

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

Alexandria Board of Architectural Review
Parker-Gray District

Wednesday, January 25, 2012
7:30 P.M., City Council Chambers, City Hall
301 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

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

Members Absent: Robert Duffy
Doug Meick

Staff Present: Planning and Zoning:
Courtney Lankford, Historic Preservation Planner
Catherine Miliaras, Historic Preservation Planner

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 December 14, 2011.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 5-0

On a motion by Ms. Kelley, seconded by Mr. Slowik, the minutes were approved, as submitted, 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 BAR2011-0370

Request for alterations at **416 N Peyton St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Ruth Weygand by John Savage

BOARD ACTION: This item was moved to Discussion Items.

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. [CASE BAR2011-0370](#)

Request for alterations at **416 N Peyton St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Ruth Weygand by John Savage

BOARD ACTION: **Approved as submitted, 5-0.**

SPEAKERS

Mr. John Savage, representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application and responded to questions.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. del Ninno asked about the proposed new vinyl sliding window and the choice of PVC in place of HardieTrim for the columns and trim. She discouraged the use of PVC to support green building initiatives.

Mr. Moffat inquired as to whether the project included encapsulation. Staff responded that the area of encapsulation associated with the enclosure of a screen porch is only where building materials (such as joists, sills, trim, columns and the like) attach to the wall, not the actual screens. If the applicant were proposing to enclose the porch with windows, then it would require approval of a Permit to Demolish/Encapsulate.

Mr. Slowik supported the application as submitted.

Chairman Conkey inquired about the use of vinyl windows and did not want to set a precedent for approval.

On a motion by Mr. Slowik, seconded by Mr. Moffat, the Board approved the application as submitted.

REASON

In general, the Board supported the application though discouraged the use of PVC for trim to support green building initiatives. The Board also noted that in this particular case it was acceptable as the vinyl basement window was located on the rear elevation of a mid-20th-century building and minimally visible from the public alley.

2. [CASE BAR2011-0282](#)

Request for construction of 3 multi-family buildings, 27 townhouses, 4 triplexes, and a park in Phase V of the James Bland Redevelopment Project at **1000 First St and 998 N Alfred St**, zoned CDD#16 Coordinated Development District #16

APPLICANT: Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority and GBP Associates, LLC c/o EYA by Kenneth Wire (McGuire Woods)

BOARD ACTION: **Deferred for further study, 5-0.**

SPEAKERS

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

Smita Anand, architect for the applicant, spoke in support of the application reviewing changes made since concept approval and responding to questions

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Moffat expressed concern about a “Great Wall of Condo” along Route 1 and thought that there should be greater color differentiation along this corridor. The applicant responded that the proposed color scheme was more brown/tan than the pink shown in the color elevations. They proposed a lighter, cream-colored brick for the rusticated base.

Ms. Kelley preferred the smooth block over the split face block at the mock-up. She also liked the changes for the courtyard planter scheme. She found the horizontal strip of HardieTrim above the windows and the larger cornice to be improvements.

Mr. Slowik had no comments and agreed with what had been said.

Mr. Moffat commended the architecture team for a well-presented design. He expressed continued concern about the height of the project, particularly adjacent to First Street. He noted that the lack of comments from the general public indicated overall support for the project.

Ms. del Ninno liked the design and the application, noting it was an improvement over the concept scheme. She expressed concern about the increased height of the area of HardiePanel over the top story windows on Building 36 (southernmost building in Phase V). Mr. Shron responded that they would work to shrink that area. Ms. del Ninno noted that Building 38 (northernmost building in Phase V) was more successful with its four stories of brick and minimal use of HardiePanel. The applicant responded that the intent was to relate to the adjacent buildings in the block to the south and to be sensitive to cost. Ms. del Ninno recommended restudy of Building 36 and consideration of another roof system that would allow for a lower parapet/cornice as it seemed exceptionally tall. Ms. del Ninno noted it was wise to move the downspouts onto the private street but suggested that the downspouts better follow the profile of the cornice and building. She also noted that the cornice below the top floor at the center five-story building was much lighter and had a better aesthetic.

Chairman Conkey suggested that the applicant bring the brick farther up, raise the windows a few inches and bring the cornice down at Building 36 to reduce the overpowering fourth story. He also questioned the use of downspouts in place of roof drains and noted that the scale of this masonry building was not appropriate for downspouts. He commented it was odd to have small building elements, such as downspouts, on big buildings such as these. He also noted that the detailing of these buildings will be important and that the industrial aesthetic could be successful with the right detailing. Chairman Conkey found all three proposed brick colors to be appropriate though suggested the applicant also consider a brick color with iron spots (orange spots) to add life. He agreed with concerns raised by other Board members about Building 36

and suggested reducing the total area of HardiePanel. He also expressed general concerns with the use of HardiePanel and noted that it must be properly detailed to be successful. Regarding the metalwork, Chairman Conkey noted that a slight design change would be appropriate but that it must have the same level of refinement as the mock-up for Phase IV. Chairman Conkey noted that the “step down” portion at Building 38 remained challenging because so much of the rest of the design was symmetrical. He found that the applied top story canopy was appropriate but requested more detailing information. He also inquired as to whether it will be an occupied roof or if planters could be added on the edge, to at least provide architectural reasons for being a two-tiered building. He also commented that he preferred the smooth-face block to the split-face block but that the mortar needed to match. Ms. Anand noted that the only split-face block on this phase was on the double band between the first and second stories and that all the headers and rustication areas were all a lighter brick.

Ms. del Ninno noted that she preferred the split-face block on the double band because it was in keeping with the industrial aesthetic.

On a motion by Ms. del Ninno, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the Board voted to defer the application for further study.

REASON

While the Board all agreed that the proposed design was an improvement from the concept submission, they found that further refinement and restudy was needed. In particular, the Board requested a reduction in the height of the fourth-story of HardiePanel at Building 36 (southernmost building on block) and a reconsideration of the roof design to allow for a lower cornice and parapet. The Board also requested more information on the color scheme and detailing for items such as the canopy and metalwork.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Update on the status of the Parker-Gray BAR Ad-hoc Design Guidelines Work Group

Chairman Conkey updated the Board on the Work Group and the Board voted to approve a change in the composition of the Work Group to include two appointees from each civic association as opposed to one, 5-0. As Matt Slowik was now a civic association member of the Work Group, the Board voted to have Ms. Kelley serve as Alternate, 5-0.

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 BAR2012-0011

Request for roof replacement (garage) at **329 N Henry St**, zoned CL Commercial

APPLICANT: Daniel Coe

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Conkey adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:45 pm.

Minutes submitted by:

Catherine Miliaras
Historic Preservation Planner