

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

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

Members Present: Slade Elkins
Christina Kelley
Kelly Mechling
Margaret Miller
Christine Roberts
John Von Senden, Chair

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

The Board of Architectural Review, Old and Historic Alexandria District, hearing was called to order at 7:31pm.

I. MINUTES

Consideration of the minutes from the **July 20, 2016** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 4-0-2.

On a motion by Ms. Kelley, seconded by Ms. Finnigan, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes, as amended, from the July 20, 2016 OHAD BAR hearing. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0-2. John von Senden and Christine Roberts abstained because they were not present at the previous hearing.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

1 CASE BAR #2016-00255

Request for alterations at **313 Duke St (Parcel Address: 315A Duke St.)**
Applicant: Thomas Welsh, Bishop of Arlington

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 6-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00255. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

2 CASE BAR # 2016-00258

Request for alterations at **800 S. Pitt Street**
Applicant: Rob & Anne Whittle

This item was removed from the consent calendar by Ms. Miller.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 6-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00258. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to the existing screened porch.
2. All replacement and new windows must meet the Alexandria Replacement Window Performance Specifications contained in the BAR's adopted window policy. The six-over-six light configuration should have 7/8" wide SDL muntins.
3. All new and replacement siding and trim, doors, and wall panels must comply with adopted BAR policies for new construction. The composite siding and trim materials must have smooth surfaces exposed rather than ersatz wood grain.

REASON

The Board found the proposed alterations for the enclosed porch to be appropriate and consistent with the Design Guidelines.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had minimal discussions and asked the project architect questions regarding the detailing and the addition of shutters to one window.

SPEAKERS

Laura Campbell, project architect, responded to questions.

3 CASE BAR #2016-00266

Request for alterations at **310 South Saint Asaph St.**

Applicant: Cheryl Jaeger

This item was removed from the consent calendar by Ms. Mechling.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 5-1.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Ms. Miller, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00266. The motion carried on a vote of 5-1. Ms. Mechling was opposed.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Approval of an encroachment ordinance by City Council.

REASON

The Board generally supported replacement of the existing non-historic stoop with a new stoop in a different configuration in order to be compliant with the building code and improve safety and accessibility.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed whether changing the orientation of a stoop is an appropriate alteration as it changes the understanding of the front façade of a building but decided that this was less important, as the front stoop was not historic. The applicant agreed to maintain exterior visibility of the existing basement window to the maximum extent possible. It was noted that should a door be

installed in the arched opening under the stoop, it should be wood.

SPEAKERS

Geoff Stone, representing the applicant, responded to questions and explained the reasoning for reconstructing the curving stoop to provide a landing at the entrance without blocking an existing basement window.

4 CASE BAR #2016-00267

Request for waiver of HVAC screening at **515 N Washington St**
Applicant: CAS Riegler dba J. River 515 Annex, LLC

This item was removed from the consent calendar by Ms. Miller.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 6-0.

On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00267. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

REASON

The screening would be larger than the units and, therefore, far more visible. The Board had no objection to the rooftop HVAC units which will be minimally, if at all, visible from a public way.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was a question regarding from what location the units might be visible and why staff frequently supported these waivers.

SPEAKERS

Robin Betteral, representing the applicant, responded to questions.

5 CASE BAR #2016-00269

Request for waiver of HVAC screening at **530 S Saint Asaph St**
Applicant: Alexandria City Public Schools

This item was removed from the consent calendar by Ms. Miller.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 6-0.

On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00269. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITION OF APPROVAL

1. The units must be painted a light, sky grey.

REASON

The Board agreed that there was no practical way to screen new rooftop HVAC units in existing locations scattered throughout the roof and found that painting the units a light grey color to match the Virginia sky would help diminish the visibility of the rooftop units.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board contemplated what type of screening could be done here and whether it would be more visually obtrusive.

SPEAKERS

Alex Alexander, representing Alexandria City Public Schools, responded to questions.

6 CASE BAR #2016-00248

Request for waiver of HVAC screening at **625 First Street**

Applicant: Carr 625 First St, LLC

This item was removed from the consent calendar by Ms. Miller.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 6-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00248. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The exterior color of the unit must match the adjacent brick wall surface.

REASON

The Board found the proposed waiver of rooftop screening to be appropriate in this location.

BOARD DISCUSSION

This item was moved to the end of the discussion docket because the applicant was not present when the case was called. The Board heard the item despite the applicant's absence but had minimal discussion beyond clarification of the proposal by staff.

7. CASE BAR #2016-00253

Request for signage at **277 S. Washington Street**

Applicant: Barre 3 Old Town

This item was removed from the consent calendar by Ms. Miller.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 6-0.

On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00253. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

REASON

The Board found the proposed signage to be appropriate for this building and consistent with the Design Guidelines.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had minimal discussion beyond asking for clarification of the request.

SPEAKERS

Meredith Kaufman, representing Barre 3 Old Town, responded to questions.

III. NEW BUSINESS

8. CASE BAR #2016-00263

Request to partially demolish at **716 Queen St.**

Applicant: Margaret Israel

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 5-1.

The OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00263. The motion carried on a vote of 5-1.

Items #8 and #9 were combined for discussion purposes.

9. CASE BAR #2016-00264

Request for alterations at **716 Queen St**

Applicant: Margaret Israel

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended. 5-1.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Elkins, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00264. The motion carried on a vote of 5-1. Ms. Mechling was opposed.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Approval of the Permit to Demolish.
2. Approval of a revised “Preferred” Option. Instead of four double-hung windows arranged in an A-A-A-A pattern, the first floor windows should have an A-B-A pattern, similar to the *window* configuration (a fixed center large multilight window flanked by 2/2 double-hung windows) shown in Figure 2 of the staff report (minus the paneling below and pilasters shown in that version). The new first floor opening should have either a wood, metal, or brick lintel (extending approximately 8” on either side of the window) with final details to be reviewed by staff prior to release of a building permit.
3. The segmental arch forms above the two second-story windows must be reconstructed to match the size and location of the two original window openings.
4. The two existing second-story windows on the southern elevation must be replaced with painted wood windows. All replacement and new windows must meet the Alexandria Replacement Window Performance Specifications contained in the BAR’s adopted window policy.
5. The applicant will retain as much of the original brick as possible and use bricks salvaged from the deconstruction of the south elevation to reconstruct the southern (rear) wall; if historic bricks are acquired from another source, they must match the existing historic bricks in color, size, and texture.
6. The mason will provide a mock-up sample of hydraulic lime mortar which matches the original mortar in color, tooling and composition. The mock-up must be approved by BAR Staff on site prior to commencement of work.

REASON

The Board generally agreed with the staff recommendation and found the project consistent with the Design Guidelines and other policies. The Board found that an “A-B-A” pattern was preferable for the first floor window, similar to an earlier scheme provided by the applicant. The Board found that a lintel should be included and provided flexibility for the final material and design, so that the applicant could work it out with staff.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board commended the applicant for repairing this significantly damaged brick wall and working with staff to study appropriate options. The Board discussed whether adding a third single window with a segmental arch would be appropriate or not as well and decided that such an approach might give a false sense of history. The Board discussed the first floor window arrangement and lintel extensively.

SPEAKERS

Maggie Israel, applicant, explained the proposal and responded to questions.

Charles Trozzo, 209 Duke Street, noted that this elevation would be very visible from the Lloyd House garden and expressed a preference to maintain the existing, original openings.

10. CASE BAR #2016-00265

Request for alterations at **119 King St.**

Applicant: Potomac Restaurants, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved. 5-1.

On a motion by Ms. Finnigan, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00265. The motion carried on a vote of 5-1. Ms. Miller was opposed.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Approval of the proposed signs, awning fabric and color.
2. The use of a retractable rather than a fixed frame awning. The awnings must be retracted when the outdoor dining area is not open for use by customers.
3. If the BAR approves a rigid, fixed frame awning, staff recommends that the awning have a loose valance and open ends and that the frame be painted black.
4. The awning may project no farther than five feet, six inches (5'-6") from the face of the building, subject to approval of an encroachment ordinance by City Council.
5. The awning must have an eight foot (8') clearance from the sidewalk to the bottom of awning fabric/material at any point. The upper portion should be mounted no lower than ten feet (10') from ground level to stay below the sill of the loading door at the second floor.
6. All care must be taken not to damage the exterior fabric of the building when installing the awning frame. The awning frame may not be installed directly into masonry but shall be mounted through mortar joints.
7. The current wall sign must be removed prior to installation of the awning.

REASON

The Board found the proposal with the above conditions to be appropriate and compatible with the Design Guidelines.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board generally agreed with the staff recommendation that a retractable awning was preferable here to not obscure this late 18th century warehouse, despite there being a fixed awning at Landini's next door.

SPEAKERS

A representative of Potomac Restaurants, LLC responded to questions.

Phillip Matyas, 219 North Pitt Street, expressed concerns about the proliferation of awnings.

11. CASE BAR #2016-00274

Request for alterations to replace existing, discontinued Gadsby light poles and fixtures with the proposed Alexandria Historic Street Light, which is a traditional, historically-accurate street light

design and which shall contain a modern, energy-efficient LED light fixture for street lights within the public right-of-way.

Street lights within the public right-of-way for the following block(s) for each street listed below:

Cameron Street 100-900; **King Street** unit block (for any addresses 0-99) - 1600; **Prince Street** unit block (for any addresses 0-99) - 1400; **Duke Street** unit block (for any addresses 0-99); **Deschantal Street** (full length); **Harvard Street** 100; **N/S Peyton Street** S 200 - N 100; **N/S Asaph Street** S 100 - N 100; **N/S Pitt Street** S 100 - N 100; **N/S Royal Street** S 100 - N 100; **N/S Fairfax Street** S 100 - N 100; **N/S Lee Street** S 100 - N 100; **N/S Union Street** S 600 - N 400; **Commerce Street** 100 - 300; **N/S West Street** S 100 - N 100; **N/S Payne Street** S 100 - N 100; **N/S Fayette Street** S 100 - N 100; **N/S Henry Street** S 100 - N 100; **N/S Patrick Street** S 100 - N 100; **N/S Patrick Street** S 100 - N 100; **N/S Alfred Street** S 100 - N 100; **N/S Columbus Street** S 100 - N 100; **Strand Street** 100 - 200; **Oronoco Street** unit block (for any addresses 0-99); **Queen Street** unit block (for any addresses 0-99); **Wolfe Street** unit block (for any addresses 0-99); **Thompson's Alley** unit block (Potomac River to Union St)

Applicant: City of Alexandria

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted. 4-2.

On a motion by Mr. Elkins, seconded by Ms. Kelly, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00274. The motion carried on a vote of 4-2. Ms. Roberts and Ms. Miller were opposed.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The final light color and ladder bars/banner holders must be approved in the field by BAR staff prior to installation.

REASON

The majority of the Board agreed that the proposed Alexandria Historic Street Light was a more historically accurate replacement for the existing Gadsby Street Lights.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the design and the use of modern LED lights. The majority of the Board found that the more historically accurate street light design was a significant improvement over the historicist Gadsby street light that was installed as part of urban renewal. There was a preference for clear glass in some respects but an acknowledgment that the LED diodes would be visible with clear, which is why frosted glass was found appropriate. There were questions regarding the height of the street lights and whether they could be lower to reflect the historic cast-iron street lights. Mr. Gammon noted that safety and traffic requirements necessitated a certain height and that the replacement street lights would be no taller than the existing Gadsby street lights without altering the spacing and making them much brighter. There was a suggestion to fatten the narrow connection between the pole and the lantern. The minority opinion wanted further study of the pole design, placement on the street and light color.

SPEAKERS

Anthony Gammon, Acting Deputy Director for the Department of Project Implementation, gave a presentation on the proposal and need for replacement of the existing lamps.

Thomas Maresh, 342 Commerce Street, expressed concerns that this was an unnecessary project and that LED lights caused cancer.

Charles Trozzo, 209 Duke Street, spoke in support and commended the staff report.

Adrienne Hensley, 314 Prince Street, expressed concern about the light color and frosted glass.

Tom Osborne, 114 North Columbus Street, supported the project but had questions about operation and maintenance of the existing street lights.

Michael Vergason, 808 Prince Street, spoke in support and asked whether installation would expand to the 800 block of Prince Street.

Phillip Matyas, 219 North Pitt Street, expressed concern about ladder bars and signs affixed to the poles.

Stephen Milone, 907 Prince Street, requested deferral to address various questions, including the design of the footing and brick sidewalk at the base.

Peter Pennington, 1213 Prince Street, made comments to fill in the blocks currently without Gadsby street lights and confirmed that they would operate on a photocell switch to save energy.

12. CASE BAR #2016-00178

Request for selected site elements and furnishings for use as Waterfront Common Elements.

Publicly-owned properties and publicly-accessible easements and right-of-way generally bounded by Oronoco Street to the north, Jones Point Park and Jefferson Street to the south, North and South Union Streets to the west and the Potomac River to the east and which includes, but is not limited to, the following addresses: **351 N UNION ST; 6 QUEEN ST; 107 N UNION ST; 105 N UNION ST; 1 KING ST; 2 KING ST; 1 A PRINCE ST; 200 STRAND ST; 206 STRAND ST; 0 PRINCE ST; 208 STRAND ST; 210 STRAND ST; 3 DUKE ST; 1 WOLFE ST; 1 WILKES ST; 500 A S UNION ST; 600 S UNION ST**

And the Public Right-of-Way for the following block(s) for the streets listed below:

From and including 400 block of **N Union Street** - 700 block of **S Union**; **Oronoco Street** unit block (for any addresses 0-99); **Thompson's Alley** unit block (for any addresses 0-99); **Cameron Street** unit block (for any addresses 0-99); **King Street** unit block (for any addresses 0-99); **Wales Alley** (full length); **Strand Street** (full length); **Duke Street** unit block (for any addresses 0-99); **Wolfe Street** unit block (for any addresses 0-99); **Wilkes Street** unit block - 200 (for any addresses 0-199); **Gibbon Street** unit block (no street addresses)

Applicant: City of Alexandria, Department of Project Implementation

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 6-0.

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00178. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. To the greatest extent possible, the lower boardwalk along the promenade should be constructed of durable wood (natural or modified) rather than a composite material.
2. The associated year (1749 or 1845) should be engraved at regular intervals for the shoreline and pier line demarcations.

REASON

The Board enthusiastically supported the Common Elements palette finding the materials and treatments to be appropriate along the Alexandria waterfront that draw from a palate of historic Alexandria details.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board was very supportive of the Common Elements palette noting that care and attention had been applied to creating this thoughtful collection. They supported the use of high-quality and durable materials. It was noted that the 1749 band could be narrowed in some areas so as to seem less like a pathway. The Board was particularly supportive of the promenade light fixtures, noting that they appreciated the clean, simple and elegant design.

SPEAKERS

Anthony Gammon, Acting Deputy Director for the Department of Project Implementation, gave a presentation and responded to questions.

Skip Graffam, OLIN, also presented and responded to questions.

Margaret Susank, Ford's Landing Homeowners' Association president, noted for the record that the interior of the Ford's Landing project was not included in the common elements district and that their boardwalk was already generally consistent with the Common Elements.

Stephen Milone, 907 Prince Street, spoke in support but noted that the 2'-4' wide border for one of the shoreline interpretations seemed too wide and that it could be confused with a pedestrian path, especially where it crosses a street, and might be dangerous for children.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, spoke in support of the staff report and work by OLIN.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

13. CASE BAR #2016-00268

Informal work session for a concept review of proposed redevelopment at **203, 205, and 211 Strand Street**. (This item is open for public comment)

Applicant: IDI Strand, L.C.

BOARD ACTION: The OHAD Board of Architectural Review held an informal work session for a concept review at 203, 205, and 211 Strand Street. On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Elkins, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review unanimously endorsed the scale, mass, height, and general architectural character of the proposed concept.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board was very supportive of the project, conceptually, and appreciated the alternate schemes presented at the hearing. They provided the following guidance:

- Support for height, scale, mass and general architectural character
- Support for use of alleys and as an area for historic interpretation on north side and extension of hotel courtyard/alley design on south side
- Preference for Alternate 3 for east, The Strand, elevation with no fieldstone on south "tower building"
- Preference for Alternate 2 for the west, S Union Street, elevation (with addition of a belt course below top floor windows)
- Preference for Alternate 1 for south elevation with arched parapet and porches
- Study the possibility of reducing height wherever possible

SPEAKERS

John Rust, project architect, gave a presentation on the proposal and responded to questions for Carlos Cecchi, owner/IDI Strand L.C.

Charles Trozzo, 209 Duke Street, expressed concern with the mass and scale.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street and representing the Historic Alexandria Foundation advocacy committee, generally supported the architectural character of Alternate #1 in the staff report but expressed concern about the size.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The OHAD Board of Architectural Review was adjourned at 11:35pm.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

CASE BAR #2016-00277

Request for window replacement at **1012 Oronoco St.**

Applicant: Thomas Manor

CASE BAR #2016-00260

Request for replace rotting wooden porch columns at **1606 Princess St.**

Applicant: Zachary Moller

CASE BAR #2016-00287

Request for adding 6" x 6" exhaust vent to side elevation at **310 Gibson St.**

Applicant: Nelson Maldonado

CASE BAR #2016-00283

Request for window replacement at **225 N Washington St.**

Applicant: National Council for Adoption

CASE BAR #2016-00284

Request for window replacement at **1100 Prince St.**

Applicant: Ann Johnson

CASE BAR #2016-00285

Request for awning & sign at **725 King St.**

Applicant: Marie L. Wallace

CASE BAR #2016-00281

Request for alterations at **228 S Pitt St.**

Applicant: St. Paul Episcopal

CASE BAR #2016-00282

Request for door replacement at **311 Queen St.**

Applicant: Gayland French

CASE BAR #2016-00280

Request for antennas at **1101 King St.**

Applicant: T-Mobile

CASE BAR #2016-00279

Request for signage at **621 Wythe St.**

Applicant: The Italian Place

CASE BAR #2016-00278

Request for repair wood porch in kind at **724 Gibbon St**

Applicant: Molly Groom

CASE BAR #2016-00276

Request for replace all windows and doors at **308 S Columbus St.**

Applicant: NV Development Service

CASE BAR #2016-00243

Request for new wood windows at **725 S. Fairfax St.**

Applicant: David Newman

CASE BAR #2016-00244

Request for storm door replacement at **602 Pendleton St.**

Applicant: Trina Edwards

CASE BAR #2016-00247

Request for selective tuck-pointing and in-kind repair of wood trim at **610 Bashford Ln.**

Applicant: Riverton Condominium

CASE BAR #2016-00250

Request to replace 3 existing antennas with 3 new, smaller antennas at **501 Slaters Ln.**

Applicant: AT&T

CASE BAR #2016-00254

Request for reroofing at **210 King St.**

Applicant: John Kenny

CASE BAR #2016-00256

Request to replace exterior lighting with LED lighting and new fixtures at **600 N Washington St.**

Applicant: Bank of America NA

CASE BAR #2016-00257

Request for skylight in-kind replacement patio door at **464 S Union St**

Applicant: Jeffrey Lowe

CASE BAR #2016-00259

Request for siding repair at **117 Duke St.**

Applicant: Childress

CASE BAR #2016-00252

Request for storm door alterations at **521 Oronoco St.**

Applicant: Mark Bustin

CASE BAR #2016-00262

Request for chimney repair at **614 Oronoco St.**

Applicant: VA Trust for Historic Preservation

CASE BAR #2016-00261

Request for roof repair at **517 S Washington St.**

Applicant: Jefferson Development

CASE BAR #2016-00251

Request for exterior light at **725 King St.**

Applicant: 5 Guys

CASE BAR #2016-00249

Request for signage at **301 Cameron St.**

Applicant: The Hive

CASE BAR #2016-00270

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

Applicant: Sunstone Counselors

CASE BAR #2016-00275

Request for trim replacement at **419 N West St.**

Applicant: Jessica Almond