

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

Board of Architectural Review  
Old & Historic Alexandria District

**Wednesday, May 20, 2015**  
7:30pm, Room 2000, City Hall  
301 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

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

Member Excused: John von Senden, Vice-Chairman  
Kelly Finnigan

Staff Present: Planning & Zoning  
Stephanie Sample, Historic Preservation Planner  
Mary Catherine Collins, Historic Preservation Planner

The meeting was called to order at 7:31 p.m. by Chairman Oscar Fitzgerald.

**I. MINUTES**

Consideration of the minutes from the April 29, 2015 special meeting.

**BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 5-0.**

On a motion by Mr. Neale, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review, approved the minutes of April 29, 2015 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 0.

Consideration of the minutes from the May 6, 2015 public hearing.

**BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 5-0.**

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Mr. Neale, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review approved the minutes of May 6, 2015, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 0.

**II. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**1 CASE BAR2015-0122**

Request for signage at 1309 King St.  
Applicant: Whim Pop

**BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 5-0.**

On a motion by Mr. Neale, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve of BAR Case #2015-0122, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 0.

**2 CASE BAR2015-0113**

Request for alterations at 624 S St Asaph St.

Applicant: Susan and John Nelson

**BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 5-0.**

On a motion by Mr. Neale, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve of BAR Case #2015-0113, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 0.

**III. NEW BUSINESS**

**3 CASE BAR2015-0112**

Request for alterations at 735 S Alfred St.

Applicant: Susan and Benjamin Space

**BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 5-0.**

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve of BAR Case#2015-0112, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 0.

**SPEAKERS**

Susan Space, applicant, spoke in support of the project asked the Board to consider a composite fence composed of a solid, paintable, recycled wood flour and high density polyethylene plastic (HDPE) for their front yard picket fence. She said that it would be painted white.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Carlin made a motion to approve the substitute composite fence material with the condition that the fence is painted white. Ms. Roberts seconded the motion which carried by a vote of 5-0.

**REASON**

The Board supported the revised fence material.

**4 CASE BAR2015-0116**

Request for alterations at 202 S Saint Asaph St.

Applicant: Patrick O'Connell

**BOARD ACTION: Approved portions and denied portions, 3-1-1.**

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve portions and deny portions of BAR Case#2015-0116, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 3-1-1. Ms. Miller abstained.

### **SPEAKER**

Geoff Stone, landscape designer for the applicant, spoke in support. He requested the relocation of the brick wall to the north of the parking area for additional space given the owner's recent health concerns and the need to park two cars on the parking pad. He said that the wall should be moved just over a foot to allow room to open a car door.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Neale said that he disagreed that the zoning ordinance did not allow for the relocation of the wall and that the applicant should be permitted to move the wall.

Ms. Collins said that because zoning does not allow for an intensification of the noncomplying use of the parking pad, it cannot be enlarged and moving the wall would effectively enlarge the parking pad.

Mr. Neale said that would be no consequence with moving the wall because parking is already permitted. He said the issue of the relocated wall and parking should be separated as they are not related.

Ms. Miller asked about how the wall failed and Mr. Stowe said that it was never constructed correctly and the freeze/thaw cycle created additional structural failures.

Ms. Roberts moved the staff recommendation and Mr. Carlin seconded the motion.

Mr. Stone clarified that the parking pad would be widened, not the curb cut on St. Asaph Street.

Ms. Miller said that she did not have enough information to make an informed decision and would abstain from voting.

### **REASON**

The Board agreed with the staff recommendation regarding the garden features.

## **5 CASE BAR2015-0117**

Request for alterations at 610 612 Bashford Ln. and 1251 Abingdon Dr.  
Applicant: Riverton Condominium

### **BOARD ACTION: Denied, 5-0**

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Miller, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to deny BAR Case#2015-0117. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 0.

### **SPEAKERS**

Christine Harrison, representing Riverton Condominiums spoke in support of the project. She said that the building was constructed in 1939 and asked for clarification about why this building was considered historic. She said that she didn't think that you could tell a difference in the design, texture and color of the synthetic slate versus real slate. She gave two examples of where fake slate was installed (although real slate had been approved by the Board) in the historic district – 819 Prince and the carriage house at the Lee boyhood home – and said you couldn't tell

the difference. She said that the roof where the slate would be installed was minimally visible from the Parkway.

Pat Cavanaugh, representing Alexandria Roofing, spoke in support of the project and said that the average person cannot tell the difference between real and synthetic slate. He said that there is a misunderstanding that all slate lasts 200 years and the Riverton buildings have Bangor slate, which lasts only 60-80 years. He said the synthetic slate is environmentally friendly because it's made of recycled materials and that the Ecostar brand he's recommending ages the same as real slate. He said he thought that the Ecostar slate complied with the Board's roof policy.

Elaine Johnston, HAF, spoke in support of the staff recommendation to deny the installation of synthetic slate. She said that the location of the Riverton was highly visible from the Parkway and was a gateway to the Old & Historic Alexandria District. She said that the *Design Guidelines* were clear in that the first choice should be to repair and preserve and if replacement was necessary it should be in-kind. She said the Board would be setting a precedent if they approved synthetic slate.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Fitzgerald said that the National Park Service reviews and provides comments on proposed changes to the buildings along the George Washington Parkway and the Board holds these structures to strict standards.

Ms. Roberts said she supports the staff recommendation and did not believe that the examples where fake slate have been installed – without BAR approval – are appropriate comparisons. She said the guidelines are very clear about roof replacement materials. Ms. Roberts said that she had synthetic slate on one of her homes and it failed.

Mr. Neale said that he needs more information to determine if the existing slate roof is failing to the point that a new roof is needed or if just certain areas can be repaired. He said a neutral consultant should be hired to make a finding on the existing roof condition.

Ms. Miller asked for clarification as to whether the applicant wanted synthetic roofing because of its appearance or was it an issue of cost. Mr. Cavanaugh said that he had priced both real and synthetic slate. She said that buildings on the Parkway are held to a higher standard and that she can tell the difference between real and synthetic slate, especially over time.

Mr. Carlin said that he agrees that real slate should be used and agrees with the National Park Service. He moved the staff recommendation to deny the request for synthetic slate. Ms. Miller seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of 5-0.

### **REASON**

The Board found that synthetic slate on this building did not meet the requirements of the BAR *Roof Policy* or *Design Guidelines*, particularly on a building fronting the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

Request for partially demolish and capsule at 312 Queen St.  
Applicant: Miguel Estrada

**BOARD ACTION: deferred, 5-0**

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR Case #2015-0114. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 0.

**SPEAKERS**

Bud Adams and Scot McBroom of Adams Architects spoke in support of the project. Mr. Adams confirmed that the wall would not be removed but that the cap would be removed and 1'-8" of additional brick wall would be constructed, topped by the old cap. He said that the same mortar would be used to aesthetically and structurally tie the existing wall and new brick portion together. He said that eight brick courses would be added and that they could get a structural engineer to ensure that the historic portions of the wall would be preserved.

Elaine Johnston, HAF, spoke in support of the staff recommendation and was happy to hear that the wall would not be demolished. She said that the Board had recently had a discussion about the importance of preserving historic brick walls and said she was concerned that the changes would put the wall at risk.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Carlin said that he was unsure whether the zoning ordinance would allow for the construction of the fireplace on the rear property line because it would be in a required setback. Mr. Neale said that fireplaces are considered a garden feature and was not subject to setbacks. Mr. Carlin said that this was one of the earlier blocks in Old Town and it was a treasure of 18<sup>th</sup> century life. He said that they should be extremely sensitive to the preservation of the historic wall. He said he understood the privacy issue but was concerned about the integrity of the wall with the proposed changes. He also recommended not attaching the fire place to the existing wall. He said that a lattice or even plantings could provide the additional privacy they were looking for.

Ms. Roberts asked if the grade changes between the subject property and the adjoining neighbor were historic. Mr. Adams said he didn't know, nor did he know the exact age of the wall.

Ms. Collins said that the wall is likely 18<sup>th</sup> or 19<sup>th</sup> century, as it is made with handmade brick, lime mortar, and laid in four course common bond.

Ms. Roberts asked for more information on the history of the wall and the grading around the wall.

Ms. Miller said she didn't think the best solution was to alter the wall and supported the idea of additional methods to provide privacy. She said that she thought it would be hard to match new the brick and mortar to the existing wall. She said that she liked the idea of differentiating the old wall from the new.

Mr. McBroom said that the other side of the wall, facing the neighbor's property, has been altered over the years and previously repaired with Portland cement mortar, further damaging that side of the wall.

Mr. Neale said that if the wall was increased in height it would be important to see a brick and mortar mock up prior to construction.

Mr. Fitzgerald said that he didn't think the wall should be raised and that they should consider other solutions for added privacy. He said something like lattice is reversible but brick is not.

Mr. Adams asked that the Board consider deferring the case to allow the applicant to restudy the proposal.

Ms. Roberts made a motion to defer the case for restudy. Mr. Carlin seconded the motion which carried by a vote of 5-0.

**REASON**

The applicant requested a deferral for additional time to restudy possible solutions.

**7 CASE BAR2015-0115**

Request for alterations and waiver of fence height at 312 Queen St.

Applicant: Miguel Estrada

**BOARD ACTION: deferred, 5-0**

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR Case#2015-0115. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 0.

Item # 6 & 7 were combined for discussion purposes.

The hearing was adjourned at 8:35pm.

Minutes submitted by,

Stephanie Sample, Historic Preservation Planner  
Board of Architectural Review

**ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS SINCE LAST MEETING**

**CASE BAR2015-0100**

Request for signage at **212 King St.**

Applicant: Georgetown KICS, LLC

**CASE BAR2015-0119**

Request for repointing at **209 Duke St.**

Applicant: Gail Rothrock

**CASE BAR2015-0121**

Request for door and siding replacement at **525 N Alfred St.**

Applicant: Douglas Wright

**CASE BAR2015-0124**

Request for window replacement at **131 S Fairfax St.**

Applicant: Maryanna Henkart

**CASE BAR2015-0125**

Request for window replacement at **414 Jefferson St.**

Applicant: Sue Cote

**CASE BAR2015-0126**

Request for window replacement at **5 Franklin St.**

Applicant: Susan Susank

**CASE BAR2015-0131**

Request for signage at **726 King St.**

Applicant: Jeymi Salon and Spa

**CASE BAR2015-0132**

Request for HVAC installation and brick repair at **209 S Lee St.**

Applicant: Amy Bayer

**CASE BAR2015-0133**

Request for window repair at **207 Wilkes St.**

Applicant: Nathan DeLong

**CASE BAR2015-0134**

Request for repointing at **115 S Henry St.**

Applicant: Paul Swartz