

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

Alexandria Board of Architectural Review
Parker-Gray District

Wednesday, March 23, 2011
7:30 P.M., Room 2000, City Hall
301 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Members Present: William Conkey, Chairman
Robert Duffy
Christina Kelley
Doug Meick
Deborah Rankin

Members Absent: Richard Lloyd
Philip Moffat

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

The meeting was called to order at approximately 7:35 p.m. by Chairman Conkey.

I. MINUTES

Consideration of the minutes of the public hearing of February 23, 2011.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 5-0

On a motion by Mr. Meick, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the minutes were approved 5-0.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

Items on the Consent Calendar are those where the applicant has agreed to all conditions of approval shown in the staff reports. Without objection, the staff recommendation for these cases will be approved as a group by unanimous consent of the Board at the beginning of the meeting. When announced by the Chairman, any member of the Board or of the public may ask that one of these cases be removed for full discussion.

1. CASE BAR2011-0044

Request for alterations to an existing addition at **428 N Fayette St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Ricardo Navarro

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 5-0

On a motion by Mr. Duffy, seconded by Mr. Meick, the Consent Calendar was approved as submitted.

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

2. CASE BAR2011-0042

Request for new portico and replacement of retaining wall at **415 N Payne St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Annette Wietecha

BOARD ACTION: **Portion approved as amended and portion deferred for further study, 5-0**

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Approval of the stone retaining wall, concrete walk and stair;
2. Deferral of the proposed front portico and railing and that the applicant return to the Board with a simple, modernist portico after working with Staff to study what is appropriate for this building type;
3. That the existing wood planter in the public right-of-way be removed by the applicant.

SPEAKERS

Ned Ponder, representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application and agreed with the staff recommendation. He suggested a wood and glass portico.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Rankin supported the staff recommendations and had questions for the applicant regarding options for the portico and whether the existing wood planter would be removed. The applicant confirmed that the wood planter will be removed.

Mr. Meick agreed the proposed portico was inappropriate and felt comfortable with the applicant working with staff to design an appropriate design.

Mr. Duffy agreed with the staff report and noted that it was important to set the bar high because this portico will be an example for similar applications in the future. He asked staff to prepare a brief survey and history of this building type to educate the Board before this case is heard again.

Ms. Kelley was in agreement with the other Board members and the staff report.

Chairman Conkey thought the portico design was an interesting project and wanted the Board to review the final design rather than staff. He suggested a minimalist design with the use of steel and glass.

Ms. Rankin moved approval of the staff recommendation for approval of the stone retaining wall, concrete walk and stair but deferred a decision on the portico with a request that the applicant return to the Board with a simple modernist portico. Mr. Meick seconded the motion which passed unanimously, 5-0.

REASON

The Board generally agreed with the Staff analysis and felt that the portico design should be restudied to reflect the architectural character of this vernacular rowhouse. The Board noted the number of mid-century brick two-story townhouses in the district, and believed that this was an

opportunity to survey the district and determine what type of portico/canopy/entry would be appropriate for this very simple and unadorned architectural style. The Board asked staff to perform a brief survey and present findings at a subsequent hearing to place this project into context.

4. **CASE BAR2011-0011**

Request for new construction of 21 townhouse units (17 single-family and 4 triplexes), 3 multi-family buildings and park, and waiver of rooftop screening requirement for Phase IV of the James Bland Redevelopment Project at **898 N Alfred St**, zoned CDD#16

APPLICANT: Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority by Kenneth Wire (McGuire Woods)

BOARD ACTION: **Portion approved as amended and portion deferred for further study, 5-0**

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Townhouse

10. That the location of the solar collectors on the individual townhouses be approved by BAR Staff prior to their installation to insure that they are either not visible or are minimally visible (previous BAR condition);
11. That all of the loft levels be painted the same color, either a light grey or light taupe, instead of the variety of subtle colors proposed by the applicant and that any exposed metal channels be painted or otherwise made non-reflective (previous BAR condition, with modification);
12. That the garage door trim may be painted the same color as the rear elevation of the townhouse where they are located or painted white to match the trim;
13. That all visible roof materials (including porch roofs) be standing seam metal, metal shingles, slate or synthetic slate. (Development-wide condition);
14. That the applicant continue to work with Staff to refine the door, window and trim treatments so that they are stylistically compatible and do not have a mix of styles on a single townhouse. (Development-wide condition);
15. That the applicant work with Staff to leave some of the painted brick units (Lots 13/14/15) unpainted and propose new and different light fixtures.
16. That all of the units adjacent to the park should front onto the park and if that was not possible, that the applicant return to the Board for further study and review.
17. That the applicant add windows to the side elevation of the loft level where possible.
18. That the window hoods at the first floor of Lots 18 and 21 on Madison Street and Lot 7 on Montgomery Street be removed.
19. That the townhouse units on Lots 5-6 on the private street be a pair of twins.
20. That the applicant restudy the fenestration of the brick townhouse on Lots 3-4 on the private street and consider adding a paired window at the third story.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTINUED STUDY

General

1. That the Board waive the screening requirements for the rooftop HVAC units and instead require the applicant to work with Staff, in the field, to locate the units so that they are

- not visible or are placed in the most subtle location feasible (previous BAR condition);
2. That the applicant use appropriate building materials, such as wood, composite, or synthetic materials which are high-quality, paintable, millable and solid throughout, for items such as door surrounds, front doors, railings and the like. Front doors shall be solid wood (Development-wide condition);
 3. That the applicant propose windows that are in conformance with the *Alexandria Replacement Window Performance Specifications*;
 4. That the applicant work with Staff on the text and graphics of the historic marker and conform to the standards set forth in the City's recently adopted Wayfinding Program.
 5. That the applicant work with Staff to determine the least obtrusive location for the mail boxes.
 6. That the applicant adequately screen all utilities and trash receptacles from the street (public or private).

Multi-Family

7. That the applicant provide a materials board and samples for the multi-family buildings and that the applicant propose a different material for the sills and headers than split-face block.
8. That the applicant simplify and coordinate the individual color palette for the multi-family buildings.
9. That the applicant provide the courtyard elevation for the center building.
10. That the applicant refine the spandrel element on the center building and work to lighten this element.
11. That the applicant consider stucco in place of the HardiePanel.

SPEAKERS

Greg Shron, representing EYA and ARHA, spoke in support of the application and responded to questions from the Board. In response to the recommendations in the staff report, the applicant stated the following:

- Hesitant to change the color scheme and thinks there is sufficient variety.
- Will need to verify with engineer whether Lot 10 can be reoriented from North Alfred Street to front on the park/Montgomery Street elevation.
- Will remove the window hoods on the first story.
- Noted that a paired window was proposed in Phase II for the brick townhouses with projecting two-story bay, similar to the design of Lots 3-4 but that it was requested in Phase II to be a single window.

Smita Anand, architect for the applicant, spoke in support of the application and responded to questions from the Board.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Townhouse Units

Ms. Kelley generally agreed with the staff recommendations and stated that she is interested in hearing what the new window will be for this phase.

Mr. Duffy asked about paint colors in the future and how homeowners will be able to change them in the future (Mr. Shron responded that the HOA will approve paint color changes).

Mr. Meick inquired about the installation of solar collectors (Mr. Shron stated that the developer will not actually install solar collectors but a solar “rough-in” package will be available).

Ms. Rankin agreed with the comment to leave some of the painted brick units unpainted.

Chairman Conkey stated he did not have any comments on the townhouses but supported the additional windows at the loft levels.

Mr. Duffy made a motion to approve the townhouse portion of the project with Conditions #10-20 with minor modifications;

1. That the garage doors be the trim color;
2. That the window hoods for unit #7 be eliminated;
3. That units #13, 14 & 15 be unpainted brick; and
4. That unit #16 be restudied and brought back if the entry cannot face the park.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Meick and approved unanimously, 5-0.

Multi-Family Buildings

Ms. Rankin repeated her previous comment to consider stucco instead of HardiePanel. (Mr. Shron explained that a true cementitious stucco over masonry was very expensive and beyond the capabilities of this project). Ms. Rankin then requested examples of the successful use of HardiePanel. Ms. Rankin also asked to see vegetation along the garage elevation (Ms. Anand responded that there are planters in front of the parking garage vents).

Mr. Meick observed that the rooftop HVAC units were visible in Phase I. He agreed that screening might be worse than seeing the units but asked staff to insure that the units were placed in the least visible locations. He did not favor the spandrel option as he thought it made the building look too heavy.

Chairman Conkey noted that the spandrel option as proposed did look heavy because a dark color was used. He noted that his previous recommendation had been for a lighter color to be used to lighten it up and appear as a two-story window.

Mr. Duffy agreed with the staff recommendations #7-9 and was pleased with the courtyard entry piers.

Ms. Kelley liked the suggestion to remove the third sash on the two end buildings and found merit in both the spandrel and non-spandrel option. Ms. Kelley inquired about the proposed metal work scheme for balcony rails and garage vents.

Chairman Conkey approved of the spandrel and found it to visually lighten the building. The Chairman asked about commercial window options (Mr. Shron responded that an aluminum window will not meet energy requirements and that they were considering a high-quality

fiberglass or aluminum-clad wood window). Chairman Conkey noted that the garage intake vents could be a streetscape killer. He also noted that the proposed metalwork was not particularly interesting and urged the applicant to consider a decorative metal work that would be a feature. Chairman Conkey liked the expressed grid pattern with the HardiePanels. He reiterated his dislike for the use of split-faced block for the lintels noting that it diminished the overall quality of the project. He proposed the use of cast stone or decorative brick lintels, perhaps in an alternating brick color.

On a motion by Ms. Rankin, seconded by Mr. Duffy, the Board voted to defer the multi-family buildings and park, 5-0.

REASON

The Board generally agreed with the analysis in the Staff report and believed that the proposed scheme is a great improvement from the previous submissions. The Board advised the applicant to consider and study the staff recommendations and their comments.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Mr. Meick asked staff to develop a proclamation for Richard Lloyd to thank him for his service to the Board over the past 8 years. Ms. Kelly seconded the motion which passed unanimously.
2. The Chairman acknowledged and welcomed John Sprinkle and his historic preservation class from NVCC.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Conkey adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:15 pm

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

CASE BAR2011-0058

Request for in-kind fence replacement at **1401 Princess St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Michael Stauber

CASE BAR2011-0062

Request for window replacement at **311 N West St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Lisa Ward

Minutes submitted by:

Al Cox, FAIA
Historic Preservation Manager