

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

Board of Architectural Review
Old & Historic Alexandria District
Wednesday, September 16, 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: Al Cox, Historic Preservation Manager
Catherine Miliaras, Historic Preservation Planner

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman John von Senden.

I. MINUTES

Consideration of the minutes from the September 2, 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 September 2, 2015 as submitted, 7 0.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

1 CASE BAR2015-0262

Request for waiver of rooftop screening requirement at **724 Gibbon St.**

Applicant: Molly Groom and Todd Hollis

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Neale, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0262, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

2 CASE BAR2015-0276

Request for signage at **116 S Alfred St.**

Applicant: The Grille at Morrison House

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Neale, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0276, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

3 CASE BAR2015-0281

Request for alterations at **501 S Washington St.**

Applicant: Verizon Wireless, LLC.

This item was removed from the Consent Calendar.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0.

On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Mr. Neale, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0281, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

SPEAKERS

Michael Weiland, the applicant, responded to questions and explained that the antenna would be concealed within the cupola.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Miller inquired as to why cell towers were being proposed in this location. The applicant responded that cell coverage was lacking in this location.

REASON

The Board found the proposal architecturally appropriate.

4 CASE BAR2015-0270

Request for revisions of previously approved plans at **711 Wilkes St.**

Applicant: Wilkes Residence, LLC

This item was removed from the Consent Calendar.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Retain the architectural character of the previous segmental arches at the door entrances for each of the two end units, to be compatible with the window openings on the associated buildings.
2. Refine the bay window on the south elevation to be architecturally appropriate to the style of the townhouse and distinct from the other bay windows on the project.
3. Refine the fence to have a brick base and piers, with either turned wood balusters or metal pickets.

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

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015 0270, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-1-1. Ms. Miller voted against and Mr. Neale abstained.

SPEAKERS

Michael Ibrahim, the applicant, responded to questions and explained that the project was currently under construction and they needed decisions on these items so that it does not delay the framing.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts expressed concern about the bay window on the south elevation, finding it should not look the same as the bay windows on the other townhouses that are of a different architectural style. She also thought that the fence on the south elevation should be more decorative and possibly include metal posts or some other architectural detailing. Mr. Carlin agreed that the fence should be more decorative. Ms. Finnigan agreed with the concern about the bay on the south elevation. She also asked if others liked the change in color for the trim.

REASON

The Board found some of the revisions to be appropriate but felt strongly that the bay window on the south elevation should be refined and that the fence should be more decorative to add visual interest.

5 CASE BAR2015-0278

Request for signage at **1001 Prince St.**

Applicant: Virginia Tech Foundation

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Neale, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0278, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

6 CASE BAR2015-0279

Request for signage at **1021 Prince St.**

Applicant: Virginia Tech Foundation

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Neale, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0279, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED

7 CASE BAR2015-0200

Request to partially demolish and capulate at **733 S Fairfax St.**

Applicant: Charles Sypula

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 5-2.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Neale, the OHAD Board of Architectural

Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015 0200, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 2. Ms. Finnigan and Ms. Kelley were opposed.

Item #7 & 8 were combined for discussion purposes.

8 CASE BAR2015-0201

Request for alterations, waiver of rooftop screening requirement, and an addition at **733 S Fairfax St.**

Applicant: Charles Sypula

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 5-2.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Neale, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0200 & 0201, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 2. Ms. Finnigan and Ms. Kelley were opposed.

SPEAKERS

Charles Sypula, applicant, responded to questions.

Kelly Andrews, 735 South Fairfax Street, expressed concern about construction issues, such as drainage. She had no objection to an addition if it were the same height as the existing and had a sloped roof. She said the shed was historic and should be preserved. If the shed is demolished, she asked that the party wall be clad in clapboard.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts asked whether the applicant plans to address the neighbor's concerns.

Mr. Sypula responded that he will retain the fence design between properties and any structural damage will be repaired. He said the neighbor's shed would be clad on the north side after his shed is demolished.

Mr. Neale states that all front entrances on the row of townhouses are relatively new and the entrance should be celebrated. He found the minimal entry alteration proposed to be appropriate.

Ms. Miller was glad to hear the owner would work with the neighbors. She did not object to the demolition of the rear sheds nor the rear ell. She liked the front door with an overhang.

Mr. Carlin did not object to a modest hood or door surround on the front.

Ms. Kelley supported the new entry hood. She thought that the configuration of the four townhouses with their original rear ells and sheds had significance and could not support demolition.

Ms. Finnigan agreed with Ms. Kelley and opposed demolition.

Mr. von Senden supported the retention of some 20th-century fabric and noted that, at some point, the rear sheds would be significant because of age but that they were not historic yet.

REASON

The Board generally found the project to be appropriate and found that the mid 20th century alterations now proposed for demolition were not yet historic in their own right.

9 CASE BAR2015-0109

Request to partially demolish and capsulate at **311 S St Asaph St.**

Applicant: Patricia and Ricky Fisher

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Mr. Neale, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015 0109, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

Item #9 & 10 were combined for discussion purposes.

10 CASE BAR2015-0110

Request for alterations at **311 S St Asaph St.**

Applicant: Patricia and Ricky Fisher

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The proposed fence must be fully located on the applicant's property;
2. Construct the fence of either wood or a solid, through-the-core, paintable and millable composite, and;
3. Include the following archaeology recommendations on all construction documents that involve demolition or ground disturbance (including Basement/Foundation Plans, Demolition, Erosion and Sediment Control, Grading, Landscaping, Utilities, and Sheeting and Shoring) so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirement:

R-1. Call Alexandria Archaeology immediately (703-838-4399) 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.

R-2. Metal detection or artifact collection may not be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

R-3. It is illegal to disturb human remains without proper authorization. If graves are discovered on this property and need to be removed, the applicant is responsible for obtaining the necessary permits, including the Virginia Department of Historic Resources burial removal permit.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Mr. Neale, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0110, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

SPEAKERS

Dennis Powell, representing the applicant, responded to questions.

Duncan Blair, representing the applicant, responded to questions and concerns.

Ronald Birch, 317 S. St. Asaph St., expressed concern that the alley would become a staging and parking area for future construction.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Kelley supported the staff recommendations.

Ms. Finnigan, Ms. Roberts and Mr. Neale had no objections.

Ms. Miller asked what direction the photograph was looking (toward the wall from the alley).

REASON

The Board had no objection to demolition of portions of a non-historic wall and found the proposal appropriate for this mid-block location on a private alley.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

11 CASE BAR2015-0273

Request for alterations at **201 N Columbus St.**

Applicant: Robert and Constance Sprigg

BOARD ACTION: Deferred, 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR Case #2015-0273. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

SPEAKERS

Robert Sprigg, applicant, explained that the existing fence is only 20 years old and not historic. He noted the proposed fence was high-quality material and design. He responded to questions.

Ivan Sindell, 200 North Columbus Street, spoke in support of the submitted design.

Kathleen Sindell, 200 North Columbus Street, said the existing fence was in poor condition.

Charles Trozzo, 209 Duke Street, expressed concern about the proposed fence design in this prominent location.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Neale stated he always liked the existing fence's design and thought it dated from at least 1975. He said that any new fence should be sensitive to the location and he was not moved by the proposed design. He inquired whether the existing fence could be repaired (not really, according to applicant).

Ms. Roberts stated that the existing fence stylistically complemented the house and asked that it either fixed or replaced in kind with something decorative.

Ms. Miller agreed with Mr. Neale and Ms. Roberts and suggested that the design could be something in between the existing and proposed.

Ms. Finnigan also inquired about repairing the fence. She wanted to see a proposal that had more character.

Ms. Kelley suggested the applicant work with staff on the design details.

Mr. Carlin noted that the current fence was at the end of its life cycle. He wanted to see a more decorative fence that tied in to the porch better. He advised working with staff on the design issues to find a fence that was: 1) sympathetic to the porch, 2) emphasized the gate feature, and 3) was painted to match the house trim and be a backdrop to Christ Church.

REASON

The BAR noted that the existing fence was not historic but found it stylistically compatible with the house and side porch. They were concerned that the proposed replacement fence was too plain in this highly visible location on Cameron Street across from Christ Church.

12 CASE BAR2015-0224

Request to partially demolish and capsulate at **119 Queen St.**
Applicant: Deborah and Kenneth Cureton

BOARD ACTION: Portions approved and portions deferred 7-0.

On a motion by Ms. Finnigan, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve portions and defer portions of BAR Case #2015-0224, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

Item #12 & 13 were combined for discussion purposes.

13 CASE BAR2015-0225

Request for an addition at **119 Queen St.**
Applicant: Deborah and Kenneth Cureton

BOARD ACTION: Portions approved and portions deferred 7-0.

On a motion by Ms. Finnigan, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve portions and defer portions of BAR Case #2015-0225, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

SPEAKERS

Kenneth Cureton, applicant, responded to questions.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Neale stated that he supported dormer additions generally and noted that buildings change over time. He explained he was disappointed with a similar dormer constructed at 101 Princess Street because it was out of scale and overwhelmed the house below. He said he could support a dormer here but not the size dormer proposed on the front and not with a flat roof. He advised the applicant to reduce the overall dormer size.

Ms. Roberts agreed with Mr. Neale. She had no objection to the shed dormer on the rear but recommended restudying the front dormer.

Ms. Miller agreed with Mr. Neale.

Mr. Carlin concurred that the front should be restudied.

Ms. Kelley agreed to the restudy.

Ms. Finnigan agreed with Ms. Roberts.

REASON

The BAR did not object to a dormer on the front elevation but wanted to see a smaller dormer that was appropriately scaled and not overwhelming. The BAR supported the rear shed dormer because it was minimally visible from a public way.

14 CASE BAR2015-0194

Request to partially demolish and capsule at **821 S Royal St**
Applicant: Karen Campbell

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0194, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

Item #14 & 15 were combined for discussion purposes.

15 CASE BAR2015-0195

Request for alterations and an addition at **821 S Royal St**

Applicant: Karen Campbell

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Include the following archaeology comments on all construction documents related to ground disturbance, so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements:
 - a. Call Alexandria Archaeology immediately (703-746-4399) if any buried structural remains (wall foundations, wells, privies, cisterns, etc.) or concentrations of artifacts are discovered during development. Work must cease in the area of the discovery until a City archaeologist comes to the site and records the finds.
 - b. No metal detection or artifact collection may be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0195, as submitted.

The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

SPEAKERS

Mark Shilenberger, project architect, was available for questions.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Finnigan preferred the previous, simpler front elevation but also supported the proposed design.

Ms. Roberts asked if the columns on the front elevation had gotten larger. The architect responded no.

REASON

The BAR had minimal discussion, finding the proposal appropriate and in conformance with the Design Guidelines.

16 CASE BAR2015-0271

Request to partially demolish and capsulate at **608 Oronoco St.**

Applicant: Leslie Ariail

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 7-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0271, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

Item #16 & 17 were combined for discussion purposes.

17 CASE BAR2015-0272

Request for alterations at **608 Oronoco St.**

Applicant: Leslie Ariail

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Include the following archaeology comments on all construction documents related to ground disturbance, so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements:
 - a. Call Alexandria Archaeology immediately (703-746-4399) if any buried structural remains (wall foundations, wells, privies, cisterns, etc.) or concentrations of artifacts are discovered during development. Work must cease in the area of the discovery until a City archaeologist comes to the site and records the finds.
 - b. No metal detection or artifact collection may be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 7-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0272, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

SPEAKERS

Shawn Glerum, project architect, responded to questions.

Leslie Ariail, applicant, responded to questions.

Morgan Delaney, 202 King Street, spoke in support of the project.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Finnigan asked whether there would be landscape changes on the steep slope. Ms. Ariail responded that most of the stairs and ivy was in the public way. She said the plantings would be enhanced and the driveway would have a simple handrail.

Ms. Kelley, Mr. Carlin, and Ms. Miller all supported the proposal.

Mr. Neale stated that the house had delicate details, particularly with the jack arches. He suggested making the porch elements thinner and more delicate. (Staff noted that the jack arches were painted plywood and could be easily changed.)

Ms. Roberts thought the porch looked more Tidewater than Alexandria but found it appropriately detailed and a nice addition to the house.

Ms. Kelly noted Ms. Ariail's previous comment asked about repairing the driveway and asked what the material would be. Ms. Ariail confirmed it would be brick.

REASON

The BAR found the design appropriate and consistent with the Design Guidelines.

18 CASE BAR2015-0274

Request to partially demolish and capsulate at **713 S Pitt St.**

Applicant: Rebecca and Robert Sutton

BOARD ACTION: The Board noted the deferral of case BAR2015-0274.

19 CASE BAR2015-0275

Request for an addition at **713 S Pitt St.**

Applicant: Rebecca and Robert Sutton

BOARD ACTION: The Board noted the deferment of case BAR2015-0275.

20 CASE BAR2015-0277

Request for alterations at **212 N Lee St.**

Applicant: David Overdovitz and Donnelly Bohan

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0277, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

SPEAKERS

Hamilton Smith, The Window Man and representing the applicant, showed the two different glass samples and responded to questions.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts stated she did not feel qualified to speak to which glass was appropriate.

Mr. Neale stated that reflective glass can change a building's character. He preferred the LoE-272 instead of the LoE-366.

Ms. Miller asked about the difference between the two glass options. Mr. Smith explained that the 366 glass had only been available for the past four years and reflected the latest energy efficient technology, which was important in this east-facing location. Ms. Miller thought it would be odd to have different glass on different levels and preferred consistency for all doors. She supported the staff recommendation for 272.

Mr. Carlin agreed that all floors should have the same glass, particularly on this twin house.

Ms. Kelley preferred the 272 glass, finding the 366 to look too green.

Ms. Finnigan agreed with a preference for the 272.

Mr. von Senden stated he supported energy efficiency but preferred the visual character of 272.

REASON

The BAR found the LoE-366 to be too tinted and reflective and therefore not appropriate as proposed in this location.

21 CASE BAR2015-0268

Request for new construction (townhouses) at **2 Duke St.**

Applicant: RTS Associates, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Deferred, 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Mr. Neale, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR Case #2015-0268. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

1. Continue to elaborate and revise the drawings to focus on the following:
 - a. Architectural variety on internal townhouses;
 - b. Bay windows;
 - c. Relationship between Duke Street townhouses and the historic warehouse;
 - d. Front entrances;
 - e. Rear elevation variety;
 - f. Details related to windows, metalwork and vents/utilities; and
 - g. Roof treatment.

SPEAKERS

Greg Shron, EYA, applicant, introduced the project and explained how the current version was a response to how they have incorporated feedback throughout the process.

Patrick Burkhardt, project architect, gave a presentation regarding the current proposal and changes since the BAR had last seen it.

Lynn Hampton, 215 Park Road, speaking for both RTS items, spoke in support.

Charles Trozzo, 209 Duke Street, was encouraged by the staff recommendations but said they should be elaborated upon. He said it was too massive and industrial and suggested adding variety to the roofline.

Tim Morgan, 319 South Union Street and Waterford Place HOA representative, expressed concerns, saying the building looked like the telephone company offices.

Gina Baum, member of the Parks & Recreation Commission and Waterfront Commission but speaking for herself, understood the neighbor's concerns but supported the design.

Eric Scott, 114 Prince Street, expressed concerns that the architectural details did not scale up well and asked to vary the roof heights.

Robert Atkinson, 1009 Pendleton Street, spoke in support. He said it was respectful and evocative without being replicative.

John Sullivan, 313 Kentucky Avenue, spoke in support.

Stephen Saperstone, 100 ½ Duke Street, expressed concern that it was too contemporary and should be constructed of wood and brick, rather than glass.

Barbara Saperstone, 100 ½ Duke Street, expressed concern that it did not appear “Old Town” and suggested that the modern elements be limited to the inside.

Dennis Auld, 215 Park Road, spoke in support of both RTS proposals.

Aimee Houghton, 1410 Cameron Street, spoke in support of both RTS proposals and recalled the success of Jefferson Houston school design process in using colors, materials and details that reflected its environment, believing the same was being done here.

Susan Savitch, 128 Waterford Place, said she was not an opponent but she had some concerns and thought the design should appear more historic.

Rob Duggar, 10 Wolfe Street, spoke in support of the project and the process, saying this had an appropriate urban texture.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Finnigan stated that she was confused about the two different sets of drawings and additional freehand sketches. She supported the industrial appearance of Buildings 6 and 9 but that the north elevation of Building 6 was perhaps too much brick. She agreed with the direction of the staff recommendations shown in the sketches.

Ms. Kelley said that the new sketches addressed her concerns as well as staff concerns.

Mr. Carlin asked what the staff reaction was to the revised sketches. Ms. Miliaras stated that the revised sketches addressed the areas recommended by staff in the report. Mr. Carlin thought the project was much stronger as a result of the revisions. He stated he endorsed the project wholeheartedly. He noted that items 1-3 had been fully addressed and 4-6 could be worked out with staff.

Ms. Miller stated that the applicant had done a very good job on the details and she liked the overall integrity of the design and the townhouses on the interior. Regarding Buildings 6 and 9, she understood the neighbors’ concerns that they don’t feel “Old Town” and she recommended more variety, particularly with respect to the roof lines.

Mr. Neale noted that this was a unique place with its own texture. He thought that the applicant had picked up on the pattern of the city to some degree. He observed that the historic district had a cacophony of different buildings. He noted that the proposed

townhouses had predominantly horizontal proportions but the rows on blocks in the historic district were predominantly vertical. He noted that most blocks have a variety of shapes and details that characterize the historic district. He said that contemporary or traditional architectural styles do not matter but that the project should possess the abstract qualities found in the district. He said that the project successfully does this on the Duke Street elevation because it achieves some variety. He suggested differing patterns for the slate walls on the townhouses. Regarding the interior townhouses, he again said that contemporary versus traditional styling was not important but that variety could be achieved by different color choices. He thought that the Union Street townhouses were disturbing and not the right approach. He recommended breaking it up, stepping down the parapet at the corners and raising the parapet in the middle. He also thought different windows should be considered. He said that the project had come a long way but should be studied further.

Ms. Roberts agreed that the design has come a long way. She liked Buildings 6 and 9 because they harken to iconic industrial buildings in Alexandria but thought the roof was still too flat. Regarding Building 4, she was thrilled that the applied bays had been removed and thought the revised sketch appeared more organic. She appreciated the precedent images and liked the changes to the windows. She liked the concept of a *piano nobile*. She expressed concern about the top floor and did not want this element to appear like a box plopped on top. She suggested the materials of the building could extend to the top. She agreed that Duke Street was the most successful but excited about the changes to the interior units. Regarding Building 5, she felt uneasy about the fourth story but liked the precedent buildings shown. She appreciated a design that was strong and respectful but not replicative. She thought that Building 7 was a very successful string and liked the more natural bays. She said that Building 8 was not her favorite and suggested exaggerating the bays to strengthen and get a more organic rhythm.

Mr. von Senden concurred with Ms. Roberts comments. He also liked Building 6 and 9 as they were. He wanted to see more ground-level perspectives, particularly to understand the visibility of the fourth floor boxes. He noted that most of the public comments tonight were in favor of approval and the majority of the concerns were with respect to the roof lines. He said that the massing had been broken up and the applicant had provided more differentiation. He said that the project had improved considerably.

REASON

The Board generally supported the revised direction of the townhouse proposal, liking the increased variety introduced in the sketches presented at the hearing. The Board wanted to see further refinement regarding the appearance of the fourth story and the roofs. The Board generally supported Buildings 6 and 9 and the townhouse string on Duke Street. The Board noted that the design of all of the townhouses had evolved considerably.

22

CASE BAR2015-0269

Request for new construction (Building #3) at **2 Duke St.**

Applicant: RTS Associates, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Deferred, 4-3.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR Case #2015-0269. The motion carried on a vote of 4 to 3. Ms. Finnigan, Mr. Neale and Ms. Miller voted against.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Continue to elaborate revised drawings in the direction of Option A and focus on the following:

1. Make the hyphen between buildings 3 and 3a stronger and more distinct;
2. Continue to differentiate building 3a at the eastern end from building 3;
3. Refine the stone work on the door surrounds on the north elevation; and
4. Consider adding visual and physical variety to the roofline.

SPEAKERS

Patrick Burkhardt, project architect, gave a presentation on the current scheme and revisions.

Greg Shron, applicant, explained the design approach of considering this building as being comprised of two distinct components: Building 3 and Building 3a.

Tim Morgan, 319 South Union Street, said that new material should not be presented at the hearing. He thought that the setbacks on S. Union were not adequate.

Richard Platt, 68 Wolfe Street, expressed concerns. He said the buildings were not bad or ugly but did not fit their context.

Hal Hardaway, 311 South Union Street, expressed concerns with the project and the process.

Robert Cvejanovich, 702 South Royal Street, agreed with the recommendation for deferral and stated that the grades and heights were incorrectly measured.

Bert Ely, 200 South Pitt Street, expressed concerns about height and piecemeal review.

Peter Kilcullen, 464 South Union Street, said that the change to Building 3 was a dramatic improvement. He spoke in support of the differentiation between buildings 3 and 3a and likes the variety of windows in option B.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts began by saying that Building 3 had come a long way and she liked the differentiation of 3a. She preferred option A. She said that there was no need to change the brick color on the fifth story and that it could be all glass, such as a clerestory or monitor. She thought that having the 3a element be a dark red brick distinguished it completely from any other brick in the project.

Mr. Neale said that many of the general comments regarding the project previously stated

for the townhouse item applied here as well. He explained that Old Town is a compilation of buildings. He thought Building 3 could fit in if it were not one long monolithic building. He said that the annex proposed at the Cotton Factory on Washington Street used a similar vocabulary and wondered whether it were appropriate. He said he could not support this building unless there were radical changes.

Ms. Miller thought Building 3 was too big and that it should be ten different buildings. She liked that it was moving forward but wanted to see more relief on the streetscape before discussing architectural details. She thought that the 3/3a approach was the right direction.

Ms. Finnigan said that this building lost her support. She supported the townhouses but not Building 3. She thought a modified roof form could provide variety. She agreed with Ms. Roberts that she slightly preferred Option A and wanted to see the fifth story of 3a made more glassy.

Ms. Kelley liked the glass hyphens with Option A and preferred industrial sash windows. She did not favor the fieldstone surrounds and wanted to see further work on those.

Mr. Carlin also liked Option A. He did not want to see a dark brown or cocoa colored brick but supported a rich red or salmon brick color. He recommended a warm deep brick that would be tactile and friendly. He moved a deferral with staff recommendations and to bring back hard line drawings showing Option A. Ms. Kelly seconded the motion.

Mr. von Senden observed that this building was the biggest challenge. He preferred Option B because he liked the lighter color and the fenestration.

The motion passed 5-2 but Ms. Miller asked for clarification of the motion. The vote was unanimously rescinded and amended by Ms. Finnigan to include additional variety in the rooflines. On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the new vote to defer passed 4-3 with Mr. Neale, Ms. Miller and Ms. Finnigan voting against.

REASON

The Board generally noted that the revisions and options for additional revision were headed in the right direction but asked for additional roof variety. The Board liked the design approach of a two-part design with a Building 3 + 3a and generally preferred the design direction of Option A.

V. DEFERRED PRIOR TO HEARING

CASE BAR2015-0265

Request to partially demolish and capsule at **101 Quay St**
Applicant: Julie Wannamaker and Howard Bergman

CASE BAR2015-0266

Request for alterations at **101 Quay St**
Applicant: Julie Wannamaker and Howard Bergman

CASE BAR2015-0290

Request for revisions to previously approved plans at **700 S Pitt St.**
Applicant: Tom Campbell

The hearing was adjourned at 12:30AM

Minutes submitted by,
Catherine Miliaras, Historic Preservation Planner
Board of Architectural Review

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS SINCE THE LAST MEETING

CASE BAR2015-0291

Request for masonry repair at **505 N Columbus St.**
Applicant: Mary Corrigan

CASE BAR2015-0292

Request for window replacement at **429 S Fairfax St.**
Applicant: Elizabeth Campbell

CASE BAR2015-0293

Request for siding repair, door replacement and vent installation at **420 Gibbon St.**
Applicant: Roger Lueken

CASE BAR2015-0294

Request for roof replacement at **606 Princess St.**
Applicant: Jacob Johnson & Amelia Townsend

CASE BAR2015-0295

Request for AC unit removal and masonry repair at **102 Prince St.**
Applicant: Nanette Troiano

CASE BAR2015-0296

Request for window and siding replacement at **704 Kahn Pl.**
Applicant: Joan McCallen