

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

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

7:00 p.m., Virtual Public Hearing

Zoom Webinar

Members Present: Christine Roberts, Chair
James Spencer, Vice Chair
Purvi Irwin
John Sprinkle
Robert Adams
Lynn Neihardt

Members Absent: Christine Sennott

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. Ms. Sennott was absent. All other members were present at the meeting by video conference.

Ms. Roberts stated that Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic emergency, the March 3, 2021 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 **February 17, 2021** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle, and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to defer the minutes from the February 17, 2021 meeting.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

3. **BAR #2021-00024 PG**

Request for alterations at 502 North Alfred Street.

Applicant: Joseph Goyette

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt, and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00024, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

IV. ITEM PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED BY THE BOARD

4. **BAR #2020-00296 PG**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 315 North Patrick Street.

Applicant: Shambhu Aryal

5. **BAR #2020-00363 PG**

Request for addition and alterations at 315 North Patrick Street.

Applicant: Shambhu Aryal

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended

On a motion by Ms. Irwin, and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00296 and BAR #2020-00363, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

1. **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

Applicant will work with staff to ensure that windows comply with *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications in the Historic Districts*.

2. Fiber cement siding will have smooth finish.

3. Rear porch columns will be simple square columns.

4. Corrected FAR sheet and revised survey must be submitted at time of building permit.

5. The applicant/developer shall 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.

a. The applicant/developer shall not allow any metal detection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

b. The above statements, 2 and 2a, shall appear in the General Notes of all site plans and on all site plan sheets that involve demolition or ground disturbance (including Basement/Foundation Plans, Demolition, Erosion and Sediment Control, Grading, Landscaping, Utilities, and Sheeting and Shoring) so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements.

6. Work with staff to either size the shutters on the west/front elevation properly for the window size, or to remove the shutters entirely.
7. Work with staff on the size and quantity of the columns on the east/rear porch.
8. Work with staff to reduce the width of the stair on the east/rear porch.
9. Work with staff to determine whether or not the windows on the south elevation of the ell are in their original locations and, if so, determine appropriate steps.

REASON

The Board appreciated the changes to the project since the prior submission, but felt that certain aspects needed attention.

SPEAKERS

Alex Middleton represented the applicant and was available to answer questions.

Mimi Konoza, 317 North Patrick Street, expressed concern regarding any potential damage to her property, especially during the excavation of the basement.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin asked Mr. Middleton if he had any indication as to original window locations on the south elevation of the ell, as the application indicates that they will remove all windows and replace them. Mr. Middleton replied that the windows themselves are not original but he was unsure as to whether or not they were in their original locations. Ms. Irwin noted that the west/front shutters appear to be inoperable and too narrow to actually cover the windows. Ms. Irwin agreed with the staff report condition regarding the east/rear porch posts/columns.

Mr. Sprinkle also expressed concern regarding the windows and appreciated Mr. Conkey's suggestion that the applicant work with staff to resolve the issue.

Ms. Roberts felt that the east/rear porch columns look too insubstantial to support the weight of the upper deck. She understood that a thin column can support such weight, but her issue was that the thinness of the columns made the upper deck look unsupported. She recommended either making these columns thicker or adding two more columns.

Mr. Spencer noted that the west/front elevation does not have room to replace the existing shutters with larger, properly sized, shutters that will operate and fit the windows. The space between the windows is too small. He also felt that the east/rear stairs are too wide.

V. NEW BUSINESS

6. BAR #2021-00053 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 603, 605, and 607 King Street.
Applicant: Douglas Development

7. BAR #2021-00052 OHAD

Request for alterations and signage at 603, 605, and 607 King Street.
Applicant: Douglas Development

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt, and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00052 and BAR #2021-00053, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The new front doors and storefront windows be made of wood and comply with *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications in the Historic Districts*
2. The applicant work with staff on signage that complies with the BAR policies
3. The proposed shutters be proportional to the window opening

REASON

The Board had no objections to staff recommendations.

SPEAKERS

Katie Nightingale, representing the applicant, was available to answer questions.

Ray Fung, the property tenant, stated that he was happy to come to Alexandria and gave an overview about the brand.

DISCUSSION

In general, the Board was pleased with the project and had no questions or concerns.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

8. BAR #2020-00612 OHAD

Request for concept review at 101 Duke Street.
Applicant: Cummings Investment Associates Inc.

SPEAKERS

Garrett Erdle, representing the applicant, introduced the project and the project team.

Shawn Glerum, architect with Odell Architects, presented the design for the project.

Public Comments

Barbara Saperstone, 100 ½ Duke Street, thanked the applicant for their engagement with neighbors. She stated that she preferred the design as presented at the previous concept review and felt that the current design is too boxy. She asked that the applicant look at adding greater articulation to the south elevation would help the appearance of the design.

Felipe Gomez-Acebo, 100 Duke Street, referred the Board to a letter that he had written regarding the project. He stated that the building as designed is too large and relates to the hotel on the opposite side of Union Street rather than the homes on Duke Street. He suggested that the building could be lowered at the south end of the site.

Lindsey Reading, 224 South Lee Street, was concerned about the privacy of homeowners on the west side of the site due to the new roof deck.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, suggested that the proposed building is too tall and would be more appropriate on route 1 than in this location. She suggested that the proposal would be improved if the applicant could build 4 townhomes instead of 6. She further asked if it would be possible to lower the ground floor and add greater articulation to the south elevation.

Yvonne Callahan, 735 South Lee Street, agreed with the comments of Ms.Saperstone and felt that the design is too modern and industrial. She also felt that the project would be improved by removing 2 townhomes from the design. She liked the introduction of the alley but is concerned about the distance between the entry stoops at the sidewalk level.

The public comment period was closed

DISCUSSION

Mr. Adams felt that the proposed building is too large and agreed with public comments that fewer townhomes on the site would improve the design. He suggested that the applicants consider the idea of having one building with a residential design and one with a more industrial design motif.

Mr. Spencer appreciated the introduction of the alley between the two buildings and the variation in designs for the entry stoops. He suggested that the applicant look at adjusting the design to provide variation between the two buildings on the site.

Ms. Neihardt thanked the applicant for responding to the comments made during the previous concept review and liked the proposed alley between the buildings. She suggested that if the development could include 5 townhomes instead of the proposed 6 with one block of 2 and one block of 3 then that would provide additional open space on the site. She liked the use of the industrial motif but agreed that some variation between the buildings would help the design.

Ms. Irwin stated that she likes the direction of the design evolution from the previous submission and indicated that she has provided staff with some warehouse precedent images for the applicant to consider, these were passed along to the applicant. She liked the introduction of the alley but was concerned about how the space will be used. Regarding the options for the design of the 4th floor, she preferred the option without the extended canopy as this helped to reduce the visual impact of this floor. She agreed with the staff recommendation regarding the use of a hierarchy for the elevations with the rear elevation being less decorative than the street facing elevation. She recommended that the applicant consider adding additional brick detailing at places such as the cornice to provide visual interest. She stated that the proposed height is acceptable and that the differences between the buildings could be successful but that they should not be dramatically different.

Mr. Sprinkle noted that the design featured what appeared to be a cornice design from the 19th century and windows more from a 20th century building. He suggested that the applicant consider revising the design to include a prominent corner element to the south east corner of the building and inquired about the possibility of there being a variation in the architectural style between the Duke and Union Street elevations. He noted that fewer townhomes on the site would make for a more successful project.

Ms. Roberts suggested that the applicant explore ways in which additional variation could be

included between the two buildings and referenced details of historic warehouses that had been shared with the Board. She noted that the south elevation building with the blank masonry panels was too stark and would be improved with additional articulation. She stated that turning the building to front on Duke Street would draw more attention to the building in competition with the historic buildings nearby and would no longer function as a background building.

Mr. Spencer noted that historic homes throughout the district that are located at the corner of blocks do not typically include strong corner elements but instead address the street with the main entrance and have a side elevation on the other street facing side. He further noted that he found the proposed height acceptable when viewing the site from the south and along Duke Street.

Ms. Irwin agreed that it is typical for historic buildings to not include a strong two sided corner element.

Mr. Adams suggested that the applicant step the southern townhome back at the top floor. He noted that while this area may have historically been industrial it is currently residential in nature.

Ms. Neihardt agreed with Mr. Adams that an effective strategy to reduce the overall perceived height would be to eliminate the top floor on the southernmost townhome.

Ms. Irwin felt that it was not necessary to remove the fourth floor if the overhang was removed and the windows were enlarged.

Mr. Spencer suggested that under the current design the building steps down significantly towards the houses to the west of the site through the inclusion of single story garages on this elevation. He stated that he found the fourth floor overhang to be helpful in reducing the overall perceived height.

9. Review By-Laws.

The Board considered larger themes of updating the bylaws, which staff will discuss with the City Attorney's office. Staff will then create a draft version for the Board to consider at a later hearing. Issues include adding term limits for officers, possibly three years, Certified Local Government (CLG) training requirements, and meeting management.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2021-00064 OHAD
Request for alterations at 207 Franklin Street.

Applicant: Vowell LLC c/o Michael Harrington

BAR #2021-00065 OHAD

Request for alterations at 819 South Lee Street.

Applicant: John Charalambopoulos

BAR #2021-00067 PG

Request for fence replacement at 1515 Princess Street.

Applicant: Albert Turnbull

BAR #2021-00068 OHAD

Request for repointing at 212 South Pitt Street.

Applicant: Nancy Woodford

BAR #2021-00069 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 209 Green Street.

Applicant: Jennifer Leonard

BAR #2021-00072 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 127 Queen Street.

Applicant: Mary Ann Way

BAR #2021-00074 PG

Request for alterations at 720 North Columbus Street.

Applicant: Meredith Selby

BAR #2021-00076 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 508 South Fairfax Street.

Applicant: Lucy Rhame

BAR #2021-00078 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 630 South Pitt Street.

Applicant: Ivar Draganja

BAR #2021-00080 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 200 South Pitt Street, #1

Applicant: Catherine Suthard

BAR #2021-00083 OHAD

Request for alterations at 228 South West Street.

Applicant: Kristin Atkins