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

Board of Architectural Review Old & Historic Alexandria District **Wednesday, December 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
	Christina Kelley
	Margaret Miller
	Kelly Finnigan
	Wayne Neale
	Christine Roberts
Staff Present:	Al Cox, Historic Preservation Manager
	Michele Oaks, Historic Preservation Planner

The Board of Architectural Review, Old and Historic Alexandria District, hearing was called to order at 7:30pm.

I. <u>MINUTES</u>

Consideration for the minutes from the December 2, 2015 public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Deferred, 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review, deferred the minutes of December 2, 2015 because a printed copy was not available prior to the hearing.

II. <u>CONSENT CALENDAR</u>

1 CASE BAR2015-0360

Request for alterations and waiver of fence height at **1210 Prince St.** Applicant: Shane Latham

This item was removed from the consent calendar.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 7-0.

On a motion by Ms. Kelley, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0360, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

REASON

The Board unanimously approved the proposed project, based in part on the applicant's representation that the existing fence was being replaced in-kind and in the same location with a new fence that was architecturally appropriate.

SPEAKERS

Shane Latham, owner, responded to questions.

2 CASE BAR2015-0373

Request for alterations at **420 N Union St.** Applicant: Tim Tran and Jessica Likas

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 #2015-0373, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

3 CASE BAR2015-0368

Request for alterations at **117 Prince St.** Applicant: Susan Joseph

This item was removed from the consent calendar.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 6-1.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0368, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 1. Ms. Miller voted against.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

- 1. The existing metal roofing may be replaced with either standing seam metal or a wood shingle that complies with the BAR's *Roof Policy*;
- 2. Standing seam metal roof panels must match the same width as the current roof and the applicant shall work with staff on an appropriate color selection to recall the aged field painted roof;
- 3. Shutters may be either wood or a paintable, millable, solid composite material.
- 4. That the existing first floor windows be donated to the Historic Alexandria Foundation.

REASON

The Board discussed whether a pre-formed standing seam roof was appropriate or whether the roof should be a field seamed copper roof. The staff noted that the Board's roofing policy since 1993 has allowed factory-formed pre-finished standing seam metal roofs for replacement of historic standing seam metal roofing which has deteriorated beyond repair. There was also a discussion about the donation of the first floor historic sashes to HAF, which the applicant supported. The Board approved the application with the staff recommendation and the added condition that the standing seam metal roof panels must match the same width as the current roof and the applicant shall work with staff on an appropriate color selection.

SPEAKERS

Susan Joseph, contract purchaser, spoke in support of the project and answered questions.

4 CASE BAR2015-0371

Request for alterations at **911 King St**. Applicant: Majestic Cafe

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 #2015-0371, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

III. <u>UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED</u>

5 CASE BAR2015-0358

Request for complete demolition at **608 S Fairfax St.** Applicant: 608 S Fairfax Street, LLC.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 4-2.

On a motion by Mr. Neale, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0358, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 4-2. Mr. Carlin and Ms. Finnigan voted against. Ms. Miller recused herself because of a financial conflict.

REASON

The majority of the Board members found that none of the Criteria for demolition were met and supported the Permit to Demolish. They generally found that this early 20th century building was not unusual or unique, did not exhibit a high degree of craftsmanship and the materials used are common and readily available today.

6 CASE BAR2015-0359

Request for new construction at **608 S Fairfax St.** Applicant: 608 S Fairfax Street, LLC.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 5-1.

On a motion by Mr. Neale, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve portions and defer portions of BAR Case #2015-0359, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-1. Ms. Finnigan voted against. Ms. Miller recused herself because of a financial conflict.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new dwelling and a Waiver of the Rooftop HVAC Screening Requirement with the conditions that:

- 1. The following notes are included on all construction drawings that relate to ground disturbing activity, so that all 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. The applicant/developer shall not allow any metal detection or artifact collection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology; and
- 2. The approval is granted for the new dwelling with the exception of a restudy of the following two items:
 - The roof/wall geometry and materials of the third floor of the hyphen above the stairwell on the north elevation; and
 - More modest details on the front (west) elevation of the building, potentially including window muntins, simplification of the front door surround and the use of one dormer instead of two.

REASON

The Board discussed the roof/wall geometry and materials of the third floor of the hyphen above the stairwell on the north elevation, and also suggested recalling the vernacular cottage character of the existing house by simplifying and reducing the number of dormers and the window light configuration on the front elevation. Overall, the majority of the Board found that the proposed new dwelling was in compliance with the *Design Guidelines* and appropriate for this location.

SPEAKERS

Stephen Kulinski, Architect for the project, summarized the project's evolution and the Board's action at the previous hearing.

John Brady, neighbor at 609 S Lee to the east, was concerned with the rear yard setback and the view of the house's rear elevation.

Joseph Wilson, neighbor at 210 Gibbon, expressed concerns with the potential impacts the new construction will have on the urban forest and the lack of tree replenishment. He objects to the position of the house on the lot as it will negatively impact a Japanese maple on his property.

Divya Shenoy, adjacent neighbor at 604/606 S Fairfax, concurred with her neighbors' concerns about the impact the new construction will have on the tree canopy. She also noted that she feels the building is too tall. As an adjacent neighbor, she is also concerned about the distance the house is from her fence and the potential need for access from her property during construction.

Lynn Niehardt, neighbor at 611 S Fairfax, supported the proposal and noted that the front yard setback was appropriate, as it was compatible with the adjacent building.

Kim Kaplan, neighbor at 418 Queen, testified that she did not support the demolition of the existing small house. She believed that small houses are their own architectural category and felt that the subject building met Criteria 1, 5, and 6 of the zoning ordinance and therefore the permit to demolish should not be granted.

Sudhakar Shenoy, father of adjacent neighbor at 604/606 S Fairfax, expressed concern his daughter's property would be damaged during construction.

Poul Hertel, resident of Fairfax County, testified that the proposed building is modest vernacular building and complimented the existing streetscape.

IV. <u>NEW BUSINESS</u>

7 CASE BAR2015-0367

Request for alterations at **10 Prince St.** Applicant: 2 Prince, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Ms. Finnigan, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015-0367, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

That all replacement windows comply with the BAR's adopted Window Policy.

REASON

The Board supported the restoration of the warehouse building and its adaptive reuse. The Board noted that the case was a demonstration of how to add a contemporary curtain wall to a historic structure and visually restore some of an original alley's open appearance.

SPEAKERS

Steven Bannigan, architect, for the project, presented.

8 CASE BAR2015-0369

Request to partially demolish and capsulate at **708 Wolfe St.** Applicant: Alexandra and Paul Clement

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 7-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015 0369, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

Item #8 & 9 were combined for discussion purposes.

9 CASE BAR2015-0370

Request for alterations at **708 Wolfe St.** Applicant: Alexandra and Paul Clement

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 7-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2015 0370, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The following notes are to be included on all construction drawings:

- 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; and
- The applicant/developer shall not allow any metal detection or artifact collection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

REASON

The Board fully supported the removal of the non-historic failing masonry wall and its replacement with a simple wooden board fence. They found that the six-foot high, board fence was architecturally appropriate for the structure and for this minimally visible location in the district. The Board asked the BAR staff to bring the concern of the neighbor's to the Code Administration staff's attention.

SPEAKERS

Paul Clement, owner, presented a summary of the project.

Ms. Namita Penngonda, neighbor at 410 S Columbus, testified that the masonry wall proposed to be demolished was a retaining wall for her property and she was concerned with the construction and the potential damage it will have to her brick wall.

Cynthia Knitenger, neighbor at 414 S Columbus, testified that the existing retaining wall has cracked two feet of the parking lot.

10 CASE BAR2015-0323

Request to partially demolish and capsulate at **111 S Payne St.** Applicant: Casa Rosada Artisan Gelato

BOARD ACTION: Deferred.

The Board noted the deferral of BAR2015-0323, due to improper noticing.

11 CASE BAR2015-0324

Request for an addition at **111 S Payne St.** Applicant: Casa Rosada Artisan Gelato

BOARD ACTION: Deferred.

The Board noted the deferral of BAR2015-0324, due to improper noticing.

WITHDRAWN PRIOR TO HEARING

CASE BAR2015-0347

Request for alterations and signage at **313 Cameron St**. Applicant: Cyrous Abedi

CASE BAR2015-0374

Request to partially demolish and capsulate at **622 S St Asaph St.** Applicant: James and Emma Burnham

CASE BAR2015-0375

Request for alterations and an addition at **622 S St Asaph St.** Applicant: James and Emma Burnham

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

CASE BAR2015-0210

Request for repointing at **418 Duke St.** Applicant: Florence Hawkins

CASE BAR2015-0379

Request for window replacement at **122 S Fairfax St.** Applicant: Clay & Anne Perfall

CASE BAR2015-0380

Request for stoop repair at **216 S Fairfax St.** Applicant: Randall Phillips

CASE BAR2015-0383

Request for fence replacement at **419 S Royal St.** Applicant: Old Presbyterian Meeting House

CASE BAR2015-0381

Request for window replacement at **814 Cameron St.** Applicant: Rick Beaudette

CASE BAR2015-0382

Request for roof repair at **407 S Union St.** Applicant: Donna Krembs

CASE BAR2015-0386

Request for repointing at **206 N Royal St.** Applicant: Vaughn Restoration

CASE BAR2015-0387

Request for siding replacement at **711 S Lee St.** Applicant: Early Times

ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review, Old and Historic Alexandria District, hearing was adjourned at 9:23pm.

V. <u>OTHER BUSINESS</u>

A work session to discuss the proposed **Potomac Yard Metro** project was held in Room 2000 of Alexandria City Hall. The work session began at approximately 9:30 pm.

BOARD ACTION: The Board held a roundtable work session to discuss design progress on the proposed Potomac Yard Metro project.

DISCUSSION

Project Staff in Attendance:

Jeffrey Farner, Deputy Director of Planning & Zoning

Jason Kacamburas, T&ES project manager Tom Canfield, City Architect, Planning & Zoning Nathan Imm, Urban Planner, Planning & Zoning Al Cox, Historic Preservation Manager, Planning & Zoning Michele Oaks, Historic Preservation Planner Ivailo Karadimov, architect for WMATA Ethan Marsh, KGP, architectural design consultant

Jeffrey Farner, introduced the project and team and gave a brief presentation. He noted that the City has been working with WMATA, the National Park Service, the Potomac Yard Metro Implementation Group (PYMIG), and consultants since the BAR last reviewed this in November 2015.

The discussion commenced with an overview of the project's design principles by Mr. Farner. Ms. Roberts expressed concerns with the reference to compatibility with Potomac Greens or Potomac

Yard. She stated that the principles list needs to be revised to remove this reference, noting the BAR had removed it at a prior hearing, as the sole concern of the BAR is the station's visual impact on, and relationship to, the George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP.) Mr. Farner acknowledged Ms. Roberts sentiments for the purposes of the BAR review but said these were general principles and noted that there are several stakeholder groups working concurrently on this project through the public process and that the design relationship to Potomac Yard is important to some of those representatives.

Summary of the key discussion points:

Site/Context

- Regarding the relationship between the station and the park/wetlands:
 - The design team was encouraged to explore combinations of walls, landforms, and other features to break up the rigidity of the linear form in the landscape
- Members expressed concern over the design of the topography/slopes on the east side of the station
 - Concern about the appearance and maintenance of a 1:1 slope at the base of the station
 - Stated desire to integrate the station with the hills and historic infrastructure of the GWMP
- Ensure that the building "looks good in the day and at night."
- Encouraged having the "natural geography dictate the architecture and geometry of the building's mass."
- Consider furthering the design based on a Parkway aesthetic (defined generally as naturalized and organic), Examine sculptural GWMP and other NPS precedents
- Mr. Neale stated the proposed massing was appropriate for a building in the landscape and the idea of two structures separated by a low-slung connection works. The station is something that WILL be seen, and what is important is that it be attractive

Architecture - general

- Based on views presented by WMATA from the inside of the station, members stated a preference for an open interior which allows visibility between escalators and through the roof to the landscape beyond (Slide 3)
- Members stated a preference for the curvilinear alternative
 - Preferred both the cross-section (arched roof) and curvilinear slope over the escalators
 - Commented that the curvilinear elevation would complement a stone base
 - Stated that this alternative is more sculptural
 - Liked the contrast between materials that sectioned/divided the station
- Consider "borrowing" the segmental arch forms from GWMP bridges and vaults to use as the form for the interior volume at the escalators between the mezzanine and platform level to make it more graceful and referential
- Regarding the discussion that the ends of the stations do not need to be symmetrical:

- Ends could express different environmental conditions (sun angle, wind, etc.)
- The curvilinear alternative may favor an asymmetrical approach
- Consider shifting the articulation of the mass
- Regarding the discussion of the longer length of the mezzanine roof section vs. a shorter mezzanine roof with a sloping roof over the escalators (discussed by WMATA architect):
 - Members suggested that the architectural design "follow a purposeful form" and yet display a "parkway aesthetic."
- A statement was made, with general assent and discussion, that the consensus of the BAR members was for the curvilinear alternative but that studies of the exterior were needed to review the effect of the more open and visually connected interior space on the exterior form and mass
- Only Ms. Finnegan and Roberts stated a strong preference for expressing the form of the escalator on the exterior of the structure
- A vaulted form roof geometry was favored for its relationship to the original Harry Weese Metro stations, along with newer station roofs at exterior escalators, for Metro system legibility and for references to other arched forms of the historic GWMP infrastructure

Materials

- There was agreement that the mezzanine floor and structure above should not be expressed on the exterior in concrete, but with a material that is compatible with the natural materials of the GWMP
- Possible integration of wood (or wood-like) material into the station probably in the horizontal fins under the mezzanines; WMATA replied that actual wood is probably not acceptable, but they would look into materials with that visual quality.

Next steps

- Focus on articulation of the building mass, as well as the materials
- For the next BAR meeting, provide multiple views from the GWMP, shown both *with* and *without* a reasonable portrayal of the landscape
 - Present the station forms in context with the proposed Parkway land forms and plantings, and provide a perspective from the GWMP with the context of the existing and proposed Potomac Yard buildings behind
 - Provide topography and vista sketches
 - Provide an east/west site section showing the relationship of the grades of the Parkway relative to the wetland, the berm(s), service road, station and the tracks

SPEAKERS

Poul Hertel, 3716 Carriage House Road in Fairfax County, expressed concerns about the impact on the wetlands and the appearance of the station from the George Washington Memorial Parkway.