

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

Board of Architectural Review  
Old & Historic Alexandria District  
**Wednesday, June 17, 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  
Margaret Miller  
Christine Roberts

Members Excused: Wayne Neale  
Kelly Finnigan

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

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

**I. MINUTES**

Consideration of the minutes from the June 3, 2015 meeting.

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

On a motion by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review, approved the minutes of June 3, 2015 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 0.

**II. CONSENT CALENDAR**

- 1 **CASE BAR2015-0142**  
Request for alterations at **822 Duke St.**  
Applicant: Joseph Johnson

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

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. von Senden, the OHAD Board

Architectural Review voted to approve of BAR Case #2015-0142, as submitted.  
The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 0.

- 2     **CASE BAR2015-0149**  
Request for alterations at **211 Franklin St.**  
Applicant: Joseph Lang

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

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. von Senden, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0149, as submitted.  
The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 0.

- 3     **CASE BAR2015-0151**  
Request for alterations at **617 S Royal St.**  
Applicant: Charlotte Olson

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

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. von Senden, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0151, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 0.

- 4     **CASE BAR2015-0064**  
Request for alterations at **628 N Washington St.**  
Applicant: NOWA Property, LLC

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

*This item was removed from the consent calendar.*

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Mr. von Senden, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0064, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 0.

**SPEAKER**

Skip Maginness, project architect, responded to questions.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Miller inquired as to why the entrance door now proposed was different from what previously had been presented. Mr. Maginness responded that he had selected a more historically appropriate door.

**REASON**

The Board supported the revised plans finding them appropriate and consistent with the Design Guidelines.

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

#### 5 **CASE BAR2014-0378**

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

Applicant: Amy and Michael Louis

*Item # 5 & 6 were combined for discussion purposes.*

#### 6 **CASE BAR2015-0379**

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

Applicant: Amy and Michael Louis

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

#### **CONDITION OF APPROVAL**

That the rooftop units be painted gray and placed in the least visible location, as determined by staff working with the applicant in the field.

#### **SPEAKER**

Stephanie Dimond, project architect, spoke in support and responded to questions.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Roberts stated that she supported the revised scheme and thanked the architect and applicant for incorporating diverse comments into the final design.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Ms. Miller, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2014-0378 and #2014-0379, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 0.

#### **REASON**

The Board noted that the final design incorporated significantly more of the historic rear ell walls than originally proposed. The Board found the addition to be appropriate and consistent with the Design Guidelines.

### IV. **NEW BUSINESS**

#### 7 **CASE BAR2015-0145**

Request to capsulate at **209 Gibbon St.**

Applicant: Mark & Oenone Sparkman

*Item # 7 & 8 were combined for discussion purposes.*

#### 8 **CASE BAR2015-0146**

Request for an addition at **209 Gibbon St.**  
Applicant: Mark & Oenone Sparkman

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

#### **CONDITION OF APPROVAL**

The applicant shall be required to document the condition of the existing alley prior to initiating any construction and shall be responsible for the mitigation of any damage caused by construction of this project.

#### **SPEAKERS**

Stephanie Dimond, project architect, spoke in support and responded to questions.

Charles Habliston, owner of 514 South Fairfax Street, noted that there was an historic cobblestone alley to the rear of the subject property that had previously been damaged by another construction project. He expressed concern and requested that the BAR require that the archaeology findings be more strongly applied.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. von Senden noted that issues relating to construction are a building code and permitting issue but that it was important to note and understand such concerns.

Mr. Cox noted that Code Administration has limited control over private alleys but added that staff has been working with the Old Town Civic Association and Historic Alexandria Resources Commission volunteers to survey and document all historic alleys to insure the proper maintenance of this early resource.

Ms. Roberts inquired whether it was possible to include a condition of approval requiring mitigation of any damage done to the alley as part of the construction. It was determined that was an appropriate condition and the applicant's architect agreed to the condition.

Mr. Carlin stated that OTCA was helping to monitor the condition of alleys.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Ms. Miller, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0145 and 2015-0146, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 0.

#### **REASON**

The Board supported the proposed addition and agreed that maintaining historic alleys was important.

**9**

#### **CASE BAR2015-0152**

Request for complete demolition at **226 The Strand.**  
Applicant: RTS Associates, LLC

**BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 3-2.**

## **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. The applicant shall provide detailed digital photographs, plans and interior and exterior wall elevations documenting the current building and, working closely with staff, identifying areas that retain 19<sup>th</sup> century material, with a copy of the drawings and history report to be provided to Special Collections as well as the Department of Planning & Zoning prior to approval of a demolition permit.
2. The applicant shall identify and carefully dismantle and store all 19<sup>th</sup>-century building materials that are deemed salvageable, with the final determination made by BAR staff in the field, and deliver these materials to a City-designated storage facility for future reuse on site.

## **SPEAKERS**

Jonathan Rak, representing the current property owner, spoke in support of the application and explained that the request for a Permit to Demolish was a required condition of approval for the Development Special Use Permit recently approved by City Council for the Robinson Terminal South site. He agreed to the conditions of the staff report.

Chuck Trozzo, 209 Duke Street and former member of the Alexandria Historical Restoration and Preservation Commission, was concerned about demolition of the building prior to approval of historic interpretation and a park design plan. He opposed demolition and recommended restoration of all portions of the building on the site.

Mr. Cox explained that during the Waterfront Plan process, this particular site was envisioned as the site of a civic building, a portion of which would be used to interpret the local maritime history. It was also discussed during the planning process that historic brick and other materials from this warehouse site could be reused and integrated into the design of the civic building to interpret the early waterfront uses.

Adam Hayes, EYA, representing the applicant, explained that they were not in a rush to tear down the existing building but that they wanted to find the right time and to be able to utilize the same contractors for demolition on the rest of the site.

Bert Ely, representing Friends of the Alexandria Waterfront, spoke in opposition to the demolition.

Poul Hertel, 3716 Carriage House Court, expressed concern with the demolition noting that the current building was a connection to the past and reminded him of a small fishing village.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Chairman Fitzgerald noted that there was very little “historic” building left here but it was unclear what would go on the site in the future.

Mr. Carlin noted that many other communities reuse portions of old buildings as part of museum space or interpretation and mentioned Beaufort, NC.

Mr. von Senden agreed with the staff requirement to require that the historic materials be reused on site. He also questioned what criteria of the zoning ordinance would be met if the BAR were to deny the Permit to Demolish. He thought it possible that Criteria #1 was relevant but stated that it was not met in this particular case.

Ms. Roberts inquired as to whether the existing one story building would be able to be reused after raising the grade and doing the necessary flood mitigation. It was agreed that it would be un-useable after the flood mitigation and it did not feature the same design to allow it to be rehabilitated *in situ*, as is proposed for the historic warehouse at 2 Duke Street.

Ms. Miller asked the applicant several questions including: will the site be dedicated to the City (yes, as a condition of the DSUP); when will it be dedicated (dedication will be concurrent with the issuance of Certificates of Occupancy); and would it be possible to tear it down later. The applicant responded that it will be most efficient to raise the grade of The Strand, the RTS site and this property at the same time that the contractor is managing construction on the rest of the site. Ms. Miller expressed opposition to using the site for temporary staging or a sales office.

Ms. Miller made a motion to defer the request until there was more information on what the future use of the site would be. There was no second.

On a motion by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0152, as amended. The motion carried on a roll call vote of 3 to 2. Chairman Fitzgerald and Ms. Miller voted against.

### **REASON**

The majority of the BAR agreed that none of the criteria outlined in the zoning ordinance regarding a Permit to Demolish were met and therefore it was acceptable to demolish/dismantle 226 The Strand, with the conditions noted above regarding documentation and salvage and reuse of historic materials. It was noted that the current building had been so altered that it had very little historic significance.

## **10 CASE BAR2015-0153**

Request for complete demolition and relocation at **802/808 N Washington St.**  
Applicant: Shakti, LLC

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

### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. The applicant shall submit drawings and digital photographs documenting the existing conditions of the motel building to the Dept. of Planning & Zoning, with a hard copy of the drawings to be deposited at The Alexandria Library Special Collections prior to issuance of a Permit to Demolish.

2. Provide a detailed description of the means and methods of the proposed relocation process, including the documentation and storage of any materials that must be carefully dismantled prior to the move.
3. Post a bond adequate to fully cover the cost of true restoration of any damage that occurs during relocation.
4. 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.
5. 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**

Mary Catherine Gibbs, representing the applicant, gave an introduction to the project and responded to questions.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street and representing the Historic Alexandria Foundation, spoke in support of reuse and rehabilitation of the historic townhouse but opposed the relocation of it. She allowed that the Town Motel was not an individually distinguished building but felt that it met criteria #4 as a representation of auto oriented travel and it was the last motel on Washington Street. She requested a deferral until a more “hotel-like” building is designed to take its place.

Poul Hertel, 3716 Carriage House Court, expressed concern about moving the historic townhouse and believed it was the subject of demolition by neglect when the original windows were removed. He also noted that the motel reflected the memorial character when it was constructed.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Miller stated that it was regrettable that the best examples of roadside motels have already been lost. She also asked why the townhouse needed to be relocated. Ms. Gibbs explained that to have a viable project of 100 rooms, they needed underground parking of a certain size. She noted that there would still be a side yard on Madison Street. Ms. Miller stated she supported preserving the townhouse as long as all the setbacks and other requirements would be met.

Mr. von Senden stated that he visited the site and noticed that all the original windows were in place and he did not feel that this was a case of demolition by neglect. He thought the historic townhouse appeared to be in great condition. He said he agreed

somewhat with the NPS comments expressing concern about demolition of the motel and noted that, even watered down, it is one of the few that is left. He said that even so-so mid-century architecture should not be dismissed but supported demolition in this instance. However, he agreed that relocating the townhouse was acceptable and supported removing the transformer from Washington Street.

Mr. Carlin stated he supported the project.

Ms. Roberts also supported moving the house and restoring it.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0153, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 0.

### **REASON**

The BAR found that none of the criteria were met regarding the Permit to Demolish the existing motel. The BAR supported the relocation and restoration of the historic townhouse.

## **11 CASE BAR2015-0158**

Request to partially demolish and capsule at **1101 N Washington St.**

Applicant: CIA Colony Inn LLC

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

### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

That the applicant submit photographs and scale elevation and plan drawings documenting the existing conditions of the building, both electronically and in hard copy, with a hard copy deposited at Special Collections and the Dept. of Planning & Zoning, prior to issuance of any building permits.

### **SPEAKERS**

Cathy Puskar, representing the applicant, introduced the project and spoke to the community outreach that was being undertaken as this project began.

John Rust, project architect, gave a brief presentation and responded to questions.

Scott Fleming, project architect, gave a brief presentation and responded to questions.

Tom Soapes, 1035 North Pitt Street and NOTICE president, expressed concerns about the project proposal in general and noted that mobilization for the demolition was not shown on the BAR's drawings.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. von Senden noted that the speaker comments did not relate to the request for a Permit to Demolish.



On a motion by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0158, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 0, by a roll call vote.

#### **REASON**

The BAR found that none of the criteria were met regarding the Permit to Demolish for partial demolition of the existing motel.

### **V. OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **12 CASE BAR2015-0156**

A work session to discuss the proposed development project at **1101 N Washington St.**

**BOARD ACTION:** The OHAD BAR held a work session on the proposed development at 1101 N Washington St. and requested that the applicant return for an additional concept review work session.

#### **SPEAKERS**

Cathy Puskar, representing the applicant, introduced the project and spoke to the community outreach that was being undertaken as this project began.

John Rust, project architect, gave a brief presentation and responded to questions. He noted that the proposed project was in the same footprint and used the same structure as the existing building, except for the new porte cochere entrance on the east side.

Scott Fleming, project architect, gave a brief presentation and responded to questions.

Bud Marsten, 1172 North Pitt Street, stated that he would be significantly affected by the project. He had concerns about the height and lack of architectural interest on the rear elevation.

Christa Watters, 1186 North Pitt Street, expressed concern about having a large commercial building so close to their townhouses. She acknowledged that the setback only applies to a commercial building and that the existing building was ugly but she requested a deferral for further study.

Elizabeth Sproul, 1128 North Pitt Street, stated that other nearby buildings were too massive and should not be models for this project.

Joan Drury, 1030 North Royal Street, expressed concern about the overdevelopment of Old Town North to expand the City's tax base.

Poul Hertel, 3716 Carriage House Road, stated that the GWMP was a national park. He explained that the building would frame the traffic circle and was a nice building but that the back side needed work, and that should have good materials. He liked the scheme with the center portion of the building painted white.

Beth Atami, Canal Way resident, stated that the process seemed backward because it did not make sense to approve demolition without considering the new concept.

Jean Bosely, 528 Belle View Place, stated that her community had not yet met with the applicant.

Caitlin Riley, 1164 North Pitt Street, expressed concern about the ability to make changes if the BAR approved the design.

Mr. Cox explained the BAR concept review process. He explained that demolition was a separate item in the ordinance and was reviewed first because it would be a waste of time to review the design of a new building if demolition of the existing one is denied. He further explained that the application was very early in the review process and that the BAR was only giving comments to the applicant at this stage and that there was no binding BAR vote until after City Council approval of the DSUP.

Stephan Pisani, National Park Service, stated that they were concerned with the overall mass of this building and the effect on the whole of this portion of North Washington Street if every building is built to the 50' height limit.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Carlin noted that the applicant and architect have made a commitment to work with the community. He supported the height, scale, mass and general architectural character. He agreed with the staff recommendations, specifically: use arches at the restaurant, study changes to the garage, embrace the Greek Revival and Federal Revival styles, create a true and differentiated attic story, work on the rear elevations, consider setting back the upper story on the rear elevation.

Ms. Roberts asked what aspects would be refined with the neighbors. Ms. Puskar stated that as this was the beginning of the review process and they still had not had an opportunity to meet with all of the neighbors, so it would be premature to state what would change. Ms. Roberts noted that comments from the BAR at concept review do not necessarily commit the BAR and changes to the design continue to occur as applicants meet with the surrounding community. Ms. Roberts found the mass and scale to be acceptable but inquired about adjusting the height of the hyphens. She expressed a preference for the original scheme but liked the arched windows for the restaurant. She did not favor the center white portion.

Ms. Miller stated she was sympathetic to the neighbor's concerns because the proposal seemed to double the height. She inquired whether the proposal was within the permitted FAR. Ms. Puskar responded it was actually just below the permitted by-right FAR. She

agreed that the choice of materials was very important.

Mr. von Senden recommended that the applicant continue to meet with the neighbors. He also inquired about the comments submitted by NPS (see above under SPEAKERS). He stated that the alternatives for the front elevation show variations that could be applied to the rear/east elevation to reduce the apparent scale of the structure for the neighbors. He noted that this project was within the 50 feet permitted height limit. He also commented that the question of the zone transition setback was a matter for the Planning Commission. He appreciated the attempt to vary the heights. He preferred Alternative 1 because the white fourth floor on the hyphens accentuated the perception of differing heights. He also recommended considering a setback at the 4<sup>th</sup> story. He preferred a strong cornice at the restaurant instead of the arches. He noted that high-quality materials would be required. He thought this could be a successful project but recommended an additional concept review work session.

Chairman Fitzgerald stated his support for the mass and scale. He recommended further work on the rear elevation and wanted to see high-quality materials.

Mr. Carlin made a motion to defer endorsement of the height, scale, mass and general architectural character until the applicant has had the opportunity to meet with all interested neighbors and make refinements. Ms. Roberts seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0.

### **13 CASE BAR2015-0154**

A work session to discuss the proposed development project at  
**802-808 N Washington St.**

**BOARD ACTION:** The Board endorsed the height, scale, mass and general architectural character, 5-0.

### **SPEAKERS**

Mary Catherine Gibbs, representing the applicant, introduced the project team and responded to questions.

John Rust, project architect, gave an overview of the proposed design.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street and representing Historic Alexandria Foundation, disagreed with the analysis of the Washington Street Standards, particularly Standard #2, and said that the proposed hotel will overwhelm the historic townhouse. She thought that the massing was too heavy and boxy and recommended reducing the overall height by one story. She asked that a condition of approval include a requirement to provide an interpretive display of all of the motels formerly on Washington Street.

Poul Hertel, 3716 Carriage House Court, expressed concerns with the design, finding it appeared as one solid mass. He said the design of the rear should be considered as well, that the transition from the historic townhouse was too abrupt and that the auto entrance

should be permitted from Washington Street. He supported the glass hyphens if they were visually transparent and exposed a masonry return on the building blocks.

Chuck Trozzo, 209 Duke Street, stated that the townhouse would be overwhelmed by the hotel and the glass hyphen was not enough to respect the historic townhouse.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Carlin stated that it was a well-conceived project but noted that the ends may need to transition down to the townhouse.

Mr. von Senden observed that North Old Town was an interesting neighborhood with a combination of low scale buildings and really large buildings. He said the current design read as four different elevations rather than one articulated mass and building. He thought the north elevation needed additional architectural detail because it was highly visible beside the Little Tavern. He preferred Alt. #1 but recommended stepping back both the hyphen and the top floor on the east side, though he liked the Corn Exchange detailing for the main mass. He recommended restudying the transition to the historic townhouse and looking at setbacks at the top story.

Ms. Miller was concerned about turning from Washington Street into the site. She agreed that the townhouse needed more prominence and that the north elevation needed more refinement.

Ms. Roberts agreed with the comments already made. She preferred the glass hyphens. She also preferred the concept of one general architectural style to allow the townhouse to retain a singular prominence. She wanted to see more refinement and detailing on the brick work. She agreed that the north elevation needed work.

Chairman Fitzgerald agreed with the others and stated that the north elevation would be highly visible and needed more work. He also supported the use of glass hyphens to separate the building masses.

Ms. Roberts made a motion to endorse the height, scale, mass and general architectural character of the project. Mr. Carlin seconded the motion and it carried, 5-0.

The Board recognized the many years of service of Chairman Fitzgerald.

The hearing was adjourned at 11:00 PM

Minutes submitted by,

Catherine Miliaras, Historic Preservation Planner  
Board of Architectural Review

## **ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS SINCE LAST MEETING**

### **CASE BAR2015-0168**

Request for fence replacement at **370 N St. Asaph St.**

Applicant: Sarah Hull

### **CASE BAR2015-0172**

Request for light fixture repair at **601 Queen St.**

Applicant: Linda Fusilier

### **CASE BAR2015-0173**

Request for alterations at **210 N Alfred St.**

Applicant: Navarro Construction

### **CASE BAR2015-0174**

Request for window, shutter and siding replacement at **630 S Fairfax St.**

Applicant: Joyce Stevens

### **CASE BAR2015-0175**

Request for signage at **207 King St.**

Applicant: Sonoma Cellars

### **CASE BAR2015-0176**

Request for window replacement at **415 S St Asaph St.**

Applicant: Barbara Bodine

### **CASE BAR2015-0177**

Request for alterations at **822 Duke St.**

Applicant: Joe Johnson

### **CASE BAR2015-0178**

Request for door replacement at **1211 Prince St.**

Applicant: Daniel Crane

### **CASE BAR2015-0181**

Request for roof replacement at **207 S Fairfax St.**

Applicant: P. Wesley Foster

### **CASE BAR2015-0182**

Request for door and window replacement at **628 S Lee St.**

Applicant: Lauren Huneke

### **CASE BAR2015-0183**

Request for HVAC replacement at **129 S Royal St.**

Applicant: Mark Paskaitis

