

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

Board of Architectural Review
Old & Historic Alexandria District
Wednesday, July 6, 2016
7:30pm, City Council Chambers, City Hall
301 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Members Present: John von Senden, Chair
Chip Carlin, Vice Chair
Slade Elkins
Kelly Finnigan Mechling
Margaret Miller
Christine Roberts

Members Excused: Christina Kelley

Staff Present: Catherine Miliaras, Historic Preservation Planner
Stephanie Sample, Historic Preservation Planner

Anthony Gammon, Acting Deputy Director, Department of Project Implementation
Matt Landes, Principal Planner, Department of Project Implementation
Jack Browand, Division Chief, Department of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities
Hilary Orr, Complete Streets Coordinator, Transportation & Environmental Services
Steve Sindiong, Acting Division Chief, Transportation & Environmental Services

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

I. MINUTES

Consideration of the minutes from the **June 1, 2016** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, 6-0.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Miller, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes of the June 1, 2016 meeting as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

Consideration of the minutes from the **June 15, 2016** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, 6-0.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Miller, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes of the June 15, 2016 meeting as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

1 CASE BAR2016-00185

Request for alterations at **108 N. Alfred St.**

Applicant: A & H, LLC (Ahmad Loghmanian)

This item was removed from the consent calendar.

BOARD ACTION: Approve 5-1.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00185 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 1, with Ms. Mechling voting against.

REASON

The Board found the proposed alterations appropriate and consistent with the Design Guidelines.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed whether the new railing on the addition should match the existing railing on the front stoop of the historic building. It was noted that it would be difficult to match it exactly due to Code requirements. The Board thought that slightly different railings helped to show the evolution of the building though the minority viewpoint was a preference for the railings to match.

SPEAKERS

James Palmer, project architect, responded to questions.

2 CASE BAR2016-00191

Request for alterations and waiver of rooftop HVAC screening requirement at **917 S Saint Asaph St.**

Applicant: Sarah Bobbin

BOARD ACTION: Approve 6-0.

By unanimous consent, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00191 as submitted, on the Consent Calendar.

3 CASE BAR2016-00151

Request for alterations at **106 S Union St**

Applicant: Virtue Feed & Grain

This item was removed from the consent calendar.

BOARD ACTION: Approve 5-1.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Mechling, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00151 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 1, with Ms. Roberts voting against.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The awnings should be attached through the mortar joints to the greatest extent possible and limit damage to the historic brick.
2. The existing rooftop HVAC screening that was previously approved by the BAR and the proposed new expansion of the screening must be painted prior to final mechanical inspection.
3. No signs are to be permitted on the awnings.
4. The awnings must be retracted when the outdoor dining area is not open to customers for use.
5. BAR staff should be on site during installation of the awnings to confirm that all of the above conditions are adhered to.

REASON

The Board supported the alterations finding them appropriate and consistent with the Design Guidelines but expressed concern about not damaging the brick during the installation of the awnings.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed concerns related to installation of the awnings noting that it was not appropriate to install through the brick and should be through the mortar joint. Some Board members thought there would be an acceptable solution that the architect could devise working with staff, such as adding a plate or horizontal ledger or bolting the awnings with blocking. The applicant also noted that they could continue to study for a custom solution. The Board added a condition that staff be on site during installation to ensure that damage to the existing brickwork would be limited to the greatest extent possible.

SPEAKERS

Scott McGee, project architect, responded to questions.

Philip Matyes, 219 North Pitt Street, expressed concerns about the project.

III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED

4 CASE BAR #2016-00160

Request for alterations at **420 S Lee St.**

Applicant: Thomas Byrne

BOARD ACTION: Deferred 6-0.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR Case #2016-00160. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

REASON

The BAR found that the proposal was not appropriate because of a lack of clear submission materials and the proposal of an out-of-scale gate that did not relate to the entrance to the townhouse. The BAR's deferral included specific items to be included in the subsequent proposal: a full site plan clearly showing the location of the wall, fence and gates, including section showing the topography; details of the gate; a detailed elevation of the fence; and a design with some portion of the brick knee wall, a pedestrian-scaled gate, and the gate aligned with the entrance of the townhouse.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Chairman von Senden began this item by reading the following statement:

*It has come to our attention that many members of the community are very interested in the case at 420 South Lee Street and seeking a resolution to the ongoing zoning ordinance violations that currently exist at this property. We understand the community's concern and value such interest in preservation matters. BAR staff has been working to bring this case forward to resolve the related outstanding BAR issues. As a reminder, the only issue before the BAR tonight is the **design of the fence**.*

The parking, the use, the curb cut and the preservation and open space easement are not within the purview of the BAR. In the past, the BAR has advised applicants that easement holders should approve any proposal to be reviewed by the BAR prior to going to the BAR as a courtesy. However, the BAR is not able to legally require that. A preservation or open space easement is a private agreement between a property owner and the easement holding organization. While the BAR and many easement holding organizations generally share common preservation beliefs, the BAR cannot consider, interpret or enforce the terms of a preservation or open space easement. It is the property owner's responsibility to make sure that his or her project is consistent with the BAR's regulations as well as the terms of his or her easement and to acquire all necessary approvals. The current proposal tonight relates only to the design of the proposed fence and the BAR's discussion should focus exclusively on the design and approval of an appropriate fence that will be installed in a timely manner. The applicant will be responsible for separately obtaining the necessary approvals from the easement holder.

Some of the BAR members thought that application needed additional information and they were dissatisfied with the current proposal. The BAR also requested more information regarding the BAR's regulatory responsibilities with regard to open space and preservation easements. They understood the position with respect to this particular case but requested additional information from the City Attorney's office. The BAR expects the next submission to address the specific items outlined above in the Reason section.

SPEAKERS

Tom Byrne, applicant, agreed with the staff report and then agreed to the deferral to work with staff.

Lance Mallamo, Director of the Office of Historic Alexandria, explained that he, as staff representative to the Alexandria Historical Restoration and Preservation Commission

(AHRPC), was working with AHRPC and the applicant to resolve a number of enforcement issues. He noted that the AHRPC had previously approved an iron or wood fence with a gate width not to exceed 3 feet.

Elaine Johnston, representing the Historic Alexandria Foundation, submitted a letter on behalf of HAF and recommending denial of the proposal.

Charles Trozzo, 209 Duke Street, expressed concerns regarding the interpretation of the BAR's ability to regulate or enforce easements.

Katy Cannady, 20 East Oak Street, spoke in opposition.

Yvonne Waight Callahan, president of the Old Town Civic Association, noted that there were broader issues to be dealt with beyond the BAR's scope of review. She also questioned the BAR's role in regulating preservation and open space easements.

Stephen Milone, 907 Prince Street, advocated for the reinstallation of the brick and iron fence installed in the 1950s and to require a pedestrian width gate in place of the larger gate proposed.

Bert Ely, 200 South Pitt Street, had concerns about the easement.

5 CASE BAR #2016-0114

Request for alterations at 421, 500, 500A, abutting parcel south of 500A, 501, 520 & 600 S Union St. (Windmill Hill Park)

Applicant: City of Alexandria, Department of Project Implementation

BOARD ACTION: Approved 6-0.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Mechling, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00114 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Bridge Option 3 as selected design, with final design details regarding an arch to be worked out with staff, incorporating any final design directions from the BAR at hearing.
2. The pier and bridge posts should be as small as structurally necessary to minimize their visual bulk.
3. Lighting fixtures and path materials, etc. shall be consistent with the Waterfront Common Elements to be approved in the fall of 2016.
4. Historic interpretation consistent with the Waterfront Common Elements should be included at this site in the future, particularly interpretation related to rail transportation and the industrial heritage of this portion of Old Town.
5. The hard edges of the granite mounting blocks should be softened.

REASON

The Board was satisfied with the current park design and noted that their concerns had been addressed in the revised drawings. They generally favored Option 3 for the bridge design though there was modest support for Option 1.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board found that the applicant was very responsive in addressing many of the concerns raised previously and in responding to questions about other items. They appreciated the explanation regarding how Windmill Hill Park fit into the larger Waterfront Plan and continuous waterfront promenade under development. Many still advocated for a more significant end point on the piers, such as a pergola if a gazebo was not possible, but also understood the community reaction for minimizing visual obstruction and gathering places on the piers. In examining the bridge options, Option 3 was selected because it related to the pier with respect to the material, incorporated an arch and was pedestrian scaled.

SPEAKERS

Anthony Gammon, Acting Deputy Director, Department of Project Implementation
Matt Landes, Principal Planner, Department of Project Implementation
Jack Browand, Division Chief, Department of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities

Mr. Gammon, Mr. Landes and Mr. Browand, gave a presentation on the revised proposal and responded to questions throughout the discussion period.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

6 CASE BAR #2016-00186

Request to partially demolish at **209 S Fairfax St.**
Applicant: Amir Tayrani & Adria Villar

BOARD ACTION: Approved 6-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00186 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

Items 6 and 7 were combined for discussion purposes.

7 CASE BAR #2016-00187

Request for alterations at **209 S Fairfax St.**
Applicant: Amir Tayrani & Adria Villar

BOARD ACTION: Approved 6-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00187 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1.All existing brick must be reused in the reconstructed brick wall to the maximum extent reasonably possible.

2.The statements below shall appear on all construction documents involving any ground disturbing activities so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements:

a.The applicant/contractor shall 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/contractor shall not allow any metal detection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

REASON

The Board had no objections to the proposal and agreed with the staff recommendation.

BOARD DISCUSSION

None.

SPEAKERS

Stephanie Dimond, project architect, was available for questions.

8 CASE BAR #2016-00193

Request for alterations at **505 S Lee St**

Applicant: Lisa Collis & Mark Warner

BOARD ACTION: Approved 5-1.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00193 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 1, with Ms. Mechling voting against.

CONDITION OF APPROVAL

Approval of the revised stoop and step layout are subject to approval of an encroachment ordinance by City Council.

REASON

The Board found the alterations to the stoop to be historically appropriate.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board supported the reconfiguration of the stoop to the side and appreciated the reuse of the Seneca sandstone. One member stated that the Seneca sandstone and late 19th-century details on the house suggested that a Second Empire railing would be more appropriate than the proposed Federal one. The Board found that the applicant had studied design options for the railing and that no further refinement with staff would be required.

SPEAKERS

Robert Bentley “Bud” Adams, architect, spoke in support and responded to questions.

Scot McBroom, project architect, spoke in support and responded to questions.

9 CASE BAR #2016-00194

Request to encapsulate at **1207 Duke St.**

Applicant: John & Mary Berry

BOARD ACTION: Approved 4-1

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Mechling, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00194 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4 to 1, with Ms. Miller voting against. Ms. Roberts was excused.

Items 9 and 10 were combined for discussion purposes.

10 CASE BAR #2016-00195

Request for an addition and accessory building at **1207 Duke St.**

Applicant: John & Mary Berry

BOARD ACTION: Approved 4-1

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Mechling, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00195 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4 to 1, with Ms. Miller voting against. Ms. Roberts was excused.

REASON

The Board generally found the modest one-story rear addition to be appropriate.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board noted that the addition was quite reasonable and well designed. The applicant was hesitant to switch the wall material on the property line from fiber cement to brick, noting that there was an existing garden wall. It was suggested that lattice could be added and the applicant agreed to paint the wall any color suitable for the neighbor.

SPEAKERS

Robert Bentley “Bud” Adams, architect, spoke in support and responded to questions.

Scot McBroom, project architect, spoke in support and responded to questions.

Christopher Kapellas, 1209 Duke Street, asked if the portion of wall facing his property could be brick rather than fiber cement siding.

11 CASE BAR #2016-00204

Request to partially demolish and capsule at **308 Commerce St**

Applicant: Mike Dameron

BOARD ACTION: Deferred 6-0

Without objection, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review deferred BAR Case #2015-00204.

Items 11 and 12 were combined for discussion purposes.

12 CASE BAR #2016-00206

Request for an addition at **308 Commerce St**

Applicant: Mike Dameron

BOARD ACTION: Deferred 6-0

Without objection, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review deferred BAR Case #2015-00206.

REASON

The Board thought that the project needed further refinement in order to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness. The Board provided the applicant with comments to address in a refined design.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board supported an addition and had no objection to the proposed demolition. The Board endorsed the rehabilitation of the existing townhouse. The Board thought the design was a good start but wanted to see more fully developed and refined drawings. The Board made the following comments:

- General size, location and massing of the addition appropriate but overall design needed to appear more finished and be either contemporary/modern OR quietly contextual (multiple approaches to the design are appropriate but need to be fully developed, consistent with *Design Guidelines* and compatible with nearby historic buildings)
- Revise chimney which appeared out of scale with the addition and lacked refinement
- Refine and balance fenestration on south elevation
- Study different roof form to better relate to existing building
- Reduce parged foundation to make more appropriately scaled
- Clarify fence location and intent to install
- Possibly relocate HVAC to ground
- Provide detailed drawings of cornice, trim and window hoods for historic block

SPEAKERS

Mike Dameron, applicant, agreed with the staff recommendations and responded to questions.

Mary Gardner, 211 South West Street, welcomed the improvements but had concerns regarding the rooftop HVAC units.

Stephen Tedeschi, 306 Commerce Street, expressed concerns about the fence and how it would impact his property.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

13 An information item concerning **Capital Bikeshare**.

Hilary Orr, Complete Streets Coordinator, gave a presentation on the Capital Bikeshare program and responded to questions.

BOARD ACTION: The OHAD Board of Architectural Review received a presentation and discussed the Capital Bikeshare Program.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review, Old and Historic Alexandria District, hearing was adjourned at 10:35pm.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

CASE BAR #2016-00224

Request for new vents and HVAC placement at **418 S Lee St**
Applicant: John & Bridget Weaver

CASE BAR #2016-00225

Request for roof replacement and trim repair at **223 & 225 N. Washington St**

Applicant: National Council for Adoption

CASE BAR #2016-00223

Request for roof repair at **215 S Fayette St**
Applicant: Sharon Timm

CASE BAR # 2016-00219

Request to repair rear steps at **107 N Patrick St**
Applicant: Matthew Gentile

CASE BAR #2016-00218

Request to replace French door and transom at **540 2nd St, apt 205**
Applicant: Maria Quetglas

CASE BAR #2016-00216

Request for masonry repair at **220 Queen St**
Applicant: Renaissance Development

CASE BAR #2016-00217

Request for door replacement at **540 2nd St, apt 305**
Applicant: Genet Berayes

CASE BAR #2016-00213

Request for in-kind roof replacement at **211 Duke St**
Applicant: Pond Roofing Company

CASE BAR #2016-00209

Request for repairs for roof, gutters/downspouts, trim and skylight at **100 Waterford Pl**
Applicant: Mike Demeo

CASE BAR #2016-00207

Request for signage at **1212 King St**

Applicant: Shenzhen Scouter & Jiayuan Zhuang

CASE BAR #2016-00203

Request for signage at **600 Cameron St**

Applicant: EEA Cameron St, LLC

CASE BAR #2016-00205

Request for trim repair and new exterior light fixture at **515 Queen St**

Applicant: Margaret Denys-Magee

CASE BAR #2016-00208

Request for storm door installation at **623 S Royal St**

Applicant: Kerri Neary

CASE BAR #2016-00214

Request for signage at **604 S Washington St**

Applicant: Tuxedo by Sarno

CASE BAR #2016-00215

Request for roof replacement at **213 S Pitt St**

Applicant: William Edwards

CASE BAR #2016-00210

Request for window replacement at **32 Alexander St**

Applicant: Bill & Pat Depuy

CASE BAR #2016-00211

Request for window replacement at **207 S Fayette St**

Applicant: Stephen Morris