

**\*\*\*\*\*DRAFT MINUTES\*\*\*\*\***

Board of Architectural Review  
Old & Historic Alexandria District  
**Wednesday, April 19, 2017**  
7:30pm, City Council Chambers, City Hall  
301 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Members Present: Christina Kelley, Chair  
Robert Adams  
Christine Roberts  
John Sprinkle  
John Goebel  
Slade Elkins

Members Absent: Margaret Miller

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 7:30 pm. Ms. Miller was excused. All other members were present.

**I. MINUTES**

Consideration of the minutes from the **April 5, 2017** public hearing.

**BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 6-0**

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Elkins, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes as submitted from the April 5, 2017 OHAD BAR hearing. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

**II. UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED**

**3. CASE BAR #2017-00082**

Request for alterations at **124 N Payne Street**  
Applicant: 950 N Washington Level Office LLC

**This case was withdrawn by the applicant.**

**4. CASE BAR #2017-00057**

Request for partial demolition and capsulation at **907 King Street**  
Applicant: 907 King LP

*Case # 4 & #5 were combined for discussion purposes*

**5. CASE BAR #2017-00080**

Request for alterations and an addition at **907 King Street**

Applicant: 907 King LP

**BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 5-1**

On a motion by Mr. Goebel, and seconded by Mr. Elkins, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2017-00057 and #2017-00080, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-1, with Ms. Roberts dissenting.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

The applicant must provide complete door window specifications for all replacement windows in conformance with the BAR's adopted Window Policy as part of the building permit review.

**REASON**

The Board appreciated the effort to redesign and minimize the glass skylight and roof access, finding the revised scheme to be appropriate and consistent with the Design Guidelines. The Board found the storefront alterations and minimal demolition of historic fabric to also be appropriate.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board was very complimentary of the applicant's response to their previous comments. Several Board members noted that they still had reservations about a glass "pop-up" stairway penthouse on the roof of this building, particularly as it would be visible from the public right-of-way. However, they noted that the revised scheme was much less visually jarring due to its reduced size and was now relatively unobtrusive as seen from the street. They found the simplified revised all glass rear mansard roof to also be an improvement over the previous scheme, noting such an approach had been successfully used in the other locations in the historic district. The revisions to the front were supported by all with the observation that the front was now a more cohesive composition. The majority of the Board supported the revised scheme with one member objecting to the glass penthouse above the stairway.

**SPEAKERS**

John Burke, Studio 27 and project architect, explained the revised scheme and responded to questions.

Stefan Schindler, applicant, was available for questions.

**6. CASE BAR #2017-00095**

Request for alterations at **320 S Pitt Street**

Applicant: Robert & Claire Wood

**BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 6-0**

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, and seconded by Mr. Adams, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2017-00095, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

Approval of the application for two-over-two, Low-E 272, double glazed, wood sash replacements with the following conditions:

1. The five windows on the front (west) elevation and the two windows on the side (north) elevation of the main block must be *painted* wood windows.
2. The one visible window on the rear (east) elevation of the ell and the one visible window on the side (north) elevation of the ell may be *aluminum clad* wood windows.

#### **REASON**

The Board agreed with the staff recommendation and the adopted Window Policy, noting that aluminum-clad windows were only appropriate in limited areas not visible or only minimally visible from a public way.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board noted that the Window Policy was very clear about using historically appropriate materials, particularly when street-facing or highly visible. They noted that aluminum-clad windows were only appropriate on buildings constructed after 1965, when that material became commercially available. The Board was concerned about setting a precedent for installing such aluminum-clad windows on a Victorian building. The Board appreciated the return to a more historically appropriate muntin configuration.

#### **SPEAKERS**

Robert Wood, applicant, spoke in support of the request for aluminum-clad windows.

### **III. NEW BUSINESS**

#### **7. CASE BAR #2017-00100**

Request for alterations at **433 S Fairfax Street**

Applicant: John H. Ralph

#### **BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 6-0**

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2017-00100, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

#### **CONDITION OF APPROVAL**

1. That the applicant work with staff to locate the kitchen exhaust hood vent centered below the existing French doors, if reasonably possible, and
2. Remove the existing wood guardrail and install the previously approved iron railing prior to release of a building permit for the new window.
3. Remove the lattice the rooftop HVAC screening, as it was never approved by the BAR

#### **REASON**

The Board supported the addition of a window and vent, finding them appropriate and consistent with the Design Guidelines. The Board conditioned approval upon also removing the inappropriate lattice screening surrounding the rooftop HVAC, noting it was never approved.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board asked whether the new window should be multi-light like the doors on the rear elevation however it was noted that the other windows on the house were all two-over-two,

consistent with the Victorian architectural period of the building. They also noted that the wood safety railing should be removed and the iron railing, previously approved and installed, should be reinstalled. The Board asked staff to work with the applicant to see whether it was reasonably possible to locate the exhaust hood vent centered below the French doors. The Board also observed that this townhouse was a good example of why the screening of rooftop HVAC can in certain circumstances be more obnoxious than the HVAC unit itself. As there was a prior waiver of the rooftop screening requirement, the Board agreed that the applicant must remove the unkempt lattice screen.

## **SPEAKERS**

Chris Wing, representing the applicant, supported the application and agreed to the conditions.

## **8. CASE BAR #2017-00099**

Request for new construction at **808 N Washington Street**

Applicant: Shakti, LLC

### **BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 5-0**

On a motion by Ms. Roberts, and seconded by Mr. Adams, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR Case #2017-00099. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused himself.

## **REASON**

The Board deferred approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness, noting that a number of design details needed further refinement.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

As the Board had already reviewed this project on three occasions as part of the BAR concept review process and endorsed the overall height, scale, mass and general architectural character, the Board's comments were generally related to design details and materials. It was noted that getting the details correct is essential to the success of the building. Board members made the following comments for the applicant to address:

- Revise the cornice profile on the light-colored brick buildings to make it less like the red brick Colonial Revival style building to the north and more Art Deco(ish) in style (consider a large cove cornice or classical elements in a simplified form). The two buildings' cornices should be clearly differentiated and both cornices refined. The dentils appear too stylized.
- Address the change in proportion and width of the red brick building (observed that windows were squatter/wider and the cornice was raised too high). Continue to work on the details of this building.
- The door surround on the red brick building should better align with windows above and have improved detailing.
- The arches on the north (red brick) building are not clearly shown and should be.
- Provide more information about the glass hyphens and preference for mullion cover rather than spandrel glass at floors in hyphen. S.S.G. mullions instead of capped?
- Request for detail of doors.
- Request for more contextual views and perspectives.
- Regarding the brick rustication at the first floor, the use of dark brick makes too hard a line and it may be preferable to approach the rustication simply as a shadow.
- Provide more details on the standing seam roof of the red brick building.

## **SPEAKERS**

Chris Comeau, project architect at Architect Inc., gave a presentation and responded to questions.

Brian Cutler, project architect at Architect Inc., gave a presentation and responded to questions.

### **9. CASE BAR #2017-00101**

Request for alterations at **404 S Lee Street**

Applicant: Davide Adams & Chloe Daley

**This item was withdrawn prior to the hearing.**

### **10. CASE BAR #2017-00098**

Request for partial demolition at **1100 King Street**

Applicant: Davide Adams & Chloe Daley

#### **BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 6-0**

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle, and seconded by Mr. Elkins, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2017-00098, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

*Items 10 and 11 were combined for discussion purposes.*

### **11. CASE BAR #2017-00098**

Request for partial demolition at **1100 King Street**

Applicant: Davide Adams & Chloe Daley

#### **BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, 6-0**

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle, and seconded by Mr. Elkins, the OHAD Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR Case #2017-00098, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

## **CONDITION OF APPROVAL**

1. Final approval of the rooftop mechanical equipment screening material and color be approved by staff during building permit review.
2. Work with staff to study a potential second sidelight on the North Henry Street entrance to make this symmetrical.

## **REASON**

The Board generally supported the design for the replacement storefront and related alterations, finding them appropriate and consistent with the *Design Guidelines*. The Board generally preferred a scheme for the side door on North Henry Street that was more balanced, with two sidelights instead of one asymmetrical sidelight, and requested that the applicant work with staff to study whether this could reasonably work with the interior plan.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board had several questions about design details and noted that usually an application like this would have some more information related to details. The applicant stated that signage and lighting for the building would come at a later date once a tenant was obtained. Some Board members expressed concern that the proposal was mixing too many styles (Victorian, Art Deco, etc...) and lacked cohesion. However, it was noted that storefronts on King Street were often of a different style than the rest of the building and reflected a building's evolution over time. The Board also questioned the use of the small 1" x 1" tiles under the bays and was uncertain about the use here until seeing an example of where they were recently used successfully. The Board agreed that the rooftop screening was likely not visible and that the applicant should work out the screening design details with BAR staff as part of the permit review process.

#### **SPEAKERS**

Paul Beckmann, project architect, spoke in support and responded to questions.

#### **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

The OHAD Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 9:30pm.

#### **V. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

##### **CASE BAR #2017-00121**

Request for roof and siding replacement at **615 S Saint Asaph Street**

Applicant: Exterior Medics

##### **CASE BAR #2017-00120**

Request for installation of wood fence at **245 Buchanan Street**

Applicant: Jack & Lynn Allen

##### **CASE BAR #2017-00117**

Request for sconce & shutter replacement at **313 N Royal Street**

Applicant: Daniel & Ann Horowitz

##### **CASE BAR #2017-00112**

Request for deck repair at **1 Cameron Street**

Applicant: Landrys Development

##### **CASE BAR #2017-00115**

Request for new gate at **110 Gibbon Street**

Applicant: Bruce Teris

##### **CASE BAR #2017-00113**

Request for roof repair at **207 S. Patrick Street**

Applicant: Katchmark Construction

##### **CASE BAR #2017-00118**

Request signage at **697 N Washington Street**

Applicant: Sterico Signs

##### **CASE BAR #2017-00116**

Request for siding repair at **529 S. Lee Street**

Applicant: W. Kuehnle & Linda Bridgeman

**CASE BAR #2017-00121**

Request for door replacement at **400 S Union Street**

Applicant: Virginia Electric and Power Company