

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

Alexandria Board of Architectural Review
Parker-Gray District

Wednesday, October 26, 2011
7:30 P.M., City Council Chambers, City Hall
301 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Members Present: William Conkey, Chairman
Robert Duffy
Christina Kelley
Doug Meick
Philip Moffat
Theresa del Ninno
Matthew Slowik

Staff Present: Planning and Zoning:
Catherine Miliaras, Historic Preservation Planner
Al Cox, FAIA, Historic Preservation Manager

The meeting was called to order at approximately 7:32 p.m. by Chairman Conkey.

I. MINUTES

Consideration of the minutes of the public hearing of September 14, 2011.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Duffy, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the minutes were approved, as amended, 7-0.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. **CASE BAR2010-0073**
Request for alterations to previously approved plans at **320 N Patrick St**, zoned RB Residential.
APPLICANT: Maribeth Monti Trust by William Cromley
BOARD ACTION: Approved, as submitted, on the Consent Calendar, 7-0.

On a motion by Ms. Kelley, seconded by Mr. Meick, the Consent Calendar was approved, 7-0.

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

2. **CASE BAR2011-0279**

Request for fence and waiver of fence height requirement at **1119 ½ & 1119 Queen St**, zoned CL Commercial.

APPLICANT: Jaki & Donald McCarthy

BOARD ACTION: **Approved, as amended, 7-0.**

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. That the 6 foot tall wood fence be located at or behind the front building wall and that the applicant work with Staff to determine a location that does not obstruct the meter or window; and
2. That the applicant have the option to extend the decorative iron fence across the front of the vacant lot.

SPEAKERS

Donald McCarthy, the applicant, spoke in support of the application and generally agreed with the staff recommendations, though he requested that the Board allow him the option to extend the iron fence across the vacant lot.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Kelley agreed with the first recommendation but though that the applicant should have the option of whether or not to extend the decorative iron fence across the vacant lot.

Mr. Duffy agreed with Ms. Kelley's comments.

Mr. Meick expressed concern about a six foot fence on Queen Street.

Mr. Slowick supported allowing the owner to have flexibility.

Mr. Moffat supported the first condition but though that the owner should have flexibility as to whether to extend the decorative iron fence.

Ms. del Ninno noted that the wood fence should be in line with the house.

Chairman Conkey was in agreement with the Board's comments about allowing flexibility.

On a motion by Ms. Kelley, seconded by Mr. Duffy, the Board voted to approve the application as amended, 7-0.

REASON

The Board generally agreed with the staff analysis and recommendations though found that allowing the applicant the option of whether or not to extend the iron decorative fence across the vacant lot was a reasonable request.

3. **CASE BAR2011-0280**

Request for siding replacement at **620 N Patrick St**, zoned RB Residential.

APPLICANT: James Sisco

BOARD ACTION: **Approved, as amended, 5-2.**

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

The Certificate of Appropriateness is approved based on an emergency situation that led to improvements on the property inconsistent with the zoning ordinance and the *Design Guidelines* with the following conditions:

1. That the rear and north side elevation may retain the HardiePlank siding;
2. That the applicant will remove the HardiePlank on the front and replace with wood German lap siding and that this work must be completed prior to issuance of any future building permits for an addition or for the sale of the house;
3. That the applicant work with Staff to bring the prominently visible east end of the south side elevation into compliance with the Board's standards and *Guidelines*, by making an earnest effort to effectively and appropriately smooth the finish of the existing wood-grained HardiePlank, such as with layers of a high-build paint, beginning with a sample patch. ~~If this is not successful, then the south side elevation must be replaced with wood German lap siding prior to issuance of any future building permits.~~ (Last part struck in friendly amendment by Mr. Slowik and the following was added: If this good faith effort to eliminate the wood grain appearance is not successful, as determined by Staff in the field, then the HardiePlank may remain, as installed, on the south side elevation.)

SPEAKERS

James Sisco, representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application and responded to questions from the Board.

Eric Gregory, neighbor at 618 North Patrick Street, spoke in support of the application

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. del Ninno agreed with the Staff recommendations finding that it was acceptable to retain the HardiePlank on the side and rear elevations. She also inquired about fines for this type of violation.

Mr. Moffat asked the applicant why he did not seek the help of Staff when he realized that there were problems that needed immediate attention. He supported extending the time frame for the applicant to correct the violation. He stated that the south side elevation should be replaced with wood siding as well due to its visibility. He noted that he based his decision on the governing ordinance which provides certainty and predictability to all applicants.

Mr. Slowik expressed concern about setting a precedent in this case by allowing after-the-fact approval. He also inquired about consideration of economic hardship. He did not support removing the HardiePlank siding to correct the violation.

Chairman Conkey asked Staff if there were a statute of limitations, for example, for the work that the applicant previously completed on the front façade in 2008. Mr. Cox responded that the zoning ordinance does not include a statute of limitations.

Mr. Meick noted that he experienced a similar situation on his own property at one time at 213 North Payne Street. He asked the applicant if the rotting sills were to be repaired on the front. He found that the siding on the front should be replaced with wood siding.

Mr. Duffy noted that the applicant's submission was very helpful and well-documented. He noted that it was essential that the Board's decision be based on the zoning ordinance and the Design Guidelines. He concurred with the staff report and thought it was reasonable to allow the applicant time to correct the violation. He noted that the Board's comments should include the applicant responded to an emergency situation.

Ms. Kelley agreed with Mr. Moffat that the south side elevation was highly visible but that the north side and rear elevations were not very visible.

Chairman Conkey understood the applicant's concerns and also noted that the north and rear elevations were minimally visible. He found that both the front and south side elevation should be replaced and wanted to give the applicant flexibility for when to replace. He suggested tying the replacement of the siding to any future building permits. He emphasized that the Board wanted to be consistent and flexible.

On a motion by Mr. Duffy, seconded by Ms. Kelley, with a friendly amendment made by Mr. Slowik that was agreed to be Mr. Duffy and reluctantly agreed to by Ms. Kelley, that the Certificate of Appropriateness be approved based on an emergency situation that led to improvements on the property inconsistent with the zoning ordinance and the *Design Guidelines*.

The motion was approved 5-2, with Mr. Moffat and Chairman Conkey voting in opposition.

REASON

The Board found it acceptable to retain the HardiePlank siding on the north side and rear elevations as these areas were minimally visible, the vinyl siding replaced by HardiePlank was not, by Board policy appropriate, and the wood siding removed below the vinyl siding appeared not to be original to the dwelling. The Board was concerned about setting a precedent not supported by the zoning ordinance, *Design Guidelines* and adopted policies. The Board agreed that the siding on the front elevation should be replaced with wood German lap wood siding because of its prominent visibility. The Board had extensive discussion as to whether the siding on the south side elevation, which they determined was clearly visible from the street, should be replaced with wood siding. One suggestion, approved as part of the approval, was to at least modify the existing wood-grained HardiePlank to have a smooth finish. The Board found this to be an acceptable compromise in light of the specific circumstances of this particular case.

4. CASE BAR2011-0282

Request for concept review of three multi-family buildings in Phase V of the James Bland Redevelopment Project at **1000 First St and 998 N Alfred St**, zoned CDD#16
APPLICANT: Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority and GBP Associates, LLC c/o EYA by Kenneth Wire (McGuire Woods)

BOARD ACTION: **Approved in concept, as amended, 7-0.**

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Continue to work on the proposed feature at the entrances to the courtyards and to design an appropriate courtyard planter scheme for permanent, appropriately-scaled planters that do not obscure architectural details or clutter the courtyard space. Restudy the courtyard expression to be more modern and in scale with the buildings
2. Refine the “hyphen” element on the northernmost building to make it as visually light as possible and to make the step down from four stories to three stories appear integrated.
3. Provide more information on the materials, colors and details of the multifamily buildings. Use high-quality, sophisticated metalwork for railings, grilles and balconies.
4. Provide details about the outdoor space and any proposed materials, such as benches, fencing and lighting, that require BAR approval.
5. Consolidate locations of all vents and drainage systems so as to minimize the visual impact of these elements and locate on secondary elevations, where possible, and integrate drainage systems into architectural design.
6. Show location of all rooftop mechanical equipment and remove all stickers and markings prior to installation.
7. Make building entrances more prominent. Make trash room door look less like an entry.

SPEAKERS

Greg Shron, EYA, representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application and responded to questions from the Board.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Kelley stated that overall she was in support of the concept presented and specifically liked the addition of a fifth story on the center building.

Mr. Duffy also was in support of the concept scheme and the recommended considerations outlined in the staff report.

Mr. Meick expressed concern about the high visibility of the labels on the rooftop HVAC units on the townhouses that have already been constructed. Mr. Shron responded that rooftop HVAC units on the multi-family buildings would be set back at least 30 feet from the building’s edge on all sides.

Mr. Moffat noted that materials and presentation for the multi-family buildings were much easier to review and commended the architect. He inquired as to why the ARHA units were being separated from the market-rate units in this scheme. Mr. Shron responded that in order to get financing, the lender required separate legal lots. He explained that EYA had had long discussions with the City and ARHA about this change and that everyone acknowledged the need to ensure that the buildings would be of comparable quality and design.

Ms. del Ninno agreed that the increase in height for the center building was acceptable and asked whether the square footage of the multi-family buildings was the same as in the original scheme.

Ms. del Ninno had the following recommendations:

- Make the trash room door look less like an entrance.
- Make building entrances more prominent
- Restudy the courtyard expression to be more modern and in scale with the buildings

Chairman Conkey noted that in the previous phase there was significant discussion about the need for high-quality, sophisticated metalwork and he wanted to emphasize that same point for this phase as well. He also commented that the “hyphen” element on the northernmost building needed more work and that it could be much lighter visually.

REASON

The Board supported, in concept, the revised scheme for the Phase V multi-family buildings and agreed that the addition of the fifth floor to the center building was appropriate.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

The Board discussed community outreach efforts and is in the process of meeting with local civic associations.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

The following items are shown for information only. Based on the Board's adopted policies, these have been approved by Staff since the previous Board meeting.

CASE BAR2011-0268

Request for vent opening at **522 N Alfred St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Barbara Levy

CASE BAR2011-0270

Request for door replacement at **316 N Payne St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: House Buyers of America

CASE BAR2011-0277

Request for vent opening at **1603 Princess St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Larry Arthur

CASE BAR2011-0278

Request for fence replacement at **720 N Columbus St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Meredith Selby

CASE BAR2011-0291

Request for siding replacement at **507 N Patrick St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Nikky Clayton

CASE BAR2011-0293

Request for siding replacement at **316 N Fayette St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Alan Dolman

CASE BAR2011-0297

Request for window replacement at **1202 Princess St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Adia Rivers

CASE BAR2011-0302

Request for window replacement and siding repair at **515 N Alfred St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Casey Purpus

V. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Conkey adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:30pm.

Minutes submitted by:

Al Cox, FAIA
Historic Preservation Manager