

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

Board of Architectural Review
Old & Historic Alexandria District
Wednesday, December 21, 2016
7:30pm, City Council Chambers, City Hall
301 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Members Present: Christina Kelley, Chair
Robert Adams
Slade Elkins
John von Senden
Margaret Miller
Christine Roberts
John Goebel

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

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 **December 7, 2016** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Ms. Miller, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes as submitted. Ms. Miller has asked for staff to check the video regarding her action on a case and staff has since confirmed that vote was correct as stated. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. CASE BAR #2016-00344

Request to partially demolish and capsule at **703 S Lee Street**
Applicant: Norma and Kevin Kuntz

Items #1 & #2 were combined for discussion purposes.

2. CASE BAR #2016-00345

Request for an addition at **703 S Lee Street**
Applicant: Norma and Kevin Kuntz

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0

This item was removed from the consent calendar because the BAR must take a roll call vote on a Permit to Demolish. On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Ms. Miller, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00344 & 00345 as submitted. The

motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The following statements must appear in the General Notes of all construction documents involving ground disturbing activity so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirement.
 - 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 may not allow metal detection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

REASON

The Board supported the revised design, finding it appropriate and compatible with the existing dwelling and surrounding buildings of historic merit.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board complimented the architect on the revised design for a simple shed dormer and appreciated the effort to revise the project. The Board also recommended that the applicant consider improving the proportions of the existing front porch, though noted the porch was not within the proposed scope of work.

SPEAKERS

Stephanie Dimond, project architect, spoke in support and responded to questions.

3. CASE BAR #2016-00418

Request for amendments to previously approved plans for alterations at **305 S Saint Asaph Street**

Applicant: William and Jennifer Strickland

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Mr. von Senden, and seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00418 as submitted on the Consent Calendar. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED

4. CASE BAR #2016-00396

Request for partial demolition and capsulation at **319 Queen Street**

Applicant: Jill and Ken Rieth

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 7-0

On a motion by Mr. von Senden, and seconded by Mr. Elkins, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00396, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

Items #4 & #5 were combined for discussion purposes, but the votes were taken separately.

5. CASE BAR #2016-00397

Request for alterations and an addition at **319 Queen Street**

Applicant: Jill and Ken Rieth

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 6-1

On a motion by Mr. Von Senden, and seconded by Mr. Elkins, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00397, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-1, with Ms. Roberts voting in opposition.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. No alterations to front elevation are approved at this time and replacement of the windows, porch light, door and transom and roofing on the front elevation must return to the Board for approval at public hearing.
2. The applicant shall work with staff on the final size and alignment of the windows and doors on the north elevation, add blind windows to the brick wall on the east side of the addition to recall the windows of the existing sleeping porch and to restudy of the height of the pyramid roof.
3. Record a legal instrument, prior to release of a building permit, requiring approval by a qualified preservation organization to alter the remaining capsulated historic roof framing, decking and the brick walls of the ell and the north wall of the main block of the house in the future.
4. All materials must be in conformance with the BAR's adopted policies.
5. The statements in archaeology conditions below shall appear in the General Notes of all site plans and on all site plan sheets that involve demolition or ground disturbance (including Demolition, Basement/Foundation Plans, Landscaping, Erosion and Sediment Control, Grading, Utilities and Sheeting and Shoring) so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements:
 - a. The applicant/developer shall 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.
 - b. The applicant/developer shall not allow any metal detection or other artifact collection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

REASON

The Board supported the revised scope of work that significantly increased the amount of historic walls and roof framing to be retained on the rear ell. They felt comfortable that a recorded legal instrument such as an easement would protect this early 19th-century element once it was capsulated. The Board also found the proposed addition to be appropriate, compatible and consistent with the Standards and Design Guidelines.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Several Board members noted that they were pleased with the reduced amount of demolition proposed for the historic rear ell and appreciated how the historic fabric and form would be incorporated into the new design and would be protected by an easement. Many felt that the

previous concerns had been appropriately addressed. Many noted that the scale of the proposed addition was in fact consistent with the neighboring properties and was not overwhelming, finding the proposal suitable for this particular context. Several found that the sleeping porch character of the addition was appropriate and architecturally interesting and provided partial mitigation for the present view of the large white wall to the east. It was noted that historic preservation is not intended to freeze a building in time but to allow for buildings to be retained and preserved while also being made more livable for this century and that some charming changes had been made to other units in this row, including dormers and a garage.

Some Board members pointed out that the proposed changes to the front were not clearly defined in the application. The BAR asked for additional information on the windows, porch light, door and transom and roofing on the front. It was noted that these features were not original or historic and could normally be approved administratively, according to the BAR's adopted policies, but some believed that they should be approved by the BAR in the future because of the extent of the changes. The applicant agreed to remove these items from this application. The Board recommended that the applicant work with staff on the final size and alignment of the windows and doors on the north elevation, add blind windows to the brick wall on the east side of the addition to recall the windows of the existing sleeping porch and to restudy of the height of the pyramid roof. The dissenting vote for the addition was based on a desire to see the new addition not extend a full eight feet beyond the existing rear addition.

SPEAKERS

Bill Cromley, representing the applicant, introduced the project and explained the revisions since the earlier scheme. He explained that the owners were committed to preserving the form of the rear ell and roof and would agree to pursuing a legal instrument to further protect these areas of the dwelling. He also explained the design intent and the inspiration for the addition from other houses in the neighborhood. He also agreed to remove the requests for alterations to the front of the house from the application at this time.

Erin May, project architect, responded to questions.

Michael Maibach, 325 Queen Street, stated that he and 21 nearby property owners were opposed to the project due to serious concerns. He requested a denial.

Gebe Johnson, 309 North Royal Street, spoke in opposition.

Becky Squires, 313 Queen Street, spoke in opposition and read aloud a letter from an adjacent neighbor, Andrea Barlow.

Dorothy Joan Roland, 323 Queen Street, spoke in opposition.

Kevin Johnson, 309 North Royal Street, spoke in opposition.

Francois Duret, 317 Queen Street, spoke in opposition.

Mary Palmer, 315 South Lee Street, spoke in opposition.

Philip Matyas, 219 North Pitt Street, spoke in opposition.

Michael Hobbs, 419 Cameron Street and representing Old Town Civic Association, urged an

understanding of the broader context and expressed concerns.

Charles Trozzo, 209 Duke Street and representing the Historic Alexandria Foundation, spoke in opposition.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

6. CASE BAR #2016-00409

Request to partially demolish and capsule at **307 S Royal Street**
Applicant: Thomas J. Welsh, Bishop of Arlington

Items #6 & #7 were combined for discussion purposes.

7. CASE BAR #2016-00410

Request for alterations at **307 S Royal Street**
Applicant: Thomas J. Welsh, Bishop of Arlington

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Miller, and seconded by Ms. Roberts, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00409 & 00410 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The exhaust cap must be painted to match the adjacent surface.
2. The salvaged must brick reused on repair the west (rear) elevation, where possible.
3. Detailing of the proposed door and window to match existing.

REASON

The Board agreed with the staff report and staff recommendations, finding them appropriate and consistent with the Design Guidelines.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had no discussion.

SPEAKERS

Michael Patrick, project architect, spoke in support and was available for questions.

8. CASE BAR #2016-00424

Request for alterations at **310 N Alfred Street**
Applicant: Navarro Construction

The case was withdrawn by the applicant prior to the hearing for administrative approval of a revised application, consistent with the BAR's adopted Window Policy.

9. CASE BAR #2016-00416

Request for demolition and capsulation at **203, 205, and 211 Strand Street**
Applicant: IDI Strand, L.C.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, and seconded by Mr. Von Senden, the OHAD Board of

Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2016-00416 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Any historic fabric (bricks, heavy timber beams and the like) identified by staff in the field once the interior finishes are completely removed must be salvaged and reused on site to the greatest extent possible.

REASON

The Board agreed with the staff analysis and found that none of the criteria for a Permit to Demolish/Capsulate were met due to the scope of demolition and significant alterations over time.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had no discussion.

SPEAKERS

John Rust, project architect, noted he agreed with the staff analysis and was available to answer any questions.

10. CASE BAR #2016-00419

Request for Concept Review at **1604-1614 King Street**

Applicant: Dechantal Associates, LLC

BOARD ACTION: The OHAD Board of Architectural Review held an informal work session for a concept review at 1606-1614 King Street. The OHAD Board of Architectural Review deferred the case for re-study.

REASON

The Board appreciated the options presented by the applicant and most agreed that this particular location was appropriate for a contemporary and even adventurous building. While the majority of the Board supported the height, scale and mass, all members expressed concern about the architectural character. An informal poll was taken to provide more direction to the applicant.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Regarding the demolition associated with the townhouses, it was noted that demolition of the rear ells was acceptable and that if the end unit 1614 could be retained, then it should be. At least three members supported deconstruction and reconstruction of 1614, with one member feeling ambivalent and another member noting that the approach for this component might evolve as the overall project design evolves. Therefore, the BAR decided to defer direction on the end townhouse to allow for continued study.

The Board expressed concerns with the proposal and noted that it needed further design work. In order to provide guidance to the applicant, the Chair took a number of informal polls. Regarding height, scale and mass, five members were in support with one undecided and one against. All members thought that the King Street elevation warranted further study and there was discussion about the character of Old Town and this particular area on upper King Street. The majority of the Board supported the concept of a glass building that would dematerialize and blend in with the sky. It was noted that because of the location on upper King Street near larger contemporary buildings and because the project would be set back behind the existing townhouses, this was a

location for a more adventurous design, even for a background building. However, this did not mean that the design should be frenzied. Four of the board members favored the following design direction: quieter/calmer approach with a more formal composition (less random/disorganized but some amount of whimsy would be appropriate) with glass as a predominant building material and masonry at the lower part, though one noted that the proposal had too much glass. Two of the board members favored the glass building with an organic/irregular design approach to add randomness and individuality.

SPEAKERS

Michael Winstanley, project architect, gave a brief presentation of the design evolution of the project and the current proposal. He also introduced Li Jon-Hong, project architect from his office, and the applicant, Peter Labowitz.

Jim Melton, 105 Harvard Street, expressed concerns about the project, particularly the height and the disruptions caused by construction here and at two nearby sites.

Kiley Larson, 103 Harvard Street, expressed concern about the design of the building finding it antithetical to the character of Old Town as well as concern about the scale and mass.

11. CASE BAR #2016-00417

Request for signage at **106 N Saint Asaph Street**

Applicant: Tamara Saltonstall

This item was deferred prior to the hearing.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The OHAD Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 10:23pm.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

CASE BAR #2016-00428

Request for new hanging sign at **107 N Fairfax Street**

Applicant: AR Workshop Alexandria

CASE BAR #2016-00429

Request for window replacement at **417 Pitt Mews**

Applicant: M. Rushen