

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

Board of Architectural Review  
Old & Historic Alexandria District

**Wednesday, April 15, 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  
Christine Roberts

Staff Present: Planning & Zoning  
Al Cox, Historic Preservation Manager  
Stephanie Sample, Historic Preservation Planner

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Oscar Fitzgerald.

**I. MINUTES**

Consideration of the minutes from the March 18, 2015 public hearing.

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

On a motion by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review approved the minutes of March 18, 2015. Ms. Finnegan made several amendments to the minutes. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0, (Ms. Miller arrived late.)

**II. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**1. CASE BAR2015-0067**

Request for revisions to previously approved plans at **513-515 N Washington St.**  
Applicant: CAS Riegler Companies

**BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0.**

On a motion by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve of BAR Case #2015-0067, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

**2. CASE BAR2015-0064**

Request for alterations at **628 N Washington St.**

Applicant: NOWA Property, LLC

**BOARD ACTION: Deferred, 7-0.**

This item was removed from the consent calendar.

On a motion by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Mr. Neale, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR Case #2015-0064. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

**SPEAKERS**

Mr. Skip McGinnis, architect, spoke on behalf of the applicant. He said that he was in agreement with staff's recommended conditions.

Ms. Gail Rothrock, Historic Alexandria Foundation (HAF), said that HAF supported the comments of the National Park Service (NPS) and opposed the design of the new stairs. She also encouraged the applicant to consider removing the paint on the brick façade.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Roberts said that she opposed the design of the applicant's proposed steps and asked that they consider wood, steel or brick steps which would be more compatible with the immediate context.

Ms. Miller said that she didn't think the multi-pane window at the basement level was appropriate, especially with the proposed window changes on the upper floors.

Mr. Neale said that he liked that the upper windows were being returned to the historically appropriate 1-over-1 configuration and thought that it would be appropriate to change the basement window to a tripartite configuration to match the bay window mullions above. He said that the new stair was not compatible and suggested that the applicant consider integrating brick into the new stair, perhaps as tread pavers in a metal pan. He said that he supported leaving the building painted because the other buildings in the row are painted.

Mr. von Senden said that there seemed to be four items for discussion: 1. The original 1-over-1 windows were there for 55 years and the porch was there for just as long; 2. He said that he didn't support leaving the basement window in its current configuration; 3. He said that the stair was too utilitarian and that it needed to be more ornamental. 4. He said that the other townhouses in this row were painted, so it was appropriate to keep this townhouse painted.

Mr. Carlin said that he agreed with both the NPS and HAF, and thought that the basement window should be replaced with a more appropriate window. He said that the stairs have been brick for 50 years and that if the applicant wanted to install metal stairs they should be more delicate and decorative.

Ms. Finnegan said that the case should be deferred for restudy and that the new railing will serve as a precedent for the other stairs in this row, so it is important that they be compatible.

Chairman Fitzgerald said that he would be supportive of metal stairs but believed that they shouldn't project more than they presently do, because a greater projection creates more of a perceived mass. He said that he thought the basement window was jarring.

Mr. McGinnis said that the brick stoops at the applicant's property and many others in the row were failing and that their style is inappropriate on the early 20<sup>th</sup> century townhouses. He also said that they weren't proposing to replace the basement window.

On a motion by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Mr. Neale, the Board voted to defer the application. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

### **REASON**

The Board felt that the front stair and railing should be restudied to be more compatible with the building and the importance of the GW Parkway, while still fitting within the context of the block of similarly altered rowhouses. The Board also requested that the applicant consider replacing the multi-pane window at the basement level with a new window that has mullions similar in proportion to the proposed bay window above and supported one-over-one sash windows on the first and second floors.

### **3. CASE BAR2015-0062**

Request for alterations and signage at **703 King St.**

Applicant: Olea Restaurant DBA Magnolia's on King

### **BOARD ACTION: Approved portions and deferred portions, 7-0.**

This item was removed from the consent calendar.

On a motion by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Mr. Neale, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve portions and defer portions of BAR Case #2015-0062. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. That the Board approves the structural alterations to the front façade, consisting of the new glazing in the existing opening on the ground floor; and,
2. That the signage is deferred for restudy.

### **SPEAKERS**

Stephen Fogleman, owner, Magnolias on King, said he supported staff's recommendation.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Carlin said that he supported the removal of the awning and the logos from the window, as well as the revised front window design and the hanging and wall signs. He said that he understood the applicants concern about visibility, but that the first floor was too busy with the existing coach lights, large menu board and hanging and wall signs. He suggested that the applicant consider removing the coach lights flanking the front window and install a single light fixture adjacent to the single door. He agreed with staff that the lighting level should be

determined in the field. While he said he didn't have a preference as to whether there were shutters or not on the upper levels, he said that they must be operable to be in compliance with the Board's policy. He also suggested a frieze board/sign band between the first and second floors, and perhaps a rollout awning, similar to the awning shown in one of the historic photos.

Mr. Neale said that he thought there should be a band separating the first floor from the upper floors, not unlike the feature shown in the early drawing of the building when it was The Lure Café. He said he also liked the use of different colors to differentiate the upper and lower uses in the building. He said he wouldn't object to the reinstallation of bay windows flanking the center window or to enlarging the masonry openings of the flanking windows.

Mr. von Senden said that he thought converting the front door into a fixed window was appropriate to allow for better views into the building and easier flow within the restaurant but that the amount of signage and lighting should be restudied. He said he liked the idea of a frieze board to help differentiate the first floor and also provide a location for the wall sign.

Ms. Miller said that she thought there were too many small elements on the façade and that the first floor wasn't cohesive. She said that she likes the transparency of the façade as shown in the historic rendering for The Lure Café. She said that she supported changing the front door to a window and that the first floor should be differentiated from the upper floors.

Ms. Roberts said that she was comfortable with the changes proposed by the applicant on the first floor, but that she did not support the installation of bay windows like some of her colleagues do. She said that she supported keeping shutters on the second floor, but not the installation of shutters on the third floor.

Ms. Finnegan said that she felt that the original architecture should not be changed with the addition of bay windows but that she supported a restudy of the lighting and signage. She said that the applicant could consider moving the hanging sign to the other side of the front window. She also said that she would like the applicant to consider installing shutters on the third floor, where they are shown on the historic photos. The applicant said they were only leasing the first floor but that he would convey this request to the building owner.

Mr. von Senden made a motion to approve the structural alterations – changing the central door to a fixed window with panels – and to maintain the same size flanking windows, require the shutters to comply with the BAR's adopted policy, and to restudy the signage. Mr. Neale seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7-0.

### **REASON**

The Board supported the applicant's goal of creating more pedestrian transparency into the restaurant by changing the front door to a fixed storefront window but they felt that the signage warranted more study.

## **III. NEW BUSINESS**

### **4. CASE BAR2015-0065**

Request to partially demolish and capsulate at **734 S Royal St.**  
Applicant: Katherine Reid

*Combined discussion with #5.*

**5. CASE BAR2015-0066**

Request for alterations at 734 S Royal St.  
Applicant: Katherine Reid

**BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 7-0.**

On a motion by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case # 2015-0065 and 2015-0066, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

**SPEAKERS**

Christine Kelly, architect, spoke on behalf of the applicant.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Roberts, Ms. Miller and Mr. Neale said that they supported the application.

Mr. von Senden made a motion to approve staff recommendations, which was seconded by Mr. Carlin.

**REASON**

The Board agreed with the staff analysis and recommendation.

**IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

**6. CASE BAR2015-0049**

A work session to discuss the proposed development project at **3640 Wheeler Ave.**  
Applicant: Siena Corporation

**SPEAKERS**

Cathy Puskar, attorney representing the applicant, said that they were happy to be able to make improvements to the historic mill building as part of the EZ Storage project and that they were looking forward to receiving the Board's feedback. She said that they would restudy the sign, ramp/lift on the historic building and the sign and frieze band proportions, but that moving the front parking lot toward the back of the lot would be difficult because of the space needed for maneuvering moving trucks. She said that they would continue to work with Staff.

Gail Rothrock, HAF, said she supported the staff recommendation and would also encourage the remove of the aluminum siding on the gambrel end of the mill. She said that the mill building would be eligible for a plaque from HAF and that she supported reduced parking in front. She commended the applicant for their restoration of the mill building.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Finnegan said that she had found some historic photos of the mill and suggested that a historic structure report be completed prior to any work on the building. (Staff noted that a student volunteer was looking for a building needing an HSR. The applicant welcomed this help and agreed the student would be provided access to the building.) Ms. Finnegan encouraged the applicant to consider additional restoration on the building and removal of some of the inappropriate later alterations, using the historic photos as a guide. She asked about the visibility of the historic mill from Wheeler Avenue once the new storage building was constructed and expressed that it shouldn't complete with the historic building.

Mr. Carlin said that he supported the overall mass, scale, height and general architectural character of the new building, as well as the demolition of the 20<sup>th</sup> century additions on the mill building. He said that perhaps in the future there may be a better use for the mill building but that the work being done by the applicant would preserve it for future uses. Mr. Carlin said that perhaps a sign band on the mill building might be more appropriate than the proposed box sign, and that the materials on the two buildings should relate to one another.

Mr. von Senden said that this was an important historic site in a portion of the city that is largely made up of 20<sup>th</sup> century construction and that the history of the area needed to be recognized, especially the original mill race. He suggested that the signs on the mill building be simplified and that a blade sign might be more appropriate. He said that he was less concerned about the handicap ramp than staff and that landscaping and grading could be used to minimize the size of the ramp. He said that the vertical proportions on the new building should be restudied and that the proposed project would be a big improvement in the area.

Mr. Neale agreed with all of the previous comments. He encouraged the applicant to remove the later portico and aluminum siding on the mill in order to bring it back to its historic appearance. He agreed that the proportions on the new building should be restudied, as well as the size of the windows on different floors. He said that the frieze band of the building was too large.

Ms. Miller said that the mill building's history should be preserved as much as possible.

Ms. Roberts said that she liked the idea of a blade sign on the mill building instead of the proposed illuminated box sign and that she could support either a lift or ramp. She said that the architecture of the new building shouldn't compete with the historic building.

Mr. Fitzgerald said that it seemed the Board was in support of the height, mass, scale and general architectural character of the new building, but that the proportions needed to be restudied. He noted that there was full support for demolition of the 20<sup>th</sup> century additions on the historic mill.

Ms. Puskar said that she was encouraged by the Board's comments and that she thought they would be relatively easy to address.

On a motion by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Mr. Neale, the BAR unanimously endorsed the scale, mass and general architectural character of the new building, as well as the treatment of the historic building, in concept. They also said that they were in support of the removal of the

20<sup>th</sup> century additions to the mill. The Board said that they would like to see a historic structures report of the mill before the applicant returns to the BAR.

The hearing was adjourned at 9:25pm.

Minutes submitted by,

Stephanie Sample, Historic Preservation Planner  
Board of Architectural Review

### **ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS SINCE LAST MEETING**

#### **CASE BAR2015-0048**

Request for windows replacement at **108 Waterford Pl.**

Applicant: Juan Narvaez

#### **CASE BAR2015-0053**

Request for roof replacement at **218 S Royal St.**

Applicant: Anita Mann

#### **CASE BAR2015-0059**

Request for windows replacement at **1250 S. Washington St. #709**

Applicant: William Byrnes

#### **CASE BAR2015-0060**

Request for windows and door replacement, alterations at **712 S. Pitt St.**

Applicant: John & Bonnie Branding

#### **CASE BAR2015-0063**

Request for lattice repair at **104 Gibbon St.**

Applicant: Lucas Moskowitz

#### **CASE BAR2015-0068**

Request for siding and window replacement at **718 N Columbus St.**

Applicant: Eric Bodley

#### **CASE BAR2015-0069**

Request for signage at **106 ½ N Columbus St.**

Applicant: Arzum Barbershop

#### **CASE BAR2015-0072**

Request for roof replacement at **528 Gibbon St.**  
Applicant: Mo Movahed

**CASE BAR2015-0073**

Request for windows and door replacement at **414 Jefferson St.**  
Applicant: Sue Cote

**CASE BAR2015-0074**

Request for fence repair at **819 Oronoco St.**  
Applicant: Joan Porche

**CASE BAR2015-0075**

Request for signage at **201 King St.**  
Applicant: 201 King St. Associates, LLC

**CASE BAR2015-0076**

Request for balcony repair at **106 Princess St.**  
Applicant: Stella Cove

**CASE BAR2015-0077**

Request for windows replacement at **206 N Royal St.**  
Applicant: Regan Ralph

**CASE BAR2015-0078**

Request for deck and fence replacement at **716 S Alfred St.**  
Applicant: Cydney Henry

**CASE BAR2015-0081**

Request for window and siding replacement at **318 N Royal St.**  
Applicant: Navarro Construction

**CASE BAR2015-0082**

Request for railing replacement at **226 S Lee St.**  
Applicant: Jacqueline Maher

**CASE BAR2015-0083**

Request for window replacement at **209 S Union St.**  
Applicant: Graham Wood

**CASE BAR2015-0084**

Request for roof replacement at **709 S Lee St.**  
Applicant: Cynthia Green

**CASE BAR2015-0085**

Request for garage door replacement at **1213 Duke St.**  
Applicant: Timothy Ryan



**CASE BAR2015-0087**

Request for signage at **219 N Washington St.**

Applicant: Douglas Realty

**CASE BAR2015-0089**

Request for exterior vent at **114 Commerce St.**

Applicant: Catherine Christ

**CASE BAR2015-0098**

Request for window replacement at **1201 King St.**

Applicant: Churchill & Prior, LLC.