

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

Alexandria Board of Architectural Review  
Parker-Gray District

**Wednesday, July 27, 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

Members Absent: N/A

Staff Present: Planning and Zoning:  
Courtney Lankford, Historic Preservation Planner  
Al Cox, FAIA, Historic Preservation Manager

The meeting was called to order at approximately 7:33 p.m. by Chairman Conkey.

**I. MINUTES**

Consideration of the minutes of the public hearing of May 25, 2011.

**BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 6-0.**

On a motion by Ms. Kelley, seconded by Mr. Meick, the minutes were approved 6-0.

---

**II. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**1. CASE BAR2011-0042**

Request for door hood at **415 N Payne St**, zoned RB Residential

**APPLICANT:** Annette Wietecha

*Deferred prior to hearing for lack of notice.*

**BOARD ACTION: The Board noted the deferral.**

**2. CASE BAR2011-0191**

Request for demolition of fence at **315 Buchanan St**, zoned RB Residential

**APPLICANT:** Anita Hall

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as submitted, by a roll call vote 6-0.**

This item was combined with item #3 for discussion purposes.

### **3. CASE BAR2011-0194**

Request for fence replacement, stoop alterations, and shutter installation at **315 Buchanan St**, zoned RB Residential

**APPLICANT:** Anita Hall

**BOARD ACTION:** **Approved as amended, 5-1.**

#### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. That no paver bricks are applied to the brick piers of the stoop. The applicant is reminded that a building permit is required to apply brick pavers to the steps and that a separate permit from T&ES is required for any work to the steps or sidewalk within the right-of-way.
2. That the wood shutters fit within the rowlock sills and concrete lintels so they do not obscure these character-defining features; that the shutters are hinged and operable (with final approval by Staff of hardware); and that the shutters are capable of covering the entire window opening when closed.
3. That the composition shingles be architectural grade per the Roof Materials Policy.
4. That the 7 foot high fence may only extend south along the east property line until it aligns with the south façade of the south addition and must then be reduced to 3'-6" high. The Board supports the return of the 7 foot high fence to adjoin the southeast corner of the south addition, if the applicant wishes to do so.
5. That approval of the fence in its existing location is subject to City Council approval of an encroachment. If the encroachment is approved, then the existing aluminum fence may remain. However, if Council does not approve the encroachment and the fence is required to be moved, then the Board requires that it be replaced with a simpler and more historically appropriate fence, such as the original style chain-link fence or a double-loop wire or metal fence.
6. That any wood trim replacements on the portico are in-kind. If major replacement or reconstruction of the portico is needed, the applicant must consult with Staff to insure that it matches the original design and construction.

#### **SPEAKERS**

Charles Hall, brother of applicant, spoke on behalf of the application.

Dallas Hall, nephew and contractor of applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Cleveland Ross, Jr., neighbor at 1615 Boyle Street, spoke in support of the application.

Matt Slowik, neighbor at 1611 Boyle Street, spoke in support of the application.

Tyrone Bigsby, neighbor at 321 Buchanan Street, spoke in support of the application.

Anita Hall, applicant, spoke in support of the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. del Ninno asked for clarification about the brick pavers and the shutters. The contractor stated that the brick pavers would start at the steps off the sidewalk and continue all the way to the front door, if allowed by the City since a portion of the steps are located in public right-of-way. The contractor also clarified that the brick pavers would not be applied to the sides of the concrete steps. Ms. del Ninno stated her concern about the dimensions of the windows and the potential for the shutters to overlap once installed. Ms. del Ninno supported the 7 foot portion of the wood fence along the east property line until it reaches the south façade of the side addition.

Mr. Moffat was in support of the Staff recommendations 2, 3 and 4. Mr. Moffat did not support Staff's analysis of the chain-link fence. For the record, Mr. Moffat felt the demolition of the chain-link fence was neutral to all of the criteria listed in set forth in the Zoning Ordinance, §10-105(B); in particular, the removal of the chain-link fence was positive in regards to criteria number six. Mr. Moffat stated that denying the Permit to Demolish would suggest that a building or material gains historical significance by the passage of time, while at the time of its inception there was limited merit or no merit at all. Mr. Moffat stated that if there were social merit as well as the passage of time, he could potentially support the protection of such a material. However, he does not feel that this fence is in need of protection that it is in need of replacement. Mr. Moffat did not feel that a new replacement chain-link fence is appropriate, but could potentially support an after-market historic replacement chain-link fence. He would prefer a double-loop fence for the replacement fence. Mr. Moffat said he could support the height increase of the wood fence along the entire eastern portion of the property.

Mr. Meick asked for clarification regarding the height of the wood fence proposed for the eastern property line. The contractor said that the top of the post would measure 7 feet and that the top rail would be less than 7 feet. Mr. Meick supported the use of architectural grade composition shingles on the portico roof and the wood shutters on the front façade, if the applicant could comply with the conditions in the Staff recommendation.

Mr. Duffy commended the applicant on her passion to preserve the neighborhood and her home. He asked if the applicant was in support of the Staff recommendation that no brick pavers are applied to the brick piers of the stoop and the applicant agreed. Mr. Duffy was in support of Staff recommendation of condition number 3, but asked the applicant to work with Staff to make sure that the proportions of the shutters are correct and that they are truly operable. Mr. Duffy also supported the architectural grade composition shingles on the portico roof, per the Roof Materials Policy. In regards to the replacement of portions of rotted wood on the portico, Mr. Duffy stated for the record that any replacements be in kind. He stated that if the applicant finds more structural damage, the applicant should confer with Staff about appropriate repairs and replacements. Mr. Duffy was in support of the Staff conditions for the Waiver of Height. Mr. Duffy confirmed with the applicant that they would be taking the placement of the aluminum fence to City Council for an encroachment. Mr. Duffy stated for the record that the Board's review of these buildings are based on their architectural design and cultural importance. He commended the Staff report for the detail regarding these resources and agreed that they are important contributing resources. Mr. Duffy stated his support of the Staff's recommendation for a replacement chain-link fence, but could also support a double-loop fence.

Ms. Kelley concurred with Mr. Duffy's comments. She supported the height of the wood fence due to security concerns, but thought it should be stepped down to a lower height as it approached the sidewalk. Ms. Kelley also supported the Staff recommendation of using architectural grade composition shingles on the roof of the portico. Ms. Kelley suggested that the applicant paint the sides of the concrete stoop that were not being covered by the brick pavers.

Mr. Conkey was hesitant to weigh in on the location of the fence due to legal issues with the encroachment. In regards to the issues at hand, Mr. Conkey stated that while individual elements may be nice, they may not be appropriate to the period of the structure. With regards to the fence, Mr. Conkey said that the visibility through the fence is what is important in this case, not the actual material. He also felt that the after-the-fact replacement aluminum fence was too decorative for this style of architecture. Mr. Conkey supported the brick on the stairs, but was concerned with the application of the brick pavers. He supported the shutters and the 7 foot high wood fence along the east property line until it reaches the south façade of the side addition. In response to the security concerns of the applicant and the zoning issues, it was recommended that the 7 foot high wood fence be returned to the building at the southern façade of the rear addition. The applicant agreed that this would be a good solution.

Mr. Moffat and Mr. Duffy suggested they spilt the application and try and find consensus on the issues at hand.

With regards to the Permit to Demolish:

Ms. del Ninno felt the aluminum fence that was installed after-the-fact was not appropriate for the style of the house, but that since a policy had not been established it would be hard to enforce it. She felt that the visibility and style should be considered in this case and that there is a better alternative than the one that was installed. Ms. del Ninno felt that while chain-link fences should be encouraged and have important qualities, she was in favor of voting to demolish the chain-link.

Mr. Moffat supported the Permit to Demolish for the chain-link, but would prefer to see a better alternative such as the double loop fence. Mr. Moffat suggested making the approval of the new fence contingent on the encroachment decision.

Mr. Moffat also supported the waiver of height requirement and the solution of returning the 7 foot portion of wood fence to the south façade of the side addition.

Mr. Meick agreed with Mr. Moffat about making the approval contingent on the encroachment decision.

Mr. Duffy supported the Permit to Demolish for the chain-link, but agreed that there was a better alternative for the replacement fence. Mr. Duffy felt that the BAR approval should be contingent on Council's decision on the encroachment: if City Council grants the encroachment then the current aluminum fence could be retained, but that if the encroachment is denied, a better alternative should be used.

Ms. Kelley supported the Permit to Demolish the chain-link, but could not support the aluminum fence that was installed. She felt that a chain-link fence or a double-loop fence should be installed.

Mr. Moffat made a motion to approve the Permit to Demolish which was seconded by Ms. Kelley. It was approved by a roll call vote, 6-0.

With regards to the replacement material:

Mr. Moffat felt there was consensus on the rest of the application and that the replacement fence material should be contingent on the encroachment application. Mr. Moffat stated that if the encroachment is not granted and the fence is required to be moved, a better fence material should be used. He stated he could support a double-loop or historically compatible chain-link fence.

Mr. Duffy made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions:

1. That no paver bricks are applied to the brick piers of the stoop. The applicant is reminded that a building permit is required to apply brick pavers to the steps and that a separate permit from T&ES is required for any work to the steps or sidewalk within the right-of-way.
2. That the wood shutters fit within the rowlock sills and concrete lintels so they do not obscure these character-defining features; that the shutters are hinged and operable (with final approval by Staff of hardware); and that the shutters are capable of covering the entire window opening when closed.
3. That the composition shingles be architectural grade per the Roof Materials Policy.
4. That the 7 foot high fence may only extend south along the east property line until it aligns with the south façade of the south addition and must then be reduced to 3'-6" high. The Board supports the return of the 7 foot high fence to adjoin the southeast corner of the south addition, if the applicant wishes to do so.
5. That approval of the fence in its existing location is subject to City Council approval of an encroachment. If the encroachment is approved, then the existing aluminum fence may remain. However, if Council does not approve the encroachment and the fence is required to be moved, then the Board requires that it be replaced with a simpler and more historically appropriate fence, such as the original style chain-link fence or a double-loop wire or metal fence.
6. That any wood trim replacements on the portico are in-kind. If major replacement or reconstruction of the portico is needed, the applicant must consult with Staff to insure that it matches the original design and construction.

Mr. Moffat seconded the motion, which was approved 5-1, with Ms. Kelley objecting.

## **REASON**

The Board stated that while they encourage the retention of chain-link, they could support the demolition of it in this case since a clear policy had not yet been established. However, the

Board felt that a more historically appropriate replacement fence should be used for this modest architectural style. The Board agreed with the other elements of this application, as they were minor. The Board also agreed that a waiver of height should be granted for a portion of the 7 foot high wood fence along the east property line in order to meet security concerns.

---

### **III. DEFERRED ITEMS**

#### **CASE BAR2011-0190**

Request for demolition of fence and awning at **431 Earl St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Bradley King

*Deferred prior to hearing at the applicant's request.*

**The Board noted the deferral.**

---

### **IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. The Board elected William Conkey as Chairman and Robert Duffy as Vice Chairman.
  2. Staff presented proposed supplemental Design Guidelines for the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century vernacular buildings based on the continued study that the Board requested.
- 

### **V. 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 BAR2011-0185**

Request for siding replacement at **403 N West St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Amy Maddox

#### **CASE BAR2011-0193**

Request for rear fence replacement at **231 Buchanan St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Stuart Cox & Marjorie Row

#### **CASE BAR2011-0195**

Request for siding repair and replacement at **720 N Columbus St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Meredith & Michael Shelby

#### **CASE BAR2011-0196**

Request for alterations and siding repair and replacement at **628 N Patrick St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Robert Tierno

---

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Conkey adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:58pm.

Minutes submitted by:

Al Cox, FAIA  
Historic Preservation Manager