

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

Board of Architectural Review

**Wednesday, March 18, 2020**

7:00pm, Sister Cities, Room 1101, City Hall  
301 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Members Present: James Spencer, Vice Chair  
Lynn Neihardt  
Purvi Irwin  
John Sprinkle (via phone)  
Christine Sennott

Members Absent: Christine Roberts, Chair  
Robert Adams

Staff Present: Stephanie Sample, Historic Preservation Planner  
William Conkey, AIA Historic Preservation Architect  
Tony LaColla, Division Chief

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was called to order at 7:03 p.m. Mr. Adams & Ms. Roberts were excused. All other members were present. Mr. Sprinkle participated by phone, subsequent to the vote on the Election Participation Policy.

Announcement regarding Change in Room and Space Capacities:

- Thank you to the Board for accommodating the change in room while the City Council utilizes the Chambers for a Budget Meeting and an Emergency Meeting relative to COVID-19.
- Thank you to the Applicants and to the Public for accommodating the change in the room's spatial format to meet social distancing requirements and to accommodate the Governor's -- and the City's -- guidelines limiting the number of people per space.
- The space in this room has been configured to accommodate an estimated 10 people including the Board, Staff and Up to 2 Speakers per item.
- We are streaming the meeting into the lobby so that everyone who is here tonight can keep abreast of the progress of the meeting.
- We are also streaming the meeting online [alexandriava.gov/Livestream](http://alexandriava.gov/Livestream) for those at home who would like to tune in.
- We ask the cooperation of any person here for an item -- that is not being considered at a given point in time tonight-- to please view the meeting from the lobby. A staff person will facilitate your entry into this room when your item is called.
- Speaker slips are located in the lobby and the staff person assigned to that area will bring them in for the Clerk as they are submitted.
- I also want to mention for those at home that they can call a number to listen to the meeting by dialing 888-323-9708 Passcode: 7670425.

- While we have a quorum here at the table tonight, there is a member (s) who would like to participate remotely.
- To allow that, the Board first needs to consider the City's Electronic Participation Policy as tailored for BAR. That policy is Item #1A on the Docket.

### **1 A. Electronic Participation for Board of Architectural Review Hearings**

For the record, as Vice Chair, sitting in for the Chair, Mr. Spencer approved the electronic participation of Board Member, John Sprinkle, who is requesting to electronically participate for reasons related to the City's Declaration of Emergency. Consequently, for these purposes, the absence(s) fit under the "emergency" category of the policy.

Mr. Sprinkle is participating from his home.

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to adopt the Electronic Participation Policy for the Board of Architectural Review Hearings. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

## **II. MINUTES**

2. Consideration of the minutes from the **March 4, 2020** public hearing.

### **BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted**

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the March 4, 2020 as submitted.

## **III. ITEMS DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING**

### **3. BAR #2020-00061 PG**

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 1001 Cameron Street

Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

### **BOARD ACTION: Deferred**

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00061.

## **IV. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED BY THE BOARD**

### **4. BAR #2020-00035 OHAD**

Request for signage and alterations at 834 North Washington Street

Applicant: North Washington Street Properties, LLC

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

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00035, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

## **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. No signs on the site may be internally illuminated except for the numerals on the monument sign, whose intensity is to be reviewed by staff at night in the field to ensure the compatibility of the illumination with the surrounding streetscape.

## **REASON**

The Board agreed with staff's recommendation.

## **SPEAKERS**

Mr. David Houston, the applicant's representative, described the project and was available to answer any questions.

## **DISCUSSION**

In general, the Board found that the project was an improvement to the property. The Board had questions about the material of the replaced roof and wanted to make sure that the applicant was aware that the monument sign being approved will probably have to be removed in seven years or so due to the new ordinance. No more question was asked.

### **2. BAR #2020-00044 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 223 South Lee Street

Applicant: Elizabeth Maier

### **3. BAR #2020-00043 OHAD**

Request for additions and alterations at 223 South Lee Street

Applicant: Elizabeth Maier

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

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00043 & BAR #2020-0044, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

## **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. 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.
2. No metal detection may be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

## **REASON**

The Board felt that the addition was modest and well designed, and was pleased that the applicant had deferred the case at the prior meeting to have further discussions with the neighbor.

## **SPEAKERS**

Elizabeth Maier, applicant, spoke in favor of the request and answered questions.

## **DISCUSSION**

The Board asked if the applicant's neighbors were satisfied with the proposed addition. Ms. Maier

said that she and the adjacent neighbor to the north have been in discussions and they were in support of the addition, with some minor details to be worked out soon. Mr. Spencer asked staff about minor changes mentioned by the applicant and whether the BAR should withhold action on the case. Ms. Sample said that she did not believe that the minor changes would raise to the level of needing BAR approval, but if they did the project would be brought back before the BAR for alterations to previously approved plans.

## **V. NEW BUSINESS**

### **4. BAR #2020-00052 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 150 Waterford Place

Applicant: Waterford Place Homeowners Association

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

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00052, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

#### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

None

#### **REASON**

Although staff recommended painting the lattice to match the brick wall behind it, the Board agreed with the applicant and found no reason for the lattices to be painted to match the walls. The Board agreed to remove the staff condition.

#### **SPEAKERS**

Ms. Diane Guerra, the Homeowner's Association president, explained the project and disagreed with staff's recommendation to paint the lattices to match the wall color. She showed several examples of white lattices around the historic district and asked to have the condition removed.

#### **DISCUSSION**

The Board had concerns about the space where the mailboxes will be installed since it looks small for all the features being proposed. The Board also had concerns about a resident's letter complaining about one of the lighting poles already installed but concluded that the matter was a neighbors' dispute and not under the Board's purview. However, the Board recommended that staff investigate the City Code for the minimal and maximum lumens allowed to ensure that the subject pole complies.

### **5. BAR #2020-00060 OHAD**

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to  
617 South Lee Street

Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

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

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00060, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

#### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

None.

## **REASON**

The Board supported the applicant-proposed location of the small cell. The Board members agreed that they had limited authority over small cell facilities within the historic districts due to existing State and Federal laws.

## **SPEAKERS**

Mr. Joshua Schakola, the applicant's representative, spoke in support of the application was available to answer any questions. He heard from two neighbors about the proposed pole location and said that he could ask the Verizon engineers to evaluate nearby poles, if the Board was interested. Mr. Schakola said that Leesburg has selected a neutral color for camouflaging their equipment that is more neutral/gray than the brown color shown in the rendering. He noted that the BAR had time to consider color as the small cells were not ready to be installed.

## **DISCUSSION**

In reference to the staff suggestion that the BAR consider relocating the proposed small cell facility, Mr. Sprinkle said that the City had already determined that the open space at the Justice Black house had no significance and was not a resource worthy of preservation so he felt that looking at alternative locations wasn't necessary. Mr. Sprinkle also noted that the BAR decision has no bearing on compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Ms. Neihardt said that she didn't have a problem with the proposed location and that streets are typically full of utility equipment in the right-of-way. Ms. Irwin suggested that the applicant in the future come forward with a preferred pole location but also show other feasible poles nearby.

### **6. BAR #2020-00062 OHAD**

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to  
421 South Union Street  
Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

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

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00062, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

## **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

None

## **REASON**

The Board members agreed that there was nothing much they could do to minimize the effect of the small cell facilities within the historic districts.

## **SPEAKERS**

Mr. Joshua Schakola, the applicant's representative, was available to answer any questions.

## **DISCUSSION**

The Board expressed disappointment that they do not have much say regarding small cell applications. As nobody from the public wished to speak on the case, the Board had no questions.

### **7. BAR #2020-00063 PG**

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 421 North

Fayette Street  
Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

**BOARD ACTION: Defer**

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR #2020-00063. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

None

**REASON**

The Board members agreed that they can do nothing to minimize the effect of the small cell facilities within the historic districts but requested that each small cell application include a study of the best location for the antenna installation.

**SPEAKERS**

Mr. Joshua Schakola, the applicant's representative, was available to answer any questions.

Mr. Doug Wright, of 424 North Fayette Street, opposed the location of the antenna and explained that an alley running behind the houses on that block of Fayette Street already has several poles with multiple equipment. He therefore felt that adding another antenna would not make much of a difference in cell reception. He also said that the next block, the 500 block, has mostly tall commercial buildings which could provide a better location for the new small cell facility.

**DISCUSSION**

The Board found that the speaker made a good point about the best location to install the small cell facility. Although the Board is aware that the antennas are strategically located, the applicant was not clear about how the locations were chosen and what study, if any, was made prior to selecting that location. Therefore, the Board deferred the application so the applicant can return and explain the criteria for choosing this location.

**8. BAR #2020-00080 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 111 Prince Street  
Applicant: 111 Prince Street, LLC

**9. BAR #2020-00081 OHAD**

Request for addition at 111 Prince Street  
Applicant: 111 Prince Street, LLC

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 5-0**

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00080 & BAR #2020-00081, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

The case was approved with the staff recommendation to repair and retain the existing front door. If the door cannot be repaired, it should be replaced with a wood, 6-panel door to match the style and dimensions of the existing.

## **REASON**

The Board found the proposed design to be appropriate and supported it unanimously.

## **SPEAKERS**

Chase Whitley, the applicant's representative, was available to answer any questions and agreed with the staff recommendations.

## **DISCUSSION**

The Board found that the addition is appropriate for the existing house and is minimally visible from the rear alley and supported the application with the staff recommendations. They questioned the applicant regarding the ability to repair the existing wood front door. The applicant indicated that he thought that it may be possible to repair the door and would work with staff accordingly.

## **VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

Discuss Small Cell Policy

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

## **VII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

The following projects were administratively approved since the last BAR meeting:

BAR #2019-00525 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 514 Prince Street

Applicant: Bill & Cathleen Phelps

BAR #2020-00074 OHAD

Request for siding replacement at 606 South Pitt Street

Applicant: Jan Rivenburg

BAR #2020-00092 OHAD

Request for alterations at 212 South Fairfax Street

Applicant: 212 South Fairfax Street, LLC

BAR #2020-00097 OHAD

Request for alterations at 200 Commerce Street

Applicant: Brandon Byrd

BAR #2020-00099 OHAD

Request for siding replacement at 118 Wolfe Street

Applicant: Dino LaVerghetta

BAR #2020-00109 OHAD

Request for alterations at 506 King Street  
Applicant: Greg Geisler

BAR #2020-00110 OHAD  
Request for roof replacement at 112 South Patrick Street  
Applicant: Austin Gordon

BAR #2020-00113 PG  
Request for signage at 1020 Princess Street  
Applicant: Elizabeth Moon

BAR #2020-00114 OHAD  
Request for roof replacement at 106 Duke Street  
Applicant: Adela Mora

BAR #2020-00116 OHAD  
Request for alterations at 602 Bashford Lane  
Applicant: Erka Alfaro

BAR #2020-00127 OHAD  
Request for repointing at 301 King Street  
Applicant: City of Alexandria