

*******DRAFT MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review
Old & Historic Alexandria District
Wednesday, September 2, 2015
7:30pm, City Council Chambers, City Hall
301 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Members Present: John von Senden, Chairman
Chip Carlin, Vice Chairman
Margaret Miller
Christine Roberts
Wayne Neale
Kelly Finnigan
Christina Kelley

Staff Present: *Planning & Zoning*
Karl Moritz, Director
Nancy Williams, Principal Planner
Al Cox, Historic Preservation Manager
Mary Catherine Collins, Historic Preservation Planner

Department of Project Implementation
Tony Gammon, Acting Deputy Director

Recreation, Parks & Cultural Activities
Jack Browand, Division Chief

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m. by Acting Chairman John von Senden.

I. ELECTION

The Board elected Mr. von Senden as Chairman, 4-3, and Mr. Carlin as Vice Chairman, 7-0.

II. WORK SESSION

Staff provided an update on the status of the various waterfront projects. Staff also informed the BAR of necessary revisions to the zoning ordinance regarding signs based on a recent US Supreme Court case requiring content neutrality. On a motion by Ms. Miller, the Board unanimously voted to go into recess until 7:00 PM.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman von Senden at approximately 7:15 PM.

III. MINUTES

Consideration of the minutes from the **July 15, 2015** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review approved the minutes of July 15, 2015, as submitted.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

1 CASE BAR2015-0232

Request for waiver of rooftop HVAC screening and alterations at 123 Wolfe St.

Applicant: Skep LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0232, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

2 CASE BAR2015-0238

Request for alterations at 604 Montgomery St.

Applicant: Heffner Architects

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0238, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

3 CASE BAR2015-0244

Request for signage and alterations at 600 Montgomery St.

Applicant: Swatchroom, LLC

This item was removed from the Consent Calendar.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0.

By unanimous consent, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2015-0244.

BOARD DISCUSSION: Ms. Roberts inquired whether or not lighting was proposed. The applicant confirmed that the only lights proposed were the up-down lamps shown in the application. Ms. Finnigan asked staff to confirm the appropriate illumination levels in the field.

4 CASE BAR2015-0230

Request for signage at 809 S Washington St.

Applicant: Old Town Ace Hardware

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015 0230, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

5 CASE BAR2015-0246

Request for alterations at 515 N Washington St.
Applicant: J River, 513/515 N Washington St., LLC

This item was removed from the Consent Calendar.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0.

By unanimous consent, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2015-0246.

BOARD DISCUSSION: Mr. Neale inquired why the brick mold window trim and sills were not shown in the application materials. The applicant responded that the brick mold and sill proposed will be as shown in the mock-up.

6 CASE BAR2015-0247

Request for a waiver of HVAC rooftop screening requirement at 113 S West St.
Applicant: 113 South West St. LLC

BOARD ACTION: Deferred, 7-0.

The Board noted the deferment of case BAR2015-0247, due to improper noticing.

III. NEW BUSINESS

7 CASE BAR2015-0248

Request for complete demolition at 0 Prince St.
Applicant: Old Dominion Boat Club

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 6-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0248, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0. Ms. Miller recused herself.

Item #7 & 8 were combined for discussion purposes.

8 CASE BAR2015-0249

Request for new construction at 0 Prince St.
Applicant: Old Dominion Boat Club

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 6-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0249, as amended. The motion carried on a roll call vote of 6 to 0. Ms. Miller recused herself.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Relocate the mechanical units from the top of the penthouse to the main roof and screen them as shown by the architect at the hearing;
2. Construct all pipe guard and hand rails from cold rolled painted steel;
3. Provide a display window with changing exhibits in the center of the first floor of The Strand elevation and install non-illuminated interpretative panels on the two flanking windows, with final approval by staff;
4. Work with staff and the Olin landscape architects during the final site plan process on an appropriate design and material for the paving for the parking lot with a material other than asphalt, and;
5. Final specifications for all materials and signage must comply with BAR and City policies, and the Waterfront Plan.

SPEAKERS

The architect, Michael Winstanley, gave a presentation on the revised design.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Finnigan suggested that at least the center window be used for physical displays on The Strand, with interpretative panels limited to the windows on each side. The architect agreed this was possible and a good compromise. She stated general support for the project, expressing support for the mechanical units on lower roof with the proposed screening. She did not support lighting the interpretative panels on The Strand and believed the ambient lighting was adequate.

Ms. Kelley also supported lowering the height of the mechanical units to the main roof, even if it meant additional screening. She had no issues with the proposed demolition and was generally in support of the new building and confident that staff could work with the applicant on the details of the issues outlined in the report. She said her preference was not to have additional lighting for the interpretative panels.

Mr. Carlin expressed support for the design and said this was his favorite waterfront building to date. He supported lowering the mechanical units and agreed with Ms. Finnigan's idea for a display window compromise, further suggesting that the window could be placed higher for security, since the applicant had stated that was a concern. He stated support for a motion to move the project forward.

Mr. Neale concurred with Mr. Carlin that this was the best thing the Board had seen in a long time and that it is a good example of a small scale contemporary building that can stand alone on the waterfront. He had no opposition to any of the alterations proposed, finding that even the mechanical units stacked as they were in the first proposal could be reminiscent of a tower on a boat. He would be happy with the mechanical units in either place. He understood the applicant's need to value engineer the parking lot and said this could be an opportunity to look better than brick.

Ms. Miller stated that she would recuse herself from the discussion to avoid any

appearance of a conflict of interest, as she is a member of the Old Dominion Boat Club.

Ms. Roberts stated that she agreed with most of what the other Board members had said and made a motion that the applicant work with staff on the paving materials and specifications; that the applicant work with staff and the relevant committees on a restudy of the interpretative panels, taking into consideration the comments made by the Board and that no additional light be added; and that all signs comply with city sign programs and materials with the common elements of the waterfront; and that the mechanical equipment be lowered and screened.

Mr. von Senden said that he was sad to see the Beachcomber's Building go, but recognized its deteriorated condition. He said that the originally proposed penthouse reminded him of a steamboat, so it did not really bother him, but from a design standpoint he preferred the lower arrangement. He said that he missed the historical interpretive display windows on The Strand and was not sure what specifically of the solid gray wall bothered him, but perhaps it was the lack of depth or return of the store front windows. Mr. von Senden asked that the painted pipe railings be fabricated of cold rolled steel, as this is a higher quality material. He felt that outstanding paving and signage issues could be resolved with staff. He expressed enthusiasm for the jack staff flag pole.

Mr. Carlin seconded Ms. Roberts' motion and the Board approved the proposal, 6-0-1. Ms. Miller recused herself.

REASON

The Board agreed with the staff recommendations and found that the existing building met the criteria for demolition, as it was constructed of utilitarian mid-20th century materials conveying no uncommon craftsmanship or design. The Board further found that the proposal for a new building generally met the *Design Guidelines* and complied with the previous BAR memo recommending that any replacement for the Beachcombers building recall that structure's utilitarian architectural character, cantilevered balconies and rooftop dining.

9 CASE BAR2015-0226

Request for signage at 1201 E Abingdon Dr.

Applicant: CBRE

BOARD ACTION: Deferred, 7-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR Case #2015-0226. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0

SPEAKERS

The applicant, represented by the sign company, stated that they do not agree with staff's recommendations, as they preferred to have all of the signs shown in the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts stated that she was not comfortable approving the application, as she felt that the sign company representative was not the right person to be answering questions regarding the removal or addition of signage. She asked the applicant if they would be willing to ask for a deferral.

Ms. Miller was in agreement with Ms. Roberts, saying that the questions she has for the applicant goes beyond what the sign company is in a position to answer.

Mr. Neale said he was in favor of the Parkway Center sign, but that its location at the top of the building was more appropriate on a highway and not a small scale civic street like Washington Street. He said that he would prefer a sign lower on the building, at the first and second floor, or less visible from the Parkway.

Mr. Carlin said he was in agreement with the statements of the other Board members and favored a deferral.

Ms. Kelley stated the same and expressed agreement with Mr. Neale's comments.

Ms. Finnigan was in agreement. The Board unanimously deferred the case.

REASON

The Board believed the quantity, location and size of the signs was inappropriate on the George Washington Memorial Parkway. The applicant was not prepared to answer the questions of the Board and agreed to a deferral.

10 CASE BAR2015-0242

Request to partially demolish and capsule at 201 S Lee St.
Applicant: Mark and Ann Kington

BOARD ACTION: Approved portions and deferred portions, 6-0.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve portions and defer portions of BAR Case #2015-0242, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 1. Ms. Finnigan voted against.

Item #10 & 11 were combined for discussion purposes.

11 CASE BAR2015-0243

Request for alterations and an addition at 201 S Lee St.
Applicant: Mark and Ann Kington

BOARD ACTION: Approved portions and deferred portions, 6-0.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve portions and defer portions of BAR Case #2015-0243, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 1. Ms. Finnigan voted against.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Final window specifications to be approved by staff;
2. The parking gate be deferred for restudy; and
3. Include the following archaeology conditions on all construction documents related to ground disturbance:
 - a. Call Alexandria Archaeology (703/746-4399) two weeks before the starting date of any ground disturbance so that a monitoring and inspection schedule for city archaeologists can be arranged.
 - b. 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.
 - c. No metal detection or artifact collection may be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

SPEAKERS

The applicant, represented by architect Bud Adams, presented the proposal to the Board. He clarified that the light fixtures will be gas and not electric, that the house has always been painted, and that all brick removed will be salvaged and reused on site. If additional brick is needed, it will be sourced from a company that makes hand-molded brick to match.

Gail Rothrock, representing the Historic Alexandria Foundation (HAF), commended the owners and architects for plans to restore the house, finding it a very thoughtful and elegant proposal. HAF agreed that enlarging the Lee Street door and steps will enhance a probable entrance and was in keeping with the Georgian proportions. HAF supported staff's recommendation to preserve the 20th century ells, and asked that the Board defer those alterations for restudy, thinking there may be a better solution. In particular, HAF would like to see a solution that retained screening of the parking.

Phillip Matyas, 219 N Pitt Street, commended the applicant for the effort going into the restoration. He asked the BAR to require screening of the parking space, citing an exposed parking pad on the 400 block of Queen Street that created a visual intrusion of the streetscape.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Chairman von Senden acknowledged that three letters were received from the public and concluded the public comment portion for the case.

Ms. Finnigan thought the application was a model example of a restoration. She grappled with whether the changes over time to the house had obtained importance in their own right but was willing to support a "restoration" to its 18th century appearance. She expressed concern that the applicant was redesigning the chimney configuration in a way that may not be authentic to its 18th century appearance and that the ell would not remain intact. She inquired about the age of the shutters and the muntin configuration.

Mr. von Senden said that he shared Ms. Finnigan's concerns about the chimney and removal of windows on the ell, but that everything else was in line with the architect's high quality standards.

Ms. Kelley said she was very impressed with the high quality of materials chosen. She asked if there was a way to install a mechanized gate at the driveway entrance. She supported the relocation and addition of windows on the ell because they were differentiated from the 18th century construction through muntin configuration. She supported the location of mechanical units and screening to the roof.

Mr. Carlin thanked the applicant for their thorough study of the house and supported the proposed alterations, with the exception of the driveway gate. He felt that the parking should be screened.

Mr. Neale told the architect that this was his best work ever and the Board appreciated the knowledge he brings to the process. He concurred with the other Board members that the parking screening gate should be retained. He felt that the last three staff recommendations had to do with the issue of livability and that the rear of the house was the proper location to make changes related to livability, therefore he supported the application. He found the muntins and shutters were sufficient to differentiate the Victorian ell from the main block.

Ms. Miller also thought the design was wonderfully done and generally concurred with the statements of the other Board members. She found the exterior design very pleasing. She stated that to her memory, the existing parking gates were frequently left open so she was not opposed to their removal, provided the paving was of a high standard.

Ms. Roberts concurred with the statements already made, but said that the chimney was far enough out of view that she was not opposed to its alteration. While she generally supports screening parking, she too acknowledged that they are frequently left open, and in this location in particular, they swing out and are a menace to pedestrians. She supported the mechanical units on the roof, provided they are completely screened.

Mr. von Senden summarized that the Board was generally supportive, with some hesitation on the proposed changes to the windows on the north ell and the parking gates.

Mr. Carlin made a motion for approval with the condition that staff approve the final window specifications, the windows on the rear ell be differentiated, the archaeology conditions be enforced, and that the parking gates be deferred for restudy. Ms. Finnigan asked for a friendly amendment to include a restudy of the chimney, which died for lack of a second. Ms. Roberts made a friendly amendment that the applicant can return with a restudy of the parking screening that also includes an unscreened option. Chip accepted the friendly amendment and using a roll call vote, the Board approved the motion on a vote of 6-1, with Ms. Finnigan voting in opposition.

REASON

The Board found that with the exception of the removal of the parking screening, the project generally complied with the *BAR Design Guidelines* and criteria for demolition.

12 CASE BAR2015-0245

Request for signage and new construction at 1202-1204 S Washington St.

Applicant: Hunting Point Apartments

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0245, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. The applicant provide detail drawings for staff review to ensure the muntins, belt courses, windows, and other architectural details have sufficient depth and reveals for a high quality design;
2. That two signs, up to 40 square feet, be permitted at each of the porte cocheres to the towers, with final approval by staff, and;
3. All illegal signs are removed from the property prior to the issuance of a building or sign permit.

SPEAKERS

The applicant stated that they were in agreement with staff recommendations, but had concerns regarding the condition of signage. Due to the fact that this is a leased building, unlike the neighboring condos, and it being situated lower and further from Washington Street, the applicant felt strongly that signage facing I-495 was appropriate. The applicant also asked if a freestanding sign on Washington Street would be permitted, but staff cited the zoning ordinance section that prohibits monument signs within 200 feet of Washington Street. The applicant concluded that they would prefer to have an elevated sign on building 1204 and they were flexible on the location of a second sign.

Stephen Pisani, representing the National Park Service, stated that the proposed building was well integrated into the site and compatible with the two existing buildings, but that the 20th century modernist project, as a whole, did not comply with the Washington Street Standards or the memorial character of the parkway. He did not want the modern style of this building to be a precedent for new construction on Washington Street.

Ms. Roberts asked Mr. Pisani what would be memorial character for the clubhouse? Is there something that you think would fit better? Mr. Pisani stated that he could not think of a better style or design because a Colonial Revival style building would stand out more at this site, but he reiterated that this project should not be a precedent.

Mr. von Senden reminded the Board that there are a few mid-century buildings on Washington Street that are not necessarily out of character with the Parkway. To say that

one has to end architectural styles with the Federal period is a narrow interpretation.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts did not like the building sign but liked the new building. She asked the applicant and Board if there was a location on the buildings for a sign that could be seen only from I-495 and not Washington Street.

The applicant suggested the river side. Mr. von Senden pointed out that east side of building 1202 could not be seen from the Parkway.

Ms. Miller stated that most people find building with GPS these days and questioned whether the amount and location of signage was actually a necessity.

Mr. Neale found the new building had a low visual impact and was well designed, as it picked up the existing character of the apartment buildings and appropriately richens the detail of what is a pretty Spartan apartment design. Regarding signage he thought the site should be permitted three signs – one per building and the signs should be located at the entrances as opposed to the wall at the top of the buildings. Staff reminded him that the zoning ordinance permitted only one sign per street frontage and this site fronted only two streets.

Ms. Finnigan thanked the applicant for a thorough and well-assembled application. She was in general support of the new construction. However, she felt that putting such large signage at this location, which is a gateway to the city, was not appropriate.

Ms. Miller stated that she had not had sufficient time to review the proposal and had no comment.

Ms. Kelley supported the new building and thought the windows and trellis added a lot of interest. She supported a sign at each building entrance but did not support any signs placed high on the buildings and thought that a sign facing I-495 was moot, since one cannot even enter the property from that location.

Mr. Carlin agreed that there was no doubt where these building are located due to their unusual size. He agreed with Ms. Kelley's comments and since only two signs are permitted, suggested that the most appropriate location was the porte cocheres at the two building entrances, as shown in the application.

Mr Carlin moved staff's recommendations, except for condition 2 being edited to say two signs up to 40 square feet, provided they are located at the porte cocheres of each of the towers. Ms. Roberts seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

REASON

The Board found the new construction and signage generally met the *BAR Design Guidelines*.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

13 CASE BAR2015-0154

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

BOARD ACTION: The BAR held a work session to discuss the proposed development project at 802-808 N Washington St.

SPEAKERS

The applicant, represented by Rust Orling Architecture, gave a presentation on the revised submittal.

Katy Canady, summarized the findings of the Old Town Civic Association, which found the proposal did not meet the Washington Street standards and that the design was too big and too modern.

Stephen Pisani, representing the National Park Service, stated that the massing of the building is too great and overpowers the adjacent historic structure. He appreciated the reduction of the glass hyphen and the simplified mutton pattern and asked if the massing could be reduced by stepping back the upper floors. It appeared to be a fifty foot tall box with details added to it. He also said a glass mansard roof is not an appropriate detail for Washington Street.

Gail Rothrock, representing the Historic Alexandria Foundation's advocacy committee, found the hyphen to be much better articulated because it is four stories tall as opposed to the originally proposed five. In general, HAF felt the structure loomed over the historic building – which should not be relocated in the first place. She cited standard #2 is and #4 among others that were not met with the current design. While she found the design improved with better articulation, she said it is too massive overall and large for both Washington Street and the adjoining historic building.

Charles Trozzo, of 209 Duke Street, and former member of the Alexandria Historical Restoration & Preservation Commission for many years, said that he is familiar with the review process. He sees this project as a lost opportunity, as it misses many of the Washington Street standards. He felt the mass should be relevant to context and not cherry picked from places in historic district. Another missed opportunity is that the structure could reflect the mid-20th century hotel proposed for demolition, as it is of the era when parkway created. Why can't the project be an upscale version of the motel design and reflecting authenticity of Parkway?

Poul Hertel, 3716 Carriage House Court, expressed disbelief that the proposed building meets Washington Street standards. He said the staff reports do not mention curb cuts or the previous change in the boundary of the historic district which specifically said that the view shed of Parkway is important.

Phillip Matyas, 219 N Pitt Street, reiterated Mr. Hertel's comments regarding the Washington Street standards, feeling that the City has adopted rules and codes to be in the spirit of what we are trying to do. He favored a reduction in height and saw similarity between this proposal and the Notch 8 building on Route 1. He lamented Route 1 style architecture intruding on Washington Street corridor and reminded the Board that the application does not discuss mechanical equipment, but that will add to the height.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Neale recused himself.

Ms. Roberts liked the revisions to the north wall, especially the brickwork. She asked whether the hyphen connecting to the historic house, would be white brick. The applicant said that the rendering was white so that the building forms could be viewed with the distraction of color and that they will return with colors proposed for approval during the Certificate of Appropriateness application. Ms. Roberts preferred the less busy hyphen and the reduction in its scale, especially next to the historic building. However, she thought the glass hyphen worked better than the revised brick version, and that perhaps it could be one story lower. Regarding the north entrance, she observed that while it is set back eight feet, it is also taller than the previous version, but she supports the way it is. She did not care for glass mansard roof and cited the Time Life Building as an example of a mansard that overwhelms the building. She suggested a flat roof here, with a lower roofline. Lastly she confirmed that there would be differentiation in the brick colors between the two primary building masses.

Ms. Miller felt that the building recedes into sky better if is a lighter color. She preferred the new hyphen more than the previous version. While the architectural detailing is in keeping with its location, she agreed with the public that the building is too massive.

Ms. Kelley said that she did not have benefit of being on Board when it was last presented, but believes a lot of concerns have been addressed in the revisions and that it is a better looking project now. She like the lowered glass hyphen next to historic building, but did not care for the glass mansard. She felt many of the remaining details could be addressed by architects before the Certificate of Appropriateness application.

Ms. Finnigan, too, was absent during first review but was generally in agreement with the public comments that the project was not in conformance with the Washington Street standards. She preferred the glazing on current proposal. She found the revised glass hyphen to be sympathetic to the historic structure and suggested borrowing that same look for center hyphen. She felt the raised panel door on the lower right corner of the east elevation did not fit with the modern approach and that the pilasters appeared to be floating, suggesting that they be carried down through the piers to visually ground the building. Lastly, she asked that next submission show the overall neighborhood context.

Mr. Carlin said that the design team has done excellent job moving this forward and was in general agreement with comments made. He felt that the design now opened up to the Little Tavern, and found that a good thing.

Mr. von Senden said he generally would be in favor of a lighter color masonry for the reasons Ms. Miller mentioned, but did not favor painting the historic building. He preferred the glass hyphen and had concerns about the glass mansard, stating that Washington Street is quite wide and it would be very visible. He feared the glass mansard may not read as successfully as it does in other parts of town. He suggested recessing the top level and reducing the massing. He found the north side much improved and liked the projecting pilasters. The revised west side is much more coherent.

Ms. Finigan asked the applicant to speak more about the folly building. The applicant said that the transformer now located on corner of Washington Street would be relocated and disguised it by this structure.

Ms. Roberts posed the question to the applicant of leaving historic building red and differentiating the new building with a light color, for instance, painted brick– white or otherwise. Mr. von Senden concurred with Ms. Roberts that a painted brick could be appropriate here.

The applicant said that an Italianate building would not be appropriately white and his personal feeling is that white or gray is not appropriate but he did not rule it out as never having been done.

Ms. Roberts reminded applicant that they are hearing from the public that there is a feeling building overwhelms historic building and perhaps a lighter color would help it recede.

Ms. Miller asked why the applicant chose an Italianate style and if there were any local precedent examples of this style. The applicant responded that it was a personal choice for Italianate and that the Campagna Center on South Washington Street was a large Italianate building, although it was not necessarily being used as a precedent. That building also is white painted brick.

Mr. von Senden summarized the Board's comments, citing concerns regarding the color, glass mansard, and lack of context images.

The applicant stated that they could return on October 21st for another concept review.

14 CASE BAR2015-0156

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

BOARD ACTION: The BAR held a work session to discuss the proposed development project at 1101 N Washington St.

SPEAKERS

The applicant, represented by Rust Orling Architects, gave a presentation on the proposal.

Stephen Pisani, representing the National Park Service, had concerns on massing and overall scale, particularly its effect on Washington Street. He said that he would like the wings lowered to allow main portion to be more prominent.

Chris Newbury, 1206 N Pitt Street, appreciated effort the applicant made to communicate the changes. Mr. Newbury felt that the height of Harris building to the north was a mistake that should not be repeated, finding it ironic that the Board opposed a sign on the Harris building because it detracted from the Washington Street character, but that doubling a hotel's size in this project would be in keeping with the memorial character of the Parkway. He felt the revised "notch" on the rear would hardly be noticeable from their homes and that air circulation, sunlight, and views of Masonic Temple are benefits to their property that cannot be replaced by another restaurant in neighborhood. He appreciated effort to blend the architectural features, but that did not detract from the fact this is still a proposed four story building rising up from asphalt parking lot.

Andrea Haslinger, 522 Bellvue Place, deferred to Chris Newbury as representative.

Morrill E. Marston, 1172 N Pitt Street, said he lives 60 feet from back of Old Colony Inn. He and other neighbors have hired an architect to provide written comments on proposal and has submitted a signed petition with their comments to the Board. He pointed out that the front façade is not symmetrical, per Colonial Revival standards. He felt the individual façade transitions were poorly articulated and not legible from the street, while the rear façade has more ornamentation and detail. He said that the non-conformance with the transition zone setback line affects the mass of the building and the neighborhood deserves more than just average architecture.

Elizabeth Chimento, 1200 N Pitt Street, said the mass of proposed hotel addition overwhelms the property, as evidenced by its encroachment in the transitional zone setback in two of the three sectors. In particular, she felt the height of the building dwarfed the townhomes located behind it, creating a canyon effect. Architecturally, the proposed hotel front appears to maintain the character of the parkway because it has flow, symmetry, balance, and grace. However the back elevation demonstrates no reference to the front with its conscious and painful attempt to replicate features of townhomes and the effect of those behind.

Elizabeth Sproul, 1128 N Pitt Street, said that the building is high compared to other buildings in the area. She reiterated that the Harris building should not be a precedent. Liberty Row is also tall, but has varying heights, like the entire parkway. She would like to see varied height in this building and more ground improvements on the rear to balance out extra height.

Jesus Medraino, represents Potomac Shores Condo, said the scale is too big, not symmetrical, and two wings are too big.

Gary Solis, 522 Bellvue Place, told the Board that while this group may be viewed as homeowner NIMBYS, that is an incorrect view because we all acknowledge something will be built here, but the question is what it will be. The neighborhood wants something smaller, particularly lower in height, but the developers so far have not considered this

possibility to be financially feasible for them. He said that he and others have an emotional investment in their homes that is not only financial. He expressed concern at the loss of air, view, and sunlight that would be a result of the proposed construction.

Viesturs Lenss, 521 Bellvue Place, asked that the addition maintain a smaller scale - just like at Abingdon Drive sign (Harris Building). He felt the applicant needs to show more clearly how proposed building compares to existing height and massing.

Linda Lord, 600 Second St #202, expressed concern over the scale in length and width to property and lack of underground parking. She felt the front is disjointed and without symmetry or attractive design, with doors that appear to be randomly located. She said the loading dock on the front would not be conducive to the clientele one would seek here. However, the Second Street façade concerns her the most due to the location of her property. The rear façade is disjointed due to modern windows of different sizes and the railings appear to be very industrial grade appearance. She preferred the appearance of Liberty row across the street, which has more classic and traditional designed railings.

James Herring, 525 Bellvue Place, stated the crux of the matter is that the proposal is too large for this property. Architects have done their best, but the size of building is the issue. Developer and community will not see eye to eye.

Poul Hertel, 3716 Carriage House Court, Fairfax County, stated that the concept review is problematic. He further felt that Alexandria is straying far from 1929 letter and standards and that the articulation on the building was not well designed and it looks like one building.

Andrea Hesslinger, Bellvue Place, asked the Board why not wait to review this proposal until the new area plan is adopted. She said that this project is a big deal for the neighborhood and if it complies with new plan, there may not be as much opposition as there is now. She felt that Washington Street should be a small scale street.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Neale recused himself.

Ms. Finnigan thanked the attendees for staying here late. She told the applicant that he precedent photographs were quite helpful. She asked the width of alley behind this building, to which the applicant responded will be a 22 feet drive aisle which is typical for two eleven foot drive lanes and a standard for EVE's. The applicant further clarified that from the proposed building face to the neighbor's garden walls would be 70 feet, with 66 feet being the standard distance between building faces in Old Town. Ms. Finnigan suggested considering sunlight studies to help inform the adjacent neighbors. She asked the applicant to explain the reasoning for doors on the façade, to which the applicant responded, they were to make it appear like rowhomes and they will be operating doors. Ms. Finnigan noted the applicant's positive effort to center the main block on the circle drive and thought the asymmetrical lengths of wings is a positive feature in this because it breaks of the scale versus two matching length wings on either side. She generally supported the main block at 50 feet tall, but would like to see if wings could be reduced in height to emphasize centerpiece and assuage neighbors.

Ms. Kelley felt the applicant had made great improvements since the last review. She asked the applicant to clarify where service doors are located, to which the applicant responded they moved them because they felt that is where the community wanted them. Ms. Kelley liked the added windows on south elevation of the restaurant because it looked more open. She asked if the changes to east elevation (alley) were made in response to concerns from the neighbors, to which the applicant responded yes. She was glad the serpentine parking screening wall remained and suggested lowering the wing height to make neighbors happier.

Mr. Carlin expressed enthusiasm at the applicant's commitment to restoring the serpentine wall and traffic circle that was originally part of Parkway design. He felt that all sides of the building do not always have to be the same and agreed with the other Board members' comments about lowering the wings. He voiced appreciation for everything the neighborhood has said.

M. Miller said that her comments were not directed at Mr. Rust, because she thought he had made good progress, but she was concerned that no one spoke in favor of the project, whereas on other projects, there is generally some opposition and some support. She reminded the applicant that the investors will profit, but the homeowners will not and she would like to see the applicant work out issues with the neighborhood first.

Ms. Roberts appreciated the precedent pictures and felt the general character was successful and the design elegant. She said that the mass and scale of middle portion works, but suggested that the building would benefit from reduced hyphens to make it not feel overwhelming, as it is a very long building.

Mr. von Senden stated that the National Park Service had telling comment – that from Washington Street, the proposed building is a level mass all the way across and there have been lots of comments about varying that mass. In his opinion, the end wings function as anchors, but there could be some articulation on west elevation facing Washington Street, similar to what is shown on the east elevation. He was surprised that Mr. Hertel did not point out that the alley elevation comes closer to the Washington Street standards than does the Washington Street elevation. Mr. von Senden liked the formality of the front and found the revised center element very successful. While he liked the refinements to the restaurant, he agreed with the majority that the wings need some articulation or lowering in mass. He is not offended by one wing being longer than the other but noted balance is required. He called for a motion to support the center mass, height, and rear elevation, with the applicant to restudy the wings. The Board voted 5-1-1, with Ms. Miller voting in opposition and Mr. Neale recused.

STAFF UPDATES

Staff noted that in addition to the cases before the Board, staff completed 38 administrative approvals since the last meeting, and that would like to provide the OHAD BAR an update on the revised Parker-Gray Design Guideline at a work session in October.

Mr. von Senden stated that he would be representing the Board for the appeal case regarding 226 The Strand at City Council docketed for September 12, 2015.

The Board asked staff if it would be possible to receive copies of letters from the public earlier than the night of the hearing. Staff responded that they would e-mail PDF's of the letters when possible, but that many letters arrive the day of a hearing. Staff also confirmed that the Board members did not want their phone numbers and e-mail addresses to be provided to the public and that correspondence should be directed through staff.

The hearing was adjourned at 11:59 PM

Minutes submitted by,

Mary Catherine Collins, Historic Preservation Planner
Board of Architectural Review

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS SINCE LAST MEETING

CASE BAR2015-0211

Request for siding replacement at **305 N St Asaph St.**
Applicant: Margaret Ingraham

CASE BAR2015-0213

Request for signage at **105 S Union St.**
Applicant: Ladyburg

CASE BAR2015-0214

Request for roof replacement at **120 Gibbon St.**
Applicant: Edward Silverman

CASE BAR2015-0217

Request for roof replacement at **608 Oronoco St.**
Applicant: Leslie Ariail

CASE BAR2015-0219

Request for window replacement at **515 N Washington St.**
Applicant: CAS Riegler

CASE BAR2015-02210

Request for shutter replacement at **304 S Fairfax St.**
Applicant: John Brown

CASE BAR2015-0221

Request for roof replacement at **814 Franklin St.**

Applicant: Greene Funeral Home

CASE BAR2015-0222

Request for roof replacement at **830 S Pitt St.**

Applicant: Greene Funeral Home

CASE BAR2015-0287

Request for window replacement at **817 S Columbus St.**

Applicant: Santo & Beverly Polizzi

CASE BAR2015-0284

Request for repointing at **204 S Pitt St.**

Applicant: Gloria Vanorder

CASE BAR2015-0282

Request for HVAC screening and gate repair at **910 S Fairfax St.**

Applicant: Sandra Creel-Sullivan and Theodore Sullivan

CASE BAR2015-0263

Request for window well installation at **410 Jefferson St.**

Applicant: Kevin and Shirley Carrol

CASE BAR2015-0280

Request for signage at **615 N Washington St.**

Applicant: Talbots

CASE BAR2015-0267

Request for signage at **107 N Fairfax St.**

Applicant: Eric Roper

CASE BAR2015-0261

Request for repointing and chimney repair at **811 Prince St.**

Applicant: Vaughan Restoration

CASE BAR2015-0260

Request for window replacement at **472 S Union St.**

Applicant: Lee Gigliotti

CASE BAR2015-0259

Request for alterations at **724 Gibbon St.**

Applicant: Molly Groom and Todd Hollis

CASE BAR2015-0257

Request for signage at **829 S Washington St.**

Applicant: Super Cuts

CASE BAR2015-0254

Request for siding repair at **310 N Payne St.**

Applicant: Johnathan Burks

CASE BAR2015-0228

Request for roof replacement at **311 N West St.**

Applicant: Lisa Ward

CASE BAR2015-0231

Request for signage at **814 King St.**

Applicant: Escape Room Live

CASE BAR2015-0252

Request for roof replacement at **610 S St. Asaph St.**

Applicant: Jennifer Runkle

CASE BAR2015-0229

Request for a storm door at **605 S Fairfax St.**

Applicant: John Delaney

CASE BAR2015-0233

Request for window replacement at **709 S Union St.**

Applicant: Charles and Mary Jane Nash

CASE BAR2015-0234

Request for window replacement at **715 S Union St.**

Applicant: David and Joan Walker

CASE BAR2015-0235

Request for window replacement at **725 S Union St.**

Applicant: Milton and Alice Ahlerich

CASE BAR2015-0236

Request for window replacement at **723 S Union St.**

Applicant: Maria Cino

CASE BAR2015-0237

Request for window replacement at **713 S Union St.**

Applicant: Joey Solis

CASE BAR2015-0046

Request for signage at **112 S Columbus St.**

Applicant: The Aquinas School

CASE BAR2015-0223

Request for window replacement at **1209 Michigan Ct.**

Applicant: Kalpish Mehta

CASE BAR2015-0239

Request for signage at **600 Montgomery St.**

Applicant: Jamie Leeds

CASE BAR2015-0240

Request for signage at **689 S Washington St.**

Applicant: Global Bridal Gallery, LLC

CASE BAR2015-0241

Request for signage at **689 S Washington St.**

Applicant: Global Bridal Gallery, LLC

CASE BAR2015-0218

Request for alterations at **721 S Royal St.**

Applicant: Hovannes Kazanjien

CASE BAR2015-0250

Request for a fence at **820 Duke St.**

Applicant: Nicole Barranco

CASE BAR2015-0251

Request for roof replacement at **725 S Royal St.**

Applicant: Louis Boero

CASE BAR2015-0256

Request for window replacement and a storm door at **1222 W Abingdon St.**

Applicant: Linda Wernery

CASE BAR2015-0258

Request for window replacement at **232 N St. Asaph St.**

Applicant: Jennifer Oehme