

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

Board of Architectural Review

**Wednesday, July 15, 2020**

7:00pm, Virtual Public Hearing

Zoom Webinar

Members Present: Christine Roberts, Chair  
James Spencer, Vice Chair  
Christine Sennott  
Purvi Irwin  
John Sprinkle

Members Absent: Lynn Neihardt  
Robert Adams

Staff Present: Stephanie Sample, Historic Preservation Planner  
William Conkey, Historic Preservation Architect

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Ms. Neihardt and Mr. Adams were excused. All other members were present at the meeting by video conference.

Ms. Roberts stated that due to the COVID-19 Pandemic emergency, the July 15, 2020 Public Hearing of the Board of Architectural Review (BAR) is being held electronically pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3708.2(A)(3), the Continuity of Government ordinance adopted by the City Council on June 20, 2020 or Sections 4-0.00(g) in HB29 and HB30 to undertake essential business. All of the members of the Board and staff are participating from remote locations through Zoom Webinar. The meeting can be accessed by the public through broadcasted live on the government channel 70, streaming on the City's website and can be accessed via Zoom hyperlink on the docket.

**II. MINUTES**

2. Consideration of the minutes from the **July 1, 2020** public hearing.

**BOARD ACTION: Approved**

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the July 1, 2020 meeting.

**III. ITEMS DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING**

3. **BAR #2020-00135 PG**  
Request for alterations at 419 North Patrick Street.

Applicants: John Corbin & Ann Riley

**BOARD ACTION: Deferred**

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00135.

**4. BAR #2020-00289 PG**

Request for alterations at 902 Oronoco Street.

Applicants: Patricia Harris & Richard LaFace

**BOARD ACTION: Deferred**

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00289.

**IV. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**5. BAR #2020-00241 OHAD**

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 526 North Washington Street.

Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 4-0**

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00241, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused.

**6. BAR #2020-00275 OHAD**

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 1299 Michigan Court.

Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 4-0**

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00275, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused.

**V. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED BY THE BOARD**

**7. BAR #2020-00030 OHAD**

Request for signage at 815 ½ King Street.

Applicant: Old Town #2, LLC

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

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00030, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

None.

### **REASON**

The Board supported the changes to the signage plan and recommended approval as submitted.

### **SPEAKERS**

Welsh Liles, applicant, spoke in support of the project and answered questions.

Mr. Circa, Patagonia, was available to answer questions.

### **DISCUSSION**

Ms. Irwin and Mr. Sprinkle said that they were pleased with the retention of the OLD TOWN sign and the installation of a Patagonia sign above the doors (under the canopy).

### **8. BAR #2020-00142 OHAD**

Request for new building at 1300 & 1310 King Street.

Applicant: 1300 King, LLC

### **BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 4-1**

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00142, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 4-1. Mr. Sprinkle opposed.

### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

The historic masonry buildings may be painted due to the poor condition of the existing brick

Upon completion of the removal of the existing bondstone on the historic buildings, the applicant should work with staff to complete the design for the window and door openings on the historic buildings to match the original configuration as closely as possible.

Use the modern tracery pattern.

Use the revised full-height jack arch.

### **REASON**

The Board agreed with staff recommendations and appreciated the changes to the earlier design.

### **SPEAKERS**

Bob Brant, attorney, represented the applicant and introduced discussion of three particular items: jack arches, tracery pattern, historic buildings.

Michael Winstanley and Leejung Hong, architects, were available to discuss the design and answer questions. They provided three options for the jack arches: similar the previous design; no arches at all; smaller jack arches. They provided a floral option and a design patterned after wheelwright tools for the tracery. The wheelwright design was conceived due to the historic use of one of the older buildings. They also presented a previously unseen historic photo of the older buildings.

### **DISCUSSION**

The Board liked the historic look to the jack arches. Mr. Sprinkle expressed an interest in having

the west side of the historic building exposed. Ms. Roberts explained that the encapsulation of the west elevation had already been approved. Mr. Spencer liked the rectilinear option on the jack arches and the floral tracery design. He also supported painting the historic buildings. Ms. Irwin also supported painting the historic buildings and was enthusiastic about the new tracery design. Ms. Sennott liked the painted brick but felt that the second floor windows should have headers to match the original. She was not sure about the jack arches on the new construction but expressed appreciation for the new wheelwright tracery pattern. Ms. Roberts would prefer brick painted white to brick painted gray.

**9. BAR #2020-00264 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 613 South Pitt Street.

Applicant: Katherine Pappas

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

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00264, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

None

**REASON**

The Board agreed with the staff recommendation.

**SPEAKERS**

Mimi Pappas, the applicant, was available to answer questions.

**DISCUSSION**

The Chair noted that the new documents were very helpful and noted that two neighbors had provided letters of support.

Ms. Pappas thanked Mr. Conkey, Mrs. Hellman, and Ms. Neibauer for their assistance.

**VI. NEW BUSINESS**

**10. BAR #2020-00007 OHAD**

Request for revisions to previously approved plans at 128 North Pitt Street.

Applicants: Martin O. Kamm & Eva M. Martoreli Gil

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

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00007, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

Applicant work with staff to fulfill conditions for plans approved by the Board on February 5, 2020, deleting the condition regarding HVAC screening, as that is no longer applicable.

**REASON**

The Board agreed with staff recommendations.

### **SPEAKERS**

Mark Yoo, architect, represented the applicant, giving a brief presentation and answering questions.

Steve Milone, representing Old Town Civil Association, noted that he had spoken against this project at the February 5, 2020 hearing, feeling the rooftop addition was too large. He endorses this design, feeling that it is much improved over the previous design.

### **DISCUSSION**

Mr. Spencer asked Mr. Yoo if he agreed with the staff recommendations. Mr. Yoo replied in the affirmative and remarked that he is happy to work with staff. Mr. Spencer said that he prefers this design to the previous design and appreciates the addition of a storefront door in the location of a historic storefront door.

Martin Kamm, the applicant, told the Board that he appreciates them.

### **11. BAR #2020-00255 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition at 932 South Fairfax Street.

Applicant: Chad Worz

### **12. BAR #2020-00254 OHAD**

Request for addition and alterations at 932 South Fairfax Street.

Applicant: Chad Worz

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

On a motion by Ms. Sennott and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00254 & BAR #2020-00255, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

Lime wash may be used on the exterior and not German smear.

### **REASON**

The Board supported the application with the exception of the German wash. The Board said that they supported the alternative lime wash treatment.

### **SPEAKERS**

Kurt West, architect, spoke in support of the application and answered questions. Mr. West said that the applicant was in support of a lime wash instead of the German smear.

### **DISCUSSION**

Ms. Roberts asked for an explanation of the window specification configuration and he noted that the windows would be six-over-six and not six-over-one as shown in the window materials. Mr. West described the German smear process but said that the applicant would be amenable to a lime wash instead.

**13. BAR #2020-00259 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 1707 Duke Street.

Applicant: Charles Hooff

**BOARD ACTION: Denied**

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to deny BAR #2020-00259. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

None.

**REASON**

The Board denied the request for aluminum clad windows and instead recommended that the applicant retain and repair the historic windows with cylinder glass and work with staff if they determine that some windows need to be replaced, according to the recommendations in the Board's window policy and replacement specifications. They encouraged the applicant to explore the use of storm windows.

**SPEAKERS**

Mr. Hooff, property owner, spoke in support of the application and answered questions. He said that the glass in the windows is historic but that he installed the historic glass in the windows when they were routinely broken by passing busses. He said the single paned windows are both noisy and allow for a lot of heat gain in the south facing rooms. He said the building is not in the historic district and that it will never be used for residential purposes. He said that the City approved the demolition of nearby buildings.

Mr. Milone, Old Town Civic Association, supports the staff recommendation and said he has interior storms that work well.

**DISCUSSION**

Ms. Roberts said that her home had interior storm windows and that they worked quite well. Mr. Spencer said that he supported the staff recommendation. Ms. Irwin said that storm windows would be her preference but that if the windows could not be repaired then she would support the historically appropriate replacement. She noted that the south façade was the more visible/important but since all sides were visible from the public way any replacement windows should meet the policy, if replacement is warranted.

**14. BAR #2020-00292 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition at 407 Prince Street.

Applicants: Carlos Cecchi & Lisa Rivas

**15. BAR #2020-00291 OHAD**

Request for addition and alterations at 407 Prince Street.

Applicants: Carlos Cecchi & Lisa Rivas

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 4-1**

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00291 & BAR #2020-00292, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 4-1. Mr. Sprinkle opposed.

#### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

The Board removed the following staff recommendation from the condition of approval: “The transoms in the proposed and replacement doors must be a vertical three panel transom to match the existing as noted on sheet A2.”

#### **REASON**

The Board supported the application with the exception of the first staff recommendation.

#### **SPEAKERS**

Patrick Camus, architect, spoke in support of the application and answered questions.

#### **DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed whether the amount of demolition was necessary to construction the addition and the configuration of the panels. Mr. Sprinkle was not in support of the amount of demolition.

#### **16. BAR #2020-00197 OHAD**

Request for complete demolition at 450 South Patrick Street, 900 Wolfe Street & 431 South Columbus Street.

Applicant: Heritage at Old Town PropCo LLC

#### **BOARD ACTION: Deferred**

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00197. The motion carried on a vote of 5 – 0.

#### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

In addition to the required notifications, applicant must provide notice to every resident of the subject buildings. Future testimony at the hearing to which this case is deferred will be limited to residents.

#### **REASON**

Residents did not receive direct notification of the BAR hearing.

#### **SPEAKERS**

Cathy Puskar, attorney with Walsh Colucci, represented the applicant and answered questions.

Brian Scholl, 804 Gibbon, questioned the probable timeline of the demolition and was told it would take place in late summer, 2021, at the earliest. He expressed concern for the residents of the subject buildings and felt that noticing was too late and insufficient.

Stafford Ward, 601 S. Columbus, felt that notifications should have gone out to a wider range of neighbors.

Elena Mola, 817 Wolfe, felt that she should have received notice because her home overlooks the

subject property. She expressed concern with construction dust and rats.

Judy Lisy, 313 S. Columbus, noted that she felt that the 1970s townhouses will be historic in 20 years and therefore should not be demolished.

Mary Morrow Megs (?), no address given, opposed the demolition. She expressed concern about dump trucks and street damage.

Steve Milone, 907 Prince, representing Old Town Civic Association, opposed the demolition. He asked the Board to either deny or defer the case. He disagreed with the staff finding that there are no feasible alternatives to demolition. He also felt that the public engagement process was inadequate.

Marta Ali, 902 Wolfe, #1C (Heritage resident), explained that many residents found the addresses on the noticing placards were misleading and confusing. For example, she lives at 902 Wolfe, but the only Wolfe Street address on the placards was 900 Wolfe. She suggested that placards include the name of the property, not just the block address.

## **DISCUSSION**

Ms. Roberts explained that this item was to discuss the demolition only, not the proposed new buildings.

Mr. Sprinkle questioned the extent of historic evaluation of the 1970s buildings to be demolished.

Ms. Roberts asked staff to explain the noticing process and to verify that proper procedures were followed; staff did so.

Ms. Sennott noted that it appeared that although noticing followed proper procedures, it had not been sufficiently substantial. She felt that residents should have received individual notifications. Ms. Puskar explained that the applicant had hosted two meetings for the residents, one in January and one on July 13. Fifty-nine (59) residents attended the July 13 meeting and the applicant provided an Amharic translator.

Mr. Sprinkle asked the Chair if they could defer the demolition discussion until the applicant can provide more information as to the potential architectural and historic significance of the subject buildings. Ms. Roberts noted that staff has experts who can determine that.

Mr. Spencer expressed concern about lack of notice to the residents.

Ms. Irwin requested that the Board defer to get more resident feedback. She and Ms. Roberts want the residents to have an opportunity to give their insights and opinions as to the historic nature of the buildings.

## **VII. NEW BUSINESS**

### **17. BAR #2020-00196 OHAD**

Request for concept review at 450 South Patrick Street, 900 Wolfe Street & 431 South Columbus



Street.

Applicant: Heritage at Old Town PropCo LLC

## **SPEAKERS**

Cathy Puskar, attorney, represented the applicant and answered questions.

Elena Mola expressed concern about noticing and the scale of the proposed development.

Brian Scholl was concerned about the height and density. He noted a preference for using traditional materials.

Stafford Ward referenced 7-703 in the zoning ordinance and asked when City Council would vote on additional bonus height.

Mary Morrow Megs (?) wanted to see renderings showing existing buildings and asked about parking and the Wilkes Street Park.

Marek Blaskiewicz, 411 S. Columbus, felt this development would be more appropriate in Potomac Yard than here.

John Szech, 413 S. Columbus, would like to see the new buildings along with existing buildings, expressing concern about the height of the new buildings and the fate of the older buildings.

Christopher Morell, 421 S. Columbus, felt the proposed building would be too tall and had no connection to historic architecture. He felt that the fenestration is commercial, not residential, and that the mass and scale is not pedestrian friendly. He recommended a shade study.

Daryl Resio, 827 Wolfe, felt that height and mass are inappropriate and more suited to Potomac Yard. He felt that the design looks like a massive commercial building.

Marta Ali liked the design as it related to some buildings. She also liked the modern design with terraces and balconies but expressed concern about natural light.

Steve Milone, asked the Board to consider noticing the north end of the site. He felt that 7 stories would be out of scale and that the design does not meet zoning requirements. He noted that a 55' height is indicated in the Small Area Plan. He recommended relocating the garage and loading entry.

## **DISCUSSION**

Mr. Spencer noted that the concept does not include context to relate the mass of the buildings to the surrounding community. He recommended the applicant include drawings of existing buildings in order to determine whether or not the proposed design will fit into the community. He expressed concern about the 7-story mass at the southwest corner, feeling that it will present as a continuous wall. He recommended providing internal alleys.

Ms. Sennott asked how comments would affect Block 4, which feels like a wall up against the road. She requested drawings showing context, noting that the design does not refer to existing buildings.

Ms. Irwin wanted to see full streetscapes. She was less concerned about character because this project is so early in the design phase. She liked the general direction of the design and would like the applicant to take another look at Block 1, which is not currently pedestrian freindly. She recommended that the applicant look at Block 1 in relation to Block 4.

Mr. Sprinkle felt the overall design is too big and lacks a connection to Old Town. He thought that the building should better fit into the southwest quadrant.

18. VRE presentation on pedestrian safety improvements at Union Station.

## **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 12:55 a.m.

## **IX. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

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

BAR #2020-00301 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 326 Commerce Street

Applicant: Wallace Cole

BAR #2020-00311 PG

Request for window replacement at 1020 Cameron Street

Applicant: Maor LLC

BAR #2020-00314 OHAD

Request for siding replacement at 522 South Pitt Street

Applicant: Leonard Calvert

BAR #2020-00317 PG

Request for window replacement at 225 North West Street

Applicant: Erica Gray