

*******APPROVED MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, April 22, 2020

7:00pm, Virtual Public Hearing

Zoom Webinar

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

Members Absent: Lynn Neihardt

Staff Present: Stephanie Sample, Historic Preservation Planner
Tony LaColla, Division Chief

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

Ms. Roberts stated the following: “The April 22, 2020 meeting of the Board of Architectural Review is being held electronically pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3708.2(A)(3) and/or the Continuity of Government ordinance adopted by the City Council on April 18, 2020.

All of the members of the Board of Architectural Review and staff are participating from remote locations through Zoom Webinar. The meeting will be broadcasted live on the government channel 70, streaming on the City’s website and can be accessed via Zoom account found on tonight’s docket.”

II. OTHER BUSINESS

Amendments to Existing Small Cell Policy

SPEAKERS

Joshua Schakola, representing Verizon, addressed some of the questions raised by the BAR.

Nathan Campbell, representing Crown Castle, introduced himself and said that Crown Castle represents Sprint and T-Mobile.

Mr. Steve Milone, President of the Old Town Civic Association, read a prepared statement making a number of suggestions for the Board’s treatment of small cell facilities.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Sample made a presentation about the proposed amendments to the small cell policy and answered questions. Mr. Tony LaColla also answered questions from the BAR.

On a Motion by Mr. Sprinkle, seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to table the proposed amendments to the existing BAR Policy for Administrative Approval of Small Cell Wireless Facilities on Utility Poles in the Right-of-Way. On a Motion by Ms. Irwin, seconded by Mr. Adams, the Board also voted to rescind the existing BAR policy to allow the Board more time to hear small cell facility applications prior to adopting a new policy.

III. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2020-00029 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 913 Prince Street

Applicant: John Alexander

BAR #2020-00038 OHAD

Request for replace garage door at 628 South Lee Street

Applicants: Michael & Iris Palmer

BAR #2020-00041 OHAD

Request for roof and window replacement at 107 South Lee Street

Applicant: Robert L. King

BAR #2020-00047 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 208 South Pitt Street

Applicants: Anne & David Ayers

BAR #2020-00048 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 406 North Lee Street

Applicant: James R. Tamm

BAR #2020-00049 OHAD

Request for repointing at 505 Wilkes Street

Applicant: Todd Pickell

BAR #2020-00050 PG

Request for repointing at 1210 Queen Street

Applicant: Todd Pickell

BAR #2020-00051 OHAD

Request for repointing at 211 South Royal Street
Applicant: Todd Pickell

BAR #2020-00055 OHAD
Request for alterations at 725 Ford's Landing Way
Applicant: George Keul

BAR #2020-00058 OHAD
Request for roof replacement at 730 South Royal Street
Applicant: Mary Clarity

BAR #2020-00059 OHAD
Request for install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 202 Green Street
Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BAR #2020-00067 OHAD
Request for install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to at 300 South Fairfax Street
Applicant: Smartlink o/b/o AT&T

BAR #2020-00070 OHAD
Request for repointing at 200 South Fairfax Street
Applicant: Ron Roys

BAR #2020-00073 OHAD
Request for roof replacement at 208 South Pitt Street
Applicants: Anne & David Ayers

BAR #2020-00088 OHAD
Request for roof replacement at 720 North Columbus Street
Applicant: Meredith Selby

BAR #2020-00096 OHAD
Request for window replacement at 803 Church Street
Applicant: Mindy Harrison

BAR #2020-00103 PG
Request for roof replacement at 403 North West Street
Applicants: Rachel & Jerry Peacock

BAR #2020-00118 OHAD
Request for signage at 722 King Street #724
Applicant: Thai Signature

BAR #2020-00119 OHAD
Request for chimney repair at 120 South Lee Street
Applicant: Thomas Raycroft

BAR #2020-00124 OHAD

Request for alterations at 310 Commerce Street

Applicant: Tim Foley

BAR #2020-00125 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 721 Ford's Landing Way

Applicants: William & JoAnn Droms

BAR #2020-00128 OHAD

Request for door replacement at 1172 North Pitt Street

Applicant: Morrill Marston

BAR #2020-00131 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 201 North Washington Street

Applicant: Kristina Delgado

BAR #2020-00133 OHAD

Request for HVAC screening at 500 Wolfe Street

Applicant: Amanda Delle Donne

BAR #2020-00141 OHAD

Request for signage at 210 North Lee Street #104

Applicant: Bob Biroonak

BAR #2020-00147 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 628 South Lee Street

Applicant: Michael Palmer

BAR #2020-00151 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 38 Wolfe Street

Applicants: Eric & Nancy Visser

BAR #2020-00153 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 62 Wolfe Street

Applicant: Jackie Berger

BAR #2020-00154 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 726 South Lee Street

Applicant: Karen O'Hern

BAR #2020-00157 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 424 North Saint Asaph Street

Applicant: James Cavanagh

BAR #2020-00158 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 7 Wilkes Street

Applicant: Harry Frazier

BAR #2020-00160 PG

Request for alterations at 317 North West Street

Applicant: Lisa Letke

BAR #2020-00161 PG

Request for alterations at 233 North West Street

Applicant: Jessica Hill

BAR #2020-00162 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 414 North Saint Asaph Street

Applicant: Nancy Richards

BAR #2020-00163 OHAD

Request for alterations at 300 Wythe Street #903

Applicant: Gretchen Bulova

BAR #2020-00165 PG

Request for alterations at 225 North West Street

Applicant: Erica Gray

BAR #2020-00167 OHAD

Request for alterations at 308 South Fairfax Street

Applicant: Cynthia Spoehr

BAR #2020-00169 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 721 South Alfred Street

Applicant: Garret Reinhart

BAR #2020-00170 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 619 North Columbus Street

Applicant: Corinne Marlowe

BAR #2020-00172 OHAD

Request for alterations at 325 Duke Street

Applicant: Mija Romer

BAR #2020-00176 PG

Request for door replacement at 1000 Cameron Street

Applicant: Vince Burgher

BAR #2020-00177 OHAD

Request for install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to at 317 North Columbus Street

Applicant: Smartlink o/b/o AT&T

BAR #2020-00180 OHAD

Request for door replacement at 822 South Lee Street

Applicant: Daigle Katz
BAR #2020-00181 OHAD
Request for roof replacement at 306 North Fairfax Street
Applicant: Brian Morris

*******APPROVED MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, May 6, 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

Members Absent: Robert Adams

Staff Present: Stephanie Sample, Historic Preservation Planner
Tony LaColla, Division Chief

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

Ms. Roberts stated that due to the COVID-19 Pandemic emergency, the May 6, 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 April 18, 2020 or City of Alexandria Page 1 Board of Architectural Review Action Docket May 6, 2020 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.

Public comment will be received at the meeting. The public may make public comments through the conference call. Comments submitted prior to the meeting to Lia Niebauer will be read into record during the meeting.

For reasonable disability accommodation, contact Jackie.Cato@alexandriava.gov or (703) 746-3810, Virginia Relay 711.

II. MINUTES

2. Consideration of the minutes from the **March 18, 2020** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the March 18, 2020.

3. Consideration of the minutes from the **April 22, 2020** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the April 22, 2020.

III. ITEMS DEFERRED FROM PREVIOUS HEARING

4. BAR #2020-00063 PG

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 421 North Fayette Street

Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 5-1

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00063, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-1.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None.

REASON

The Board generally agreed that even though they have to review small cell facilities applications, there is not much room for discussions and improvements since there are Federal laws that prevent local governments' input, however, they want to understand better the process and requirements prior to approve an administrative approval policy for the historic districts.

SPEAKERS

Joshua Schakola, the applicant, addressed the Board's concerns from the previous hearing explaining that the pole near 421 North Fayette is the only pole suitable for the small cell collocation as per reasons stated in a document provided to staff. Mr. Schakola was also available to answer questions.

Tim Ryan, resident at 417 North Fayette, pointed out that the staff report and documents included in the docket didn't mention the Dominion's reasons for choosing that specific pole, he brought up that there are a gas line and a water discharge system next to the subject pole and there was no reference to them in the documents. He stated his opposition to the small cell facility installation on this location.

Mark Mahar, resident at 421 North Fayette, stated that he had sent staff a letter numbering his concerns and required, if possible, to have the replacement pole installed in the exact location of the existing to avoid car loading issues.

DISCUSSION

Generally, the Board had concerns about ADA compliance. Mr. Schakola did not have

information about Dominion's guidelines for ADA requirements, but Mr. LaColla explained that the Department of Transportation and Environmental Services (T&ES) is in charge of reviewing the applications for ADA compliance and the suitability of the equipment proposed in the right-of-way. The Board also had questions about the distance between the antennas which was clarified to be about 240 to 500 feet radius.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

5. BAR #2020-00121 OHAD

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 222 North Lee Street

Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BOARD ACTION: Denied, 6-0

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to deny BAR #2020-00121. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Denied

REASON

Due to a shot clock regulation, the Board could not defer the application for further study and voted to deny it for the reason established on Article X Sec.10-105(A)(2)(c) and (g) of the City Zoning Ordinance.

SPEAKERS

Joshua Schakola, the applicant, introduced the project with a power-point presentation and was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

In general, the Board found that the proposed pole location is not appropriate for the small cell facility collocation as the location is a prominent corner, similar to other prominent hill corners in the historic district. The Board felt that locations with similar contexts are not suitable for either 4G or 5G antenna installation. The Board noted the necessity of a more comprehensive plan showing the chosen locations throughout the city so they could understand better the criteria and make a more effective decision.

6. BAR #2020-00122 PG

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 1224 Princess Street

Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 6-0

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00122, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board agreed that the pole location chosen for the small cell facility was appropriate in this case, close to taller buildings and busier streets.

SPEAKERS

Joshua Schakola, the applicant, explained why the subject pole was chosen and was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

The Board requested that staff add the shot clock date on staff reports so that the Board can better manage their time to act on the case. They feel that deferral is a better option than denial in some cases. In general, the Board agreed that this location is suitable for the small cell colocation.

7. BAR #2020-00123 PG

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 229 North Henry Street

Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 6-0

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00123, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None.

REASON

The Board agreed that the pole location chosen for the small cell facility was acceptable.

SPEAKERS

Joshua Schakola, the applicant, introduced the project and was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

The Board agreed that this location is suitable for the small cell colocation and asked that the applicant work with Dominion Energy to locate the exterior boxes away from the sidewalk and toward the street.

8. BAR #2020-00201 OHAD

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 323 South Fairfax Street

Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 6-0

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00201, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None.

REASON

The Board agreed that the pole location chosen for the small cell facility was acceptable.

SPEAKERS

Joshua Schakola, the applicant, introduced the project and was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

The Board agreed that this location is suitable for the small cell.

The case was subsequently withdrawn by the applicant following the hearing.

9. BAR #2020-00203 OHAD

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

Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

V. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2020-00056 PG

Request for door replacement at 1000 Cameron Street

Applicant: Vince Burhger

BAR #2020-00156 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 610 Bashford Lane #1313

Applicant: Susan Hill

BAR #2020-00164 PG

Request for alterations at 405 North Henry Street

Applicant: Chris Penndorf

BAR #2020-00174 OHAD

Request for siding replacement at 301 North Washington Street

Applicant: William Bennett

BAR #2020-00178 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 300 Queen Street

Applicant: Scott Corzine

BAR #2020-00179 OHAD

Request for alterations at 300 Queen Street
Applicant: Scott Corzine

BAR #2020-00183 OHAD
Request for door replacement at 330 North Columbus Street
Applicant: Christine Pryately

BAR #2020-00188 OHAD
Request for window replacement at 811 Cameron Street
Applicant: Thomas West

BAR #2020-00198 OHAD
Request for roof replacement at 4 Alexander Street
Applicant: Margaret Fitzsimmons

BAR #2020-00204 PG
Request for roof replacement at 1007 Cameron Street
Applicant: Steven Burke

*******APPROVED MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, June 3, 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: Susan Hellman, Historic Preservation Principle 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. All members were present at the meeting by video conference.

Ms. Roberts stated that due to the COVID-19 Pandemic emergency, the June 3, 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 April 18, 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 **May 6, 2020** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to defer the minutes from the May 6, 2020 meeting.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

This item was pulled from the consent calendar.

3. **BAR #2020-00075 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 408 North Union Street

Applicant: Elizabeth Reno

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Adams, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00075, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Include updated specifications that comply with the *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specification in the Historic Districts* when applying for a building permit.
2. Work with staff to choose the best of two options: 1) use the same size panes on the proposed bay window as those in the other four existing windows on this elevation and 2) divide the bay window opening into three sections to accommodate three equal size windows with the same size windowpanes. One possible option involves a center section with a 12 over 12 pane configuration, and the outer two sections with a 9 over 9 pane configuration.

REASON

Mr. Adams removed the item from the consent calendar because he felt that equal windowpane size on the new proposed bay window would be aesthetically better and more appropriate for this Colonial Revival townhouse.

SPEAKERS

Ms. Elizabeth Reno, the property owner, was available to answer questions

DISCUSSION

In general, the Board agreed with Mr. Adams that the different size windowpanes on the proposed bay window are not appropriate. The Board prefers that the windows on the main façade have same size windowpanes.

Ms. Reno clarified that other properties on the same block have the same windows as those she is proposing. She did not understand the Board's issue with the proposed window.

Ms. Irwin suggested that the applicant work with staff to approve the best option in regard to the windowpane size. The applicant should prepare two proposals showing 1) how the bay windows would appear with same windowpane size as the existing windows and 2) a proposal with three equally divided windows. One of the proposals is to be approved by staff. The suggestion progressed to a motion approved unanimously.

4. BAR #2020-00100 OHAD

Request for alterations at 804 South Lee Street

Applicants: Eugene Smith & Laura Doyle

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00100, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

5. BAR #2020-00111 OHAD

Request for alterations at 510 Wolfe Street

Applicants: Peter C. Labovitz & Sharon M. Labovitz as Tenants by the Entirety

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00111, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. That the color and shape of the proposed synthetic slate match the existing slate on the porch roof.

6. BAR #2020-00115 OHAD

Request for alterations at 728 South Washington Street

Applicant: Washington Jefferson LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00115, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The awning sign have target external illumination, that illuminates only the sign.
2. The two existing wall plaque signs on the Washington Street elevation be removed.
3. The pin-mounted wall sign on the Jefferson Street elevation have a backing to protect the masonry wall.
4. The signs' letters be made of metal or wood.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

7. BAR #2020-00079 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 612 South Lee Street

Applicants: Daniel B. & Sarah M. Lipson

8. BAR #2020-00078 OHAD

Request for addition at 612 South Lee Street

Applicants: Daniel B. & Sarah M. Lipson

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00078 & BAR #2020-00079, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Include the following statements on all construction documents involving demolition or ground disturbance, so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements:
 - a. No metal detection or artifact collection may be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

- b. Call Alexandria Archaeology immediately (703.838.4399) if any graves, 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.

c. **REASON**

The Board agreed with staff recommendations.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Bradley Linden, representing the design company *Linden + Kehyari Associates LLC*, stated that he agreed with the staff report and was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin had a question about the color black chosen for the new steel doors on the east elevation since all the windows' sashes and trims on the main house are white. Mr. Linden explained that the doors are not going to be visible from a public way and that he found it appropriate to differentiate the new high-quality door system from the windows on the historic main building by using a different color. There was no further discussion.

9. BAR #2020-00101 OHAD

Request for alterations at 419 South Royal Street

Applicant: Old Presbyterian Meeting House

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 7-0

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00101, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The intensity of the light is to be reviewed by staff at night in the field to ensure the compatibility of illumination with surrounding residences.
2. Work with staff to find the shortest pole height that will provide the necessary illumination, without adding more poles, that complies with Code requirements.

REASON

In general, the Board agreed with staff recommendations, but found that more research is required to establish the minimum pole height that will supply the required light level.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Aaron Siirila, Old Presbyterian Meeting House Director of Operations, and Mr. Thomas Moser, member of the Facility Committee, were available to answer questions. Mr. Moser explained that the existing poles lost power a year and a half ago and no one was able to find the power source, thus, they decided to replace them with solar powered poles which won't require cabling. Mr. Moser also said that they are working with the adjacent property owner at 417 North Royal Street to make sure the illumination of the pole is less intrusive. The proposed light fixture has a LED down light that diffuses less than a regular light, thus reducing light spill.

Elizabeth Walker, resident at 405 Wilkes Street, said that the previous lighting on the parking lot was too bright and that she is pleased with the solar powered option. However, she finds the

proposed pole height inappropriate. She showed an example of a shorter pole which she thinks would work better at the location and interfere less with adjacent properties.

Kevin Coyne, resident at 418 South Pitt Street, thanked church personnel for working with the neighbors answering their questions. He found that the proposed pole battery enclosure is not aesthetically pleasing, and that the solar equipment could be less accentuated.

J. J. Smith, resident at 401 Wilkes Street, stated that he never really had a problem with the parking lot illumination, but would like to see shorter poles with directed light instead.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Moser clarified that the proposed poles are the same height as the existing, 15 feet, the light fixture will be adjustable and dark sky certified. He also clarified that the size of the solar panels is directly related to the number of hours of light provided.

Mr. Spencer stated that the amount of illumination in a parking lot is regulated by code and the reduction in pole height will require adding more poles.

Ms. Roberts suggested that the applicant work with staff to find the shortest pole that complies with the code requirements without adding new poles. The suggestion progressed to a motion and was approved unanimously.

10. BAR #2020-00105 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 630 South Pitt Street
Applicants: Ivar & Rana Draganja

11. BAR #2020-00104 OHAD

Request for addition at 630 South Pitt Street
Applicants: Ivar & Rana Draganja

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Mr. Adams and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00104 & BAR #2020-00105, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Conditions set forth by Alexandria Archaeology

REASON

The Board agreed with staff recommendations.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Ivar Draganja, the applicant, was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Adams found the project appropriated and agreed with staff recommendations. There was no further discussion.

12. BAR #2020-00108 OHAD

Request for alterations at 609 Princess Street
Applicants: Richard G. & Susan C. Bosland

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 #2020-00108, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Windows must have one over one or two over two light configuration.

REASON

The Board agreed with the staff report findings but decided to approve the application by giving the property owner choices of window light configuration.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Richard Bosland, the property owner, stated that the subject windows are not original to the property and he would like to replace them in-kind to keep the window uniformity of the houses on the same block. The other windows on the subject property are multi-light as well and he thinks that it is aesthetically better to have all windows matching throughout the house. He also stated that he is replacing the windows for noise and energy efficiency issues.

DISCUSSION

In general, the Board agreed with staff and explained to the applicant that historic and stylistic appropriateness do not always conform to the property owner's taste. The properties in the same block are of different styles so they cannot be compared with the subject property. Ms. Roberts also explained that storm windows do not require BAR approval and can diminish the noise from the cobblestone street and help with energy efficiency. Ms. Neihardt stated that this application represents a wonderful opportunity to restore the building's façade with the historically appropriate window light configuration. There was no further discussion.

13. BAR #2020-00120 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 417 South Lee Street
Applicants: John & Fiona Moran

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00120, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board agreed with staff's recommendation and found the project straightforward.

SPEAKERS

Mr. William Cromley, the project designer, was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin wanted to clarify that even though the proposal will not be visible from a public right of way, it was brought before the Board for approval of a permit to demolish as required for properties in the OHAD. This would not apply if the property were in the Parker-Gray District since the districts' policies differ. There was no further discussion.

14. BAR #2020-00142 OHAD

Request for new building at 1300 & 1310 King Street

Applicant: 1300 King, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR #2020-00142. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board felt that more research and investigation on the historic buildings are required before approving the project. Historic buildings should be the focus of the project and not subsidiary to the new building. The Board also agreed that the removal of the bond stone is required to investigate the historic buildings' original fenestration and decided to defer the application until the inspection is complete.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Bob Brant, from the firm *Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, P.C.*, represented the applicant and gave a brief summary of the project's path to this final proposal. He took the opportunity to compliment City staff who worked diligently with the applicant's team to make it happen. He said that it was an exciting for his team to be able to preserve the historic buildings and work with the BAR.

Mr. Michael Winstanley, from the *Winstanley Architects & Planners* firm, presented the project highlighting the improvements made from the previous hearing and addressed staff's recommendations.

Ms. Theodora Stringham, attorney representing *Goldtree Realty LLC* at 112 South West Street, stated that the development will impact her client's property and had questions about how the development will address the accessibility to her client's property since the project proposes an encroachment on the public alley that provides access to pedestrians, cars, and utility services such as garbage pickup. Other issues she brought up were the proposed parking that abuts the alley that both properties share and security concerns.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts stated for the record that the project was reviewed by the Board previously and approved for height, mass and scale. Ms. Roberts also clarified that the alley encroachment and parking issues brought up by Ms. Stringham are not under the BAR purview and were approved during the DSUP review process.

Ms. Irwin and Ms. Neihardt stated that they would prefer that the tracery have a more modern feeling than the floral pattern being proposed. Mr. Spencer did not have an issue with the proposed tracery and liked the overall outcome of the project. Ms. Irwin also had concerns about the architectural vocabulary on the west elevation, she would like to see the same architectural vocabulary throughout the building, including the jack arches on the King Street elevation which Mr. Adams found to be complementary and a good architectural detail. Mr. Adams also had questions about the asymmetry of the tracery on the residential entrance section which was clarified to have been intentional to make a differentiation between the commercial and residential portions of the building. During this discussion the architect clarified that the design for the canopy would include the metal tracery.

Mr. Sprinkle noted that he thinks that the proposed balcony on the second story of the King Street elevation is inappropriate and that it will set a wrong precedent in the historic district. He also had questions about the historic buildings' rehabilitation. There are several components of the buildings yet to be revealed and he is not sure how the architect will address the uncovering. He suggested more research and focus on the historic buildings.

Ms. Roberts clarified that the questions about the historic buildings' adaptation to the new development became an issue at this level because in the concept review stage only mass, height, and scale were under review, but now the Board has to review the Certificate of Appropriateness of the whole project and the historic buildings are the main focus for the BAR. Ms. Sennott also found that the historic buildings' portion of the project needs refinement. The Board also requested to see the historic reports submitted by the applicant for the concept reviews. The Board indicated that the design for the new portion of the building should stand on its own. They indicated several areas where they wanted to see revisions on the new portion of the building including: 1) review options for the jack arches; 2) look at a more modern pattern for the tracery, and 3) see a sample of the material for the tracery. They also said that the indentation proposed by staff was not necessary.

15. BAR #2020-00143 OHAD

Request for demolition and encapsulation at 210 Wilkes Street
Applicants: John & Bridget Weaver

16. BAR #2020-00138 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 210 Wilkes Street
Applicants: John & Bridget Weaver

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Sennott and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00138 & BAR #2020-00143, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Modifications to existing gate and masonry wall must maintain existing height and location, applicant must submit proposed gate and wall details to staff prior to submitting for a building permit.
2. Proposed handrails must be visually minimal, with a post and rail without balusters, applicant must submit handrail details to staff prior submitting for a building permit.

3. The statements in Archaeology conditions below shall appear in the General Notes of all site plans and on all site sheets that involve demolition or ground disturbance (including demolition, erosion and sediment control, grading, landscaping, utilities and sheeting and shoring) so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements:
 - a. The applicant/developer shall call Alexandria Archaeology immediately (703.838.4399) 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.
 - b. The applicant/developer shall not allow any metal detection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

REASON

The Board agreed with staff recommendations

SPEAKERS

Mr. Patrick Camus, the project architect, was available to answer any questions

DISCUSSION

The Board in general liked the design and found the project appropriate, there was no further discussion.

17. BAR #2020-00145 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 318 South Fairfax Street

Applicants: John & Susan Nelson

18. BAR #2020-00144 OHAD

Request for addition & alterations at 318 South Fairfax Street

Applicants: John & Susan Nelson

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 #2020-00144 & BAR #2020-00145, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The statements in Archaeology conditions below shall appear in the General Notes of all site plans and on all site sheets that involve demolition or ground disturbance (including demolition, erosion and sediment control, grading, landscaping, utilities and sheeting and shoring) so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements:
 - c. The applicant/developer shall call Alexandria Archaeology immediately (703.838.4399) 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.
 - d. The applicant/developer shall not allow any metal detection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

REASON

The Board agreed with staff's recommendations.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Patrick Camus, the project architect, clarified that the proposed HVAC on the roof had been moved to the side of the property as a result of a neighbor's concern. He was available to answer any questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin observed that the lantern on the pavilion's roof will obstruct the view of the backyard from the main building windows. Mr. Camus explained that this was an attempt to create a "pavilion-esque" look. Mr. Adams complimented the project and had a question about the transom on the front door, which seem to be more contemporary to him. Mr. Camus explained that the lights in the transom are in diamond shape just to add some flair. There was no further discussion.

Deferral Requested by Applicant

19. BAR #2020-00148 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 277 South Washington Street
Applicant: 277 South Washington Street, LLC

20. BAR #2020-00139 OHAD

Request for alterations at 277 South Washington Street
Applicant: 277 South Washington Street, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00139 & BAR #2020-00148.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board accepted the request for deferral.

SPEAKERS

None

DISCUSSION

None

21. BAR #2020-00150 OHAD

Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 919 Prince Street
Applicant: The Joey Pizzano Memorial Fund, Inc.

22. BAR #2020-00149 OHAD

Request for alterations at 919 Prince Street
Applicant: The Joey Pizzano Memorial Fund, Inc.

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00149 & BAR #2020-00150.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board, in general, found the project confusing and in need of improvement.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Harold Smith, the project architect, was available to answer questions

Mr. Pizzano, from *The Pizzano Memorial Fund, Inc.*, explained that the uses of the space will include two accessory apartments and the *Best Program* facility. He explained that they are proposing separate entrances to the different uses addressing the Board's concerns about the different entrances to the building.

Mr. Steve Milone, resident at 907 Prince Street, found the drawings confusing and asked the Board to require the applicant to revise the fenestration proposed for the south facade of the frame addition in the east side yard of the property... Mr. Milone also brought to the Board's attention that the proposed bathrooms on the second floor in this location will have a dividing wall in the middle of the window visible from outside. He additionally explained that the alley on the north side of the property is historic stone gravel which should not be covered with asphalt. Finally, Mr. Milone noted that the drawings of the wrought-iron fence on the South Patrick elevation contained errors. He supported retaining the existing fence, and recommended using brick, not concrete, if a short wall is to be added to the base of the fence.

DISCUSSION

The Board had questions about the functionality of the project and found that elevations were confusing, and more details are needed for better understanding of the project. Ms. Irwin asked for additional views of the project from the North. Mr. Smith tried to explain but agreed that the project needs to be refined. He agreed to defer the proposal at the request of the Board. In general, the Board had issues with the inaccuracy of the drawings and found that the "cube's" door and transoms should be full-light. Overall, the cube should have larger panes and fewer muntins; that the second story bathroom window being divided in the middle needs to be revisited; the blank wall facing Prince Street requires fenestration; the fence needs restudy as well; and the alley paving must be addressed properly. There was discussion that the paving material allow for wheelchair navigation. It was the preference of the Board not to use cobblestones or unit masonry. The Board does not want the use of asphalt, but stamped concrete is a possibility.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

(At this point in the meeting, Mr. Adams excused himself).

23. BAR #2019-00556 OHAD

Request for concept review at 912, 916 & 920 King Street

Applicant: Galena Capital Partners

SPEAKERS

Mr. Michael Winstanley gave a brief presentation and was available to answer questions.

Leejung Hong, of Winstanley Architects & Planner, was also available to answer questions.

Mr. Mike Gimbert, owner of the adjacent building at Firehouse Square, noted that he likes the changes and improvements the applicant has made since the Concept I hearing. He expressed concern about the alley between the two buildings, saying that narrowing the alley as proposed will negatively affect the light and space. He asked Mr. Winstanley if the alley would be converted to solely pedestrian use, as he would prefer greater vehicular access. Mr. Winstanley explained that there are no public alleys on the property, and this alley would remain pedestrian only.

DISCUSSION

The Board expressed enthusiasm for the project and appreciation for the changes the applicant had made since the Concept I hearing. Ms. Irwin recommended that the BAR approve the proposed storefront glazing, which is slightly less than that required by the zoning ordinance, 72% instead of the required 75%. Ms. Roberts and other Board members agreed, noting that they appreciate the proposed design's proportions and rhythm. Ms. Irwin and Ms. Roberts also discussed the six brick color options provided by the applicant, expressing preference for a lighter palette.

BOARD ACTION:

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Spencer, by unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review endorsed the height, mass, scale, general architectural character, and detailing. They recommended that the applicant move forward with a Certificate of Appropriateness.

24. BAR #2019-00557 OHAD

Request for concept review at 116 South Henry Street
Applicant: Galena Capital Partners

SPEAKERS

Mr. Michael Winstanley gave a brief presentation and was available to answer questions.

Leejung Hong, of Winstanley Architects & Planner, was also available to answer questions.

Jason Longfellow, owner of Kyo Gallery at 111 South Patrick Street, presented a video expressing his concerns regarding the size of the proposed building at South Patrick Street and Downham Way. He felt that the building was too tall, narrow, and too close to South Patrick Street, recommending that it be set back from the street to reduce its impact.

DISCUSSION

The Board found Mr. Longfellow's video compelling and discussed the merits of moving the proposed building back from the sidewalk. Mary Catherine Gibbs, attorney for the applicant, explained that the zoning ordinance requires the building to be at the property line; the zoning ordinance does not allow a setback. Mr. Sprinkle expressed appreciation that the applicant

responded to the Board's suggested changes in Concept I. Mr. Spencer noted that they addressed many concerns, improving the project. Ms. Irwin also liked the changes, but did not like the red brick on the South Henry Street elevation. The Board also discussed the alley, Downham Way, at the north end of the parcel. The applicant intends to widen the alley to allow for both pedestrian use and two-way automobile traffic. Ms. Irwin suggested different pavement or striping to better protect pedestrians. In regard to the proposed garage, Ms. Irwin asked if the applicant could use a higher quality material than EFIS. Ms. Hong explained that EFIS is an economical choice for such a large area to cover, and that the garage surface would be brick at the sidewalk level. Additionally, EFIS has a metallic looking finish that they will use in some locations, mostly in window spandrels, on the residential buildings. The residential buildings will have stone at the ground level.

BOARD ACTION:

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, by unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review endorsed the height, mass, scale, and architectural character. They recommended that the applicant move forward with a Certificate of Appropriateness.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 12:00 a.m.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2020-00122 PG

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to at 1224 Princess Street

Applicant: Cello Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BAR #2020-00123 PG

Request install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to at 229 North Henry Street

Applicant: Cello Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BAR #2020-00132 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 654 South Columbus Street

Applicant: Nicholas Kalivretenos

BAR #20202-00175 OHAD

Request for door replacement at 16 Duke Street

Applicant: Laurie Fink

BAR #2020-00208 OHAD

Request for fence replacement at 805 Chetworth Place

Applicant: Andrew Scott

BAR #2020-00213 OHAD

Request for alterations at 107 South Alfred Street

Applicant: Sylvia Kaboy

BAR #2020-00214 OHAD

Request for antenna replacement at 909 North Washington Street

Applicant: Jessica Bingham

BAR #2020-00216 PG

Request for roof replacement at 632 North Columbus Street

Applicant: Cynthia Ortiz

BAR #2020-00219 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 322 South Pitt Street

Applicant: Cynthia Ortiz

BAR #2020-00222 OHAD

Request for siding replacement 320 North Alfred Street

Applicant: Ricardo Navarro

BAR #2020-00223 OHAD

Request for door replacement at 606 South Pitt Street

Applicant: Gary Gust

BAR #2020-00225 PG

Request for siding replacement at 308 North Fayette Street

Applicants: Erika King & Jjana Valentiner

BAR #2020-00226 PG

Request for siding replacement at 306 North Fayette Street

Applicant: Steven Harper

BAR #2020-00229 OHAD

Request for signage at 711 King Street

Applicant: Ken Lake

BAR #2020-00230 OHAD

Request for siding replacement at 522 South Pitt Street

Applicant: Gary Gust

BAR #2020-00232 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 1 Potomac Court

Applicant: Austin Gordon

BAR #2020-00233 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 809 King Street

Applicant: Austin Gordon

BAR #2020-00234 OHAD

Request for fence replacement at 328 Commerce Street

Applicant: Karen Griffin

BAR #2020-00236 OHAD

Request for antenna replacement at 1202 South Washington Street

Applicant: Steve Brianas

BAR #2020-00240 OHAD

Request for roof replacement 734 South Royal Street

Applicant: Artin Sharolli

BAR #2020-00244 OHAD

Request for alterations 606 Princess Street

Applicant: Stacy Spencer

BAR #2020-00245 OHAD

Request for alteration 418 North Union Street

Applicant: Cynthia Ortiz

BAR #2020-00246 OHAD

Request for antenna replacement at 1421 Prince Street

Applicant: Shea Beltran

BAR #2020-00247 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 734 South Alfred Street

Applicant: Nathan Hillery

BAR #2020-00248 PG

Request for mortar repair at 1201 Cameron Street

Applicant: David Robbins

BAR #2020-00253 OHAD

Request for fence replacement at 503 Franklin Street

Applicant: Lowell Zeta

BAR #2020-00258 OHAD

Request for fence replacement 312 North Columbus Street

Applicant: Brad Fleetwood

*******APPROVED MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, June 17, 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: Susan Hellman, Historic Preservation Principal 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. All members were present at the meeting by video conference.

Ms. Roberts stated that due to the COVID-19 Pandemic emergency, the June 3, 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 April 18, 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 **May 6, 2020** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the May 6, 2020 meeting.

3. Consideration of the minutes from the **June 3, 2020** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the June 3, 2020 meeting.

III. ITEMS DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING

4. **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. CONSENT CALENDAR

5. **BAR #2020-00228 OHAD**
Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 300 South Washington Street.
Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 5-0

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00228, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused, and Mr. Adams absent.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

6. **BAR #2020-00235 OHAD**
Request for alterations at 600 North Washington Street.
Applicant: Bank of America, N.A.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 5-0

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00235, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused, and Mr. Adams absent.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. That the intensity of the dispenser's illumination is to be reviewed by staff at night in the field to ensure the compatibility of the illumination with the surrounding streetscape
2. Include the following statements on all construction documents involving demolition or ground disturbance, so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements:
 - a. No metal detection or artifact collection may be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.
 - b. Call Alexandria Archaeology immediately (703.838.4399) if any graves, 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.

V. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED BY THE BOARD

7. BAR #2020-00148 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 277 South Washington Street.
Applicant: 277 South Washington Street, LLC

8. BAR #2020-00139 OHAD

Request for alterations at 277 South Washington Street.
Applicant: 277 South Washington Street, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 3-2

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00148, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 3-2, with Mr. Spencer and Ms. Roberts opposed. Mr. Sprinkle recused and Mr. Adams absent.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. As per requirements noted by Zoning and Development.
2. The proposed lighting to be controlled by dimmer and its intensity approved by staff on site after installation.

REASON

The Board agreed with Ms. Irwin that it was reasonable, in this case, to waive the regulation that prohibits internally illuminated signs in the historic districts because the proposed back-lit and internally illuminated signage and building numbers are small and setback from the street.

SPEAKERS

Ms. Michelle Rosati, attorney from *Holland + Knight LLP* representing the applicant, and Mr. Mike Patton, the project's architect, were available to answer questions.

Mr. Richard LeBaron, resident at 706 Prince Street, stated that he had concerns about the proposed use of the building, especially about the future rooftop activities even though they will be set back. He was concerned the use will generate noise as people enter and exit the building. He stated that he understood that the issue is not under the BAR purview.

DISCUSSION

In general, the Board agreed with Ms. Irwin that the project was tastefully designed and appropriate for the historic district. The Board agreed that the proposed internally lit signs and building numbers are setback and small, which will have minimal impact from the street view.

Ms. Irwin explained to Mr. LeBaron that the residential portion of Prince Street is on the northwest side of the building and that the proposed rooftop addition will be on the southeast corner, thus it is unlikely that rooftop activities will impact the residential area on Prince Street. She also mentioned that the inappropriate signage illumination regulation refers to big box internally lit signs and not to set back, small signage as the proposed.

Mr. Spencer had questions about the two poles to be replaced at the building's entrances that seem to him to be radiating light instead of illuminating just the ground. Mr. Patton explained that the

rendering is not accurate, but the poles will radiate some light and clarified that all proposed lighting will be LED controlled by dimmer, these lights are dark sky rated. There was no further discussion.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

9. BAR #2020-00195 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 625 & 635 Slaters Lane.

Applicant: Brookfield Towngate, LLC

10. BAR #2020-00194 OHAD

Request for alterations at 625 & 635 Slaters Lane.

Applicant: Brookfield Towngate, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 6-0

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00194 & BAR #2020-00195, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The new windows and doors comply with the Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications.
2. The applicant works with staff on a new railing design that is compliant with the code but respects the architectural vocabulary of the existing.

REASON

The Board agreed that the conversion to residential requires functional changes on the buildings and that most of the changes are sympathetic with their current architectural vocabulary. However, the proposed railing replacement is not compatible with the existing character defining feature of the buildings.

SPEAKERS

Cathy Puskar, from the firm *Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, P.C.*, representing the applicant, gave a brief summary of the proposal and was available to answer questions; Mr. Chris Sansone, the project architect, and Mr. Cris Maina, representing *Brookfield Residential*, were available to answer questions as well.

Mr. Thomas Moore, whose office is a tenant on the 625 Slater's Lane building, thanked the Board members for their service and stated that he finds the project appropriate and that the design changes respect the character defining features such as the top floor round windows.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin had questions about the proposed modifications to the buildings' entrance that weren't very clear on the drawings. She would prefer to have a rendering illustrating the setback entrance doors and the second floor windows being brought forward, but did not find the issue major as the proposed change in design of the buildings' railing that, in her opinion, is a character defining feature that should be considered. Ms. Puskar clarified that the existing horizontal bars of the railings are not code compliant.

In general, the Board found that the project respects the architectural vocabulary of the building complex and that the changes on the top floor windows will help differentiate the residential from the office buildings. The Board agreed with Ms. Irwin that the new railing design must retain the same architectural vocabulary as the existing as far it complies with the code. There was no further discussion.

11. BAR #2020-00200 PG

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 902 Oronoco Street.
Applicants: Patricia Harris & Richard LaFace

12. BAR #2020-00209 PG

Request for alterations at 902 Oronoco Street.
Applicants: Patricia Harris & Richard LaFace

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00200 & BAR #2020-00209, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Upon demolition of the chimney, the metal roof is to be repaired so there is no visible patch.
2. The new basement window is to match the adjacent windows on the north elevation of the building in construction and configuration.
3. The new masonry infill at the site fence is to match the existing masonry in color, pattern, and unit size.
4. Include the following statements on all construction documents involving demolition or ground disturbance, so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements.
 - a. No metal detection or artifact collection may be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.
 - b. Call Alexandria Archaeology immediately (703-838-4399) if any graves, 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.
5. The brick wall be at the same height and aligned with the bottom of the brick cap and will be slightly recessed to be differentiated from the existing wall.

REASON

The Board, in general, liked the proposal and agreed with Ms. Irwin that the different height of the fence on the Oronoco Street elevation needed refinement.

SPEAKERS

Ms. Patricia Harris, the applicant, briefly described the proposal and was available to answer questions

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin had a question about the proposed fence height on the Oronoco Street elevation that seemed a little odd in her opinion. Ms. Harris clarified that the reason for the height was privacy and code compliance purposes since there is a balcony at that level.

In general, the Board agreed with Ms. Irwin's suggestion to raise the brick wall about four inches up to under the pier's cap but to recess the new infill wall to differentiate it from the existing wall. The suggestion progressed to a motion which was approved unanimously.

13. BAR #2020-00217 OHAD

Request for partial demolition at 212 Jefferson Street

Applicant: Julie Guiffre

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Sennott and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00217, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board agreed with staff's recommendations.

SPEAKERS

Stephanie Elsheikh, from the firm *Dimond Adams Design Architecture*, representing the applicant's architect, was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin had a question about the originality of the window and door being removed even though she understood that the application was for demolition only and that the rear elevation is not visible from any public way view. Ms. Elsheikh stated that she did not believe that the window and door were original. There was no further discussion.

14. BAR #2020-00238 PG

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 225 North West Street

Applicants: Matt Gray & Erica Gray

15. BAR #2020-00237 PG

Request for alterations at 225 North West Street

Applicants: Matt Gray & Erica Gray

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 6-0

The Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00237 & BAR #2020-00238, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0. Ms. Roberts absent.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board agreed that the project is an improvement to the building and neighborhood.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Matt Gray, the applicant, had a question to staff about the kind of Hardi Plank can be used on the sides and back of the building. Mr. Conkey explained the Guidelines state that smooth Hardie Plank is allowed, and that staff would be happy to forward a copy of the Guidelines to him. Mr. Gray was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

There was no discussion.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2020-00243 OHAD

Request for siding replacement at 404 Gibbon Street

Applicant: Chris Kurowski

BAR #2020-00268 OHAD

Request for antenna replacement at 1202 South Washington Street

Applicant: Leigh Dukatt

BAR #2020-00270 OHAD

Request for signage at 6 Prince Street

Applicant: Six Prince Partners LLC

BAR #2020-00280 PG

Request for fence replacement at 1300 Oronoco Street

Applicant: Samuel Richardson

BAR #2020-00281 OHAD

Request for alterations at 1714 Carpenter Road

Applicant: Melissa Wolfson

BAR #2020-00283 PG

Request for alterations at 421 North Fayette Street

Applicant: Sondra Stokes

BAR #2020-00286 OHAD

Request for siding replacement at 1308 Michigan Avenue

Applicant: Walter Houseknecht

*******APPROVED MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, July 1, 2020

7:00pm, Virtual Public Hearing

Zoom Webinar

Members Present: Christine Roberts, Chair
Purvi Irwin
John Sprinkle
Lynn Neihardt

Members Absent: James Spencer, Vice Chair
Robert Adams
Christine Sennott

Staff Present: Susan Hellman, Historic Preservation Principal 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. Sennott, Mr. Spencer 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 1, 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 **June 17, 2020** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approved the minutes from the June 17, 2020 meeting.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

3. **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: Deferred

BAR #2020-00241 deferred due to lack of quorum.

4. BAR #2020-00260 OHAD

Request for install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to at 600 Franklin Street.
Applicant: Smartlink o/b/o AT&T

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 4-0

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00260, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None.

5. BAR #2020-00261 PG

Request for alterations at 308 North Fayette Street.
Applicants: Cliff Williams & Jjana Valentiner

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 4-0

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00261, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1- That the new window complies with the *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications in the Historic Districts*.

6. BAR #2020-00264 OHAD

Request for alterations at 613 South Pitt Street.
Applicant: Katherine Pappas

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00264.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The applicant should work with staff, specifically Mr. Conkey, to update her application.

REASON

The Board requested further documentation regarding the proposed pergola.

SPEAKERS

The applicant, Mimi Pappas, represented herself and was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

The Board asked that the applicant provide better documentation regarding the proposed pergola's type of wood, color of wood, and neighborhood context. The Chair compared the application's rendering to a Minecraft game. The applicant noted that the BAR application does not require professional plan but agreed to defer.

7. BAR #2020-00266 OHAD

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 500 A South Union Street.

Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 4-0

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00266, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None.

8. BAR #2020-00267 OHAD

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 530 South Saint Asaph Street.

Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 4-0

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00267, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

- 1- That the applicant works with staff to find a less prominent pole location for the small cell installation.

REASON

Ms. Irwin removed the item from the consent calendar because she found that the proposed pole is very prominent and not appropriate for the small cell installation.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Joshua Schakola, the applicant's representative, was available to answer any questions.

DISCUSSION

In general, the Board agreed with Ms. Irwin that a less prominent location would be better for the small cell colocation. There was no further discussion.

IV. ITEM DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING

9. 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.

V. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED BY THE BOARD

10. BAR #2020-00150 OHAD

Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 919 Prince Street.
Applicant: The Joey Pizzano Memorial Fund, Inc.

11. BAR #2020-00149 OHAD

Request for alterations at 919 Prince Street.
Applicant: The Joey Pizzano Memorial Fund, Inc

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 4-0

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00149 & BAR #2020-00150, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The applicant must work with staff, specifically Mr. Conkey, to refine the gutter and cornice of the proposed fence facing Prince Street and the “cube” addition.

REASON

The Board felt that the roof of the proposed addition needed to be more substantial and relate to the historic building. The applicant had not yet determined a final design for the Prince Street fence.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Harold Smith, project architect, represented the applicant and answered questions.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Smith clarified some areas of the overall plans and elevations that the Board found confusing. Ms. Roberts and Ms. Irwin noted that the cube addition appeared too light, almost temporary. Mr. Sprinkle stated that the previous design was too much and that this design was too little.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

12. BAR #2020-00251 OHAD

Request for partial demolition at 709 South Lee Street.
Applicant: Clare Little

13. BAR #2020-00249 OHAD

Request for addition at 709 South Lee Street.
Applicant: Clare Little

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 4-0

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00249 & BAR #2020-00251, as Submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1- That the applicant pursue scheme number two.

REASON

The Board agreed with staff recommendation and approved scheme number two for the addition's cladding because it will differentiate the new addition from the historic portion of the building.

SPEAKERS

Kurt West, the project architect, asked the Board to approve one out the three schemes for the addition cladding presented and was available to answer any questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin stated that she did not have a preferred scheme for the cladding, her only concern was matching the new brick of the addition with the brick of the existing building. In her opinion, the second scheme, which proposes the second story cladded with siding, is the best option. Mr. Sprinkle also found scheme number two to be the best choice since it will differentiate the addition from the existing building. There was no further discussion.

14. BAR #2020-00263 OHAD

Request for partial demolition at 820 South Royal Street.

Applicants: Melissa & Robert Manaker

15. BAR #2020-00262 OHAD

Request for addition at 820 South Royal Street.

Applicants: Melissa & Robert Manaker

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 4-0

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00262 & BAR #2020-00263, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board agreed with the staff report.

SPEAKERS

The applicants and their architect, Rebecca Bostick, were available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts thanked the applicants for submitting an excellent application.

16. BAR #2020-00271 PG

Request for partial demolition at 309 North Patrick Street.

Applicant: Jay Zelaya

BOARD ACTION: Denied

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to deny BAR #2020-00271. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The Board denied the application, but endorsed the Department's direction to remedy the siding violation by acquiring old-growth wood and have siding milled and planed to match the original historic siding on the west elevation in dimension and style with final details to be approved by staff, specifically Mr. Conkey.

REASON

The applicant removed all historic siding and framing without consulting with staff as to its condition.

SPEAKERS

The applicant, Jay Zelaya, represented himself.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Zelaya described the poor condition of the materials prior to removal, and Ms. Roberts told him that he should have consulted with staff prior to demolition. Ms. Neihardt noted that the applicant has worked in the City previously and should have known to contact staff. Ms. Roberts told the applicant that if he did not use historic materials for the reconstruction, that he would be fined the cost of reconstructing with historic materials. Ms. Roberts and Ms. Irwin thanked the applicant for being willing to use historic siding to remedy the issue. Mr. Sprinkle pointed out that this building could no longer be considered a historic resource due to Mr. Zelaya's actions. At Ms. Roberts' request, Mr. Conkey explained the \$1500/day fine, administered by the City Attorney's office.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 8:48 p.m.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2020-00274 OHAD

Request for fence replacement at 512 Gibbon Street

Applicant: Michael White

BAR #2020-00287 OHAD

Request for alterations at 200 Duke Street

Applicant: Carl & Jaye Smith

BAR #2020-00294 PG

Request for window replacement at 1108 Queen Street

Applicant: Cagatay Bagcivan

BAR #2020-00298 OHAD

Request for signage at 109 South Alfred Street

Applicant: Old Town 1 LLC

BAR #2020-00299 OHAD

Request for antenna replacement 1421 Prince Street

Applicant: BXREP II Prince Street LLC

BAR #2020-00302 OHAD

Request for mortar replacement at 207 South Lee Street

Applicant: Sheila Kennett

BAR #2020-00303 OHAD

Request for alterations at 207 South Lee Street

Applicant: Sheila Kennett

BAR #2020-00304 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 209 Princess Street

Applicant: Jamie French

BAR #2020-00306 PG

Request for alterations at 414 North West Street

Applicant: Margaret Grimes

*******APPROVED 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 smear. 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

The Board thought it prudent that the residents of the buildings to be demolished be noticed so their opinions regarding the historic nature of the buildings could be ascertained.

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

*******APPROVED MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review
Wednesday, September 2, 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

Members Absent: Robert Adams

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

Ms. Roberts stated that due to the COVID-19 Pandemic emergency, the September 2, 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 15, 2020** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the July 15, 2020 meeting, as amended by the Chair.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

3. **BAR #2020-00370 PG**
Request for alterations at 428 North Peyton Street
Applicant: Bethany Chalfant

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 6-0

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00370, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The HardiPlank siding has a smooth finish
2. That the existing screened openings on the porch's east elevation also be enclosed with windows

IV. ITEM DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING

4. BAR #2020-00307 OHAD

Request to install small cell facility on a new standalone pole adjacent to 1 Prince Street.

Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00307.

V. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED BY THE BOARD

5. BAR #2020-00197 OHAD (*Amharic Translator Will Be Provided*)

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: Approved, as Submitted, 5-1

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00197, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-1. Mr. Sprinkle opposed.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board agreed that the buildings do not meet any of the six demolition criteria.

SPEAKERS

Cathy Puskar, attorney with Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley, Walsh, represented the applicant, gave a brief presentation, and answered questions. She explained the complete notification process and advised that no residents will be relocated prior to September of 2021.

Gail Rothrock, 505 Duke Street, claimed that the buildings to be demolished may be historic and that the City should hire an outside contractor to determine historic significance.

Brian Scholl, 800 Gibbon Street, complained that he could not access the case materials until Monday, 8/31 and argued that the buildings may be historic.

Stafford Ward felt that the height of the proposed development was too high; the Chair advised

him to save those comments for the concept review discussion.

Steve Milone, 907 Prince Street, represented the Old Town Civic Association. He stated that 416 South Alfred Street was not included in the project map, meaning that some owners of properties on Wolfe Street had not been notified. He also echoed Ms. Rothrock's comments.

Chris Morell, 421 South Columbus Street, felt that not enough surrounding properties were notified and that demolishing these buildings would significantly degrade the ambience of the Old and Historic District.

Yvonne Callahan, 735 South Lee Street, agreed with Ms. Rothrock and Mr. Milone that the City should hire an outside contractor to assess the potential historic value of the buildings.

Leslie Roberson, 422 South Columbus Street, President of Wilkes Row HOA, discussed the importance of local artisans.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Sprinkle read a pre-written statement discussing the history of the site and its potential historic significance (see Attachment 1). He felt that the project should have some level of NEPA and/or NHPA Section 106 review and wondered if the existing buildings had to be demolished for the project to move forward. Ms. Puskar explained that HUD specifically indicated that no Section 106 review or environmental assessment was required. She also explained that the project cannot meet the goals of the Small Area Plan, approved in 2018, if the subject buildings remain standing.

Ms. Irwin felt that the 1970s construction of these buildings was undertaken in a discriminatory fashion, and that this project can right the wrongs of the past. She would like to see more historic research, providing a full, rich history. She felt that we can do better by bringing back the previous history while still incorporating the new.

Mr. Spencer appreciated Ms. Irwin's words, noting that we can do better in representing the history that was there. These particular buildings have no historic value. We should focus on what was there prior to their construction.

Ms. Sennott liked the idea of more research, noting that the existing buildings can be better. They feel like segregation. The new proposed design looks more integrated.

Ms. Neihardt felt the subject buildings, while not well built and a symbol of discrimination, are a part of our history regardless of their age. She reluctantly agrees with the demolition.

Ms. Roberts agreed with her colleagues, especially Ms. Irwin and Ms. Neihardt. She noted that the buildings were not made in a way that would meet the demolition criteria. The buildings are not important, but the setting is.

6. BAR #2020-00196 OHAD (*Amharic Translator Will Be Provided*)

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

Applicant: Heritage at Old Town PropCo LLC

Attachment: John Sprinkle statement (under separate cover)

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 contextual precedents and a review of the heights and ages of adjacent structures.

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

Leslie Roberson, President of HOA Wilkes Row, expressed concern about the location of the service entrance on the street.

Chris Morell, 421 South Columbus, was concerned about the number of units proposed for the development, and the fact that open space planned for the project is internal to the development. The small area plan includes drawings that show 4 story buildings instead of the height that is proposed.

Stafford Ward stated that the review of the demolition permit should not take place prior to the concept review. The height of the building needs to be approved by City Council, the review of the design with this height is misleading. He requests clarification on the number of units in the development. What are next steps in the review process? Why is Block 3 highlighted in this presentation and not in previous presentation. Applicant responded to questions.

Darryl Resio, 827 Wolfe Street, was looking for the proposed garage entrances on Alfred Street. He expressed concern about the size and height of the buildings relative to neighborhood. He appreciates revised styling for north end of Block 1 but the overall design does not reflect Old Town architecture.

Yvonne Callahan, 735 South Lee Street, appreciates the addition of balconies etc., but the revisions to the design are minimal in response to BAR comments. The design of the buildings could be anywhere in the region. She requested additional context photos to understand building. Building porosity is insufficient with bridges, add additional north-south openings.

Ellen Mosher, 324 North St. Asaph, shared a presentation comparing the proposed design to others from applicant website from around the region. The proposed design does not reflect the character of Old Town.

Brian Scholl, 800 Gibbon Street, stated that the proposed design is more compatible to Crystal City than Old Town, yet it is supposed to be a gateway to Old Town. Little evolution in design has been made from the previous submission. He stated that the proposed design is not permeable, and is concerned about loss of green space in the neighborhood.

Manfred Stommel, 428 South Columbus, stated that the neighborhood has been subject to flooding and is concerned about how the sewage system will handle additional runoff. He also believes that the design is appropriate for Crystal City.

Mary Marrow-Box, is concerned that there will not be enough space for interpretive elements.

Dirk Bouma, 419 South Columbus, stated that the Block 2 elevations are deceptive because the taller elements are grayed out.

Steve Milone, OTCA, stated that the revisions have only minimally addressed the architectural character. OTCA would like the applicant to include a physical model for the public and Board review. The 45' height limit as shown in the small area plan should be held without granting additional height. The 7-story portion of the building should be limited to 5 stories and blend into the district architecture.

Kay Morell, 425 South Columbus Street, is concerned that the new building will be much taller than the proposed and that the existing building blends into the neighborhood better. She feels that drawings are deceptive.

Marissa St. Louis, 728 South Patrick Street, pointed out that the proposed buildings do not give justice to previous inhabitants in the area.

Katherine Kolasowski, 807 Church Street wants to know if River Renew project will account for additional residents.

Amos Desjardin, 719 South Alfred Street, believes that the buildings that are proposed could be anywhere in the region and that the design eliminates open space.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin asked the applicant for a clarification on the proposed heights for the development. Ms. Puskar noted that the height of the buildings is being measured to the high point of the flat roof and that the 7 story buildings will be approximately 70' tall. Ms. Irwin appreciated the revisions to the design and liked the addition of the pedestrian mews and the recessed balconies. She preferred the northeast corner of the Block 1 building as previously submitted and believed that the revisions to the southeast corner of Block 2 are too fussy. She asked that the buildings include creative interpretive elements similar to the Belle Prix. She likes the arrangement of the massing but would like to see additional three-dimensional views. Ms. Irwin does not have a problem with the height as proposed.

Mr. Sprinkle asked how the proposed design addresses the guidance that is given for new construction in the Design Guidelines. He felt that the precedent images that were shown fit into the context of Old Town but that the proposed design does not match the precedents. He asked why it is not possible for the additional density that is mentioned in the small area plan to occur in projects outside the historic district. Mr. Sprinkle does not support the proposed height, scale, mass, or architectural character.

Ms. Neihardt stated that City is choosing to allow greater density in this neighborhood in lieu of spending money to create affordable housing units. The choice of the architectural style is not appropriate for Old Town. She believes that the applicant needs to start over on the design for the project and does not support the proposed height, scale, mass, or architectural character.

Ms. Sennott asked that the history of the neighborhood be integrated into the proposed design. She believes that there is no precedent for a contiguous building of this size within the historic district

and does not support the proposed height, mass, scale, or architectural character.

Mr. Spencer stated that the design as proposed could be located anywhere throughout the region and has not been integrated into the surrounding context. In the previous meeting he asked for additional context drawings and the applicant provided some but not enough. He stated that the scale of the building is too large.

Ms. Roberts stated that she believes that the applicant needs to consider hiring a new architect. She believes that the revisions that have been made to the design have only served to add to the perceived height and mass of the building. The proposed design does not reference buildings within the historic district. She was concerned that the permeability mentioned in the small area plan is not being implemented in the proposed design. She mentioned that these blocks will become the precedent for the development that occurs outside the district and therefore the Board has an important role in setting the expectations for the other designs as well as these buildings.

7. BAR #2020-00368 PG

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 902 Oronoco Street.
Applicants: Patricia Harris & Richard LaFace

8. BAR #2020-00289 PG

Request for addition at 902 Oronoco Street.
Applicants: Patricia Harris & Richard LaFace

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 6-0

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00289 & BAR #2020-00368, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The applicant must submit updated window specifications with the building permit to confirm that the proposed windows met the *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications in the Historic District*.

REASON

The Board supported the application with staff recommendations.

SPEAKERS

Patricia Harris, property owner, was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

There was no discussion regarding this case.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

9. BAR #2020-00361 OHAD

Request for encapsulation at 700 South Washington Street (Parcel Address: 610 Franklin Street)
Applicants: CH Sullyfield Associates, LLC, Randon Sullyfield, LLC, and CH South Washington Associates, LLC

10. BAR #2020-00345 OHAD

Request for addition at 700 South Washington Street (Parcel Address: 610 Franklin Street)
Applicants: CH Sullyfield Associates, LLC, Randon Sullyfield, LLC, and CH South Washington Associates, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 5-0

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00345 & BAR #2020-00361, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Work with staff to simplify the design of the addition.

REASON

The Board felt that the conservatory addition was too classical and residential looking for the 1980s office building and recommended that the applicant work with staff to simplify the design.

SPEAKERS

Robert Brandt, applicant's attorney, spoke in support of the project and answered questions. Mr. Brandt said that they were trying to differentiate the new addition from the existing building, per the *Design Guidelines*.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Neihardt said that she thought the addition was too classical for the 1980s office building and recommended that it be simplified. Ms. Roberts agreed and said that the addition seemed more appropriate for a residential structure and suggested that the window pattern be more compatible with the windows on the office building. Ms. Irvin and Mr. Spencer suggested that the architect consider simpler, larger windows and encouraged a restudy of the cornice.

11. BAR #2020-00365 PG

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 315 North Alfred Street.
Applicant: SW Alfred Development LLC

12. BAR #2020-00364 PG

Request for addition and alterations at 315 North Alfred Street.
Applicant: SW Alfred Development LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 5-0

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00364 & BAR #2020-00365, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0. Ms. Sennott recused.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Proposed replacement window size, location and configuration to be determined by staff based on physical evidence uncovered in the field during construction;
2. All historic siding on the west and south elevation must be retained and repaired where possible, and;

3. If it is an Early building, the front (west) windows, door, and trim should be painted wood.

REASON

The Board supported the revised staff recommendations.

SPEAKERS

Steve Kulinski, architect

DISCUSSION

There was no discussion regarding this case.

13. BAR #2020-00366 PG

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 902 Pendleton Street.

Applicant: Michelle Haynes

14. BAR #2020-00346 PG

Request for addition and alterations at 902 Pendleton Street.

Applicant: Michelle Haynes

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 #2020-00346 & BAR #2020-00366, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Windows on the addition must be one-over-one configuration, and without tint or reflective glass;
2. The existing masonry must remain unpainted; and,
3. Include the statements from Alexandria Archaeology, below, in the General Notes of all on all construction documents 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:
 - a. Call Alexandria Archaeology (703.746.4399) two weeks before the starting date of any ground disturbance so that a monitoring and inspection schedule for city archaeologists can be arranged.
 - b. 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.
 - c. No metal detection may be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

REASON

The Board supported the application with staff recommendations.

SPEAKERS

Michelle Haynes, property owner, was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

The Board discussed alternatives to the use of vinyl windows and the appropriateness of the canopy style.

Moved to Consent Calendar

15. BAR #2020-00371 OHAD

Request for alterations at 707 Prince Street.
Applicant: DBL2M Prince LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 6-0

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00371, as submitted.

16. BAR #2020-00376 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 109 South Lee Street.
Applicant: Cabell Hickman

17. BAR #2020-00374 OHAD

Request for partial alterations at 109 South Lee Street.
Applicant: Cabell Hickman

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 6-0

On a motion by Ms. Sennott and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00374 & BAR #2020-00376. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The new window on the south elevation complies with the City's *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications in the Historic Districts*
2. The applicant works with staff to choose the gas lantern design

REASON

The Board in general, found that the proposed project will be minimally visible from a public right-of-way and agreed with staff recommendations

SPEAKERS

Ms. Evelyn Smith, the project designer, agreed with staff recommendations and was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

The Board did not have comments about the project. Mr. Sprinkle had a question about the proposed depth of the storage area which was clarified to be one foot by Ms. Smith. Ms. Irwin asked if the proposed window on the south elevation will be fire-rated due to the proximity with the neighbor's wall, it was also clarified by Ms. Smith that it will be.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

Note: Ms. Neihardt did not attend the rest of the hearing.

18. BAR #2020-00378 OHAD

Request for concept review at 114 North Alfred Street.

Applicant: Mechanic's Hall Properties, LLC

SPEAKERS

Bill Cromley, architect for the project, gave a brief presentation and answered questions.

Walter Grace, 908 Cameron Street, said that the proposed addition would destroy the beautiful view and his quality of life as it will block the sun in his yard and kill his plants. He described the addition as a monstrosity.

Tony Alexander, also at 908 Cameron Street, agreed with Mr. Grace and requested that the Board closely review the project.

James Robbins, 912 Cameron Street, agreed with Mr. Grace, noting the negative impact on quality of life. He felt that the design of the addition looks innovative and interesting but is too tall.

John Loomis, 112 and 114A North Alfred Street, claimed that most houses here have original gardens and viewpoints to the center of the block. This addition would destroy the open garden feel. He asked if the City requires some permeable ground.

Mr. Cromley responded that all of these are commercial properties, not residential, and all are permitted to build on the entire lot. The proposed addition would not affect the light. He undertook a light study that he will share with Mr. Grace and Mr. Alexander. He appreciated their comments and is happy to meet with them. He also noted that light is not under BAR purview.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin checked to verify the roof heights.

Ms. Sennott felt that the roofline at the rear seems large, but the rest looks fine.

Mr. Spencer felt that the architectural character and scale are fine, he had no issue with the mass. As Mr. Cromley noted he intended to lower the height of the rearmost roof, Mr. Spencer also felt the height if fine.

Mr. Sprinkle asked Mr. Cromley if he had considered underground parking. Mr. Cromley responded that the lot is too narrow. Mr. Sprinkle approved the scale, height, mass, and architectural character.

Mr. Cromley explained that he can reduce the height of the rear/west roof by shortening the windows, shortening the roof pitch, or some combination of the two, bringing that roof down to the height of the original building, possibly lower. As part of stormwater management, the top 18" to 24" of the roof terrace wall will be a planter to absorb and filter water. This will provide a green screen and some privacy.

Ms. Roberts said that the project looks great. The inspirational photos are good. She encouraged

Mr. Cromley to talk with the neighbors.

19. BAR #2020-00379 OHAD

Request for concept review at 3601 Potomac Avenue (Pump Station associated with the redevelopment of North Potomac Yard).

Applicant: CPYR Theater, LLC

Note: Mr. Sprinkle recused himself from the discussion

SPEAKERS

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

Lucia Tang, architect with Hickock Cole addressed the recommendations in the staff report. The use of concrete for the lower portion of the exterior wall would result in a revision to the footprint of the building because of space constraints for the equipment. She would look into various options for the proposed metal panels to provide the variety of textures indicated in the staff report. The intention for the design of the building is that it be a background to the adjacent park. They would like to keep the design of the panels as proposed in order to have a simple elevation.

There were no public speakers.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts appreciated the staff comments but liked the design as submitted and is enthusiastic about the project.

Mr. Spencer liked the design of the building and asked staff for the reason behind the comments regarding the concrete wall. Mr. Conkey responded that this was an effort to get additional textures into the project and for durability of the lower portion of the wall. Mr. Spencer appreciated the comments but supports the project as submitted.

Ms. Irwin supports the project as submitted and is interested in seeing the potential development of the SWEE.

Ms. Sennott did not have much comment on the design and endorsed the project for height, mass, scale, and general architectural character.

Ms. Roberts indicated that the project should proceed to Certificate of Appropriateness and does not require an additional concept review.

20. BAR #2020-00380 OHAD

Request for concept review 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)

Note: Mr. Sprinkle recused himself from the discussion

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 staff recommendations, the applicant is proposing revisions to the design. In order to make the canopy above the entrance similar to the north pavilion, they propose to split the canopy into two separate elements rather than wrap the corner. They will be relocating one of the bridge supports, which will allow them to relocate the mechanical equipment under the bridge to be concealed by the support. The user has indicated that the roof over the stair should remain and that they have maintenance concerns regarding the use of glass for the roof. They feel that the enclosure at the bottom of the stair is appropriate because the materials are the same as those used on the bridge.

There were no public speakers.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin stated that the roof does seem to be heavier than the one shown at the north pavilion and therefore supports the staff comment regarding revising the fascia profile. She appreciated the effort to move the mechanical and electrical equipment under the bridge. She endorsed the project for height, mass, scale, and general architectural character.

Ms. Sennot did not have any comments on the proposed design.

Mr. Spencer was interested in the continued development of the entry canopy but prefers a single canopy that wraps the corner if it can be made to feel lighter. He liked that the design for the stair includes a structure that does not touch the ground. He expressed concern regarding the heavy feel of the enclosure at the bottom of the stair.

Ms. Roberts agreed with her colleagues and is interested in the potential use of artwork in the design. She stated that the project should proceed to Certificate of Appropriateness and does not require an additional concept review.

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 #2019-00503 OHAD

Request for shutter replacement at 513 South Lee Street.

Applicants: Harry Mahon & Ann Murray

BAR #2020-00008 OHAD

Request for alterations at 213 South Alfred Street.

Applicant: Old Town Manor, LLC

BAR #2020-00279 OHAD

Request for alterations at 325 Duke Street.

Applicant: Mija Romer

BAR #2020-00313 PG

Request for window replacement 233 North West Street.

Applicant: Jennifer Mabry

BAR #2020-00315 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 727 South Lee Street.

Applicant: Juliana Nicoletti

BAR #2020-00316 PG

Request for fence replacement at 631 North Alfred Street.

Applicant: Chang Ki Hong

BAR #2020-00319 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 604 Ford's Landing Way.

Applicant: Donna & Alfonzo Lopez

BAR #2020-00324 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 232 North Saint Asaph Street.

Applicant: Kara Hourihan

BAR #2020-00325 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 118 South Lee Street.

Applicants: Wilfred Heam, Jr. & Grace Hinchman

BAR #2020-00327 OHAD

Request for fence replacement at 125 Wolfe Street.

Applicant: Valentine Kass

BAR #2020-00329 OHAD

Request for chimney replacement at 633 South Saint Asaph Street.

Applicant: Elizabeth Decteur

BAR #2020-00330 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 1 Franklin Street.

Applicant: Bill Harter

BAR #2020-00332 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 819 South Royal Street.

Applicant: Colleen Krieger

BAR #2020-00334 PG

Request for fence replacement at 418 North Fayette Street.

Applicant: Lori Gershaw

BAR #2020-00335 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 702 Ford's Landing Way.

Applicants: Gerald J. & Carol J. Stalun

BAR #2020-00338 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 724 South Royal Street.

Applicant: Daniel A. Weggeland

BAR #2020-00339 OHAD

Request for signage at 917 King Street.

Applicant: FMG Holdings

BAR #2020-00343 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 911 Bashford Lane.

Applicants: Maggie & Chris Mesaros

BAR #2020-00344 OHAD

Request for signage at 101 South Saint Asaph Street.

Applicant: Megan Podolsky

BAR #2020-00347 OHAD

Request for door replacement at 1250 South Washington Street #516

Applicant: Andre L'Heureaux

BAR #2020-00348 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 900 Franklin Street

Applicant: Dallas McVicker

BAR #2020-00349 OHAD

Request for door replacement at 1250 South Washington Street #223

Applicant: Paul Currer

BAR #2020-00350 OHAD

Request for door replacement at 834 North Washington Street

Applicant: North Washington Street Properties, LLC

BAR #2020-00351 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 319 South Union Street.

Applicant: Everett Smith

BAR #2020-00352 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 800 South Saint Asaph Street #311

Applicant: Thomas West

BAR #2020-00353 OHAD

Request for relocating condensing unit 121 South Henry Street

Applicant: Brendan Owens

BAR #2020-00354 PG

Request for door replacement at 322 North Patrick Street.

Applicant: Ricardo Navarro

BAR #2020-00355 PG

Request for railing replacement at 715 Princess Street.

Applicant: Staff Restaurants, LLC

BAR #2020-00356 OHAD

Request for sign replacement at 315 South Washington Street.

Applicant: Gabriella Brown

BAR #2020-00357 OHAD

Request for signage at 210 King Street.

Applicant: 210 King Street, LLC

BAR #2020-00358 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 421 South Pitt Street.

Applicant: Emily McMahon

BAR #2020-00359 OHAD

Request for repointing at 310 South Saint Asaph Street.

Applicant: Cheryl Jaeger

BAR #2020-00360 OHAD

Request for shutter replacement at 207 South Lee Street.

Applicants: Clete Johnson & Sheila Kennett

BAR #2020-00362 OHAD

Request for replace equipment at 1101 King Street.

Applicant: Leigh Dukatt

BAR #2020-00369 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 715 Ford's Landing Way.

Applicant: Denise Joseph

BAR #2020-00377 OHAD

Request for alterations at 109 South Lee Street.

Applicant: Cabell Hickman

BAR #2020-00382 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 700 Ford's Landing Way.

Applicant: Kiely Bruce

BAR #2020-00384 OHAD

Request for lighting replacement at 110 South Union Street.

Applicant: South Union Street Holdings, LLC

BAR #2020-00388 OHAD
Request for shed at 818 Franklin Street.
Applicant: ALCE Investments, LLC

BAR #2020-00389 OHAD
Request for garage door replacement at 100 Quay Street.
Applicant: Magaly Galdo-Hirst & Thompson M. Hirst

BAR #2020-00390 PG
Request for shutters at 320 North Patrick Street.
Applicant: Jay Roach

BAR #2020-00391 OHAD
Request for window replacement at 831 South Lee Street.
Applicant: Helen Mannen

BAR #2020-00392 PG
Request for window replacement at 716 North Columbus Street.
Applicant: Genevieve Morelli

BAR #2020-00397 OHAD
Request for repointing at 213 Ramsay Alley.
Applicant: Talmage Day

BAR #2020-00399 OHAD
Request for door replacement at 829 Queen Street.
Applicant: Kyong Yi

BAR #2020-00406 PG
Request for fence replacement at 1306 Princess Street.
Applicant: Michael Turletes

BAR #2020-00416 OHAD
Request for alterations at 413 Prince Street.
Applicant: Ashley Wilson

X. ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: John Sprinkle statement

*******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. 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 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. MINUTES

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. CONSENT CALENDAR

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 larger 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. NEW BUSINESS

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. ADJOURNMENT

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

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

*******APPROVED MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, October 7, 2020

7:00pm, Virtual Public Hearing

Zoom Webinar

Members Present: Christine Roberts, Chair
Christine Sennott
Purvi Irwin
John Sprinkle
Lynn Neihardt
Robert Adams

Members Absent: James Spencer, Vice Chair

Secretary: William Conkey, 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. Mr. Spencer was excused. All other members were present at the meeting by video conference.

Ms. Roberts stated that due to the COVID-19 Pandemic emergency, the October 7, 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 **September 16, 2020** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the September 16, 2020 meeting, as amended.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

3. **BAR #2020-00408 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 624 South Saint Asaph Street
Applicant: Michael Mills

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 6-0

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00408, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0

4. BAR #2020-00413 OHAD

Request for alterations at 437 North Columbus Street
Applicant: HF ENTWISLE, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 6-0

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00413, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

5. BAR #2020-00430 OHAD

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 1600 West Abingdon Drive.
Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 6-0

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00430, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

IV. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED BY THE BOARD

6. BAR #2020-00455 PG

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 419 North Patrick Street.
Applicants: John Corbin & Ann Riley

7. BAR #2020-00135 PG

Request for addition and alterations at 419 North Patrick Street.
Applicants: John Corbin & Ann Riley

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 6-0

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00455 & BAR #2020-00135, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

In lieu of the proposed vinyl siding, the applicant use wood or fiber cement siding on the addition.

REASON

The Board supported the project and agreed with staff recommendations.

SPEAKERS

John Corbin and Ann Riley, the property owners, were available to answer any questions

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin asked the applicant if they agreed with the staff recommendations. They responded

that pending information on the cost of wood or fiber cement they would be willing to use it on the first and second floors of the addition. Ms. Irwin expressed concern about the use of vinyl siding and stated that she would not support its installation on the second floor of the addition.

Ms. Neihardt agreed with the comments from Ms. Irwin and stated that she would be comfortable with the use of either wood or fiber cement on the second floor addition.

8. BAR #2020-00386 OHAD

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

9. BAR #2020-00387 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 912 Green Street.
Applicants: Christina Schoeler & Paul Fischer

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 6-0

On a motion by MR. Adams and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00386 BAR #2020-00387, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

REASON

The Board felt that the revised details addressed the concerns raised at the first hearing.

SPEAKERS

Paul Fischer, applicant, spoke in support of the application and answered questions.

DISCUSSION

The Board thanked the applicant for the improved drawings and approved the revised application, as submitted.

V. NEW BUSINESS

10. BAR #2020-00439 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 211 A South Union Street.
Applicant: 211 A South Union, LLC

11. BAR #2020-00438 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 211 A South Union Street.
Applicant: 211 A South Union, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 6-0

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by MR. Adams the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00438 & BAR #2020-00439, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The request was approved as submitted.

REASON

The Board supported the staff recommendations.

SPEAKERS

Jen Harty, architect, were available to answer any questions.

DISCUSSION

The Board supported the staff recommendations without discussion.

12. BAR #2020-00442 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 112 Cameron Mews.

Applicants: Timothy M. & Laura R. Biddle

13. BAR #2020-00445 OHAD

Request for alterations at 112 Cameron Mews.

Applicants: Timothy M. & Laura R. Biddle

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 6-0

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00442 BAR #2020-00445, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. That the doors comply with the *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications in the Historic Districts*
2. That the new brick-clad lintel has the same jack arch with keystone design as the existing

REASON

The Board supported the project and agreed with staff recommendations.

SPEAKER

Timothy M. and Laura R. Biddle, the property owners, were available to answer any questions

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin had questions about the light configuration of the proposed doors and asked if the existing security doors were original to the building since, in her opinion, they may be a character defining feature of the property. The property owners clarified that some properties in the same development have security doors and some don't, and that they had submitted specs for the proposed doors which showed full light doors. There was no further discussion.

14. BAR #2020-00444 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 133 North Fairfax Street.

Applicant: Alden Philbrick

15. BAR #2020-00443 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 133 North Fairfax Street.

Applicant: Alden Philbrick

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 6-0

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Adams, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00443 & BAR #2020-00444, as amended.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Applicant should consider retaining some form of the jack arch over the window on the south elevation that will be converted to a door, if possible.

REASON

Retaining the jack arch will indicate that this opening was originally a window, providing historical context for the future.

SPEAKERS

Michael Patrick, project architect with BarnesVanze Architects, represented the applicant and was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts, Ms. Sennott, Ms. Irwin, and Mr. Adams all highly praised the application for its thoughtfulness, excellent renderings, and design, noting that this is a seminal building in Alexandria and they appreciate the applicant's efforts to retain its historic nature.

Ms. Neihardt asked how the applicant intends to determine when to repair and when to replace historic materials. Mr. Patrick explained that they will continue to consult with staff and their masonry contractor during the entire project. He noted that the balustrade is modern concrete and wrapped in Saran wrap to keep it from falling off the building. That feature will be replaced. The cornice is in poor condition, but one section has enough good detail that they will be able to replicate it for the portions to be replaced. The watertable/base is heavily eroded, structurally unsound, and allows water penetration into the basement. They will replace this with a veneer-like layer of stone that will allow the placement of waterproofing.

Ms. Irwin expressed concern that enlarging the existing door on the south elevation and giving it a more elaborate pediment may give a sense of false history, as this would have been a secondary door without such rich detail. She also asked for details on the proposed new canopies and agrees that they should be simple and modern.

Mr. Adams commended the project and said he was fine with the proposed pediment over the south door. Ms. Neihardt and Ms. Sennott concurred. Mr. Patrick noted that the new pediment is more Federal in style, matching the overall building, and that they felt that the lovely terrace should have handsome architecture.

Ms. Irwin asked if the applicant would consider retaining the jack arch over the window on the south elevation that will be converted to a door. Mr. Patrick liked the idea and said he would confer with the applicant, but he thought they would keep the jack arch. They will also keep the bank vault deposit door on the south elevation. It is not original to the building, but is an important feature.

Mr. Adams agreed with Ms. Irwin regarding to the jack arch over the window. He also suggested making this new door a jib door. Mr. Patrick said they had considered that option but decided that

this door should be seen as secondary to the center/primary door on this elevation. A jib door would give it more prominence than it should have.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2020-00328 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 402 Prince Street.

Applicants: Shawn Fisher & Sirine Hafez

BAR #2020-00433 OHAD

Request for minor amendments at 600 North Washington Street.

Applicant: Caycee Hart

BAR #2020-00434 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 14 Keith's Lane.

Applicant: Harry Frazier

BAR #2020-00441 OHAD

Request for wheelchair lift replacement at 121 North Fairfax Street.

Applicants: Carlyle House/ NOVA Parks

BAR #2020-00452 OHAD

Request for door replacement at 524 Gibbon Street.

Applicant: John Elsea

BAR #2020-00453 OHAD

Request for signage replacement at 321 South Washington Street.

Applicant: Elkins 321 South Washington Street, LLC C/O Seaport Properties Attn:
Cheryl Monno

BAR #2020-00454 PG

Request for alterations at 620 North Alfred Street.

Applicant: Carrie Miller

BAR #2020-00456 OHAD

Request for repointing at 501 Duke Street.

Applicant: Jane Dunning

BAR #2020-00458 OHAD

Request for repointing at 210 Prince Street.

Applicant: Richard Banchoff

BAR #2020-00460 OHAD

Request for alterations at 616 South Fairfax Street.

Applicants: Suzanne Corcoran Early & Dennis Early

BAR #2020-00462 PG

Request for signage at 110 South West Street.

Applicant: Via Volcan Coffee Roastery

BAR #2020-00463 PG

Request for siding replacement at 406 North Payne Street.

Applicant: William Stapleton

BAR #2020-00472 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 815 Queen Street.

Applicant: Deborah Darrah

BAR #2020-00474 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 2 Franklin Street.

Applicant: Cynthia Ortiz

BAR #2020-00477 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 120 South Lee Street.

Applicant: Andrew Watson

BAR #2020-00478 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 118 South Lee Street.

Applicant: Andrew Watson

BAR #2020-00481 PG

Request for alterations at 204 South Patrick Street.

Applicant: Michelle Saroff

BAR #2020-00487 OHAD

Request for alterations at 324 North Fairfax Street.

Applicant: John Pascazio

BAR #2020-00489 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 700 Chetworth Place.

Applicant: Tina Chovanec

BAR #2020-00490 PG

Request for door replacement at 428 North Peyton Street.

Applicant: Bethany Lynn Chalfant

*******APPROVED 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

*******APPROVED MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review
Wednesday, November 4, 2020
7:00pm, Virtual Public Hearing
Zoom Webinar

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

Members Absent: Lynn Neihardt
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. Neihardt and Ms. Sennott 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 November 4, 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 21, 2020** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the October 21, 2020 meeting, as submitted.

III. ITEMS DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING

3. **BAR #2020-00396 PG**
Request for new construction at 1413 Princess Street.

Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00396.

4. BAR #2020-00412 PG

Request for new construction at 1415 Princess Street.

Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00412.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

5. BAR #2020-00220 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 1221 Prince Street.

Applicants: Matthew Newton and Jennifer Zakriski

6. BAR #2020-00193 OHAD

Request for alterations at 1221 Prince Street.

Applicants: Matthew Newton and Jennifer Zakriski

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 #2020-00193 & BAR #2020-00220, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The applicant will work with staff to ensure that the glazing in the proposed door and windows complies with the Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications.

REASON

The Board agreed with the staff recommendation.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Newton introduced the project and thanked staff and the BAR for their consideration.

DISCUSSION

None.

7. BAR #2020-00482 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 518 Queen Street.

Applicant: Tracey L. Spotts

8. BAR #2020-00473 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 518 Queen Street.
Applicant: Tracey L. Spotts

BOARD ACTION: Deferred for Restudy

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00473 & BAR #2020-00482.

REASON

The Board found the proposed addition's roof line inappropriate for the flounder house as well as the removal of the window on the east elevation.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Jim Palmer, the project architect, gave a brief presentation stating that the proposed roof solution was to make room for an attic which will be used as storage space since the subject property is very small. He was available to answer questions.

Ms. Gail C. Rothrock, resident at 209 Duke Street, representing Historic Alexandria Foundation, spoke against the project. She found the proposed roof line awkward and inappropriate for the historic flounder house. She also mentioned that the removal of the historic window on the east elevation should not be approved and asked the Board to require deferral of the application for re-study.

DISCUSSION

The Board agreed that the proposed addition's roofline needs to be re-studied and that the window on the east elevation should be retained. The Board unanimously agreed with the deferral of the project. There was no further discussion.

9. BAR #2020-00500 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 1309 Prince Street.
Applicants: Mark and Lauren Shanks

10. BAR #2020-00502 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 1309 Prince Street.
Applicants: Mark and Lauren Shanks

BOARD ACTION: Deferred for Restudy

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00500 & BAR #2020-00502. Mr. Adams recused.

REASON

The Board found that the proposed third floor addition including the mansard roof at the front of the property to be inappropriate for the historic triplet of houses.

SPEAKERS

Lucy Adams, the project architect, gave a brief presentation of the project explaining that that proposed third floor addition would be used to provide much needed space to the interior of the building. The proposed mansard roof is set back from the edge of the continuous cornice line to allow the triplet to read as a continuous unit. This roof form is a feature found throughout the

district and is used to diminish the visual impact of the top story of buildings.

Ms. Irwin asked the applicant if they had prepared a structural analysis of the proposed addition to determine the impact on the existing building. She also asked if the window that is being proposed to be removed is original to the house. Ms. Adams responded that the structural analysis would be completed during the permitting phase and would be supplied to the City for review. She also stated that the referenced window is a replacement in an original window opening location.

Mr. Sprinkle asked the applicant if a rear addition had been considered in lieu of the proposed third floor addition. Ms. Adams responded that a rear addition had not been considered because of the location of a parking easement on that portion of the property.

Minturn Wright, attorney representing 1311 Prince Street, stated that the proposed third floor addition is inappropriate for this building. The design for the mansard is in the second empire style which is not compatible with the style of the historic building. The continuous cornice line is the dominant feature of this triplet and despite the fact that the addition is set back from the cornice, it will be visually disruptive. He was also concerned about the structural impact of the addition on the existing buildings and stated that the addition would block sunlight for the neighboring properties.

Janice Hughes, 1304 Prince Street, stated that this block is often visited by tourists because of the historic marker and is concerned that the proposed addition will detract from the historic character of the block. She also stated that if this were to be approved it would be the only building with a mansard and could represent a bad precedent for projects going forward.

R. L. Sheedy, 1311 Prince Street, stated that the historic charm of the neighborhood is critical to the local economy and was concerned that the proposed addition would detract from this historic charm. In addition to the concern about the addition at the front of the property, she was concerned about the rear part of the addition overwhelming the building at 1311 Prince Street.

Gail Rothrock, resident at 209 Duke Street, representing Historic Alexandria Foundation, stated that the proposed addition should be considered a pop-up and that these are not appropriate in a historic district. She recognized that the Board does not have an established policy on pop-ups but that one should be developed. She stated that triplets in their original condition are rarely found in the historic district and that this pristine example should be retained without modification.

Yvonne Callahan, 735 South Lee Street, reinforced Ms. Rothrock's statement regarding the appropriateness of the third floor addition. She suggested that the applicant explore a rear addition to add the required space in lieu of the proposed third floor addition.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Sprinkle stated that pop-ups should not be allowed in the historic district and that the Board should develop a specific policy regarding proposed pop-ups.

Mr. Spencer appreciated the design of the proposed addition and liked that the mansard was set back from the front edge of the building to allow the cornice to read uninterrupted. He was concerned that this could set a precedent for future third floor additions.

Ms. Irwin stated that the mansard addition is not appropriate and that it would be visible from the opposite side of Prince Street. She agreed that if approved this could create a precedent for future third floor additions. She was less concerned about the addition at the rear of the building and appreciated the subtle differentiation in the design for the brick, she did suggest that the addition could be further differentiated from the existing portion of the building. She also stated that she felt that the existing window on the ground floor should not be removed as proposed.

Ms. Roberts stated that she agreed with other comments regarding the appropriateness of the third-floor addition and asked Ms. Adams if she would like to defer and she agreed. She asked Ms. Adams to please reach out to staff for assistance.

11. BAR #2020-00504 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 915 South Saint Asaph Street.
Applicant: Kenneth W. Miller

12. BAR #2020-00503 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 915 South Saint Asaph Street.
Applicant: Kenneth W. Miller

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 #2020-00503 & BAR #2020-00504, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The fiber cement siding must have a smooth finish and the applicant should work with staff to ensure that the windows comply with the Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications.

REASON

The Board agreed with staff.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Miller explained the project and was available to answer questions.
Tom Rust, the contractor, was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin asked about a basement window on the north end of the west elevation. Mr. Rust said it would be bricked in as part of the project.

13. BAR #2020-00509 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 424 North Washington Street.
Applicant: The BurnBrae Companies

14. BAR #2020-00506 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 424 North Washington Street.
Applicant: The BurnBrae Companies

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 4-0

On a motion by Ms. Irwin, and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00506 & BAR #2020-00509, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Work with staff on color of addition.

REASON

The Board supported the application.

SPEAKER

Christopher Peoples, architect, explained the project, and was available to answer questions.

Allison Ricketts, neighbor, 420 N Washington Street, concerned that any damage to her property be repaired appropriately.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Adams spoke favorably of the project and Ms. Irwin asked for clarity on the color of the addition.

15. BAR #2020-00296 PG

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

Applicant: Shambhu Aryal

16. BAR #2020-00363 PG

Request for addition/ alterations at 315 North Patrick Street.

Applicant: Shambhu Aryal

BOARD ACTION: Deferred for Restudy

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00296 & BAR #2020-00363.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

N/A

REASON

N/A

SPEAKERS

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

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, noted that the house has an important history. She did not object to removing the south wall, but objected to losing the ell shape, raising the roof, and changing the roof form from a shed roof to a gable. She recommended that the case be deferred for restudy.

Yvonne Callahan, 735 South Lee Street, reinforced Ms. Rothrock's statement, feeling that the

design makes the house too long and too box-like. She agreed the case should be deferred. She also had concerns regarding open space and floor area ratio.

Joseph Chapman, 313 North Patrick Street, had concerns about damage to his house when the porch between the houses would be removed. Mr. Middleton assured him that any damage would be repaired by the contractors. Mr. Chapman also noted that the rear yard of the subject property is now overgrown, rat infested, and used as a dumping ground.

Steve Milone, 907 Prince Street, urged the applicant to retain the original fabric and form of the building. He had concerns that a gable roof would shed onto the neighbor to the north, and cleaning gutters would be difficult as it would require going onto the neighbor's property. He also felt that open space would be lacking.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin could not support demolishing a 19th century wall to move it 2 ½ feet. Although the siding on the ell may be 20th century, the ell itself is not. She also felt that the new roof over the ell should be a shed roof.

Mr. Sprinkle agreed with Ms. Irwin. He also questioned adding new windows to the south elevation of the main block of the house, wondering if windows had originally been there.

Mr. Spencer agreed with Ms. Irwin and Mr. Sprinkle.

Mr. Adams felt that this should be treated more like a preservation project than a modern addition to a historic house.

Ms. Roberts asked Mr. Middleton if he would like to defer and he agreed. She asked him to please reach out to staff for assistance.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2020-00396 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 209 B North Fairfax Street.

Applicant: Magee Whelan

BAR #2020-00483 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 310 North Columbus Street.

Applicant: Melissa Newman

BAR #2020-00512 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 113 Quay Street.

Applicant: Annette J. Hinaman

BAR #2020-00522 PG

Request for light replacement at 1020 Queen Street.

Applicant: Adam Hernandez

BAR #2020-00523 OHAD

Request for repointing at 319 Prince Street.

Applicants: Mary Lou Egan and Marc Bendick Jr.

BAR #2020-00525 OHAD

Request for alterations at 211 South Saint Asaph Street.

Applicants: Erin Cleary and Paul Murtagh

BAR #2020-00529 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 726 South Lee Street.

Applicants: Bob and Karen O'Hern

BAR #2020-00535 OHAD

Request for garage door replacement at 23 Keith's Lane.

Applicant: Katherine Hamilton

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

Board of Architectural Review
Wednesday, November 18, 2020
7:00pm, Virtual Public Hearing
Zoom Webinar

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

Members Absent: None

Secretary: William Conkey, AIA, Historic Preservation Architect
Staff Present: Amirah Lane, 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 November 18, 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 **November 4, 2020** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the November 4, 2020 meeting, as submitted.

III. ITEMS DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING

3. BAR #2020-00533 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 108 Gibbon Street.
Applicants: Benedict and Carol Capuco

4. BAR #2020-00532 OHAD

Request for alterations at 108 Gibbon Street.
Applicants: Benedict and Carol Capuco

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00532 & BAR #2020-00533.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

5. BAR #2020-00521 OHAD

Request for alterations at 801 South Fairfax Street.
Applicant: Lawrence Farrell

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt, and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00521, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

6. BAR #2020-00527 OHAD

Request for reapproval of previously approved plans at 428 North Washington Street.
Applicants: James and Maria Bethard

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 6-0

On a motion by Ms. Irwin, and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00527, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused.

V. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED BY THE BOARD

7. BAR #2020-00412 PG

Request for new construction at 1415 Princess Street.
Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

8. BAR #2020-00396 PG

Request for new construction at 1413 Princess Street.
Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

BOARD ACTION: Deferred for Restudy

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00396 & BAR #2020-00412.

REASON

The Board felt that they needed additional information regarding windows on the east elevation of 1413 Princess St. and an updated site plan. However, they had no objection to the design on the south elevation.

SPEAKERS

Deyi Awadallah, property owner, available for questions.
Steve Davidson, 1403 Princess St., spoke in opposition.
Mike Stauber, 1401 Princess St., spoke in opposition.
Allen Russell, 1403 Princess St., spoke in opposition.
Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke St., spoke in opposition.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Neihardt expressed her support of the design and replication of the design on three adjoining townhouses. Mr. Spencer requested a more detailed site plan for the proposed construction. Mr. Sprinkle requested information regarding the approval of 1403 Princess St. In general, the Board supported the design but needs more information for clarification of design and site elements. Ms. Irwin stated that she believes purpose G of the Article X – Historic District and Buildings of the Zoning Ordinance (sec.10-101(G)) can be applied to this case.

9. BAR #2020-00536 PG

Request for alterations to previously approved plans at 607 North Alfred Street.
Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

10. BAR #2020-00537 PG

Request for alterations to previously approved plans at 609 North Alfred Street.
Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 7-0

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, and seconded by Mr. Adams, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00536 & BAR #2020-00537, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

- ~~1. On the east elevation, the three windows on the second floor must remain; and, (removed by BOARD)~~
2. The applicant must submit updated window specifications that comply with the Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications in the Historic Districts at time of permitting.

REASON

The Board general supported the new design, favoring the larger windows and dormers.

SPEAKERS

Deyi Awadallah, property owner, available for questions.

DISCUSSION

The Board general supported the new design, favoring the larger windows and dormers. Mr. Sprinkle was in opposition of the revised design.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

11. BAR #2020-00531 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 214 North Fairfax Street.
Applicants: Jonathan Slemrod and Toska Gamble

12. BAR #2020-00505 OHAD

Request for alterations at 214 North Fairfax Street.
Applicants: Jonathan Slemrod and Toska Gamble

BOARD ACTION: Partially Approved, Partially Deferred, 7-0

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to partially approve and partially defer BAR #2020-00505 & BAR #2020-00531, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

REASON

The Board felt that they needed additional information as to whether there was any evidence of windows being on the first-floor side elevation historically prior to making a decision. However, they had no objection to the windows on the rear.

SPEAKERS

Rachael DeBaun, representing the property owners, spoke in support of the application and answered questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Neihardt asked the applicant why the proposed rear windows were smaller than the other windows on the rear elevation. Ms. DeBaun said that interior partition walls limited the size of the windows. Mr. Spencer said that he felt the windows on the side might not comply with the Building Code. Ms. Roberts and Mr. Sprinkle encouraged that applicant to do some interior demolition to try to determine if there were originally first floor windows on the side, which would make the Board more inclined to approve the windows. Ms. Neihardt made a motion to allow for staff approval of the side windows if historic evidence was found, which Ms. Sennott seconded. That motion was then rescinded. Mr. Spencer then made a motion stating that it was important for the applicant to return to the BAR if additional historic information was uncovered so that they could make the determination, rather than staff, about the appropriateness of the new windows.

13. BAR #2020-00534 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 323 South Washington Street.
Applicant: GSSI - Jose Blanco

14. BAR #2020-00528 OHAD

Request for alterations at 323 South Washington Street.
Applicant: GSSI - Jose Blanco

BOARD ACTION: Deferred for Restudy

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00528 & BAR #2020-00534. Mr. Sprinkle recused.

REASON

The Board found that the proposed staircase should have a better design since it will be the main access to the upper residential units. The Board also required a treatment plan for the rear wall.

SPEAKERS

Robert Berriz, representing the applicant, was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Adams found the proposed staircase inappropriate for the building, he stated that there are no similar fire stairs in the historic district that were approved by the Board. He would prefer that the access to the upper stories be done through the building's interior or an enclosed addition to the rear.

In general the Board did not have issues with the proposed staircase since it is at the building's rear and not visible from Washington Street, but they agreed that the proposed staircase should not be an utilitarian staircase and should have a better design since it will be the main access to the upper stories residential units. They also found an open staircase less intrusive than an enclosed addition.

Ms. Irwin stated that she would like to see plans for the rear wall treatment as well, as part of the restudy deferral.

There was no further discussion.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

15. Diversity and Inclusion in Historic Preservation: Rethinking How We Preserve our Past for the Future.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2020-00499 OHAD
Request for roof replacement at 7 Franklin Street.
Applicant: Doris Rudolph

BAR #2020-00542 OHAD
Request for alterations at 608 Ford's Landing Way.
Applicant: Mark Mullaney

BAR #2020-00545 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 707 Day Lane.

Applicant: Karen Hayes

BAR #2020-00546 PG

Request for window replacement at 909 Princess Street.

Applicant: Carole Edwards

BAR #2020-00548 OHAD

Request for repointing at 415 South Washington Street.

Applicant: Edenir Lopes

BAR #2020-00550 OHAD

Request for door replacement at 600 Second Street #405.

Applicant: Melissa Laurenza

BAR #2020-00555 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 600 Ford's Landing Way.

Applicant: Jack Liu

BAR #2020-00556 OHAD

Request for alterations at 311 North Alfred Street.

Applicants: Al and Kathy Cox

BAR #2020-00557 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 10 Franklin Street.

Applicant: Paul Lewis

BAR #2020-00562 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 520 South Pitt Street.

Applicant: Dan Pollock

BAR #2020-00563 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 427 South Lee Street.

Applicant: Jack Carpenter

*******APPROVED MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review
Wednesday, December 2, 2020
7:00pm, Virtual Public Hearing
Zoom Webinar

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

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 December 2, 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 **November 18, 2020** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the November 18, 2020 meeting, as amended.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

3. BAR #2020-00544 OHAD

Request for alterations at 422 South Fairfax Street.

Applicants: Mark and Kelly Robertson

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt, and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00544, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The statements in archaeology conditions below shall appear in the General Notes of all site plans and on all site plan sheets that involve demolition or ground disturbance (including Demolition, Basement/Foundation Plans, Landscaping, Erosion and Sediment Control, Grading, Utilities and Sheeting and Shoring) so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements:
 - a. The applicant/developer shall call Alexandria Archaeology immediately (703-838-4399) 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.
 - b. The applicant/developer shall not allow any metal detection or other artifact.

REASON

This item was pulled from the consent calendar because the Board received a letter from an adjoining property owner.

SPEAKERS

Lynette Camus, Studio Camus, represented the property owners and answered questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin asked if there was an existing 6' fence at the property and the applicant's representative said that there was an existing fence of differing heights surrounding the rear yard.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

4. 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.

Ryan Kautz, architect with Hord Coplan Macht, presented the revised design for the project. Board questions for the applicant, answers provided by Ryan Kautz, architect with Hord Coplan Macht

Ms. Roberts asked about the distance from the curb to each face of the building along South Patrick Street on Block 1. Mr. Kautz responded that the distance from each façade to the curb is the same with the exception that the southwest corner is set back an additional 5 feet. The distance from the curb to the façade on South Patrick Street is 30 feet.

Ms. Irwin asked for clarification regarding the brick colors on the South Alfred Street townhouse elements. Mr. Kautz responded that the colors are three different shades of brown brick.

Ms. Irwin asked about the depth of the projecting bays along South Alfred Street. Mr. Kautz responded that the fronts of the bays are aligned but the variation in depth occurs at the rear of the bays.

Ms. Roberts asked if the balconies facing Wilkes Street Park on Block 1 are projecting. Mr. Kautz responded that these are projecting balconies.

Ms. Roberts asked for clarification on the projecting bay at the southwest corner of Block 1. Mr. Kautz responded that the bay projects 2 feet from the adjacent building face.

Mr. Sprinkle asked what design influences were used in the interest of greater variation in the design. Mr. Kautz showed precedent images and referred to a variety of window configurations.

Mr. Sprinkle asked if the applicant had done a study of the solid to void relationship on historic buildings and how this applied to the proposed design. Mr. Kautz responded that they would provide this information.

Mr. Adams asked why the Board is looking at the project prior to approval by the Planning Commission and City Council. Mr. Conkey responded by explaining that the Concept Review policy allows for a preliminary review of a design for a project prior to these approvals.

Ms. Roberts asked if the projecting bays on the South Alfred Street elevation of Block 2 stop above the entry doors. Mr. Kautz responded that these bays stopped above the entry door to create a canopy for the door.

Mr. Spencer asked about the material for the canopies at the fourth floor roof deck on the east side of Block 2. Mr. Kautz responded that these are to be an open trellis.

Ms. Irwin asked if the ground floor entrances facing Wilkes Street Park are recessed. Mr. Kautz responded that these entrances are recessed.

Ms. Roberts asked if the balconies on the Wilkes Street Park elevation are projecting. Mr. Kautz responded that these balconies do project.

Public Comments

Chris Morell, 421 South Columbus, summarized the features included in the Small Area Plan and asked the Board to protect the historic district from the project developers.

Kay Morell, 421 South Columbus, stated that she has not seen a view showing what the building would look like from her back yard. She is concerned that the project is being steamrolled through the process and would like a balance of good design with the need for affordable housing.'

Carren Camp, 310 Franklin, stated that the proposed density is too great, the design is too contemporary, and that the design is not compatible with Old Town,

Stafford Ward, 600 block of South Columbus Street, supported comments from Mr. Adams regarding the design and stated that the City should be driving the development process instead of the developer.

James Beattie, 718 Wolfe Street, was concerned that the northeast corner of Block 2 is too industrial near existing nearby residential properties and stated that this is the least compatible part of the design.

Ellen Mosher, representing Old Town Civic Association, 324 North St. Asaph, shared a presentation comparing the current design to the previously submitted design.

RL Sheedy, representing HAF, 1311 Prince Street, was concerned that the building as designed will loom over the historic district. She stated that the project does not fit into the architecture of the historic district and that the building should blend into the existing fabric. HAF is requesting that a physical model of the project and the surrounding context be built.

Manfred Stommel, 428 South Columbus Street, was concerned that the presentation did not adequately show the proposed parking.

John Szczech, 413 South Columbus Street, echoed previous concerns that the comments about the height, mass and scale have not sufficiently been addressed. He thought that the practice of whitening out the background buildings in the elevations is misleading.

Darryl Resio, 827 Wolfe Street, felt that it is difficult to provide input on a project of this size and scale. He felt that the project needs to include greater variation in the window configuration and that the buildings are too large.

Judy Cohen, 720 Gibbon Street, shared a photograph of the Sunrise project on North Washington Street and talked about how it is successful as a large building because it is broken into discrete parts that are compatible with the neighborhood.

Mary Marrow-Bax, stated that she has repeatedly asked for the size of the park and the adjacent building and would like to know the proposed number of overall and affordable units. Ms. Puskar responded that the Wilkes Street Park is 66'-4" x 246'-6", the existing 6 story building is 59'-8" wide, and there will be a total of 750 units, 185 of which will be affordable but this number is subject to change based on input from HUD.

Barbara Hayes, 802 Duke Street, recommended that the Board review the recommendations of the small area plan.

Steve Hayes, 802 Duke Street, felt that the developer is not responding to comments from the Board and that the design feels like a prison.

Brian Scholl, 800 Gibbon Street, stated that the current design is not responsive to previous Board comments and feels that the design has gotten larger.

Stafford Ward, 600 block of South Columbus Street, asked about the physical model that had been requested by civic groups. Ms. Roberts responded that the Board does not have the authority or ability to create a model. Mr. Conkey responded that the Director of the Department of Planning and Zoning had written a letter in response to the request.

Yvonne Callahan, 735 South Lee Street, stated that the Board concerns had been ignored in the proposed design and that the drawings do not adequately show the 6 and 7 story buildings behind the 4 story buildings. She feels that there is too much metal included in the design for the buildings and that the applicant should include more references to historic buildings. She also stated that Wilkes Street Park is more of a street than a park.

The public comment period was closed

DISCUSSION

General Comments

Ms. Irwin stated that the architecture of the historic district is euro-centric in nature and the Design Guidelines reflect this tendency. When considering the influences for this project the applicant should look to the diversity of the history of the site. The building design should have its own character aside from the strict language of the historic district that includes all influences.

Mr. Sprinkle stated that the quality of the design be respectful of the past and nearby historic architecture. He further asked the applicant to demonstrate a precedent where a building of this size and scale was introduced into an historic district.

Ms. Neihardt stated that a building that is used for affordable housing should have a similar quality design and materials to market rate buildings. She further indicated that the Block 1 building is too large and should be broken into two separate buildings.

Mr. Spencer appreciated the efforts of the architect to attempt to design a project of this size so that it is compatible with the historic district. He was concerned that the height and scale have not been adjusted per the Board comments. Per previous comments he would like the architecture of the building to include references to the history of the site.

Ms. Sennott is of the opinion that the design for the building needs more surprise and delight, the design at this point lacks a cohesive character.

Mr. Adams stated that the design for the building is of a 2021 architecture style. The buildings

are too large. The design should be a near replica of historic buildings in a way similar to the Sunrise project.

Ms. Roberts stated that the building architecture is not of the historic district, changes to the design have been incremental rather than more holistic as the comments have stated. She asks that the building be the best possible design.

Block 1 – South Patrick Street

Ms. Irwin stated that the scale on this portion of the building is acceptable because it is adjacent to South Patrick Street. She felt that the previous color scheme was more successful than the revised version. The applied bays on the building provide visual interest and break up the facades. She stated that as a design approach the applicant should not be directly taking forms from historic buildings and applying them to a new building.

Mr. Spencer agreed that the metal bays are successful as design elements. He was concerned about the potential for a canyon type of feeling to South Patrick Street if the opposite side of the street is similarly developed. He pointed out that the perspective does not show the hill to the north of the site and the large church buildings at the corner of South Patrick and Duke Street.

Ms. Roberts asked the applicant if there could be greater variation in the distance from the curb to the various facades to add visual interest and texture. She felt that this façade is too large and should be further broken into components.

Ms. Sennott was concerned about the proximity of the building to the sidewalk and wants to see additional visual interest at the first floor.

Ms. Neihardt felt that the South Patrick Street design was not successful.

Mr. Adams felt that there should be greater variation of the cornice line with definable separate elements.

Block 1 – Northwest corner

Ms. Irwin likes the revisions to the balconies.

Ms. Neihardt felt that the design for this portion of the building needs greater variation.

Ms. Roberts stated that the design for the lower 5 story section is successful and relates more to the precedent images than other parts of the building. She further indicated that if the building will have a 7 story portion then there should be fewer steps in the elevation.

Mr. Spencer agreed that the 5 story section of the building is successful and asked if there was a way that the recessed upper levels could be better integrated.

Ms. Sennott suggested that greater contrast between the window frames and the adjacent masonry would help to provide additional visual interest.

Mr. Sprinkle suggested that adding a defined building entry to each block could help to give the

impression of multiple smaller buildings.

Block 1 - Northeast Corner

Ms. Irwin felt that previous versions of this corner were more interesting and that this design felt boring in comparison, however the addition of detailing in the next phase of the development of design will help to alleviate this concern. She suggested that the history of the site should be integrated into the design and this could happen through the detailing.

Mr. Adams suggested that the building should provide a more dynamic silhouette.

Mr. Spencer stated that this portion of the building felt like a podium design with residential over retail and suggested removing the band above the first floor to create a more unified design.

Ms. Roberts suggested that a quiet, boring design for this corner is appropriate as a counterpoint to the historic home on the opposite street corner.

Block 1 – South Alfred Street Elevation

Ms. Irwin stated that she likes the recessed entrances as a way to add variety to the streetscape but suggested that a variation in the depth from the sidewalk to the face of the building would help to break up the massing.

Mr. Spencer likes the current design of the corner window elements. He suggested that the minimal variation in façade depth at the roof should be more significant and should result in a variation of depth at the street level.

Ms. Roberts stated that she supports the use of the glass bridge to allow a view into the mews and create the feeling of distinct buildings.

Ms. Neihardt stated that the bridges should be eliminated and there should be two separate buildings instead of one joined by bridges.

Mr. Sprinkle stated that this elevation is an opportunity for the design to vary because directly across the street is Block 2.

Mr. Adams stated that this portion of the building could benefit from the introduction of a variety heights, bay shapes, and roof forms. The applicant should look to the historic district for inspiration for these forms.

Block 1 – Southeast corner

Ms. Irwin stated that she liked the design direction of this being a projecting tower element rather than the previous recessed vertical element but suggested that metal and glass would be a more appropriate language.

Mr. Adams suggested that the lack of an historical precedence for this part of the design makes

it difficult for there to be a consensus on the design.

Block 2 – Southwest corner

Ms. Irwin prefers this version of the corner design to the previous version and encouraged the applicant to explore the possibility of adding some version of balconies back to the west elevation to provide visual interest.

Ms. Neihardt stated that the brick spandrels are more successful than previous metal spandrels and appreciates the overall warehouse feel of this portion of the building.

Mr. Spencer liked the large precast opening on the west elevation and suggested that the applicant explore the possibility of adding a segmented arch to the underside of the opening. The introduction of a peak or other roof element to the corner could add to this as a strong corner.

Ms. Sennott agreed with Ms. Irwin that the inclusion of balconies on the west elevation would help to improve the elevation.

Mr. Adams stated that the corner needs additional detail and relief to give it a richness of design.

Block 2 – Northwest corner

Ms. Irwin stated that there should be additional variation amongst the window design and does not like the large dark panel between the windows on the metal clad fourth floor at the north end of the building.

Mr. Sprinkle questioned the compatibility of the fourth floor at the north end of the building and suggested the introduction of a mansard roof form as a possible variation and reference to historical buildings.

Ms. Neihardt felt that the projecting bays above the ground floor entries are not appropriate and are not found elsewhere in the historic district.

Block 2 – Northeast corner

Ms. Irwin stated that she likes the recessed central bay as shown in this version and suggested the introduction of additional detailing at the ground floor.

Ms. Roberts was concerned about the wedding cake effect on this portion of the building but agreed that the three story massing at the ground floor is more compatible with the low scale residential buildings nearby.

Block 2 – Southeast Corner and South Elevation

Ms. Irwin stated that she preferred the wraparound projecting bay to this version because it created a strong corner as a counterpoint to the other corners on the proposed buildings.

Ms. Roberts suggested that the proposed projecting bay is a response to a similar projecting bay on a building across the street.

Ms. Irwin preferred the proposed version of the south elevation and inquired about depth at the ground floor park entries. She felt that the variety of roof lines at this portion of the building is successful.

Ms. Neihardt felt that this design is too blocky and could use greater differentiation.

Mr. Spencer stated that it is difficult to provide feedback on the design for the two story portion of the south elevation because it is difficult to see it in the provided renderings. He further indicated that he did not like the previous wraparound projecting bay but is still unsure of the proposed corner. He felt that the proposed bay is too narrow.

Mr. Sprinkle suggested that the applicant consider what the building would look like if the various portions had been built over time by different architects. He felt that the southeast corner is too weak and should be a prominent element similar to other corners.

The Chair conducted a straw poll on the height, mass, scale, and architectural character of the proposed from each Board member.

Mr. Sprinkle:

Height, Mass, & Scale: The building is generally two stories too tall and is unprecedented in and historic district.

Architectural Character: The building is missing a cohesive style and needs more variation of design elements.

Ms. Irwin:

Height, Mass, & Scale: The applicant has been responsive to concerns about height and has located the tallest sections in the areas where it is most appropriate.

Architectural Character: Encouraged the applicant to create a building that is unique but compatible with the historic district. This can be achieved through greater variation of design elements. She felt that the design for the Sunrise project is too historicist and would not support it for this project.

Mr. Spencer:

Height, Mass, & Scale: Agreed with Ms. Irwin regarding the location of the tallest portions of the building and acknowledged that the Board has not been consistent regarding the question of scale.

Architectural Character: Through the evolution of the design he likes some elements of the current design and some of previous designs. He felt that the building should read as a collection of smaller buildings rather than a monolithic building.

Ms. Sennott:

Height, Mass, & Scale: With appropriate architectural detailing the proposed building height and scale could be appropriate.

Architectural Character: The design for the building should include a variety of building design

elements. She felt that the level of detailing at the Sunrise project is appropriate but the style is not in this location.

Ms. Neihardt:

Height, Mass, & Scale: The building is generally too large.

Architectural Character: The design should include more items of interest and should have more defined sense of entry.

Mr. Adams:

Height, Mass, & Scale: The building is generally too large, a modest three to four story building would be appropriate in this location.

Architectural Character: The design should include more variation in design elements and should generally be a higher quality building.

Ms. Roberts:

Height, Mass, & Scale: Seven stories is too tall for the historic district but if this height is determined to be required then it could be possible to make it successful through the use of better architectural articulation. The massing could be improved through the introduction of greater porosity and breaking down the massing into separate buildings.

Architectural Character: The design should include more variation in design elements and should create a sense of place in the neighborhood.

Ms. Roberts offered that as the project moves into the Certificate of Appropriateness phase the applicant could meet with Board Members individually to review continued evolution of the design.

5. BAR Elections

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, the BAR voted 7-0 to reelect Ms. Roberts as Chair to another one year term

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle, the BAR voted 7-0 to reelect Mr. Spencer as Vice-Chair to another one year term

V. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 11:33 p.m.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2020-00510 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 210 South Payne Street.

Applicant: Mary Rust

BAR #2020-00543 PG

Request for fence replacement at 513 North Columbus Street.
Applicant: Thomas Wise

BAR #2020-00561 OHAD
Request for alterations at 214 North Fairfax Street.
Applicant: Toska Gamble

BAR #2020-00565 OHAD
Request for window replacement at 801 South Pitt Street #122.
Applicant: Muriel Forster

BAR #2020-00566
Request for window replacement at 801 South Pitt Street #317.
Applicant: Jann Gilmore

BAR #2020-00570 OHAD
Request for window replacement at 1821 West Abingdon Drive #101.
Applicant: Eugene Paul

BAR #2020-00575 OHAD
Request for fence replacement at 718 South Alfred Street.
Applicant: Jacqueline M. Kennedy

BAR #2020-00576 OHAD
Request for alterations at 214 North Royal Street.
Applicant: Tom Crowley

BAR #2020-00575 OHAD
Request for door replacement at 601 Wilkes Street #402.
Applicant: Dan and Christine Gill

BAR #2020-00582 OHAD
Request for door replacement at 115 South Payne Street.
Applicant: Anthony Pandolfi

*******APPROVED MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review
Wednesday, December 16, 2020
7:00pm, Virtual Public Hearing
Zoom Webinar

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

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 December 16, 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 **December 2, 2020** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

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

III. ITEMS DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING

3. BAR #2020-00296 PG

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

Applicant: Shambhu Aryal

4. BAR #2020-00363 PG

Request for addition and alterations at 315 North Patrick Street.

Applicant: Shambhu Aryal

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00296 & BAR #2020-00363.

5. BAR #2020-00553 PG

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 215 North Patrick Street.

Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00553.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

6. BAR #2020-00571 OHAD

Request for alterations at 328 South Lee Street.

Applicants: Shawn Martin and Charlene MacDonald

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt, and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00571, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

V. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED BY THE BOARD

7. BAR #2020-00482 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 518 Queen Street.

Applicant: Tracey L. Spotts

8. BAR #2020-00473 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 518 Queen Street.

Applicant: Tracey L. Spotts

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review

voted to approve BAR #2020-00473 & BAR #2020-00482, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board was pleased with the revised plans which took into consideration the Board's recommendations.

SPEAKERS

Mr. James Palmer, the project architect, was available to answer any questions.

Ms. Gail C. Rothrock, resident at 209 Duke Street, representing Historic Alexandria Foundation, complimented the Board and the applicant for having addressed the previous proposal concerns. She stated that she was pleased with the outcome of the revisions and had no objection to the new proposal.

DISCUSSION

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

VI. NEW BUSINESS

9. BAR #2020-00549 OHAD

Request for new construction and waiver of rooftop screening at 3601 Potomac Avenue (Pump Station associated with the redevelopment of North Potomac Yard).

Applicant: CPYR Theater, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 6-0

On a motion by Ms. Irwin, and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00549, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board was pleased with the revisions to the project since the Concept Review hearing.

SPEAKERS

Bob Brandt, attorney for the applicant was available to answer any questions

Siobahn Steen, architect with Hickock Cole, presented the revisions to the design for the pump station building

Simon Beer, landscape architect for the project, presented the revisions to the materials for the

covered walkway in front of the pump station and the other park elements.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin asked the applicant about the finish for the aluminum tubes at the covered walkway. Ms. Steen responded that they are not to be a powder coated finish because that would not allow for repair of the material should it get damaged. They are to be painted with a vandal resistant paint that can easily be repaired.

Ms. Irwin stated that she liked the design for the project and that the revisions since the Concept Review have improved on an already successful design.

10. BAR #2020-00559 PG

Request for alterations, including painting unpainted masonry, at 402 North Fayette Street.
Applicant: Andrew Haas

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Irwin, and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00559, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Denial of the request to paint the masonry;
2. Approval of the fence and railing; and,
3. Approval of the canopy provided the applicant work with staff on the design details.

REASON

The Board felt that the painting was inappropriate and inconsistent with the zoning ordinance and Design Guidelines, and that the painting could damage the masonry. The Board supported the metal fence/railing and did not object to a canopy over the door, provided that the applicant work with staff on the design details.

SPEAKERS

Andrew Haas, applicant, spoke in support of the application and answered questions.

Gail Rothrock, 206 Duke Street and HAF, spoke in support of staff recommendation for denial of the painting of the masonry house. She said that she agreed that staff should work on the design details of the canopy with staff.

Inocencio Davilia, 412 N. Henry Street, spoke in support of the application and said that there were other painted masonry buildings in the neighborhood.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Haas said that he didn't know painting brick was not recommended and that a number of his neighbors were also interested in painting their homes. He said that the canopy design is more subtle than the current canopy. None of the Board members supported the painting of the masonry and recommended that the applicant work with staff to ensure that the design and installation of the new canopy did not compromise the brick.

11. BAR #2020-00573 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 509 Duke Street.
Applicants: Jennifer and Sam Watson

12. BAR #2020-00580 OHAD

Request for alterations and waiver of rooftop HVAC screening requirement at 509 Duke Street.
Applicants: Jennifer and Sam Watson

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle, and seconded by Ms. Neihart, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00573 & BAR #2020-00580, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board agreed with staff and found the proposal appropriate.

SPEAKERS

Karen Becker, project architect, represented the owners and was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin asked if the window openings on the north/rear elevation were original. Ms. Becker was unsure. Mr. Adams indicated that they are not.

Mr. Adams complimented the design and expressed his support.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

13. Presentation “From Historic Preservation to Neighborhood Conservation: Displacement, Urban Violence, and Architectural Survey in Alexandria, Virginia”

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

IX. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2020-00568 OHAD

Request for door replacement at 211 Princess Street.

Applicant: Julie Christodoulou

BAR #2020-00569 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 515 South Royal Street.
Applicants: Derek Donovan and Kathryn Donovan

BAR #2020-00579 OHAD
Request for fence replacement at 420 South Pitt Street.
Applicant: Michael E. Hines

BAR #2020-00581 OHAD
Request for window replacement at 702 Rose Square.
Applicant: Dave and Margaret Ryder

BAR #2020-00584
Request for shutter replacement at 320 South Alfred Street.
Applicant: Albert Pierce

BAR #2020-00594 OHAD
Request for window replacement at 1130 Duke Street.
Applicant: Julie Keegan

BAR #2020-00595 OHAD
Request for window replacement at 1008 Powhatan Street.
Applicant: Alison Rausch

BAR #2020-00599 OHAD
Request for door replacement at 600 Second Street #404
Applicant: Brian Thiel

*******APPROVED MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, January 6, 2021

7:00pm, Virtual Public Hearing

Zoom Webinar

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

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 January 6, 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 **December 16, 2020** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Ms. Sennott and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the December 16, 2020 meeting, as submitted.

III. ITEMS DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING

3. BAR #2020-00396 PG

Request for new construction at 1413 Princess Street.

Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00396.

4. BAR #2020-00412 PG

Request for new construction at 1415 Princess Street.

Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00412.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

5. BAR #2020-00553 PG

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 215 North Patrick Street.

Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00533.

V. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED BY THE BOARD

6. BAR #2020-00534 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 323 South Washington Street.

Applicant: GSSI - Jose Blanco

7. BAR #2020-00528 OHAD

Request for alterations at 323 South Washington Street.

Applicant: GSSI - Jose Blanco

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 #2020-00528 and BAR #2020-00534, as submitted, recommending paint option A. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. That the proposed doors comply with *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance*

Specifications in the Historic Districts.

2. The applicant work with staff and submit a thorough masonry treatment plan for the rear/west elevation wall prior the issuance of any permit.
3. The applicant follows the recommendations of Alexandria Archaeology.

REASON

In general, the Board was pleased with the modifications done to the previous proposed project and found that option A, which proposes a black freestanding staircase, is the best color option.

SPEAKERS

Robert Berriz, representing the applicant GSSI, gave a brief presentation and was available to answer questions

Patricia Delaney Yurgitis, resident at 713 Wolfe Street, stated that she lives across the parking lot for about forty years and she had concerns about the number of residential units being proposed and parking spaces provided, she also wanted to know what kind of business will occupy the first floor. Mr. Berriz explained that there will be two residential units with assigned parking and that there is no tenant for the first-floor commercial unit yet.

RL Sheedy, representing the Historic Alexandria Foundation, asked the applicant to photograph and document the interior staircase which the applicant agreed to do.

DISCUSSION

The Board found that the modifications to the previous proposal was an improvement and that the black color option A was the best option since it will give a nice contrast with the light color of the wall and for maintenance purposes as well.

Ms. Irwin had concerns about the product to be used in the rear wall treatment, she would like staff to work with the applicant to choose the most appropriate product that allow the old soft brick to breath and therefore avoid further deterioration. There was no further discussion.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

8. BAR #2020-00588 OHAD

Request for alterations at 815 King Street.

Applicant: Old Town #1 LLC

BOARD ACTION: Denied

On a motion by Ms. Sennott and seconded by Ms. Neihart, the Board of Architectural Review voted to deny BAR #2020-00588. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

REASON

The Board agreed with the staff recommendation that the existing unpainted masonry should not be painted.

SPEAKERS

Tavia Barksdale Jones, representing the applicant, gave a brief presentation

Responses to questions from the Board were provided by the applicant

Ms. Roberts asked the applicant why they thought that the existing brick was installed on top of the original limestone. The applicant responded that they had done research on the history of the building which indicated this construction. Staff indicated that they had researched the building and found no evidence of this installation.

Ms. Sennott asked the applicant why they wanted to paint the existing brick. The applicant responded that they felt that the color of the brick is drab and that paint would improve the look of the building.

Ms. Irwin asked the applicant if they planned to paint the limestone details in addition to the brick. The applicant responded that the intention was to only paint the brick.

Public comments included the following:

R L Sheedy, 1311 Prince Street, representing the Historic Alexandria Foundation, stated that they support the staff recommendation for denial of the proposal to paint the unpainted masonry.

Steve Milone, 907 Prince Street, representing Old Town Civic Association, stated that they also support the staff recommendation for denial of the proposal to paint the unpainted masonry and that the painting would result in the loss of historic fabric. Mr. Milone further stated that when the building was renovated approximately 10 years ago there was an attempt to match the existing yellow brick when infilling areas of previous wall penetrations.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Spencer stated that the unpainted masonry should not be painted.

Ms. Neihardt agreed that the unpainted masonry should not be painted.

Ms. Irwin suggested that the applicant explore the possibility of cleaning the existing masonry in lieu of painting to improve the look of the building.

Ms. Sennott stated that there is no reason to paint the existing unpainted masonry.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

9. Review updated window replacement policies. The Board reviewed staff suggestions, made edits, and unanimously approved an updated “Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications in the Historic Districts,” to be included in the “BAR Policies for Administrative Approval.” The approval is provisional for one year, until January 2022, when the Board will revisit the document to ensure that the specifications meet expectations.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

IX. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2020-00589 OHAD

Request for window and door replacement at 1250 South Washington Street #210.

Applicant: Nicholas Kalivretenos

BAR #2020-00590 OHAD

Request for window and door replacement at 1250 South Washington Street #703.

Applicant: Michael Behrman

BAR #2020-00596 OHAD

Request for window and door replacement at 622 South Saint Asaph Street.

Applicant: Katie Johnson

BAR #2020-00597 OHAD

Request for alterations at 511 South Lee Street.

Applicant: William and Laura Bennett

BAR #2020-00604 PG

Request for alterations at 300 North Fayette Street.

Applicant: 1201 Queen St Alexandria VA 22314 LLC

BAR #2020-00606 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 613 South Washington Street.

Applicant: Edward Semonian

BAR #2020-00609 OHAD

Request for siding replacement at 1010 King Street.

Applicant: Hofgard LLC

BAR #2020-00613 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 1110 King Street.

Applicant: Marazie Mohammadi Marx LLC

*******APPROVED MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, January 21, 2021

7:00pm, Virtual Public Hearing

Zoom Webinar

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

Members Absent: None

Secretary: William Conkey, AIA, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Amirah Lane, 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 January 21, 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 **January 6, 2020** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the January 6, 2020 meeting, as submitted.

III. ITEMS DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING

3. BAR #2020-00616 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 208 South Payne Street.

Applicant: Alabama Avenue LC

4. BAR #2020-00615 OHAD

Request for alterations at 208 South Payne Street.

Applicant: Alabama Avenue LC

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00615 and BAR #2020-00616.

5. BAR #2020-00598 OHAD

Request to install small cell facility on a new standalone pole adjacent to 500 South Royal Street.

Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00598.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

6. BAR #2020-00025 OHAD

Request for alterations at 512 Queen Street.

Applicants: Todd B. Catlin and Daniel W. Lee

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 #2020-00025, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

7. BAR #2020-00618 OHAD

Request for alterations at 130 Prince Street.

Applicants: Gregory Wilson and Kathleen Cummings

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 #2020-00618, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

V. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED BY THE BOARD

8. BAR #2020-00307 OHAD

Request to install small cell facility on a new standalone pole adjacent to 1 Prince Street.

Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended, 7-0

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00307, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

- 1- To the possible extent, the applicant should work with the property owner who objected to the small cell installation at the location due to viewshed obstruction and determine either a less obstructive location between windows or a higher pole.

REASON

In general, the Board had no objections to the standalone pole location and/or design. The Board had concerns about pole height and location when obstructing viewsheds in the historic districts.

SPEAKERS

Joshua Schakola, representing Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless, was available to answer any questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin questioned the possibility of increasing the pole height. Mr. Schakola explained that there is a limit of fifty feet in height for poles around the city and to go beyond that would require City Council approval.

Mr. Spencer found that the idea of proposing a different height would set a bad precedent since every homeowner will feel entitled to do the same. Mr. Sprinkle added that only public buildings' viewsheds, not private, are protected.

Ms. Sennott suggested that the new standalone pole be placed between windows to avoid the viewshed obstruction; the suggestion was accepted by the Board and made a condition of approval.

Ms. Roberts suggested that the applicant work with the local public before scheduling the proposal for a hearing. Mr. Schakola accepted. There was no further discussion.

9. BAR #2020-00553 PG

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 215 North Patrick Street.

Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00553.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None.

REASON

The Board agreed that a standalone pole could be an option for this location since there is no other existing suitable pole for small cell installation in the vicinity.

SPEAKERS

Joshua Schakola, representing Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless, was available to answer any questions.

DISCUSSION

The Board acknowledged letters of concern from the public about the pole location and inquired if there was another pole that could receive the small cell facility. Mr. Schakola explained that in this location the subject pole is the only suitable pole to receive the small cell facility.

Ms. Roberts suggested that a standalone pole could be a solution for this location and advised the applicant to study the possibility and bring the findings back before the Board for evaluation. Mr. Schakola agreed and requested deferral.

10. BAR #2020-00396 PG

Request for new construction at 1413 Princess Street.
Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

11. BAR #2020-00412 PG

Request for new construction at 1415 Princess Street.
Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00396 and BAR #2020-00412.

REASON

In general, The Board did not object to the construction of the townhouses. However, the Board requested additional information to clarify many aspects of the proposed design including location, restudy of proportions, and architectural detailing.

SPEAKERS

Deyi Awadallah, applicant, was available for questions.

Steve Davidson, 535 N Columbus St., spoke in opposition. He referenced the zoning ordinance and expressed the opinion that the proposed design is not compatible with the community.

Laura Kibby, 1401 Princess St., spoke in opposition. She noted that the purpose of the BAR is to say no to incompatible buildings and that the proposed building design is incompatible with history.

Allen Russell, 1403 Princess St., spoke in opposition. He never expected that a house would be built right on the property line adjacent to his house. He felt that the design sticks out from the rest of the neighborhood.

Michael Stauber, 1401 Princess St., spoke in opposition, saying that the design is not compatible

with the block and asked that the building be pushed to the rear of the site.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke St., spoke in opposition. She felt that the concept of a triplet does not match the neighborhood. She also expressed concern with the design impact on the historic fabric.

DISCUSSION

The Board stated that the submitted plans were inaccurate and it was therefore difficult to weigh in on the proposed design.

Mr. Adams stated the triplet concept is a bad precedent the design should reference other historic styles. He noted that a restudy is needed.

Ms. Neilhardt wanted to see more differentiation between the proposed townhouses because the neighborhood has a variety of styles. She suggested that the middle building be pushed further back and noted that design faults are more obvious with three buildings instead of one. She noted that a colonial style was originally submitted but she could support a modern style.

Mr. Spencer agreed that it is not uncommon to have a front entrance and a side entrance home next to each other. He does not mind a modern design next to a historic architectural style. He stated that the architectural elements can use some refining, including the window portions, cornice, and bay window.

Mr. Sprinkle stated this was a missed opportunity and recognized the constraints of the Special Use Plan and the approval of the adjacent building at 1417 Princess Street. He noted that the context of the block is very important. He also stated that the townhouses should be treated as separate designs.

Ms. Irwin stated that if the properties are moved closer to the sidewalk, the neighboring property (1403 Princess St.) would potentially not have a wall facing the back half of the dwelling. She noted that the house should be simple, given the size, and that the number of design elements is good. She likes the design and would not oppose some variations.

Ms. Roberts supported different design concepts for each property.

Ms. Sennott wants to see a connection to the Arts and Craft architectural style and would like for the townhouses to blend into the streetscape. She supports a restudy.

Mr. Spencer and Ms. Irwin requested updated block site plan and diagrams to show site location options for the proposed townhouses.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

12. BAR #2020-00610 PG

Request for alterations at 1000 Queen Street.

Applicant: Bravo Solutions

BOARD ACTION: Denied

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to deny BAR #2020-00610. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

REASON

The Board had no objections to staff recommendations.

SPEAKERS

Perry Henderson, general contractor, was available to answer questions.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke St, HAF, spoke in support of staff recommendations.

Steve Milone, 907 Prince Street, citizen, spoke in support of staff recommendations, saying that painting masonry does not meet the zoning ordinance or the Design Guidelines.

Yvonne Callahan, 735 S. Lee St., spoke in support of staff recommendations, noting that the Old Town Civic Association has historically opposed painting unpainted masonry.

DISCUSSIONS

The Board agreed with staff recommendations and noted reasons why painting masonry is inappropriate.

Ms. Irwin noted similarities to a recent case on King St. at the previous hearing. She noted that painting a masonry building makes the building lose its detail and charm. It also creates a maintenance issue because the building must be repainted, and it is not an alternative to cleaning the brick. Repointing is the better method for brick repair. She supports the staff recommendation to denial.

Mr. Sprinkle stated property owners in the historic districts receive a letter annually stating what requires BAR approval.

Ms. Roberts noted that it is rare for the Board to support the painting of masonry because painting hurts the masonry more than it helps.

13. BAR #2020-00619 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 810 Prince Street.

Applicant: Puscheck LLC

14. BAR #2020-00617 OHAD

Request for alteration at 810 Prince Street.

Applicant: Puscheck LLC

BOARD ACTION: Deferred for restudy

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR #2020-00617 and BAR #2020-00619, for a restudy. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

N/A

REASON

SPEAKERS

Ms. Karen Conkey, project architect, made a brief presentation and was available to answer questions.

Mr. Kahan Dillon, applicant, was available to answer questions.

Steve Milone, 907 Prince Street, President of Old Town Civic Association, spoke against the proposed upper roof deck along the Prince Street side of the house.

Victoria Vergason, 808 Prince Street, noted that 808 Prince is historic and that Mr. Adams designed the renovation several years ago. She expressed concern about the fire stair attached to the west elevation of her home and questioned the appropriateness of a roof deck on a historic building.

Michael Vergason, 808 Prince Street, expressed concern about the possibility of basement excavation damaging his house's footings, as well as the issue with the fire stair. Ms. Conkey assured the Vergasons that she will ensure that the fire stair does not damage their house.

Alexander Sant'Antonio, 208 South Alfred Street, spoke in opposition to the roof decks, noting that any visibility would compromise rooflines and establish an inappropriate precedent.

John Harman, owner of 812 Prince Street, agreed with the prior speakers and expressed concern about the weight of the roof decks on the historic structure, and questioned the appropriateness of metal cable railings.

Patrick Wood, 814 Prince Street, agreed with Mr. Sant'Antonio.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Adams praised Ms. Conkey's documentation and noted that the permitting process will deal with any potential structural problems. He has no issue with the cellar but expressed concern with the visibility of the roof decks, noting that they will not be visible from Prince Street. Mr. Adams feels that the architectural character of the property does not lend itself to a roof deck, especially if umbrellas and furniture are added.

Ms. Irwin noted that the lower deck at the rear of the property will not be visible from a public right of way and the cable railings disappear. The minimal design of the roof decks provides a light touch. She has no issue with the design and noted that the BAR does not have purview over neighbor privacy concerns. She expressed general support of the project.

Ms. Neihardt agreed with Mr. Adams.

Mr. Sprinkle noted that the applicant should work closely with Alexandria Archaeology prior to excavating the cellar. He also expressed concern that shoring up the structure could harm to

historic material. Ms. Roberts reminded him that this topic is outside of BAR purview.

Ms. Sennott referenced the Design Guidelines, observing that the proposed roof decks do not interfere with the roofline and do not detract from the historic architecture. She therefore does not oppose the roof decks. She praised Ms. Conkey's designs.

Mr. Spencer had no issue with the project, as the roof decks are minimally visible. He noted that if this were a corner lot, he would oppose the project. As it is not a corner lot, he is in support. He highly recommended that the applicant find a way to make the fire stair self-supporting.

Mr. Spencer moved to approve the project; Ms. Irwin seconded. This motion was denied 4 – 3. Ms. Irwin then moved that the applicant return to the BAR with a substantially different design; that motion passed.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

15. 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

Stephen and Ellen Mitchell, 115 Duke Street, felt that the design for the project seems to be relating to the hotel across the street and the design of the rear of the property appears to be less evolved.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, stated this is an important site as a gateway into the City when approaching from the South. She suggested that 6 4-story townhouses are not appropriate in this location and would rather see 4 3-story townhouses with entrances direct from the sidewalk.

Kathleen and Bruce Oehler, 108 Duke Street, said that they appreciate the effort that the applicant has made towards public outreach.

Yvonne Callahan, 735 Lee Street, supported the comments from Gail Rothrock and feels that the design seems awkward. She asked that the view from the west side of the site be improved and that the building relate more closely to Union Street.

The public comment period was closed

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin agreed with the staff recommendations regarding the design. She felt that building feels too tall and that the proportions are wrong. She suggested that the introduction in varying

heights of entry stoops could help the building relate better to the street. She stated that it is important for the design for the building to be a reflection of the current time and place and that the building should be special. She felt that the height is too tall. The architectural character should be more of the time and place and that the proportions need further development.

Ms. Sennott stated that she felt that the building is too large and should be designed to be more consistent with the smaller neighboring buildings. She noted that the 100 block of Queen Street has more variety of building entrance heights than the proposed design.

Mr. Adams agreed with the previous comments of the other Board members and felt that the proposed design is too tall and massive. He felt that the architectural character could have additional variety but like the approach to the design. He suggested the possibility of adding additional variety in the setback from the street to the various elements.

Mr. Spencer agreed with comments from other Board members. He noted an architectural disconnect between the modern fourth floor element onto the historicist lower portion of the building when the two are being built at the same time. He felt that the entrances are too tall above the grade at Union Street. He suggested that the applicant look at the possibility of using split level interiors to address the issues with the level of the garage at the rear of the site. He suggested that the proportions of the façade are not correct and that this is a result of the height of the first floor. He stated that the designs should not be a direct replica of historic properties.

Ms. Neihardt agreed with comments from other Board members. She felt that the project is too large and massive and that the project is an opportunity to relate to the character of the waterfront.

Mr. Sprinkle felt that the building is reading as one monolithic building rather than individual townhomes. He suggested that the applicant look to 18th and 19th century industrial buildings as a possible design inspiration.

Ms. Irwin suggested that the applicant look for ways in which the history of the specific can be integrated into the design.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

IX. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2020-00600 PG

Request for window and siding replacement at 830 Oronoco Street.

Applicant: Casey Sutherland

BAR #2020-00620 OHAD

Request for alterations at 122 South Fairfax Street.
Applicant: Tom McMurray

BAR #2020-00621 OHAD
Request for window replacement at 1804 West Abingdon Drive #202.
Applicants: Margaret Langer and Joel Agee

BAR #2020-00623 OHAD
Request for door and window replacement at 810 Prince Street.
Applicant: Puscheck LLC

BAR #2020-00624 OHAD
Request for window replacement at 315 South Pitt Street.
Applicant: Peter Verne

BAR #2021-00007 OHAD
Request for repointing at 428 North Washington Street.
Applicant: James Bethard

*******APPROVED MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, February 3, 2021

7:00 p.m., Virtual Public Hearing

Zoom Webinar

Members Present: Christine Roberts, Chair
Purvi Irwin
John Sprinkle
Robert Adams
Lynn Neihardt
Christine Sennott

Members Absent: James Spencer, Vice Chair

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. Mr. Spencer 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 February 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 **January 21, 2020** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the January 21, 2020 meeting, as submitted.

III. ITEMS DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING

3. BAR #2020-00598 OHAD

Request to install small cell facility on a new standalone pole adjacent to 500 South Royal Street.
Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00598.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

4. BAR #2020-00626 OHAD

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 400 South Washington Street.
Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt, and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00626, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused himself.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The applicant work with staff to determine the possibility of painting the subject pole black.

REASON

In General, the Board did not have concerns about the proposal but found that Mr. Milone's request to have the subject pole in black finish a good idea

SPEAKERS

Mr. Stephen Milone, resident at 907 Prince Street, asked the item to be pulled off the consent calendar since he had requests and questions about the project. Mr. Milone requested that the new pole's base be underground and not projecting above grade as shown in the plans, he also requested the wireless boxes to be placed towards the sidewalk side instead of the street's for visibility concerns, and finally he requested the pole to be painted black to match the other poles in the street such as traffic poles and meters.

Mr. Milone also had questions about the viability to have the small cell antennas on the traffic poles instead. Mr. Conkey clarified that the traffic poles were found not resistant enough to support the small cell facilities and discarded by the City as an alternative.

Mr. Schakola, representing Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless, was available to answer questions and clarified that the wireless carrier does not own the pole and has no jurisdiction over Dominion poles, but he could ask Dominion if the pole can be painted black instead

DISCUSSIONS

Ms. Neihardt found Mr. Milone's suggestions relevant but clarified that the BAR does not have authority to act on such. She asked the applicant for the possibility of having Dominion painting the pole black. Mr. Schakola said that he could reach out and make the request to Dominion. There was no more discussion.

2. BAR #2021-00001 OHAD

Request for alterations at 419 North Columbus Street.

Applicants: Robert and Randee Blume

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 #2021-00001, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

V. NEW BUSINESS

3. BAR #2021-00003 PG

Request for alterations at 634 North Alfred Street.

Applicant: Dean Joseph Fajerski

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Mr. Adams and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00003, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-1.

REASON

The Board agreed with the staff recommendations that the roofing may remain but that the windows and door should be replaced to meet the requirements of the Guidelines.

SPEAKERS

Dean Fajerski, Property owner, was available to answer any questions.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, representing HAF, Supported the staff recommendations and inquired about public outreach regarding residents in the historic district.

DISCUSSIONS

Ms. Irwin stated that she was disappointed that this application is for after-the-fact approval. She agreed with the staff recommendation regarding the door and that the 6 over 6 vinyl windows are inappropriate. She stated that she would like to see the asphalt roof replaced with standing seam metal to match the original roofing.

Mr. Sprinkle stated that he agreed with staff recommendations regarding the windows and door.

Ms. Sennott stated that she agreed with the staff recommendations.

Ms. Neihardt stated that she agreed with the comments of her colleagues and staff recommendations.

Mr. Adams stated that he agreed with staff recommendations

Ms. Irwin voted to oppose the motion because she felt that the asphalt shingle roof should be replaced with a standing seam metal roof.

4. BAR #2021-00004 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 414 North Union Street.

Applicant: David L. Charney

5. BAR #2021-00005 OHAD

Request for addition, alterations and waiver of rooftop HVAC screening at 414 North Union Street.

Applicant: David L. Charney

BOARD ACTION: Deferred for Restudy

On a motion by Ms. Irwin, and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR #2021-00004 and BAR #2021-00005, for a restudy. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

N/A

SPEAKERS

Mr. Steve Kulinski, project architect, represented the applicant and answered questions. He advised the Board that the current owner is the original owner, having purchased the property in 1974. The proposed alterations will help him to age in place, transition into retirement, and better utilize the house.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Adams felt that the third-story dormer on the primary/east elevation looks too massive and disrupts the solid/void pattern of the blockface.

Ms. Irwin noted that this dormer glass is taller and bigger than the windows below, therefore creating a heavy feel to the top of the house.

Ms. Sennott felt that the windows look narrow. Mr. Kulinski explained that they are the same size as the existing openings, but the lack of shutters makes them appear smaller.

Ms. Irwin likes the casement windows and the overall direction of the design. However, she felt that the front dormer does not relate to the other windows on the house.

Ms. Sennott felt that the metal cladding of the dormer makes it look off-center and out of alignment. Ms. Irwin agreed that it looks unbalanced.

Mr. Adams' primary concern was the size of the dormer glass; he had no issue with how the dormer relates to what is below. The design is otherwise well done.

Ms. Roberts said the design needs refinement and a better understanding as to how it fits into the neighborhood. She suggested adding divided lites to the dormer.

Ms. Irwin disagreed on the need for divided lites. She was more concerned with the alignment, feeling that if the dormer is better aligned, it may not look so heavy.

Ms. Neihardt asked if the dormer could be pushed back, made to disappear more.

Mr. Adams agreed that recessing the top could help. He liked the second-floor bay and recommended that the architect repeat that bay on the top floor to provide a level of harmony.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

6. Review Updated Roof Policy

Ms. Sample gave a brief presentation outlining the revised roof policy language which was to be integrated into the *BAR Policies for Administrative Approval* document. The Board made minor changes to the proposed language and voted to integrate the policy into the inclusive policy document.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2020-00611 PG
Request for roof replacement at 1607 Princess Street.
Applicant: Mark Smith

BAR #2021-000009 OHAD
Request for roof replacement at 421 Wilkes Street.
Applicant: Indie Grant

BAR #2021-00014 OHAD
Request for roof replacement at 318 Commerce Street.
Applicant: Rick Plotkin

BAR #2021-00018 OHAD
Request for roof replacement at 603 South Lee Street.
Applicant: Ellen McCallie

BAR #2021-00027 OHAD
Request for siding replacement at 315 South Pitt Street.
Applicant: Peter Verne

BAR #2021-00028 PG
Request for roof replacement at 318 North Columbus Street.
Applicant: Colin Young

BAR #2021-00029

Request for roof replacement at 212 South Pitt Street.

Applicant: Nancy Woodford

BAR #2021-00030 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 4 Alexander Street.

Applicant: Margaret Fitzsimmons

BAR #2021-00044 PG

Request for door replacement at 1016 Queen Street.

Applicant: Alan Gordon

*******APPROVED MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, February 17, 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
Christine Sennott

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 February 17, 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 3, 2021** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the February 3, 2021 meeting, as submitted.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

Removed from Consent Calendar

3. BAR #2020-00598 OHAD

Request to install small cell facility on a new standalone pole adjacent to 500 South Royal Street.
Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

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 #2020-00598, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-1. Ms. Neihardt opposed.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

- 1- That the gap between the base and the ground be covered or filled.

REASON

Ms. Roberts removed the item from the consent calendar since an opposing letter from the public was received.

In general, the Board found the proposed standalone pole design appropriate and had no objections to the location but had questions about the pole finishing.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Joshua Schakola, representing Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless, was available to answer questions.

Mr. Craig Miller, resident at 915 Cameron Street, asked Mr. Schakola the dimensions of the equipment box to be mounted on the pole. Mr. Schakola explained that the dimensions are 21.5" D x 22" W x 36.1" H and clarified that the question was referring to other small cell item on the Docket.

Mr. Paul Delay, resident at 511 South Royal Street, stated that he has been living at the location since 1994 and had sent an opposition letter to the Board; he was representing the residents of the 500 block of South Royal Street. He explained that there are only a few utility poles in this block and suggested other possible poles to receive the small cell facility. He also inquired about the existence of an overall strategy plan for the installation of new poles since there are many carriers requiring new poles which can be overwhelming to the city's blocks.

Ms. Roberts explained that one of the poles suggested by Mr. Delay, across the Wilkes Tunnel, is not appropriate for the small cell facility because it carries a high voltage line.

Mr. Conkey explained that the FCC (Federal Communication Commission) establishes the guidelines for small cell locations and provides that multiple carriers cannot utilize the same pole. In addition, the City cannot mandate different providers to work on a common single plan, but the City has established parameters for the use of public spaces and the number of poles allowed per block as example.

Mr. Schakola added that the other poles suggested by Mr. Delay are out of the carrier target area and that the lack of an overall plan is due to the carriers' speculative locations for small cell facilities. Locations cannot be anticipated, but he is willing to provide a map with all the confirmed locations.

DISCUSSIONS

Ms. Neihardt expressed concern with the number of poles being proposed and the City's standards. Mr. Adams also had questions about the gaps shown on the drawings between the base of the pole and the sidewalk and another on the top of the base and the pole master. Ms. Irwin stated that page 24 of the plans shows that the gap between the top of the base and the pole master being covered by a decorative element which was confirmed by Mr. Schakola, but the gap between the base and the ground did not show any coverage. Mr. Spencer suggested that gap to be filled or covered as a condition of approval, which was accepted by Ms. Irwin, who made the motion to approve the project.

4. BAR #2021-00019 OHAD

Request for alterations at 401 Duke Street.
Applicants: David and Anne Ayres

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle, and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00019, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

Removed from Consent Calendar

5. BAR #2021-00021 PG

Request for alterations at 225 North West Street.
Applicants: Matt and Erica Gray

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 #2021-00021, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. That the railings be similar to the railings shown on page 32 of the application, not anchored to the building, with a small plate at the bottom of the posts, and the balusters be spaced with the Code's maximum required distance.

REASON

The Board sympathized with the property owner's concerns and found that a simpler guardrail would be stylistically appropriate for the building since similar guardrails are found all over the historic districts and have minimal visual impact on a building's architectural style.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Matt Gray, the property owner, stated that he acquired the property about a year ago and that he has been improving it over time. He would like to install guardrails on the stoop since he and his wife have had a couple of accidents there; thus they want to prevent accidents from happening again.

DISCUSSIONS

Mr. Adams removed the item from the consent calendar since he believes that the simpler railing

shown on some examples in the application can be acceptable as well the ones suggested by staff. They are not associated with any particular era and don't detract from the building's architectural style.

Ms. Roberts agreed that the simpler railings with pickets should be accepted since they do not compromise the architectural style and are all over the historic districts.

Ms. Irwin stated that she thinks that vertical balusters are acceptable as long they are simple, thin, well-spaced with no details, and no cap or finials on the posts as the one shown in the application page 32. Mr. Spencer agreed and added that the examples shown in the application are much lighter than the one proposed by the applicant. He would add to the motion that the number of balusters be limited to the minimum required by Code.

2. BAR #2021-00032 PG

Request for alterations to previously approved plans at 402 North Fayette Street.

Applicant: Andrew Haas

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle, and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00032, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

IV. ITEM PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED BY THE BOARD

3. BAR #2020-00553 PG

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 215 North Patrick Street.

Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BOARD ACTION: Denied

On a motion by Mr. Adams, and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to deny BAR #2020-00553. The motion carried on a vote of 4-3. Ms. Roberts, Ms. Irwin, and Mr. Spencer opposed the motion.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

N/A

REASON

The Board felt that due to the existing pole's proximity to the 215 North Patrick Street property line and the uncertainty of the exact location of the replacement pole, which has a two feet leeway to the north or south of the existing pole, the proposed pole could possibly end up in front of a historically significant property (211 North Patrick Street) or detract from a possible future structure at 215 North Patrick Street. The Board noted that the application is not clear and raised concerns about the potential negative visual effect of the replacement pole and the small cell facility on the significant historic property. They also expressed concern about the noticing requirements; if the replacement pole is placed to the south of the existing, it will be directly across the property at 214 North Patrick Street which was not notified about the project but would be affected by it in that location.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Joshua Schakola, representing Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless, was available to answer questions.

Mr. Robert Meyers, resident at 311 Alabama Avenue and owner of the property at 222 North Patrick Street, brought up the issue of noticing requirements since he had not received any notification for the proposed project and if the pole replacement were to be placed in a different location, he would never know. He also stated that the 12'-3" height increase plus the height of the antenna, 5'-6" will have a significant visual impact, not only on the property at 215 North Patrick, but on the entire block.

Mr. Jamahl Bracey, property owner and resident at 214 North Patrick, also had concerns about the noticing, claiming the subject pole is directly aligned with his doorstep from which he believes the application's pictures were taken. He feels that he and other neighbors who were not notified will be directly affected by this project. Mr. Bracey said that he is not comfortable with only verbal discussions about the final location of the replacement pole; he thinks that the uncertainty of the final location concerns the residents who will have to live with the small cell in front of their property for a long time.

Mr. Craig Miller, resident and co-owner of the properties 211, 215, and 217 North Patrick Street, stated that there is no 213 North Patrick Street, and that he feels that the proposed project will negatively impact his historic property at 211 North Patrick Street where he resides. He added that the proposed small cell facility will be the tallest approved in the historic district being 13 feet taller than the historic property which violates Article X, Sections (a),(g) and (h) of the City's Zoning Ordinance and therefore must be denied by the BAR. Mr. Miller also clarified that the original site for this facility was at the corner of Cameron and Patrick streets. This location was denied by Dominion and therefore 215 North Patrick is not the preferred location for the location of the small cell facility. Mr. Craig also stated that BAR2009-00295 established precedent in referencing the grandness of the property at 211 North Patrick Street and its unique roofline and architecture. He gave a brief summary of the cultural significance of the property saying that the property at 211 North Patrick was the residence of the first African American doctor in Alexandria who lived at the location from 1943 until he passed away in 1985.

Ms. Lisa Brock, co-owner of the properties at 211, 215 and 217A North Patrick Street, stated that she was very concerned with the discrepancies and incomplete information in the application. It omits existing trees that will be affected by the pole replacement, the actual height of the replacement pole seems to be much taller than the 10 foot increase stated in the application, and the actual location of the pole is different on the architectural drawings. She also had concerns about the incomplete information on the utility standards which are not clear. She opposed the project and asked the Board to deny or defer the project.

Mr. Chris Kuhman, resident at 205 North Patrick Street, had concerns about the structural soundness of the new replacement pole, as the street is prone to accidents and he is concerned that a non-sound structure can potentially cause damage to nearby residences in case of an accident.

Mr. Steven Burke, resident at 1007 Cameron Street, stated that his property's rear will be affected by this project and he has concerns about the height of the new pole which will establish a new standard that can be increased through the time. He finds that the height of the replacement pole

is not appropriate for the historic districts.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts clarified that the project was properly noticed as per the City's Zoning Ordinance requirements. Ms. Roberts also stated that the same application was heard at the January 21 hearing and was deferred for restudy to check the possibility of another pole for the small cell facility or a freestanding pole instead. After listening to the public speakers, Ms. Roberts clarified that the 13 feet height increase for this project includes the small cell facility and does not exceed the height limitation of 50 feet, which was confirmed by Mr. Conkey.

Mr. Schakola explained the results of the restudy, clarifying that a standalone pole at the location is not possible due to overhead wires that zig-zag across the street not allowing the necessary safety and signal transmission requirement for horizontal and vertical clearance (10' and 4'-5' respectively). He also stated that the only possible location that would comply with this requirement is the northwestern corner of North Patrick Street, but the location has underground obstructions which makes the standalone pole installation not feasible.

Ms. Sennott had questions about the importance of this block to the network overall plan, and also about the discrepancy on the maps showing the location of the pole since seemed to her that in the application's picture, the replacement pole is clearly to the south of the property line and in front of 211 North Patrick driveway. Mr. Schakola clarified that if the location is not approved, it might signify a gap in the intended service for the area. This particular location is also a capacity site which alleviates overburdened small cell facilities nearby, where the demand for service is intensified especially now that more people are working from home due to COVID-19.

Mr. Adams stated that even though the proposed small cell facility will be on a pole in front of a vacant lot, the lot could be developed in the future and his recollection was that the Board had already discussed that such facilities should not be located in front of any property but in between properties, so that no house will have an antenna in front of its window or front door. He would like staff to consider all the possible locations including the corner of Cameron or Princess which was previously selected as a possible site for this small cell facility. Mr. Adams also brought up that the replacement pole can be placed to the north of the existing and therefore will be in front of a future building or to the south that will be right in front of the historic property (211 North Patrick Street) driveway and not an alley as stated in the application.

Ms. Irwin questioned if the guidelines address trees that are in private properties as well, since the pole replacement could be one or two feet to the north of the location of the existing pole and could affect the existing mature trees in the vacant lot. She also inquired about the possibility to require that the replacement pole be relocated in the south direction instead. Mr. Schakola answered that the location of the replacement pole is up to Dominion and T&ES standards since there are other factors to be considered. Ms. Irwin also clarified to the public speakers who had concerns about the notice requirements, that the Board is restricted to comply with the Zoning Ordinance and that a recommendation to the City Council can be written requesting modifications to these requirements for larger projects.

Mr. Sprinkle added that the noticing issue is relevant since Dominion has a leeway to replace this pole south of the projecting property line which will directly affect the property right across the street that was not noticed, in this case 214 North Patrick Street. He also stated that the staff report

should consider all properties that will have its viewshed affected by the project and not only the property directly across from it. Ms. Roberts concurred and suggested that staff should include in the staff report the location of significant historic properties at least in a 50' radius of the proposed small cell location.

V. NEW BUSINESS

4. BAR #2021-00013 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 311 Wolfe Street.
Applicants: Charles Kelley and Elisabeth Pearson

5. BAR #2021-00012 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 311 Wolfe Street.
Applicants: Charles Kelley and Elisabeth Pearson

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, and seconded by Mr. Adams, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00012 and BAR #2021-00013, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-1. Mr. Sprinkle opposed.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Include the statements from Alexandria Archaeology, below, in the General Notes of all on all construction documents 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:
 - a. 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.
 - b. The applicant/developer shall not allow any metal detection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

REASON

The Board supported the application as submitted with opposition from Mr. Sprinkle.

SPEAKERS

Patrick Camus, project architect, represented the applicant and was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Sennott asked for clarification regarding the proposed metal grate, which is non-visible from a public right of way.

Mr. Sprinkle questioned if the introduction of a new window and the removal of historic fabric on the primary/south elevation is appropriate.

Mr. Adams said it was odd that there was not a window already in this location. He and Ms. Roberts felt this this new window would be appropriate.

Mr. Spencer noted that this window would provide balance.

6. BAR #2021-00022 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 302 South Saint Asaph Street.

Applicant: John Rock, 302 Saint Asaph LLC

7. BAR #2021-00017 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 302 South Saint Asaph Street.

Applicant: John Rock, 302 Saint Asaph LLC

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 #2021-00017 and BAR #2021-00022, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Approved as submitted

REASON

The Board supported the application as submitted

SPEAKERS

Robert Guynn, architect with Braswell Design Build, was available to answer questions

No Public Comments

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin noted that while the existing kitchen addition may not be original to the building it has gained some amount of historic significance since its original construction date in the 1930's. She asked if there is any remaining historic fabric and if it could be retained.

Mr. Conkey noted that based on site observation, the existing windows and the siding are modern in material and not original to the construction of the addition. He further noted that the construction of the large chimney on the rear wall had removed a significant portion of original material that may have existed.

Mr. Spencer asked the applicant if they were planning to enclose any of the existing windows on the south side of the building. The applicant indicated on a photograph that these had already been enclosed.

Mr. Sprinkle indicated that if Staff determined that there is not sufficient historic material to be retained then he could approve the demolition of the 1930's era addition

8. BAR #2021-00023 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 314 Commerce Street.

Applicants: John and Emily Galer

9. BAR #2021-00020 OHAD

Request for alterations at 314 Commerce Street.

Applicants: John and Emily Galer

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00020 and BAR #2021-00023.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

10. 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 for the applicant, introduced the project.

Lori Hall, architect with Penney Design Group, presented the design for the project.

Board Questions

Ms. Roberts noted that the current zoning for the site is RB and asked what the proposed zone will be. Mr. Wire responded that the applicant is in the process of working with the City to establish the proposed zone for the project.

Ms. Roberts asked where the proposed open space will be on the site. The applicant responded that the open space will be split between the ground and the rooftops.

Ms. Sennott asked about the design for the wall at the north property line. The applicant responded that the wall is planned to be on the property line and that per the building code there are no windows allowed on the property line.

Ms. Roberts asked for clarification on the proposed vehicular access to the site.

Public Comments

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, appreciated the effort on the design but was concerned about the location of a five story building in close proximity to lower historic homes. She further stated that she was concerned about the safety of the use of wood frame construction.

The public comment period was closed.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Adams pointed out that the houses on the opposite side of Columbus Street are low scale and felt that the proposed building should step down further towards Columbus Street. He stated that he is not concerned about the inauthenticity of using townhouse elements as a design precedent

for the lower part of the building. This area of the city was a residential area, not industrial so the use of residential architecture as a precedent would be more appropriate. He would like to see greater delineation of the building entry.

Mr. Spencer expressed concern about the use of industrial buildings as a design precedent for the lower portion of the building, he further noted that the proposed proportions are not compatible with the adjacent historic buildings. He stated that he would prefer to see a two story lower portion of the building instead of the proposed three stories. He felt that the proposed building design works with the adjacent hotel but does not work with the residential buildings. He mentioned that he does not feel that the building needs to look like historic townhomes but that it should be compatible with them. The proposed background building is too flat as currently designed and should be different but related to the lower portion of the building. He stated that a stronger entry would help to give a focal point to the building.

Ms. Neihardt stated that she felt that the proposed building is too tall as designed. She agreed that the industrial precedent is not appropriate for this neighborhood. She would like to see additional variation in the design of bays along the lower portion of the building.

Ms. Sennott was concerned about locating a three story portion of the building directly across the street from the low scale historic townhomes. She felt that the proposed building is missing the life and character of the Portner's Landing building that was used as a design precedent. She stated that the building felt like a commercial building in a residential neighborhood.

Ms. Irwin stated that the building needs to have a more defined building entrance. She felt that the lower portion and the background building should be different but should be connected in some way. She asked the architect if the photos in the streetscape are the correct scale because the home across Columbus Street are actually 2 ½ stories and are appearing smaller than that. She suggested that the architect prepare site sections to include these properties to demonstrate the relationship between the proposed building and the smaller townhouses. These drawings could indicate that three stories is appropriate near the 2 ½ story buildings if they are drawn accurately.

Mr. Sprinkle stated that too much of the site open space is on the alley side of the site and that it could be reconfigured to locate the mass of the building adjacent to the hotel and would create a deeper court. He felt that the proposed design is too tall but that through moving the building closer to the hotel the applicant could maintain the building density.

Ms. Roberts had concerns about the height relative to the townhouses on the opposite side of Columbus Street and suggested that the applicant add variation to the proximity of the building to the sidewalk. She agreed with Mr. Sprinkle that the massing of the building should be shifted towards the hotel to free up space along Columbus Street. She asked the applicant to propose a building that does not pretend to have historic and new elements.

Mr. Sprinkle suggested that the applicant look to educational buildings that were previously located in the area as a possible design precedent that has a direct connection to the site.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2021-00011 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 707 South Lee Street.

Applicant: James Szostek

BAR #2021-00016 OHAD

Request for door replacement at 309 Franklin Street.

Applicant: Mary Beth Long

BAR #2021-00025 OHAD

Request for garage replacement at 801 South Pitt Street.

Applicant: Saint Asaph Square Condominium

BAR #2021-00045 PG

Request for window replacement at 1020 Queen Street.

Applicant: Adam Hernandez

BAR #2021-00050 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 733 South Pitt Street.

Applicant: Rebecca Maggard

BAR #2021-00055 OHAD

Request for fencing at 610 South Lee Street.

Applicant: Cayley Tullman

BAR #2021-00056 PG

Request for repointing at 119 South Henry Street.

Applicant: Paul Swartz

BAR #2021-00063 OHAD

Request for lantern replacement at 309 Wolfe Street.

Applicant: Michelle Patterson

*******APPROVED 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

*******APPROVED MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, March 17, 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
Christine Sennott

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 March 17, 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.

*Please note: On March 17, the Alexandria City Council Special Meeting will be broadcast live on government Channel 70. Due to this, the Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing will not be broadcast on Channel 70 or streamed live on the City's website.

II. MINUTES

2. Consideration of the minutes from the **February 17, 2021** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the February 17, 2021 meeting, as amended.

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

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the March 3, 2021 meeting, as submitted.

III. DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING

4. **BAR #2020-00533 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 108 Gibbon Street.

Applicants: Benedict and Carol Capuco

5. **BAR #2020-00532 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 108 Gibbon Street.

Applicants: Benedict and Carol Capuco

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00532 and BAR #2020-00533.

6. **BAR #2021-00023 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 314 Commerce Street.

Applicants: John and Emily Galer

7. **BAR #2021-00020 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 314 Commerce Street.

Applicants: John and Emily Galer

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00020 and BAR #2021-00023.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

8. **BAR #2021-00066 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 105 North Union Street.

Applicant: City of Alexandria

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00066, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

V. ITEM PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED BY THE BOARD

9. BAR #2020-00396 PG

Request for new construction at 1413 Princess Street.

Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

10. BAR #2020-00412 PG

Request for new construction at 1415 Princess Street.

Applicant: Deyi Awadallah

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00396 and BAR #2020-00412.

REASON

The Board felt the two townhouses should have more variations in the design and the architectural elements should be more refined.

SPEAKERS

Deyi Awadallah, applicant, available for questions

Ashley Clearman, applicant, presented project and available for questions

Michael Stauber, 1401 Princess St., neighbor, communicated with applicant and agreed with the proposed setback. He also stated that design is not compatible with neighbors.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Neihardt was in support of the design and liked the staggered site plan.

Ms. Sennott expressed concerns about the mirrored facades but stated that the design fit into the overall neighborhood.

Mr. Spencer discussed the diversity of the architecture in the neighborhood and stated that the cornice could use refinement.

Ms. Irwin and Mr. Sprinkle expressed that this project is an opportunity for a unique design and the cornice need more development.

Mr. Adams stated that the middle building should be a different design or pushed back further.

11. BAR #2021-00004 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 414 North Union Street.

Applicant: David L. Charney

12. BAR #2021-00005 OHAD

Request for addition, alterations, and waiver of rooftop HVAC screening at 414 North Union Street.

Applicant: David L. Charney

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00004 and BAR #2021-00005.

REASON

The Board felt that the design needed more refinement, especially in regards to the third-floor dormer and penthouse.

SPEAKERS

Steve Kulinski, project architect, represented the applicant, gave a brief presentation, and was available to answer questions.

R.L. Sheedy, 1311 Prince Street, spoke on behalf of the Historic Alexandria Foundation. She supported the comments and letter provided by Al Cox and felt that the case should be deferred to allow the architect to create a more coherent design. She also noted that the Board should reconsider roof decks in general and come up with a set policy.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Adams liked the style and the details but felt that the top window was too big and the roof deck railing should be pushed back.

Ms. Sennott thought that the applicant answered the Board's comments from the previous hearing, noting that the latest design is more balanced and symmetrical. She also indicated that the top floor dormer is still a bit too large.

Mr. Spencer liked the project but felt that the top dormer still appears a bit top heavy.

Ms. Irwin noted that the top window looks overbearing and too heavy. She did like the changes to the rooftop elements and windows.

Mr. Sprinkle thought that the new design should be more respectful to the original 1970s design.

Ms. Neihardt opposed the top dormer, saying that it looks like a shed dormer. She felt that the penthouse is too much and out of character of the neighborhood.

Ms. Roberts also felt that the top dormer is too heavy and out of context, recommending that it be scaled back.

VI. NEW BUSINESS**13. BAR #2021-00071 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 124 South West Street.
Applicant: King West Properties Inc., William B. Hatherill

14. BAR #2021-00070 OHAD

Request for alterations at 124 South West Street.
Applicant: King West Properties Inc., William B. Hatherill

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00070 and BAR #2021-00071, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board found the alterations to be appropriate.

SPEAKERS

Steve Kulinski, the architect, was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

None

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2021-00043 OHAD

Request for alterations at 312 South Washington Street.

Applicant: MVP Equities Fund II LLC

Bar #2021-00073 PG

Request for alterations at 720 North Columbus Street.

Applicants: Meredith and Michael Selby

BAR #2021-00087 OHAD

Request for alterations at 30 Alexander Street.

Applicants: Angela Cordle and Robert Barbour

BAR #2021-00090 OHAD

Request for door replacements at 824 South Pitt Street.

Applicant: Even Taran

BAR #2021-00093 PG

Request for alterations at 615 North Columbus Street.

Applicant: Del Bagno

BAR #2021-00094 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 1251 East Abingdon Drive #1122.

Applicant: Alan Eyres

BAR #2021-00095 PG

Request for fencing at 1611 Princess Street.

Applicant: Tamara Adams

BAR #2021-00099 OHAD

Request for signage replacement at 111 Franklin Street.

Applicant: Kirby Newman

BAR #2021-00105 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 426 North Union Street.

Applicant: Jim Murphy

BAR #2021-00106 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 114 Commerce Street.

Applicant: Catherine Christ

BAR #2021-00109 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 1209 Michigan Court.

Applicant: Kalpish Meha

BAR #2021-00116 PG

Request for shed at 513 North Columbus Street.

Applicant: Thomas Wise

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

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, April 7, 2021

7:00 p.m., Virtual Public Hearing

Zoom Webinar

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

Members Absent: John Sprinkle

Secretary: William Conkey, AIA, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Amirah Lane, Historic Preservation Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Sprinkle 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 17, 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 **March 17, 2021** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the March 17, 2021 meeting, as submitted.

III. DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING

3. **BAR #2021-00098 OHAD**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 119 South Fairfax Street.
Applicant: A.L. Freed Railroad Development, LLC

4. BAR #2021-00081 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 119 South Fairfax Street.
Applicant: A.L. Freed Railroad Development, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00081 and BAR #2021-00098.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

5. BAR #2021-00108 OHAD

Request for alterations at 600 South Union Street.
Applicant: City of Alexandria

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 #2021-00108, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

V. ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED

6. BAR #2020-00500 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 1309 Prince Street.
Applicants: Mark and Lauren Shanks

7. BAR #2020-00502 OHAD

Request for alterations at 1309 Prince Street.
Applicants: Mark and Lauren Shanks

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00500 and BAR #2021-00502, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The windows comply with the *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications in the Historic Districts*
2. Bricks removed from the building be saved and used to patch around the revised door location and below the sill of the modified window.
3. If the applicant chooses to construct a new chimney, they should work with staff on the design for this chimney and utilize bricks removed during the demolition of the existing chimney.

REASON

The Board found that the proposed modifications are minimally visible and are appropriate for the

age and design of the structure. The Board found that the existing chimney is not a character defining feature for the structure due to its configuration and limited visibility from a public right of way. As such, the Board approved the demolition of the existing chimney.

SPEAKERS

Mark Shanks, applicant, gave a brief presentation and was available to answer questions

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, representing the Historic Alexandria Foundation, appreciated the revised, reduced scope of the project and supported the staff recommendations with the exception that she felt that the existing chimney should remain in place.

RL Sheedy, 1311 Prince Street, appreciated the revised design which does not modify the Prince Street elevation, keeping the appearance of the historic triplet intact. She expressed concern regarding the location of interior plumbing fixtures within the party wall and asked the applicant to provide a construction schedule

Stephen Milone, 907 Prince Street, appreciated the revised, reduced scope of the project and stated that the existing chimney should remain in place.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin thanked the applicant for revising the design in response to the Board's previous comments. She stated that the chimney proposed to be removed is minimally visible and not a significant part of the design of the structure.

Mr. Spencer agreed with Ms. Irwin that due to the limited visibility of the existing chimney, it is not a character defining feature.

Ms. Neihardt felt that the chimney should be retained.

Ms. Sennott agreed that the chimney is minimally visible but was concerned about the Design Guidelines' recommendation that chimney should remain in situ.

Mr. Adams was happy to see the applicant return to the Board with a revised scope and asked if it would be possible to construct a new chimney using bricks from the chimney to be demolished.

Ms. Roberts questioned whether an element that is minimally visible can be considered a character defining feature, allowing for its removal within the framework of the Design Guidelines.

Mr. Spencer stated that the existing chimney is not unique in design or a character defining feature for the structure.

8. BAR #2020-00533 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 108 Gibbon Street.
Applicants: Benedict and Carol Capuco

9. BAR #2020-00532 OHAD

Request for alterations at 108 Gibbon Street.
Applicants: Benedict and Carol Capuco

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00532 and BAR #2021-00533.

REASON

The Board felt that the proposed dormer was too large and overwhelmed the size of the roof.

SPEAKERS

Steve Kulinski, project architect, represented the applicant, gave a brief presentation and was available to answer questions.

Marianne Talbot, 104 Gibbon Street, stated that her property is directly adjacent to the subject property and would be most effected by the proposed construction. She stated that the proposed dormer would be visible from Union Street and would be a significant change to the character of this property and other adjacent properties. She was also concerned about the loss of privacy once the dormer is completed.

Yvonne Callahan, 735 South Lee Street, stated that this proposal would replace a large blank roof with an expanse of windows and sliding door. She was concerned about the size of the dormer and the amount of glazing.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, stated that she was concerned about the size of the proposed dormer and that this could create a precedent for additional projects.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin noted that this dormer is unique in that it is not on an elevation that is directly adjacent to the public right of way, it is set back from the street and faces directly onto a courtyard. She felt that the proportions for the dormer were compatible with the building and that due to the limited visibility the project should be approved.

Mr. Adams was concerned about the large size of the dormer and asked if it would be possible to reduce the size by eliminating the northern portion.

Ms. Neihardt agreed that the size of the dormer is too large for the building and asked if the proportion of solid to void could be altered to make it smaller and more compatible.

Mr. Spencer questioned the asymmetry of the design for the dormer and asked if a gable roof form would work.

Ms. Sennott stated that she felt that the proportions for the dormer are compatible with the rest of the building. She indicated that she could approve the design as submitted.

Ms. Roberts noted that there were concerns about the proposed design and asked the applicant if he would a deferral in order to address these concerns.

10. BAR #2020-00616 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 208 South Payne Street.

Applicant: Alabama Avenue LC

11. BAR #2020-00615 OHAD

Request for alterations at 208 South Payne Street.

Applicant: Alabama Avenue LC

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00615 and BAR #2021-00616, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The applicant work with staff to refine the rear deck design
2. The brick chimney be retained
3. The two new windows in the easternmost bay of the north elevation have one-over-one light configuration and comply with the *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications in the Historic Districts*. The other new window on that elevation may have a six-over-six configuration.

REASON

The Board was pleased with the project and agreed with staff recommendations. The Board agreed that the chimney, which is visible from the public alley, is a character defining feature that must be preserved.

SPEAKERS

Steve Kulinski, the project architect, stated that keeping the chimney was not part of the plan and that, in his opinion, it is not a character defining feature, he stated that the chimney is not associated with a fireplace, but a boiler. Mr. Kulinski was available to answer questions.

Ms. Gail Rothrock, resident at 209 Duke Street, spoke against the removal of the chimney which she considers a character defining feature.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin asked if the property's siding on the front elevation was original. Mr Kulinski clarified that it is not.

The Board agreed that the chimney is a character defining feature which should be preserved due to the visibility from the public alley. There was no further discussion.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

12. BAR #2020-00603 OHAD

Request for alterations at 712 South Alfred Street.
Applicant: Stephan Heidenhain

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00603, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Applicant must replace the first story vinyl picture window with a window of a material other than vinyl that has two vertical muntins, visually dividing the window into three parts. When the second floor windows are replaced they must meet the requirements of *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications in the Historic Districts*.

REASON

The Board felt that replacing the ground floor picture window would bring the appearance closer to the original.

SPEAKERS

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke, noted that the Board is reviewing many after-the-fact applications and recommended that staff mail two letters of notification each year instead of just one. She felt that the large window on the first floor was a mistake and provided suggestions as to how to minimize its appearance. She said the upstairs windows were fine. She asked the Board to recommend that any replacement window have a central vertical muntin. She also expressed concern over staff's recommendation to treat this community in a similar manner to the Parker Gray Historic District.

Steve Milone, 907 Prince, echoed Ms. Rothrock's comments. He recommended that any future windows be of a material other than vinyl.

DISCUSSION

The Chair noted that the Board had approved a similar window project in the Old and Historic District where the façade was 12' from the property line; in this case the façade is 27' from the property line.

Ms. Neihardt thought the staff comparison to Parker Gray was odd. She recommended replacing the single pane, non-operable first floor window with an appropriate non-vinyl window.

Mr. Spencer agreed with Ms. Neihardt.

Mr. Adams complimented the staff on the history of the property and suggested that the first floor window be replaced with a triple window, closer to the original design. He would like to see the second windows replaced with casements.

Ms. Irwin noted that none of the original windows in this community remain in place; they are all now double hung sash. She agreed with Mr. Adams about replacing the lower window but felt it would look odd to replace that one and leave the others as is.

Ms. Sennott agreed with staff recommendations to approve the application with the condition that future windows be of a material other than vinyl.

Mr. Spencer noted that replicating the original steel window pattern with wood would not be successful and would look clunky.

Ms. Neihardt moved that the applicant replace the single vinyl window with a wood divided window and leave the upstairs windows as is. Future upstairs windows should meet the Design Guidelines. Mr. Spencer seconded.

Ms. Irwin then made an amendment, requesting that the applicant replace the first floor window with a fixed pane window with two thinner vertical muntins. Ms. Neihardt accepted the amendment and Mr. Spencer seconded.

13. BAR #2021-00085 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 203 Strand Street (Parcel Map ID: 075.03-0B-00).
Applicants: IDI Strand, L.C. and Trae Lamond

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended

On a motion by Mr. Neihardt and seconded by Ms. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00085, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The applicant should move forward with Option 2 in the submission
2. The windows comply with the *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications in the Historic Districts*.

REASON

The Board found that the proposed balcony and modifications to the north elevation are in keeping with the warehouse nature of the historic building and are similar to balconies on other historic properties of a similar age. They further found that Option 2 as submitted has the least impact on the historic fabric while also not impeding the use of the alley.

SPEAKERS

Bob Brandt, attorney representing the applicant, introduced the project and was available to answer questions

Mike Ernst, architect with Rust Orling, gave a brief presentation and was available to answer any questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts asked the applicant why two versions of the design for the balcony have been submitted. Mr. Ernst responded that Option 1 would attach to the existing building structure and Option 2 would be freestanding with support provided by columns against the exterior wall.

Ms. Roberts stated that she preferred Option 2 because it allows for the lightest possible touch on the historic fabric and asked the applicant if they would be able to commit to this option. Mr. Ernst responded that the applicant would prefer to have flexibility regarding the options pending additional exploration of the soil bearing capacity.

Mr. Adams stated that he was comfortable with the design and would defer to staff regarding the structural questions.

Ms. Irwin stated that she supported the design and prefers Option 2 because of the limited effect on the historic fabric.

Mr. Spencer expressed concern about the ability to connect to the existing building structure and therefore preferred Option 2.

Ms. Roberts stated that she preferred Option 2 for similar reasons regarding the effect of the work on the existing structure.

Ms. Neihardt agreed with the comments of her colleagues.

14. BAR #2021-00092 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 508 North Washington Street.

Applicant: Anne Toth

15. BAR #2021-00091 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 508 North Washington Street.

Applicant: Anne Toth

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00091 and BAR #2021-00092, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The chimney must be constructed without a corbel.

REASON

The Board supported the proposed design without the corbel on the chimney.

SPEAKERS

Bill Cromley, designer, representing the applicant, provided a presentation and was available to answer questions.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke, supported the renovation to match the twin next door but was concerned with the proposed bay window addition.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Adams supports the design, including the bay window.

Ms. Irwin asked for clarification regarding the treatment at the top of the chimney and expressed a preference for the bay to touch the ground rather than cantilever from the wall

Ms. Neihardt supports the design, including the bay and preferred the chimney with the corbel.

Ms. Sennott and Mr. Spencer expressed concerns about the bay window.

16. BAR #2021-00121 PG

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 1215 and 1215 ½ Queen Street.
Applicant: Donald D. Devers

17. BAR #2021-00123 PG

Request for addition and alterations at 1215 and 1215 ½ Queen Street.
Applicant: Donald D. Devers

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00121 and BAR #2021-00123.

REASON

The Board request more information regarding the history of the garage.

SPEAKERS

Lyndl Johnson, architect, represented applicant, provided a presentation which included the statement that in order to consolidate the lots the garage must be removed. She was further available for questions.

DISCUSSION (*combined discussion with 1213 Queen Street*)

Mr. Spencer stated that the pediment is heavy, and odd with proposed 2\2 windows. The new design is too stylistic. The 1st floor windows should be taller, and the garage should be rehabbed.

Ms. Sennott said the facades are too ornate, and she is ok with the demolition of the garage based on its age.

Ms. Irwin stated that the garage is older than house and should be retained. If the façade is going to change than it should reflect design in 2021.

Mr. Adams said he could support the retention or demolition of the garage. He supports the façade and downspouts.

Ms. Neihardt supports the façade alterations and is concerned about demolition of the garage and thinks it should be restored if it's a character defining feature.

18. BAR #2021-00125 PG

Request for alterations at 1213 Queen Street.
Applicant: Donald D. Devers

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00125.

REASON

The applicant requested to defer the discussion, so it can be heard in conjunction with 1215 – ½ Queen Street at a later date.

SPEAKERS

Lyndl Johnson, architect, represented applicant

DISCUSSION (*combined discussion with 1215 ½ Queen Street*)

Mr. Spencer stated that the pediment is heavy, and odd with proposed 2\2 windows. The new design is too stylistic. The 1st floor windows should be taller, and the garage should be rehabbed.

Ms. Sennott said the facades are too ornate, and she is ok with the demolition of the garage based on its age.

Ms. Irwin stated that the garage is older than house and should be retained. If the façade is going to change than it should reflect design in 2021.

Mr. Adams said he could support the retention or demolition of the garage. He supports the façade and downspouts.

Ms. Neihardt supports the façade alterations and is concerned about demolition of the garage and thinks it should be restored if it's a character defining feature.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

19. Discussion on By-Laws

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

IX. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2021-00075 OHAD

Request for door replacement at 603 South Saint Asaph Street.

Applicant: John M. Sollosi

BAR #2021-00097 OHAD

Request for alterations at 1309 Prince Street.

Applicant: Mark Shanks

BAR #2021-00107 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 618 South Saint Asaph Street.

Applicant: Cathy Pharis

BAR #2021-00118 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 417 Wilkes Street.
Applicant: John Mazor

BAR #2021-00119 OHAD
Request for roof replacement at 419 Wilkes Street.
Applicant: John Garrett Burke

BAR #2021-00127 PG
Request for roof replacement at 814 Cameron Street.
Applicant: Richard Beaudette

BAR #2021-00129 OHAD
Request for window and door replacement at 920 Pete Jones Way.
Applicant: Agnieszka Nawalaniec

BAR #2021-00130 PG
Request for fencing at 1321 Cameron Street.
Applicant: Mounsif Tolab

BAR #2021-00131 OHAD
Request for repointing at 209 North Fairfax Street.
Applicant: Al Baharmast

BAR #2021-00137 OHAD
Request for window and door replacement at
Applicant: Ghassen Zouari

BAR #2021-00138 PG
Request for fencing at 419 North Alfred Street.
Applicant: Alan Bondzio

BAR #2021-00145 OHAD
Request for window replacement at 211 Wilkes Street.
Applicant: Joseph Bojanowski

BAR #2021-00146 OHAD
Request for roof replacement at 423 Wilkes Street.
Applicant: Eion Kelley

BAR #2021-00156 OHAD
Request for window replacement at 205 Princess Street.
Applicant: Sarah Koll

BAR #2021-00161 OHAD
Request for roof replacement at 701 Rose Square.
Applicant: Susan Young

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

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, April 21, 2021

7:00 p.m., Virtual Public Hearing

Zoom Webinar

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

Members Absent: Christine Sennott
Robert Adams

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 and Mr. Adams were absent. All other members were present at the meeting by video conference.

Ms. Roberts stated that Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic emergency, the April 21, 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 **April 7, 2021** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the April 7, 2021 meeting, as amended.

III. DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING

3. **BAR #2021-00143 PG**

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 425 North Alfred Street.
Applicant: 425 North Alfred Street, LLC

4. BAR #2021-00142 PG

Request for alterations at 425 North Alfred Street.
Applicant: 425 North Alfred Street, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00142 and BAR #2021-00143.

5. BAR #2021-00139 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 24 Wolfe Street.
Applicant: 55 LLC

6. BAR #2021-00140 OHAD

Request for alterations at 24 Wolfe Street.
Applicant: 55 LLC

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00139 and BAR #2021-00140.

IV. ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED

7. BAR #2021-00088 OHAD

Request for alterations at 720 South Alfred Street.
Applicants: Mary Ritley-White and TJ White

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00088, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Approved with the recommendation that when replacing the front door in the future, but before the property changes hands, the replacement be a six-panel door to match the original.

REASON

The Board felt that staff's recommendation was too broad and difficult to enforce. However, the Board found that the replacement door design is not too modern, nor does it conflict with the building's architecture, which otherwise would require immediate replacement.

SPEAKERS

Ms. Ritley-White, the property owner was available to answer questions.

Ms. R.L. Sheedy, 1311 Prince, representing the Historic Alexandria Foundation, spoke against

staff's recommendation. She stated that allowing after-the-fact work to remain sets a bad precedent and discourages property owners to do the right thing. She also said that staff should send out more information more frequently about the Design Guidelines and BAR procedures to property owners in the historic districts, so they become familiar with the requirements and process.

DISCUSSION

The Board found it odd that they have been seen so many after-the-fact applications for properties in this block. In general, the Board found that the houses in this neighborhood have changed throughout the years, and it is difficult to enforce small changes such as doors or windows replaced several years ago.

Ms. Roberts acknowledged Ms. Sheedy's concerns and agreed that staff should do more outreach work.

Ms. Irwin stated that she walked around the block and noticed that only one house has its original windows, and that most houses have replacement doors and windows. She also said that the subject property door replacement is not too modern or incompatible with the building's architecture; therefore, she was fine with staff's recommendation.

Mr. Spencer agreed with Ms. Irwin but suggested a timeline for the door to be replaced since properties change hands often and it would be difficult to enforce the compliance of the recommendation. Mr. Spencer's suggestion was accepted as a motion amendment which was approved unanimously.

8. BAR #2021-00098 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 119 South Fairfax Street.
Applicant: A.L. Freed Railroad Development, LLC

9. BAR #2021-00081 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 119 South Fairfax Street.
Applicant: A.L. Freed Railroad Development, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00081 and BAR #2021-00098, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Historic bricks may be used to construct the addition provided it has modern brick detailing and a date stone;
2. That the adjacent property owner at 117 S. Fairfax Street be permitted to repoint the south wall of their property and that it be completed in a timely manner, prior to the start of construction on the subject property;
3. That the gap created between 117 and 119 S. Fairfax Street be weather proofed;
4. Work with staff on the structural connection to the existing historic building;

5. Include the statements from Alexandria Archaeology, below, in the General Notes of all on all construction documents 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:
 - a. 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.
 - b. The applicant/developer shall not allow any metal detection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

REASON

The Board felt that the addition was stylistically appropriate but added conditions to ensure that the addition clearly reads as an early addition, allowing for the use of historic bricks but recommending modern brick detailing and a date stone. The Board felt that the amount of demolition was very minimal and allowed for a “light touch” on the historic building.

SPEAKERS

Bill Cromley, representing the applicant, described the project and spoke in support of the project.

Minturn Wright, 124 S. Royal Street, speaking on behalf of 117 S. Fairfax St., said that the south wall of 117 needs to be repaired before construction begins.

Gail Rothrock, HAF, spoke in opposition to the project because it did not meet the Demolition criteria and that the addition was not consistent with requirements for new construction.

Yvonne Callahan, 724 S. Lee Street, said that she had questions about the status of the private alley and believed it may instead be considered a public alley.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Cromley said that the owners of 117 S. Fairfax would be able to repoint/repair their wall before construction begins on the project and that he didn’t object to the alley becoming public in the future. Mr. Cromley said that it was his intent to use historic salvaged brick on the addition.

Mr. Sprinkle asked about visibility from the fire station because it was a publicly owned building and noted that the design of the addition responds to the context. He said that he liked the use of historic bricks but suggested some variation in mortar color or profile to distinguish the new addition.

Ms. Irwin said that the design is representative of a historic building but the use of historic brick may give the false impression that the new addition is actually historic. She said the building should read as a later, contemporary addition.

Ms. Sennot said that she appreciated the use of historic brick and suggested that a date stone be installed to identify the addition as new construction.

Ms. Neihardt said that she liked the addition and the minimal amount of demolition.

Mr. Spencer suggested using jack arches, not headers, to distinguish the new addition.

V. NEW BUSINESS

10. BAR #2021-00158 OHAD

Request for alterations at 714 South Alfred Street.

Applicant: Lauren Oliphant

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00158, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The applicant must either replace the first-floor window with an SDL tripartite window with vertical muntins or replace all windows with a configuration matching the original steel casement. If windows are replaced to replicate the original, they may be fiberglass or aluminum. The upper windows may remain as is until replaced or the property is sold. Any future replacement windows must comply with Board of Architectural Review *Design Guidelines*.

REASON

The Board heard a similar case at the previous hearing for the property next door and wanted to be consistent with that case. They therefore made the same recommendations.

SPEAKERS

The applicant was available to answer questions. She noted that when she purchased the property in October of 2020 the existing windows were in place. She contacted two previous owners who did not know when these windows were installed.

R.L. Sheedy, 1311 Prince, representing the Historic Alexandria Foundation, expressed frustration at the increase in after-the-fact applications and recommended that staff provide more frequent notification to property owners that they are in a historic district and must follow district guidelines.

DISCUSSION

Several Board members discussed Ms. Sheedy's opinion regarding historic district notification.

The Chair and Ms. Irwin noted that they had visited the neighborhood and found its variety interesting.

Ms. Neihardt felt that, to be equitable, this applicant should have to comply with the same conditions as the applicant for 712 South Alfred. Mr. Spencer agreed.

Ms. Irwin said she thought that the applicant should be permitted to return the windows to their original configuration. These windows could be aluminum or fiberglass – not necessarily steel.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

11. Review small cell policy.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 9:32 p.m.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2021-00082 OHAD
Request for fencing at 1005 Duke Street.
Applicant: Leo Metz

BAR #2021-00133 OHAD
Request for window replacement at 705 Ford's Landing Way.
Applicant: Leslie Beavers

BAR #2021-00149 PG
Request for alterations at 425 North Alfred Street.
Applicant: 425 N ALFRED ST LLC

BAR #2021-00153 OHAD
Request for gate replacement at 1011 Duke Street.
Applicants: Kristen Brady and Kumar Patel

BAR #2021-00155 OHAD
Request for window replacement at 805 Chetworth Place.
Applicant: Andrew Scott

BAR #2021-00157 PG
Request for window replacement at 602 North Columbus Street.
Applicant: M&M Building Investments

BAR #2021-00160 OHAD
Request for repointing at 229 South Payne Street.
Applicant: Alan Young

BAR #2021-00162 OHAD
Request for repointing at 313 Queen Street.
Applicant: Marti Kubik

BAR #2021-00163 PG
Request for siding replacement at 418 North Payne Street.
Applicant: Kevin Williamson

BAR #2021-00164 OHAD

Request for alterations at 736 Ford's Landing Way.

Applicant: Sara Chadason

BAR #2021-00169 PG

Request for roof replacement at 322 North Columbus Street.

Applicant: James Foggo

BAR #2021-00171 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 605 South Lee Street.

Applicant: Mary Page Hickey

BAR #2021-00172 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 222 South Alfred Street.

Applicant: John Weyrich

BAR #2021-00173 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 827 South Royal Street.

Applicant: Michael Courtney

BAR #2021-00176 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 401 North Lee Street.

Applicant: Lisa Blumerman

BAR #2021-00181 OHAD

Request for alterations at 109 Duke Street.

Applicant: Martha Peterson

BAR #2021-00182 OHAD

Request for alterations at 127 North Washington Street.

Applicant: Lori Alexander

BAR #2021-00184 OHAD

Request for siding replacement at 404 Gibbon Street.

Applicant: Chris Kurowski

BAR #2021-00189 PG

Request for signage at 809 Cameron Street.

Applicant: Jessica Hill

BAR #2021-00190 OHAD

Request for shed installation at 116 South Payne Street.

Applicant: Barry Stauffer

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

Board of Architectural Review

Monday, May 3, 2021

7:00 p.m., Virtual Public Hearing

Zoom Webinar

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

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

BOARD ACTION: Approved

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the resolution. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

II. MINUTES

3. Consideration of the minutes from the **April 21, 2021** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the April 21, 2021 meeting, as submitted.

III. DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING

4. BAR #2021-00139 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 24 Wolfe Street.
Applicant: 55 LLC

5. BAR #2021-00140 OHAD

Request for alterations at 24 Wolfe Street.
Applicant: 55 LLC

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00139 and BAR #2021-00140.

6. BAR #2021-00152 OHAD

Request for signage at 200 Commerce Street.
Applicant: Mutual Ice Holding Company, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00152.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

7. BAR #2021-00165 OHAD

Request for alterations at 117 Quay Street.
Applicants: Hans and Leslie Wechsel

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 #2021-00165, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

V. ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED

8. BAR #2021-00121 PG

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 1215 and 1215 ½ Queen Street.
Applicant: Donald D. Devers

9. BAR #2021-00123 PG

Request for addition and alterations at 1215 and 1215 ½ Queen Street.
Applicant: Donald D. Devers

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00121 and BAR #2021-00123.

REASON

The Board requested more information regarding potential methods to rehabilitate the garage (or its materials) and additional detailing for the façade.

SPEAKERS

Lyndl Johnson, architect, represented applicant.

DISCUSSION *(combined discussion with 1213 Queen Street)*

Mr. Spencer asked for clarification in the installation of fences on both properties, re-grading of the front yard, and paver application. He also stated the windows may be better in three sections and that if the cornice was raised it would help the composition of the façade. He does not support the removal of the garage and noted that molded CMU is not readily available.

Ms. Neihardt stated that she would prefer to see the garage retained.

Mr. Adams stated he appreciated the revisions to the houses and likes the door pediments. He asked if the ground floor windows match the second-floor windows and if the roof slope would be changed. He also asked if the molded CMU could be used elsewhere on the property.

Mr. Sprinkle asked for clarification about a horizontal bridging piece connecting the rear of the properties. Ms. Johnson explained that this is a gutter and will be removed.

Ms. Irwin asked if the proposed casement windows could be fixed windows to match the second-floor. She also expressed concern about demolishing the garage because it is a unique outbuilding. She supported raising the parapet to include the gutter and suggested a simplified version of the cornice would be better. She agreed with Mr. Adams about the door pediments.

Ms. Sennott agreed with the design suggestions of the Board and stated that limited original material on the garage is present. She asked if it was a way to preserve the molded CMU.

10. BAR #2021-00125 PG

Request for alterations at 1213 Queen Street.

Applicant: Donald D. Devers

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00125.

REASON

The applicant requested to defer the discussion, so it can be heard in conjunction with 1215 – ½ Queen Street at a later date.

SPEAKERS

Lyndl Johnson, architect, represented applicant

DISCUSSION *(combined discussion with 1215 ½ Queen Street)*

Mr. Spencer asked for clarification in the installation of fences on both properties, re-grading of the front yard and paver application. He also stated the windows may be better in three sections and that if the cornice was raised it would help the composition of the façade. He does not support the removal of the garage and noted that molded CMU is not readily available.

Ms. Neihardt stated that she would prefer to see the garage retained.

Mr. Adams stated he appreciated the revisions to the houses and likes the door pediments. He

asked if the ground floor windows match the second-floor windows and if the roof slope would be changed. He also asked if the molded CMU could be used elsewhere on the property.

Mr. Sprinkle asked for clarification about a horizontal bridging piece connecting the rear of the properties. Ms. Johnson explained that this is a gutter and will be removed.

Ms. Irwin asked if the proposed casement windows could be fixed windows to match the second-floor. She also expressed concern about demolishing the garage because it is a unique outbuilding. She supported raising the parapet to include the gutter and suggested a simplified version of the cornice would be better. She agreed with Mr. Adams about the door pediments.

Ms. Sennott agreed with the design suggestions of the Board and stated that limited original material on the garage is present. She asked if it was a way to preserve the molded CMU.

11. BAR #2021-00143 PG

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 425 North Alfred Street.
Applicant: 425 North Alfred Street, LLC

12. BAR #2021-00142 PG

Request for alterations at 425 North Alfred Street.
Applicant: 425 North Alfred Street, LLC

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00142 and BAR #2021-00143, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. That the new front door be a four-panel wood door; and,
2. That the applicant provides full window specifications to demonstrate they are in compliance with the Board's *Policies for Administrative Approval for Windows*.

REASON

The Board agreed with the staff recommendation.

SPEAKERS

James Palmer, architect, spoke in support of the project and answered questions.
Heather Blake, 423 N. Alfred Street, asked questions about construction activity and noise.

DISCUSSION

In response to the neighbor's questions about construction activity and noise Mr. Palmer said that there would be very little exterior demolition and after the completion of the work the site would be thoroughly cleaned.

Mr. Spencer asked the applicant if they had read the staff report and whether they agreed to the staff recommendation. Mr. Palmer said that he had not read the report but nonetheless agreed to the staff conditions.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

13. BAR #2021-00170 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 610 South Lee Street.
Applicant: Cayley Tullman

14. BAR #2021-00168 OHAD

Request for alterations at 610 South Lee Street.
Applicant: Cayley Tullman

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00168 and BAR #2021-00170, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The new window on the north elevation meets all the *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications in the Historic Districts* criteria.
2. ~~The applicant seeks after the fact BAR approval for the stairs and landing on the north elevation.~~
3. Approve the after-the-fact stairs and landing extension.

REASON

The Board found the proposed tempered glass guardrail on the new rooftop deck compatible with the contemporary rear addition design and found that the after-the-fact stairs and landing on the north elevation are architecturally appropriate.

SPEAKERS

Mr. William Cromley, the project architect, clarified that he intended to include the after-the-fact stair and landing extension in the scope, and would like the Board to review and approve the work which was done by a previous property owner. He was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts agreed to include the after-the-fact extension of the stairs and landing in the review. In general, the Board found the project appropriate and agreed with staff's recommendation.

Mr. Adams inquired if the proposed tempered glass railing was compatible with the building's architectural vocabulary. Ms. Roberts stated that it will probably disappear since the proposed rooftop deck is at the property's rear and minimally visible from the street. Mr. Cromley clarified that the rear one-story addition has a contemporary design and that the proposed glass railing is not intrusive and compatible with that portion of the building. There was no further discussion.

15. BAR #2021-00174 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 405 South Washington Street.
Applicant: Robert Bentley Adams

16. BAR #2021-00175 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 405 South Washington Street.
Applicant: Robert Bentley Adams

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00174 and BAR #2021-00175, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. ~~The applicant install wood shingles in lieu of the proposed metal roof to match the original roofing material.~~
2. The applicant work with staff to ensure that the proposed windows meet the requirements of the *Alexandria New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications in the Historic Districts*
3. The applicant be allowed to install a standing seam metal roof as submitted.

REASON

The Board found that the proposed design is compatible with the existing historic resources. They further found that a standing seam metal roof could be used in this location because one of the neighboring houses that was built along with this house has a standing seam metal roof and that standing seam metal would have been an appropriate type of roof for the age of the structure.

SPEAKERS

Susanne Adams, applicant, presented the design and requested that they be allowed to use a standing seam metal roof in lieu of the wood shingles indicated by staff.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts stated that she prefers the use of a standing seam metal roof in this location to the suggested wood shingles because it is part of a triplet and one of the other buildings in the triplet has a standing seam metal roof.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2021-00135 OHAD

Request for signage at 118 North Saint Asaph Street.

Applicant: Saint Asaph Ventures LLC

BAR #2021-00167 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 227 South Fairfax Street.

Applicant: Errol De Montille

BAR #2021-00177 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 520 South Pitt Street.
Applicant: Jackie Pollock

BAR #2021-00178 OHAD
Request for window replacement at 316 North Royal Street.
Applicant: Kevin Dupuis

BAR #2021-00191 OHAD
Request for alterations at 738 Ford's Landing Way.
Applicant: Lynda Gallagher

BAR #2021-00203 OHAD
Request for alterations at 1101 King Street.
Applicant: 1101 King Street Condominium

BAR #2021-00209 OHAD
Request for window replacement at 300 Queen Street.
Applicant: Scott Corzine

*******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 4th 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

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

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, June 2, 2021

7:00 p.m., Virtual Public Hearing

Zoom Webinar

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

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

BOARD ACTION: Approved

On a motion by Mr. Adams and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the resolution. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

II. MINUTES

3. Consideration of the minutes from the **May 19, 2021** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Mr. Adams and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the resolution.

III. DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING

4. **BAR #2021-00230 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 130 Prince Street.

Applicants: Gregory Wilson and Kathleen Cummings

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00230.

IV. ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED

5. BAR #2021-00121 PG

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 1215 and 1215 ½ Queen Street.
Applicant: Donald D. Devers

6. BAR #2021-00123 PG

Request for addition and alterations at 1215 and 1215 ½ Queen Street.
Applicant: Donald D. Devers

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00121 and BAR #2021-00123.

7. BAR #2021-00125 PG

Request for alterations at 1213 Queen Street.
Applicant: Donald D. Devers

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00125.

V. NEW BUSINESS

8. BAR #2021-00199 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 500 South Washington Street.
Applicant: Capital One N A

9. BAR #2021-00198 OHAD

Request for alterations at 500 South Washington Street.
Applicant: Capital One N A

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00198 and BAR #2021-00199, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused himself.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board did not have any comments about the project.

SPEAKERS

Alan Su, the project architect, explained the project and was available to answer any questions.

DISCUSSION

There was no discussion.

10. BAR #2021-00216 OHAD

Request for alterations at 601 Wilkes Street #101.

Applicant: Simone Fitzgibbon

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 #2021-00216, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board supported the application as submitted.

SPEAKERS

Catharine Nina Schierow, presented on behalf of applicant and available for questions.

Simone Fitzgibbon, applicant, available for questions.

DISCUSSION

The Board supported without discussion.

11. BAR #2021-00229 PG

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 435 North Fayette Street.

Applicants: Jennifer Sheridan and Robert Palute

12. BAR #2021-00223 PG

Request for addition and alterations at 435 North Fayette Street.

Applicants: Jennifer Sheridan and Robert Palute

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00223 and BAR #2021-00229, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board agreed with staff's recommendation to approve.

SPEAKERS

C.J. LaMora, project architect, gave a brief synopsis and was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Adams wanted to see the front/west elevation to better understand the context.

Ms. Irwin referred to the project as a nice, modest addition. She agreed that the fiber cement siding on the addition be smooth. She recommended that the proposed new door swing the other way so that the hinges would be against the wall, noting that this was a friendly recommendation, not a requirement.

Ms. Roberts praised the nice and complete application.

13. BAR #2021-00227 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 114 North Alfred Street.

Applicants: Eric and Theresa Olson

14. BAR #2021-00226 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 114 North Alfred Street.

Applicants: Eric and Theresa Olson

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt and seconded by Mr. Adams, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00226 and BAR #2021-00227, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. That the new windows on the addition comply with the Board's New and Replacement Window Performance Specifications; and,
2. Include the statements from Alexandria Archaeology, below, in the General Notes of all on all construction documents 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:
 - a. 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.
 - b. The applicant/developer shall not allow any metal detection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

REASON

The Board agreed with staff's recommendation to approve.

SPEAKERS

William Cromley, builder, spoke in support of the application and described changes since the Board saw the case at concept.

DISCUSSION

The Board asked for clarification on the art studio portion of the accessory apartment and Mr. Cromley described the changes.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 7:36 p.m.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2021-00114 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 1010 King Street.

Applicant: Jefferson Hofgard

BAR #2021-00213 OHAD

Request for alterations at 702 Ford's Landing Way.

Applicants: Gerald and Carol Stalun

BAR #2021-00242 PG

Request for window replacement at 904 Pendleton Street.

Applicant: Joshua McGeehon

BAR #2021-00243 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 472 South Union Street.

Applicant: Kim Winnard

BAR #2021-00247 OHAD

Request for garage door replacement at 422 North Union Street.

Applicant: John Kane

BAR #2021-00251 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 1251 Portner Road.

Applicant: Erica Socker

BAR #2021-00253 PG

Request for roof replacement at 1303 Queen Street.

Applicants: Sarah and Otis Harris

BAR #2021-00258 PG

Request for window replacement at 209 North Columbus Street.

Applicant: Shannon and Kris Stillings

BAR #2021-00259 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 600 Ford's Landing Way.

Applicant: Jack Liu

BAR #2021-00262 OHAD

Request for alterations at 330 South Lee Street.

Applicants: Bob and Becky Cady

BAR #2021-00264 OHAD

Request for a new deck at 420 Wolfe Street.

Applicant: Geoffrey Wolfe

BAR #2021-00265 PG

Request for a new fence at 830 Oronoco Street.

Applicant: Beechtree LLC

BAR #2021-00266 OHAD

Request for alterations at 123 South Fairfax Street.

Applicant: Mary's Properties 2 LLC

BAR #2021-00268 OHAD

Request for garage door replacement at 417 Pitt Mew.

Applicant: Steven and Mary Rushen

BAR #2021-00270 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 1407 East Abingdon Drive #2.

Applicants: Michael and Pamela Benton

BAR #2021-00271 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 305 South Union Street.

Applicants: Holly and Cordell Hull

BAR #2021-00273 OHAD

Request for door and window replacement at 12 Wolfe Street.

Applicant: Lousie Roseman

BAR #2021-00275 OHAD

Request for alterations at 102 North Union Street.

Applicant: Torpedo Factory Condominium

BAR #2021-00276 OHAD

Request for alterations at 1303 Duke Street.

Applicant: 2718 Jefferson Drive LLC

BAR #2021-00277 OHAD

Request for alterations at 1309 Duke Street.

Applicant: 2718 Jefferson Drive LLC

BAR #2021-00287 OHAD

Request for alterations at 10 Norton Court.

Applicant: Old Town Community Church