## \*\*\*\*\*\*DRAFT MINUTES\*\*\*\*\* Board of Architectural Review Wednesday, September 16, 2020 7:00pm, Virtual Public Hearing Zoom Webinar

Members Present:	Christine Roberts, Chair James Spencer, Vice Chair Christine Sennott Purvi Irwin John Sprinkle Lynn Neihardt Robert Adams
Members Absent:	None

Staff Present:	Amirah Lane, Historic Preservation Planner
	Stephanie Sample, Historic Preservation Planner

# I. <u>CALL TO ORDER</u>

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was called to order at 7:00 p.m. All members were present at the meeting by video conference.

Ms. Roberts stated that due to the COVID-19 Pandemic emergency, the September 16, 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. <u>MINUTES</u>

2. Consideration of the minutes from the September 2, 2020 public hearing.

# **BOARD ACTION: Approved**

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the September 2, 2020 meeting, as amended.

# III. ITEM 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.

# IV. <u>CONSENT CALENDAR</u>

## 4. BAR #2020-00395 (100-Year Old Building)

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 3737 Seminary Road. Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

# **BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0**

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00395, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

## 5. BAR #2020-00405 PG

Request for alterations at 1310 Queen Street. Applicants: Ildar Abdullin & Anna Kachalova

# **BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0**

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00405, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

## Removed from the consent calendar for discussion

## 6. BAR #2020-00414 OHAD

Request for alterations at 405 South Fairfax Street. Applicants: Jennie Korth & Dave Osterndorf

# **BOARD ACTION: Denied**

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Mr. Adams, the Board of Architectural Review voted to deny BAR #2020-00414 for after-the-fact approval of a larger pergola and the increased gate height. The motion carried on a vote of 6-1 (Ms. Irwin voted no).

## **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

None

# REASON

The Board felt that the originally approved pergola was more appropriate than the pergola that was constructed and denied the request for after-the-fact approval. During the hearing the increased front gate height was noted, which the Board also denied.

## **SPEAKERS**

Patrick Camus, Studio Camus/designer, spoke in support of the application and answered questions. He said that during construction, as the landscape plan evolved, the applicant asked for a larger pergola, which was constructed. Mr. Camus noted that the previously approved pergola (March 2019) would have been visible from the street. He said that he should have sought BAR approval for the lager pergola before it was constructed. With respect to the taller gate, he said he had a conversation with Ms. Sample about the minor revision to the gate and staff suggested that it was discussed as a replacement.

Yvonne Callahan, Old Town Civic Association, spoke against the after-the-fact approval and said she does not believe that the pergola as built would have been approved, and that as constructed it is 6' further into the yard and just inches from 407 S. Fairfax. She said that the pergola as constructed was out of place behind the historic building, noting that it was too high, large, and bulky. She said the gate was also taller without BAR approval. She said that the originally approved pergola was appropriate, and that the application should be denied so that it is not visible from the street as originally approved.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, said that the applicant did not construct the pergola that the BAR approved and that it should not be visible from the street. She said she was surprised that staff recommended approval of the larger pergola.

Matthew Feely, 308 Wolfe Street, said that his property abuts the applicant's property. He asked to share photos and he coordinated with Ms. Niebauer, but he was unable to share them due to technical difficulties. He said that the formerly approved pergola would not have been visible and that as constructed it makes it impossible for the neighbor to make maintenance to their property because it was constructed so close to the side. He said that since the construction of the addition there have been multiple infractions by the applicant. Ms. Roberts suggested these are Code issues, but Mr. Feeley said that his fence was damaged by the applicant and said that lighting in the rear yard was too bright.

Elaine LaMontagne, 407 S. Fairfax Street, said that she strongly objected to the pergola and had two significant concerns. First, that the pergola was only inches from her house, and she didn't know how she will maintain that elevation of her house. She also said that the pergola is inconsistent with the historic structure as well as visible.

Jenny Korth, applicant, said that they constructed a larger pergola but that they had worked hard to preserve the integrity of the historic house. She said that the pergola met zoning so they believed that it would be acceptable to make it larger and said that the approved pergola would also have been visible. She said it was several inches from the adjacent house and that it was only extended by approximately 2.5'.

# DISCUSSION

Mr. Adams said that the house represented a hallmark of preservation and that the originally approved drawings were appropriate. He said that the larger pergola doesn't fit and that the taller gate was also not appropriate. He said that he would uphold what was approved and the gate should be returned to its former height.

Ms. Neihardt asked why the pergola size was changed and said that she preferred the original and would not support the larger pergola. She said that if the larger pergola was originally proposed it probably would not have been approved.

Ms. Irwin said that she didn't object to a larger pergola but thought that it was too close to the neighboring house. She said if the pergola was set back farther from the neighboring house it would give it more breathing room and be less visible. She said there wasn't a plan submitted so she couldn't recommend a specific solution.

Mr. Spencer said he supported the original proposal but not the new larger pergola that was constructed because it was more than twice the size as the original.

Mr. Sprinkle asked staff if they go out to check things beyond complaint items. Ms. Sample said that staff does not typically look for additional violations beyond what the violation is for, and because the pergola was clearly visible, she told the applicant that after-the-fact approval was required. He asked if perhaps there might be other things that have been changed that the BAR was not aware of.

Ms. Sennott asked the Board whether they would have approved the larger pergola if the applicant had come forward with the constructed pergola.

Ms. Neihardt recommended denial of the after-the-fact pergola and accepted a friendly amendment from Mr. Adams to reduce the height of the gate to its previous height. Mr. Adams seconded the motion and it carried by a vote of 6-1 (Ms. Irwin voted no).

# V. <u>NEW BUSINESS</u>

# 7. BAR #2020-00277 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 819 South Lee Street. Applicants: John Charalambopoulos & Hourig Ishkanian-Charalambopoulos

# **BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0**

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00277, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

# **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

None

## 8. BAR #2020-00276 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 819 South Lee Street. Applicants: John Charalambopoulos & Hourig Ishkanian-Charalambopoulos

# **BOARD ACTION: Deferred for Restudy**

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR #2020-00276 for restudy. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

# REASON

In general, the BAR found that the project needs refinement to the addition's articulation, roof lines, and door surround.

## **SPEAKERS**

Ms. Rebecca Bostick, the project architect, agreed with staff's recommendations, but clarified that the proposed corbel is actually a brick string course matching the existing above the first floor and below the second story windows and that she would be happy to work with staff to comply with the staff conditions. She was also available to answer questions.

Mr. John Charalambopoulos and Mrs. Hourig Ishkanian-Charalambopoulos, the property owners, were available to answer questions

# DISCUSSION

Mr. Adams was not supportive of the project. He stated that the subject property was an important end row unit that integrates the back yard with the street landscaping view, which is characteristic of the Yates Garden neighborhood. He also found that the proposed two-over-two windows were not appropriate for the Colonial Revival structure and that the addition's massing was too bulky and not compatible with the existing building and the surrounding, adjacent houses.

Mr. Spencer noted that the addition's articulation needed refinement since, in his opinion, it did not complement the main structure harmoniously, and it is too accentuated on the north elevation.

Ms. Irwin did not have issues with the design but wanted to know the reason for enclosing the second basement window to the west. Ms. Bostick explained that the window was not needed since it is in the house's utility room. Mr. Charalambopoulos added that they have water infiltration and pest issues due to holes for vents on the existing boarded up window. Mrs. Irwin found that a new, well installed window would take care of the existing issues and would look better from outside.

Ms. Neihardt and Mr. Sprinkle also found that the addition's articulation needed refinement and that the roof line was not well resolved which is also in need of refinement.

Ms. Roberts clarified that the addition's north elevation will not be totally visible from South Lee Street and that a portion of the west elevation will be minimally visible from South Fairfax Street. She also found that the project needs refinement and would like to see details on the proposed door surround, refinement on the roof lines, and on the addition's articulation to the main building. There was no further discussion.

# 9. BAR #2020-00381 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 712 South Pitt Street. Applicants: Ryan R. Au & Megan E. Au

# 10. BAR #2020-00372 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 712 South Pitt Street. Applicants: Ryan R. Au & Megan E. Au

# **BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 7-0**

On a motion by Mr. Adams and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00381 & BAR #2020-00372, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

# **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

Applicant should work with staff to refine window design.

# REASON

The Board supported the design and noted that the issues raised by the public were beyond the purview of the Board.

## **SPEAKERS**

Joyce Malcolm, owner of 411 Jefferson Street, spoke in opposition, David Diamantopoulos, owner of 413 Jefferson Street, spoke in opposition, Carol Wallack, owner of 417 Jefferson street, spoke in opposition,

## DISCUSSION

Overall, the Board supported the addition. Mr. Spencer supported the application and use of a hyphen.

## 11. BAR #2020-00386 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 912 Green Street. Applicant: Christina Schoeler & Paul Fischer

## 12. BAR #2020-00387 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 912 Green Street. Applicant: Christina Schoeler & Paul Fischer

## **BOARD ACTION: Deferred for Restudy**

On a motion by Mr. Adams and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR #2020-00386 & BAR #2020-00387, for restudy. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0. Ms. Irwin was absent.

## **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

None.

## REASON

The Board felt that the design of the dormer should be more refined and compatible with the existing architecture.

## **SPEAKERS**

Paul Fisher, applicant, spoke in support of the application and said that he agreed with the staff condition to use a fiber cement siding rather than vinyl.

## DISCUSSION

Mr. Adams said that the windows were too contemporary, and the layout of the dormer was awkward.

Mr. Spencer thought the dormer was too wide and suggested that the windows align with the elevation below.

Mr. Sprinkle said that the drawings did not look professional and that they should look for precedent dormers.

Mr. Adams made a motion to defer the application which Mr. Spencer seconded. The vote carried by 6-0 (Ms. Irwin was out of the room and did not vote).

## 13. BAR #2020-00404 OHAD

Request for permit for demolition/ encapsulation at 425 South Lee Street.

Applicant: Joan Porche

## 14. BAR #2020-00411 OHAD

Request for alterations at 425 South Lee Street. Applicant: Joan Porche

## **BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0**

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00404 & BAR #2020-00411, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

## **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

- 1. Submit material specifications and detailed drawings of the proposed new gate when applying for the building permit, and;
- 2. The applicant must submit window specifications with the building permit to confirm that the proposed windows comply with the Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications in the Historic Districts.

## REASON

The Board supported the application with the staff recommendations.

## **SPEAKERS**

Jon Reinhard, architect, spoke in support of the application and answered questions.

## DISCUSSION

In general, the Board supported the proposed alterations.

## 15. BAR #2020-00425 OHAD

Request for demolition at 3601 Potomac Avenue (Associated with the redevelopment of North Potomac Yard - Blocks 7E and 10). Applicant: CPYR Theater, LLC

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

On a motion by Ms. Sennott and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00425, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused.

# **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

None

# REASON

The Board agreed that the building does not meet any of the demolition criteria

## **SPEAKERS**

Cathy Puskar, attorney with Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley, Walsh, represented the applicant and was available for any questions.

#### DISCUSSION

There was no discussion regarding this case.

#### VII. <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

## VIII. <u>ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS</u>

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

BAR #2020-00331 OHAD Request for signage at 707 Oronoco Street. Applicant: John Beard; Washington Partners, LLC

BAR #2020-00417 OHAD Request for signage at 913 Duke Street. Applicant: Nate Moore

BAR #2020-00419 PG Request for window and door replacement at 804 North Columbus Street. Applicant: Brendan Quinn

BAR #2020-00420 OHAD Request for roof replacement at 218 North Columbus Street. Applicant: Charles Mason

BAR #2020-00421 PG Request for siding replacement at 321 North Fayette Street. Applicants: Seth Jaffe & Jennifer French

BAR #2020-00423 OHAD Request for antenna replacement at 1101 King Street. Applicant: Alex Beiro

BAR #2020-00426 PG Request for fence replacement at 524 North Columbus Street. Applicant: Matthew Gluth

BAR #2020-00427 OHAD Request for door replacement at 727 South Lee Street. Applicant: Juliana Nicoletti

BAR #2020-00429 OHAD Request for window replacement at 517 Wilkes Street. Applicant: Allison N. McGinn

BAR #2020-00431 OHAD

Request for signage at 480 King Street. Applicant: Sage Alexandria Hotel Manager, LLC

BAR #2020-00432 OHAD Request for window replacement at 360 North Saint Asaph Street. Applicant: Kim Murray

BAR #2020-00435 OHAD Request for window replacement at 424 North Union Street. Applicant: Carlos Abrego

BAR #2020-00440 OHAD Request for roof replacement at 605 Jefferson Street. Applicant: Monticello Lee