE # 2014-0119**

A work session to discuss the proposed development project at **500 and 501 N Union St.**

### **SPEAKERS**

Ken Wire, attorney for the project, thanked the Board for their time and comment.

Mike Hickok, the project architect, provided a brief overview of the proposal, pointing out the refinements made since the last concept review.

Van Van Fleet, representing Old Town Civic Association, said the west building was too massive and unconnected to the street grid or Federal style architecture of Old Town. He expressed concern that the all glass design will prohibit any art or museum use within the pavilion. He stated that the east building lacks synergy with the adjacent townhouses and is an "abrupt visual assault on the Old & Historic District".

Bert Ely, co-chair of Friends of the Alexandria Waterfront, spoke on behalf of the friends. They found the project too large and massive for the scale of the immediate neighborhood. He stated that the renderings misrepresent how the proposed buildings will fit within the existing environment.

Ted Pulliam, a member of the Archaeology Commission, but not necessarily speaking on their behalf, praised the improvements in the historic interpretation plan. He objected to the flat roof and suggested a new roof form for the main block of the east building but supported the pavilion refinements and staff's recommendation for a contrasting or reflective glass.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Miller said that she struggled to find the historic connection between the proposed architecture and the community. She struggled with the west building and the proposed hotel use. She felt that the project stands out on its own as opposed to being a transition between Old Town and North Old Town. She stated that she liked the pavilion design, in particular because of its movement and view from the waterfront. She found that the revised east building fit better into the fabric of Old Town, because of the design and the scale of its elements.

Mr. Neale found the design for the pavilion building acceptable, but stated that the east building lacks any historical iconographic reference that would link it to Alexandria. It is a missed opportunity. He found the architectural treatment of the condominium building as a single building, with a very limited vocabulary of materials, unsettling and stated that it would be more successful if it were treated as a village or diverse collection of buildings with more variety in the facade treatments. A singular vocabulary of building materials should be expanded to include more brick colors, etc. He found the massing of the proposed hotel inappropriate and resembling a highway hotel that was designed to achieve a marketing mission as opposed to one which best fits the urban context. He continued to believe that it could be two stories shorter and spread out over more of the site to resemble a European hotel. Lastly, he found the retail use inappropriate for the site, as it is too far away and disjointed from the activity of King Street. Ultimately, he believes that the retail use will not be successful in this location.

Mr. von Senden asked the applicant to describe how they will address staff's recommendation for contrasting glass on the pavilion.

Mr. Hickok explained that the main building will have clear glass, but the glass on the pavilion will be of same family. He felt that the curve in the pavilion wall will create a lighting gradation without the use of the tinted or reflective glass. The frit will whiten and lighten the glass, which will also increase the contrast.

Mr. von Senden stated that he like the modern interpretation of window lintels and jambs with metal on the Union Street side of main east building. He stated that the metal needs to be more than 16 gauge metal because a flimsy metal would lack depth. He asked applicant to clarify their intention.

Mr. Hickok stated that the metal would be anodized, and/or could be painted. He stated that his intent is that the metal have some dimension and will be at least 1/4" in depth, projecting slightly beyond the brick face to create shadow and give visual appearance of thicker metal. He assured the Board that it will not appear flimsy.

Mr. von Senden asked the applicant to clarify how the interpretation of the historic shoreline will be addressed as an architectural or site element.

Mr. Wire said that they will work with staff on a final design consistent with the overall design of the waterfront park, but that it is not the intent of the applicant to include the shoreline within the building. They will accommodate any direction from the City for exterior paving to incorporate a shoreline marker.

Mr. von Senden summarized by acknowledging that there is some validity to some comments made by the public regarding the artistic interpretation that seemingly occurs in photorealistic renderings. However, had the applicant shown more of the architectural landscape to the north in these renderings, Mr. von Senden believes that one would see that it fits nicely with what is occurring in Old Town North. Mr. von Senden stated that he disagreed with Mr. Neale on the facade design and that if it were designed as twenty-foot wide townhouses, it would diminish the importance of nearby historic townhouses. By and large, he expressed his enthusiasm for the design and said that the refinements have come a long way since the first concept review.

Mr. Carlin, clarified that the Board had more or less signed off on the west building, with the exception of the brick detailing. Therefore his comments were limited to the proposed east building. Mr. Carlin asked the applicant to clarify where the scope of work ends near Ralph's Gut. The applicant explained that their improvements end at the property line, but they are taking cues from the City's waterfront plan for the property beyond.

Mr. Carlin found the scale suitable and especially liked the treatment of the west elevation along the urban edge at N Union Street. He thought the pavilion will shimmer on its own without additional glass tint or color. He seconded Mr. von Senden's comments and supported the design overall.

Ms. Finnigan stated that she was fearful of patchwork appearance of glass on pavilion because she believed that the more you showcase pavilion, the less that the tall four story building will fade away from view. She asked the applicant why the fourth story parapet/fascia on the southeast corner (also described as an overhang above the fourth floor balconies) looks different in B5 v. B7.

Mr. Hickok clarified that this parapet element will be clad with glass to match the rest of the building and will have something opaque behind it. The thin line that is clearly visible on page B5 is a coping, or flashing cap on top of the parapet. He explained that this parapet serves as a creative way to vary the building height.

Ms. Finnigan said that the final design of the east building should not draw the eye away from the pavilion. Additionally, she liked the proposed inscriptions for historic interpretation and hopes they remain.

Mr. Cox conveyed Ms. Robert's comments, which were provided in writing prior to the meeting. She wrote that she was "thrilled" with pavilion design and that the applicant had incorporated the Board's comments. She believed that the applicant has now provided an appropriate seam between Old Town and Old Town North. She, too, asked whether the coping on the masonry blocks of the west and south elevations could project slightly or provide a shadow through a cap or other method. She also thought the soldier courses are subtle and perhaps not enough brick detail.

Mr. Hickok said that anywhere there is masonry, it will be capped with slate above, which is fairly dark.

The Chairman summarized the findings of the Board as follows:

1. Work with staff to insure that the metal framing of the windows is high quality and that the visual character of glass on the east building and pavilion is appropriate;
2. Any future committee formed to review proposed historic interpretation of the site should include a BAR member and that Christine Roberts had expressed interest in this role;
3. The pavilion successfully fits into its context, through its reference to waves on the river;
4. Generally supportive of the scale and mass;
5. The cornice should not draw the eye away from the pavilion and it should also be better articulated;
6. The Board supported the textured grey slate accent material but found grey brick is too trendy and incompatible with native red brick color of Old Town. The Board consistently

recommended lighter or brighter colors, in lieu of brown or dark red, with a range in value (not monochromatic); and

7. There was general support for the west building, with a few dissensions.

Mr. von Senden made a motion to endorse the scale, mass and general architectural character of the project, as represented to the Board in the meetings and in the renderings, including the comments and recommendations made by the Board and summarized by the Chairman. Mr. Carlin seconded the motion, which passed 4-2. Ms. Miller and Mr. Neale voted against.

---

#### **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

The Board of Architectural Review, Old and Historic Alexandria District hearing was adjourned at 10:15pm.

---

#### **V. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

##### **CASE BAR2015-0009**

Request for hanging sign at **311 N Washington St.**

Applicant: Marcicela Noble

##### **CASE BAR2015-0022**

Request for fence replacement at **411 Queen St.**

Applicant: Rebecca Anne Kilduff

##### **CASE BAR2015-0025**

Request for window and door replacement at **1235 Portner Rd.**

Applicant: Sarah C Nordstrom

Minutes submitted by,

Michele Oaks, Historic Preservation Planner  
Board of Architectural Review