

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

Board of Architectural Review

**Wednesday, May 19, 2021**

7:00 p.m., Virtual Public Hearing

Zoom Webinar

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

Members Absent: Lynn Neihardt

Secretary: William Conkey, AIA, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Stephanie Sample, Historic Preservation Planner

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

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

2. Resolution Finding Need to Conduct the Board of Architectural Review Electronically.

**BOARD ACTION: Approved**

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the resolution. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

**II. MINUTES**

3. Consideration of the minutes from the **May 3, 2021** public hearing.

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted**

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the May 3, 2021 meeting, as submitted.

**III. CONSENT CALENDAR**

4. **BAR #2021-00180 OHAD**

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 300 North Lee Street.

Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted**

This item was pulled from the consent calendar.

On a motion by Ms. Sennott and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00180, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

## **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

None

## **REASON**

In general, the Board found that the chosen pole is appropriate for the small cell facility since it is not adjacent to any residence and is next to a five-story commercial building, therefore diminishing the facility's visual impact on the neighborhood.

## **SPEAKERS**

Ms. Roberts removed the item from the consent calendar since two letters of concern were received from the public.

Joshua Schakola, representing the applicant, stated that this application is in response to a previous application (BAR #2020-00121, near 222 North Lee Street) which was denied by the Board on May 6, 2020. Mr. Schakola also clarified, in response to the letters of concern received, that other poles nearby were taken into consideration but declined by Verizon engineers since they are required to maximize the use of the structures. He was available to answer any questions.

Jeffrey Hayden, resident at 309 North Lee Street, stated that he sent a letter to the Board requesting the denial of the application since the proposed facility will be about thirty feet away from his property and in front of his kitchen window. He said that the small cell facility is an eyesore not consistent with the neighborhood settings and that he also had health concerns due to the proximity of the facility to his residence. Mr. Hayden found that the application had discrepancies and was not very well studied. He finalized by asking the Board to deny the application and suggested that small cells facilities not be considered in residential areas.

## **DISCUSSION**

Ms. Roberts brought up that Ms. Irwin had concerns about the previous proposed location at 222 North Lee Street and asked if she considered this new location more appropriate for the facility colocation.

Ms. Irwin stated that she finds this location appropriate since it is next to a parking garage's blank wall and not directly in front of any residence window. Ms. Irwin also said that the facility will be above thirty feet high, taller than the average two-story houses nearby and not on eye level.

Mr. Adams stated that on Saturday, May 15, 2021, a small cell proposal was appealed to the City Council because residents objected the proposed small cell location for being near to a historic property and in front of a buildable lot, but City Council overturned the BAR decision. Mr. Adams said that the application being discussed now was the result of the Board's action to deny the previous proposed location, which, in his opinion, is the proper way to address small cell proposals. The applicant should be required to investigate alternative locations since small cell facilities should not be in front of anyone's house but should be at streets intersections if possible. Therefore, he supported this new proposal.

Mr. Conkey, at Ms. Roberts' request, clarified that City Council found that the small cell facility location being appealed (215 North Patrick Street) will not be a detriment to the historic property or the vacant lot adjacent to the proposed pole and that the application met all zoning requirements; therefore there were no basis for the denial of the application.

Ms. Sennott agreed that the proposed pole is the best option for the small cell facility collocation. There was no further discussion.

#### **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

##### **5. BAR #2021-00195 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 900 Franklin Street.

Applicant: Elizabeth McCeney

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

On a motion by Ms. Sennott and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00195, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

##### **REASON**

The Board disagreed with the staff recommendation and found that there were extenuating circumstances in this case to support double-glazed wood windows on the street facing facades.

##### **SPEAKERS**

Elizabeth McCeney, applicant, spoke in support of the application and listed a number of reasons why double-glazed wood windows were needed on the property.

Barney Ales, 727 S. Alfred Street, spoke in support of the applicant's request.

##### **DISCUSSION**

The Board felt that there were a number of factors in this particular case that allowed them to support an exemption from existing policies, such as the house's corner location very close to the noise and vibration of the Capital Beltway, the frequent rush hour traffic around this area and the fact that the windows have already been replaced. They also noted that this house is on the very edge of the historic district.

##### **6. BAR #2021-00237 PG**

Request for alterations at 607 North Alfred Street (Parcel Map ID: 054.04-13-39).

Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

##### **7. BAR #2021-00239 PG**

Request for alterations at 609 North Alfred Street (Parcel Map ID: 054.04-13-40).

Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

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

On a motion by Ms. Sennott and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00237 and BAR #2021-00239, as submitted. The motion carried on

a vote of 6-0.

### **REASON**

The Board supported the proposed alterations because the properties are new, setback from the property line and texture is not visible from the public right-of-way.

### **SPEAKERS**

Deyi Awadallah, property owner.

### **DISCUSSION**

Mr. Adams and Ms. Sennott supported the application noting that the texture is not visible from the public right-of-way.

## **V. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **8. BAR #2020-00612 OHAD**

Request for concept review at 101 Duke Street.

Applicant: Cummings Investment Associates Inc.

### **SPEAKERS**

Ken Wire, attorney representing the applicant, introduced the project and the project team.

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

#### *Board Questions*

Mr. Spencer asked for a clarification on the grey box shown adjacent to the Duke Street sidewalk. The applicant responded that this is an existing electrical transformer that will remain in place under the proposed construction

Ms. Irwin asked for the distance between the north building and the existing neighboring building and between the two proposed buildings. The applicant responded that there will be approximately 3' between the existing building to the north of the site and 9' between the two proposed buildings.

#### *Public Comments*

Barbara Saperstone, 100 ½ Duke Street, felt that the revised design is an improvement specifically noting the revisions to the Duke Street elevation.

Yvonne Callahan, 735 South Lee Street, stated that she would prefer to see four residences on the site instead of the proposed six in order to reduce the site density. She further felt that the design for the South building felt lighter than the north building.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, felt that the design is an improvement over the previous design but thinks that it still looks like an apartment building instead of townhomes. She stated that the height of the building relates more to the hotel on the opposite side of Union Street than to the residential buildings to the west of the site. She preferred the design of the south building to the north and agreed with Staff regarding the continued development of the stoops.

Ann Loomis, 132 Waterford Place, President of HOA, appreciated the revisions to the design but would like to see additional revisions to the south building to better integrate it into the other buildings on Duke Street.

Martha and Steven Peterson, 109 Duke Street, appreciated the outreach from the developer and would like to see the building pulled back further from Duke Street than shown in the current proposal, the elimination of the gap between the buildings would allow for this to occur.

Anna Gomez-Acebo, 100 Duke Street, was concerned about the proposed height of the building and thought that the proposed building should not be as tall as the Indigo hotel. She asked the applicant to provide a view from the waterfront to better understand the building relative to the adjacent residential buildings.

The public comment period was closed

## **DISCUSSION**

Mr. Spencer said that the massing of the building is acceptable. He further noted that he was comfortable with the architectural character but preferred the design of the north building.

Ms. Roberts asked the applicant if the building is the same distance from the sidewalk on Duke Street as the existing building. The applicant responded that they will be the same distance.

Mr. Adams asked the applicant if they would be seeking zoning exceptions for the project. The applicant responded that the proposed height is by right, they are seeking exceptions for some of the setbacks because of the introduction of the alley between the two buildings. The 2.0 FAR that is proposed is allowable through the DSUP process.

Mr. Adams said that the BAR should not endorse the scale and mass for the project because it is too large, 4 or 5 five houses on the site would be preferred in order to reduce the density. He preferred the original design for the site which included a more residential design motif if they could be smaller. The south building should be a completely different design motif than the north and should be more in scale with the residential buildings on Duke Street.

Ms. Irwin liked the updated design and prefers the warehouse motif to a residential townhome motif. She was comfortable with the proposed height and liked the variation between the buildings and would like to see this development continue. She was concerned about the windows on the north side of each building that face directly onto narrow alleys. She did not have any issue with there being 6 residential units on the site. She was comfortable with the height, mass, and scale and felt that the architectural character is going in the right direction. She would be open to some greater differentiation in the window design between the buildings.

Ms. Sennott appreciated the revisions to the design in response to previous Board comments. She felt that the project fits within the context of Union Street but is not compatible with the houses on Duke Street. She felt that the height and scale are acceptable, but the massing is too blocky on Duke Street.

Mr. Sprinkle said that the buildings should be more different in design and should embrace their

different styles. The corner as proposed should be more referential to Duke Street and should include variation between the window types. He remains concerned about the articulation of the fourth floor massing. He liked the site being broken into two buildings but felt that the south building should be smaller.

The Chair took a straw pole on height, mass, scale, and architectural character.

Height: 4 in favor and 2 against

Mass: 3 in favor and 3 against

Scale: 3 in favor and 3 against

Mr. Adams stated that the scale is not compatible with the neighbors on Duke Street or the building to the north of the site.

Ms. Sennott requested streetscape elevation drawings for both Duke Street and Union Street.

Mr. Sprinkle suggested that the building be pulled away from Duke Street and towards Union Street.

Architectural Character: 4 in favor and 2 against

Mr. Adams felt that the design is too repetitive.

Mr. Sprinkle suggested that the buildings have their own individual style and consider the use of a mansard roof to conceal the 4<sup>th</sup> floor.

Ms. Sennott suggested that the design include more character.

Ms. Irwin likes the direction of the design and would like the inclusion of more character as the design develops.

Mr. Spencer likes the introduction of the alley and would like to see greater development of the southern building.

Ms. Roberts would prefer for there to be greater differentiation between the two buildings.

## **9. BAR #2021-00048 OHAD**

Request for concept review at 805, 809, 811, 815, and 823 North Columbus Street.

Applicants: PT Blooms, LLC, contract purchaser

### **SPEAKERS**

Ken Wire, attorney representing the applicant, introduced the project and the project team.

Patrick Bloomfield, applicant, presented the project

### *Board Questions*

Mr. Adams asked if there are any zoning exceptions being pursued by the project. The applicant responded that they are proposing a complete rezoning to include bonus density because of the introduction of affordable housing.

### *Public Comments*

Rachel Sheedy, 1311 Prince Street, representing Historic Alexandria Foundation, appreciated the changes to the design in response to previous comments but remained concerned about the scale and mass of the project and would like to see a better model of the building. They are concerned about the extent of continued development in the city.

Todd Kelly, 822 North Columbus, was concerned about the proposed height and additional on street parking needs related to the development.

The public comment period was closed

## **DISCUSSION**

Mr. Sprinkle said that the comparison to the townhouses on North Columbus is not valid because of the scale of the fourth and fifth floor massing. He felt that the tallest part of the building should be pushed further east towards the hotel currently under construction. He felt that the building is too large, and the architectural character is not consistent with the surrounding context.

Mr. Adams complimented the applicant on the presentation but said that the scale and mass for the building are too large.

Ms. Irwin appreciated the inclusion of drawings that show the size of the building relative to the neighbors. She felt that this building is similar in site context to the recently opened Lineage building which is compatible with the surrounding context. She had no issue with the proposed height or scale of the building. She supports the approach to the architectural character.

Ms. Sennott thanked the applicant for providing the complete streetscape elevation drawing for the Columbus Street elevation and the Madison Street elevation and for the detailed presentation. She was supportive of the architectural character but felt that the building is too large.

Mr. Spencer appreciated the changes to the design and the reference to the neighbors shown in the drawings. He was supportive of the height and massing. He likes the corner element and the brick detailing around the windows but would like to see these developed further as the design progresses.

Ms. Roberts was supportive of the architectural character. She stated that the scale for the building is appropriate and thought that the significant set back and lower townhouse elements are a successful transition from the large hotel east of the site. She thought that the larger courtyard is successful as an entrance to the building. She was concerned about the north elevation and the relationship to the building immediately to the north of the site.

## **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

## **VII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

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

BAR #2021-00084 PG

Request for alterations at 611 North Alfred Street.

Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

BAR #2021-00179 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 1202 Michigan Court.

Applicant: Brooke Carr

BAR #2021-00186 PG  
Request for alterations at 317 North Payne Street.  
Applicant: Mount Jezreel Baptist Church

BAR #2021-00188 OHAD  
Request for window replacement at 301 South Alfred Street.  
Applicant: Alfred Street Baptist Church

BAR #2021-00200 PG  
Request for repointing at 200 North Columbus Street.  
Applicant: Ivan Sindell

BAR #2021-00205 OHAD  
Request for fencing at 1431 Duke Street.  
Applicant: Jared Underberg

BAR #2021-00206 OHAD  
Request for repointing at 117 South Fairfax Street.  
Applicants: Scott E. Flick and Shelby J. Hoover

BAR #2021-00207 OHAD  
Request for door replacement at 10 Alexander Street.  
Applicant: Patrick Boyd

BAR #2021-00208 OHAD  
Request for window replacement at 601 Queen Street.  
Applicant: Thomas Vecchiolla

BAR #2021-00211 OHAD  
Request for shed installation at 1226 Prince Street.  
Applicant: Daniel Crane

BAR #2021-00215 PG  
Request for roof replacement at 618 North Patrick Street.  
Applicant: Chris Haltom

BAR #2021-00219 PG  
Request for window replacement at 414 North Henry Street.  
Applicant: Jansen Paul Building Associates

BAR #2021-00220 OHAD  
Request for door replacement at 314 Princess Street.  
Applicant: Kevin Woods

BAR #2021-00221 OHAD  
Request for window replacement at 716 Battery Place.  
Applicant: Nancy M. Pomerleau



BAR #2021-00224 OHAD

Request for gutter replacement at 818 Duke Street.

Applicant: Shefali Mahta

BAR #2021-00240 PG

Request for alterations at 827 Queen Street.

Applicant: Kurt Meyer

BAR #2021-00241 PG

Request for window replacement at 201 North Columbus Street.

Applicants: Sprigg Constance and Robert Constance

BAR #2021-00244 OHAD

Request for masonry repair at 333 North Fairfax Street.

Applicant: Domar Properties, LLC

BAR #2021-00245 OHAD

Request for deck replacement at 1405 East Abingdon Drive #2.

Applicant: Neal Blessinge

BAR #2021-00246 PG

Request for siding replacement at 532 North Columbus Street.

Applicant: Dale Tasharski

BAR #2021-00252 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 521 South Saint Asaph Street.

Applicant: Maria Ryan

BAR #2021-00256 OHAD

Request for repointing at 602 Princess Street.

Applicant: Michale Delaney