

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

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, October 21, 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

Secretary: William Conkey, AIA, Historic Preservation Architect
Staff Present: Susan Hellman, Historic Preservation Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER

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 October 21, 2020 meeting 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 Section 4-0.01(g) in HB29 and HB30, enacted by the 2020 Virginia General Assembly (Virginia Acts of Assembly Ch. 1283 and 1289), to undertake essential business. BAR board members 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 **October 7, 2020** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the October 7, 2020 meeting, as submitted.

III. ITEMS DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING

3. **BAR #2019-00366 PG**

Request for alterations to previously approved plans at 607 North Alfred Street.

Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2019-00366.

4. BAR #2019-00368 PG

Request for alterations to previously approved plans at 609 North Alfred Street.

Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2019-00368.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

5. BAR #2020-00457 OHAD

Request for signage at 600 North Washington Street.

Applicant: Bank of America

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00457, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Work with staff to choose an appropriate target external illumination, that illuminates only the signs
2. The wall sign be mounted through the mortar joints
3. The signs be made of metal or wood

Removed from the consent calendar.

6. BAR #2020-00475 OHAD

Request for alterations at 515 North Columbus Street.

Applicant: Susan Taylor

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Irwin, and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00475, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board agreed with staff.

SPEAKERS

Karen Conkey, project architect, gave a brief summary of the project and was available to

answer questions.

Susan Taylor, owner, was also available to answer questions.

Tom Wise, at 513 ½ N. Columbus Street, objected to the height of the additional length of the proposed addition to the deck, which is 1'9" above grade. He requested that the additional length be at grade instead of even with the existing deck, explaining that this height would create privacy issues between the properties.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts advised Mr. Wise that he can request a waiver of fence height and raise his fence that additional 1'9" over the 6' limit. She noted that if the rest of the Board agrees, he could secure administrative approval for that height waiver instead of having to go to a BAR full hearing.

Mr. Spencer asked if the stairs could be pulled back. Ms. Taylor explained that they could not due to a hatch in the deck that leads to a cellar access door.

In voting to approve, the Board agreed with Ms. Roberts that Mr. Wise may secure administrative approval for a fence to be 6' higher than the floor level of the proposed porch extension.

V. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED BY THE BOARD

7. BAR #2020-00276 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 819 South Lee Street.

Applicants: John Charalambopoulos & Hourig Ishkanian-Charalambopoulos

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt, and seconded by Mr. Adams, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00276, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The windows comply with the *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications in the Historic Districts*
2. The applicant works with staff to choose the design of the front door light fixture
3. The addition be painted in a different color hue than the main existing structure
4. The applicant follows the recommendations of Alexandria Archaeology

REASON

The Board was satisfied with the changes made on the project that accommodated the Board's comments from the September 16 hearing and agreed with staff recommendations.

SPEAKERS

Rebecca Bostick, the project architect, mistakenly stated that the picture of the rear, west elevation, on the staff report was actually the neighbor's property (821 South Lee Street), she also stated that the applicants agree with staff's condition to paint the existing building in a different hue than the addition. She was available to answer any questions.

John Charalambopoulos & Hourig Ishkanian-Charalambopoulos, the property owners, were available to answer any questions.

Jake Dowling, resident at 802 South Lee Street, spoke in favor of the project and stated that he and his wife found the plans tasteful and in line with Alexandria and Old Town.

Ted and Elaine Mannen, residents at 831 South Lee, spoke in support of the project. Mr. Mannen said that the scale of the proposed addition is restrained and the style compatible with the neighborhood, that the project is preserving green spaces, no trees are being lost, and finally that the proposed materials are of superior quality.

Michael Hazzard and wife Allison, residents at 809 South Lee Street, stated that they are supportive and excited about the proposed project.

Tricia Holley and husband Donald, residents at 800 South Lee Street, find the proposed project well done and tasteful, Mrs. Holley said that the project will increase the neighborhood property values and that they are in support of the project which will allow the applicants to stay in the neighborhood and continue to be part of the community.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin stated for the records that she does not support the painting of unpainted masonry in general, but she understands that the subject property is a newer building that does not have the same issues as older buildings. She said that, in her professional opinion, the applicant is adding a maintenance problem since brick buildings need to be repointed every 100 years while painted buildings need to be repainted every five to ten years. She recommended the applicants not to paint the unpainted masonry. She added that she is supportive of the changes made to the project and was happy that the applicants took into consideration the Board's comments. There was no more discussion.

V. NEW BUSINESS

8. BAR #2020-00459 PG

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 907 Oronoco Street.

Applicant: Andrew Floyd

9. BAR #2020-00447 PG

Request for alterations at 907 Oronoco Street.

Applicant: Andrew Floyd

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Irwin, and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00459 & BAR #2020-00447, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None.

REASON

The Board supported the project with dormer Option A, as submitted.

SPEAKERS

Andrew & Jessica Floyd, applicants, was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts asked the applicant for their preferred design and the applicant said that they would prefer Option A. The Board agreed that Option A was an appropriate dormer.

10. BAR #2020-00461 PG

Request for alterations to previously approved plans at 902 Pendleton Street.

Applicant: Michelle Haynes

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle, and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00461, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The applicant must provide windows specifications when applying for a 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 that application with staff recommendation.

SPEAKER

Robert Byrnes, architect, available to answer questions

Michelle Haynes, property owner, available to answer questions

DISCUSSION

None.

11. BAR #2020-00479 OHAD

Request for certificate of appropriateness of south entrance pavilion at 2407 Potomac Avenue (2405, 2401, 3701, 3251 Potomac Avenue, 700 Carpenter Road, 1702, 1880 and 2500 Potomac Greens Drive).

Applicants: City of Alexandria and Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00479, as submitted.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The design for the enclosure at the bottom of the egress stairs be modified per the design shown in the presentation

REASON

The Board supported the project with the modification shown in the presentation

SPEAKERS

Daphne Kott project director with the Department of Project Implementation , City of Alexandria,

represented the applicant and introduced the project.

Graham Thomas, architect with Leuterio Thomas, presented the project and answered questions. In response to the recommendations in the staff report, the design for the enclosure at the bottom of the egress stair was modified so that the mesh is a larger opening size and the height is limited to eight feet and follows the slope of the stair.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts appreciated the revisions to the design in response to comments from the Board.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

12. 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 with Walsh Colucci, represented the applicant and introduced the project and answered questions.

Chase Eatherly, architect with Hord Coplan Macht, presented the revised design for the project.

Ryan Kautz, architect with Hord Coplan Macht, presented the revised design for the project.

Jim Simmons, Owner representative with Asland Capital Partners, presented a history of the Bottoms including photos of artifacts from the area. Mr. Simmons represented that an interpretation of this history will be included in the design of the interior and exterior of the Heritage project.

Mr. Sprinkle asked about the possibility of there being historic artifacts discovered during the proposed construction. Mr. Simmons responded that because of the construction of the existing buildings in the 1970s, most of the existing artifacts would have already been removed, but the applicant hired Thunderbird and are working with Audrey Davis and Krystyn Moon. They will work closely with Alexandria Archaeology as the project progresses.

Board questions for the applicant, answers provided by Ryan Kautz, architect with Hord Coplan Macht

Ms. Roberts asked if the balconies as shown are projecting or recessed on Block 1. Mr. Kautz responded that they are recessed with a minimal projection.

Ms. Roberts asked what the proposed material is for the recessed top two floors at the northwest corner of Block 1. Mr. Kautz responded that they would be panelized but that the final material had not yet been determined.

Ms. Roberts asked if the projecting bays on Block 1 extended to the ground. Mr. Kautz responded

that as designed, they stop at the second floor.

Ms. Neihardt asked about the purpose for the bridge elements at the east and west sides. Mr. Kautz responded indicating that the bridge at the west side includes a single loaded corridor on the street side with units on the mews side. The bridge on the east side of the building includes a connecting corridor only. These bridges are needed for the internal circulation and building systems.

Ms. Roberts asked about the two part design for the south end of the west elevation. Mr. Kautz responded that this portion was broken into two pieces in order to improve the proportion of this element.

Ms. Roberts asked about the purpose of the projecting bay at the southwest corner of the building. Mr. Kautz responded that this is meant to be a focal point for the entrance to the Wilkes Street park.

Ms. Roberts asked the applicant to identify the locations for building entrances on the plans. Mr. Kautz indicated that the main entrances for the multi-family buildings would be located at the corners adjacent to Wilkes Street park and that entrances to walk up units would be located at the perimeter of the buildings.

Ms. Roberts asked for a drawing showing the south elevation of both proposed buildings together. Mr. Kautz responded that this drawing is not currently available.

Public Comments

Danny Smith, HARC Co-Chair, stated that HARC had passed a resolution to forward a letter to the Board. They believe that the proposed design is not compatible with the historic district. The project as a gateway to the historic districts should be an important consideration. They appreciated the plan to include the history of the Bottoms into the proposed design.

Chris Morell, 421 South Columbus, was concerned about the size of the building, the location and configuration of the proposed open space, and setbacks from the street. The proposed building is too large, and the character is reminiscent of Potomac Yard.

Ellen Mosher, representing Old Town Civic Association, 324 North St. Asaph, shared a presentation comparing the proposed design to those approved for Potomac Yard.

Leslie Roberson, President of HOA Wilkes Row, stated that the mass and scale are too large for the historic district and the character is inappropriate.

Kay Morell, 425 South Columbus Street, stated that the objections to the project are based on the proposed design and not to the inclusion of affordable housing in the neighborhood.

Darryl Resio, 827 Wolfe Street, expressed concern about the size and height of the buildings relative to neighborhood. The character of the proposed design is more compatible with the historic district than the previous design but has not evolved enough.

Marek Blaskiewicz, 411 South Columbus, was interested in how the history of the area will be

interpreted and was concerned that the historic Odd Fellows building will be overwhelmed.

Brian Scholl, 800 Gibbon Street, stated that the proposed design is not permeable, and is concerned about loss of green space in the neighborhood. He felt that the City infrastructure could not support such a large project.

Stafford Ward, 600 block of South Columbus Street, expressed support for the views of previous speakers.

Jennifer Resio, 827 Wolfe Street, stated that the seven story portion of the building will be too visible and too tall.

Mary Marrow-Bax, was concerned about the relationship of the buildings to the Wilkes Street Park and a potential loss of open space.

Yvonne Callahan, 735 South Lee Street, would like to see additional internal alleys, wants the drawings to include additional context, and stated that the design for some balconies is more successful than others. She felt that the applicant had not addressed BAR concerns and only made minor changes to the previous design.

Mr. Kautz showed a video animation of a street view of the two blocks.

Steve Milone, Old Town Civic Association President, 907 Prince Street, was opposed to the design of the buildings and that little change had been made to the drawings. The buildings as proposed are inappropriate in height, mass, scale, and architectural character and they do not enhance the historic district.

Barbara Hayes, 802 Duke Street, stated that the buildings do not meet the intent of the small area plan. The drawings make the streets appear wider than they are in reality, and are concerned about the loss of tree canopy.

The public comment period was closed

DISCUSSION

Block 1 – Part A – portion adjacent to South Patrick Street

Ms. Irwin stated that she liked the massing at the northwest corner of the building. She did not like the inclusion of the narrow slots on the central portion of the west elevation. In summary she was comfortable with the height, mass, scale, and architectural character.

Mr. Spencer approved of the design for the southwest corner of the building. The narrow slots in the central portion of the elevation are too narrow and occur too often to be effective. He approved of the revisions to the design for the northwest corner building and mentioned that the bridges are required for the functioning of the building. In summary he was comfortable with the height, mass, scale, and architectural character.

Mr. Adams stated that the buildings should be a preview for the historic district. He suggested

that there should be greater differentiation between the different building sections and that the design for the hyphen is not effective. In summary he felt that the building should be no more than five stories, the massing needs more space between elements, he cannot make a judgement on the scale of the building without seeing other buildings, and the character should be more historic.

Ms. Neihardt suggested that the bridge elements be removed, the building should be no more than five stories, the massing should read as separate buildings, and that the character should be more historic.

Christine Sennott stated that the scale of the building is too large, the massing is too imposing on Patrick Street, and that the character is too contemporary. She stated that the height should be no more than sixty feet.

Mr. Sprinkle stated that he agreed with the comments from Mr. Adams.

Ms. Roberts stated that she was okay with the buildings on Patrick Street reading as large buildings and they should be full height without multiple setbacks; the use of an industrial precedent for the design could be appropriate. For a possible precedent the applicant could look at the large Art Deco building on the northwest corner of Washington Street and Prince Street. She suggested that they should avoid the use of protruding balconies and applied bays. In summary, she stated that the mass and scale of this portion of the building could be okay if each part read as a distinctly separate building, and that the character needs greater articulation.

Block 1 – Part B – portion adjacent to South Alfred Street

Ms. Irwin stated that the proposed design for the northeast corner is successful because this is a transitional element and it should not appear to be too historic in competition with the historic home on the northeast corner of the adjacent intersection. Regarding the townhouses along South Alfred Street, she noted that she felt that the previous design was more successful. For these elements she suggested that the applicant use either different colors or different styles, not both.

Mr. Spencer agreed with Ms. Irwin regarding the townhouse elements and the design for the northeast corner as it relates to the surrounding context. In general he was supportive of the size and massing of this portion of the building. He was concerned about the design for the southeast corner of the building saying that the character was too commercial and was not compatible with either the neighboring buildings or the rest of this building.

Mr. Adams stated that the massing at the northeast corner should be broken up into smaller elements that are more reminiscent of historic buildings. The townhouse elements should be grouped into doubles or triples similar to the typical pattern of townhomes in the historic district. The introduction of elements such as peaked roofs or chimneys would also help to make this portion of the building more contextual. In addition, the applicant should consider a variation of the roof line along the east elevation to reinforce the townhouse-like rhythm. Mr. Adams stated that the bridge elements should be deleted.

Ms. Niehardt agreed with Mr. Adams regarding the townhouses and stated that the glass bridge at the mews should be deleted.

Ms. Sennott stated that the design for the northeast corner is too industrial and should be more residential in nature. She agreed with Ms. Irwin and Mr. Spencer regarding their recommendation for the townhouses. She appreciated the continued evolution of the design.

Mr. Sprinkle stated that the east elevation needs additional variation in the roof line in order to break up the massing and some variation in the height of portions of this building. Regarding the architectural character, he stated that the applicant should pick an historic architectural style found in the district and use this to guide the design for the building.

Ms. Roberts stated that the design for the northeast corner is appropriate, creating a background element for the nearby historic buildings. The bridge on the east side of the building is acceptable. She agreed with previous comments regarding the townhouses stating that the applicant should choose a style and pattern rather than using a variety of styles. Ms. Roberts also agreed with previously mentioned concerns about the design for the southeast corner.

Block 2 - Southwest corner

Ms. Irwin felt that the revised design for the southwest corner is too fussy and preferred the previous design. She was comfortable with the height and mass but would like to see a design that is an evolution of the previous design.

Mr. Spencer agrees that he preferred the previous design for the corner to the revised version. The main building entry appears to be too monumental. He stated that a five story massing would be better for this portion of the site but that with some design changes, the proposed height could be acceptable.

Mr. Adams stated that the building is too tall and should be limited to four or five floors. He would like to see the character for the building be more contextual and include a variety of different window types and additional articulation. He appreciated the inclusion of the cornice as an element in reference to existing buildings within the historic district.

Ms. Neihardt stated that she prefers this revised design to the one previously submitted and agreed with Mr. Adams regarding the inclusion of the cornice.

Ms. Sennott was comfortable with the revised design but would like to see revisions to make it less symmetrical.

Mr. Sprinkle stated that the building as designed is too big and too tall. He would like to see a greater diversity of details including windows, roof line, etc. In order to improve the design he encouraged the use of additional detailing.

Ms. Roberts like the full height glass corner as a design element and likes the precast entry surround as a formal element. Similar to other parts of the building she does not support the use of projecting balconies or applied cornices. The height in this location was acceptable.

Block 2 - Southeast corner

Ms. Irwin prefers the previous version of the south elevation facing Wilkes Street Park that

included a lower scale building massing on the backdrop of the larger massing. The east elevation has become too stark from the previous versions that included the projecting bay.

Mr. Spencer agreed that the previous version of the Wilkes Street Park elevation was more successful but stated that the lower portion could be an additional story. The applied metal bay at the corner is not compatible with the rest of the design. He agreed with Ms. Irwin regarding the level of detail on the revised design for the east elevation.

Mr. Adams also agreed that the previous design for the south elevation facing Wilkes Street Park was more successful. He stated that the overall height of the building is too tall and should be brought down by one floor and that the building was generally too large. The slots in the building at the east elevation are reminiscent of slots which were used for downspouts on historic buildings.

Ms. Neihardt agreed with the comments from Mr. Adams.

Ms. Sennott also agreed with the comments from Mr. Adams.

Mr. Sprinkle stated that the building is overwhelming for the location and should be reduced in size and height.

Ms. Roberts stated that the previous design for the east elevation which included a four story block with projecting bays was more successful than the current design which is more stark.

Block 2 – Northwest corner

Ms. Irwin preferred the revised version with the lower massing and more formal townhouse design, she found the previous design to be too busy. The brick detailing at the window openings in the revised design helps to improve the scale of the building.

Mr. Spencer was supportive of the revised design and the architectural character, he felt that the slots between the townhouse elements were too small and there should be greater differentiation between the parts of the building. The design for the garage entrance with the elimination of the projecting metal bay was more successful but he did not like the metal fourth floor at the north end.

Mr. Adams preferred the previous design for the townhouse elements.

Ms. Neihardt stated that this elevation is too plain and would prefer greater articulation. This massing could be acceptable since the project is still in the concept phase.

Christine Sennott was supportive of the direction for the proposed design and would like to see further development.

Mr. Sprinkle stated that the proportions for the townhouse elements was not correct and believed that the building is too large. He agreed with previous comments regarding the metal at the fourth floor at the north end of the building.

Ms. Roberts felt that the design for the townhouses was too plain and would like to see greater

articulation as these elements continue to develop. This approach can be successful with greater evolution in the design.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2020-00410 OHAD

Request for alterations at 500 South Washington Street.

Applicant: John Kidwiler

BAR #2020-00450 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 214 Franklin Street.

Applicant: David Abizaïd

BAR #2020-00451 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 1311 Prince Street.

Applicant: Rachel Sheedy

BAR #2020-00501 OHAD

Request for brick repair at 1001 Cameron Street.

Applicant: Derek Connor

BAR #2020-00508 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 703 Day Lane.

Applicant: William Clancy

BAR #2020-00513 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 4 Muirs Court.

Applicant: Peggy Philbin

BAR #2020-00513 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 6 Muirs Court.

Applicant: Jonathan Perkes

BAR #2020-00515 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 8 Muirs Court.

Applicants: Raymond Gernhart & Fritz Schmidt

BAR #2020-00516 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 10 Muirs Court.

Applicant: Robert Schreibeis

BAR #2020-00517 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 12 Muirs Court.

Applicants: Corey and Cherie Rice

BAR #2020-00518 OHAD

Request for roof materials at 1319 Prince Street.

Applicant: Commerce Prince West, LLC

BAR #2020-00519 OHAD

Request for minor amendment at 600 North Washington Street.

Applicant: Beverly Barraza

BAR #2020-00520 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 108 Wolfe Street.

Applicant: Nick Kunesh