

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

Alexandria Board of Architectural Review  
Parker-Gray District

**Wednesday, February 22, 2012**

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

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

Members Absent: Doug Meick

Staff Present: Planning and Zoning:  
Al Cox, Historic Preservation Manager  
Catherine Miliaras, Historic Preservation Planner  
Stephanie Sample, 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 January 25, 2012.

**BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 5-0-1** (Mr. Duffy abstained)

On a motion by Ms. Kelley, seconded by Mr. Slowik, the minutes were approved, as submitted, 5-0-1.

---

**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 BAR2012-00022**

Request for fence alterations at **534 N Columbus St**, zoned RB Residential

**APPLICANT:** Deborah Plunkett

**BOARD ACTION: Approved on the Consent Calendar, 5-0-1** (Mr. Moffat abstained).

On a motion by Mr. Duffy, seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Consent Calendar was approved, 5-0-1 (Mr. Moffat abstained).

### III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

2. [CASE BAR2012-00020](#)

Request for demolition/encapsulation at **324 N Patrick St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Andrea Seward by Allison Thurmond

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

**This item was combined with Item 3 for discussion purposes.**

3. [CASE BAR2012-00021](#)

Request for addition at **324 N Patrick St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Andrea Seward by Allison Thurmond

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

#### **SPEAKERS**

Allison Thurmond, architect representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application and responded to questions.

Andrea Seward, applicant, spoke in support of the application.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Kelley found the design interesting and compatible. She did have a question regarding roof drainage, which was answered by the designer.

Mr. Duffy agreed with the staff report and supported the project.

Mr. Slowik had a question regarding what portion of the roof would be replaced. Staff responded that all of the roof will be replaced, and the historic portion facing the roof visible from N. Patrick Street will be replaced with a traditional standing seam appearance to match the existing.

Mr. Moffat inquired as to whether the taller addition will be visible from farther away, as is often the case. Staff displayed the applicant's graphic, demonstrating that the addition was only slightly smaller than the neighbor's house and would only be visible through a narrow horse alley, if at all.

Chairman Conkey complemented the design and suggested further investigating the relationship of the metal and wood on the rear railing and noted if the railing is a different material it should be on a separate plane. He also suggested the applicant work with Staff regarding the cornice on the front elevation.

On a motion by Ms. Kelley, seconded by Mr. Duffy, the Board approved the application with the condition that the applicant work out railing details and the front cornice with Staff. The motion carried on a roll call vote, 6-0.

**REASON**

The Board supported the application and found it to be an appropriate design for this location.

**4. 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: **Multi-family buildings approved, as amended, and Phase III and V townhouses, triplexes and park deferred for further study, 6-0.**

**See item 5 for discussion related to Phase V townhouses, triplexes and park.**

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

General

1. That the Board waive the screening requirements for the rooftop HVAC units but that the applicant further study how to minimize the visible impact of the rooftop HVAC units. In addition, the applicant must 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). The applicant must clarify the location of the rooftop HVAC units for final approval by Staff prior to issuance of building permits.
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 townhouse condition), or may be fiberglass or metal clad (for multi-family and townhouse rear deck and patio doors).
3. That the applicant propose windows that are in conformance with the *Alexandria Replacement Window Performance Specifications* and that the applicant provide full specifications for all windows and doors prior to the building permit process (previous BAR condition).
4. That the applicant provide specifications for materials such as vents, light fixtures, entry and service doors and any other materials as necessary during the building permit review process (previous BAR condition with modification).
5. That the applicant work with Staff on the text and graphics of the historical marker and conform to the standards set forth in the City's recently adopted Wayfinding Program (previous BAR condition).
6. That the applicant work with Staff to determine the least obtrusive location for the mail boxes (previous BAR condition).

7. That the applicant adequately screen all utilities and trash receptacles from the street (public or private). Where illumination is required for utility and trash areas, the light fixtures should be discreet and unobtrusive (i.e., not goosenecks), with final approval by Staff (previous BAR condition with modification).
8. That the applicant reduce the cornice projection as discussed in previous phases.

### Multi-family Buildings

1. ~~That the applicant extend the brick to the top of the fourth story windows and reduce the area of HardiePanel between top story windows and the cornice for the southernmost building with final approval by Staff~~ That the applicant work to reduce the actual and/or perceived height of the fourth story at Building 36 (southernmost multi-family in Phase V) with final approval by Staff;
2. That the visual impact of the proposed accessibility ramp on Montgomery Street be as minimal as possible, with final approval by Staff;
3. That the mechanical equipment be grouped in the center of the roof to the maximum extent possible to minimize visibility from the surrounding streets and that all stickers, labels and markings not required by the manufacturer be removed from all mechanical equipment.

### **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 and responded to questions. She reviewed changes made since the previous hearing.

Roy Priest, CEO of ARHA, spoke in support of the project and reminded the Board about the limited budget of this project.

Connie Staudinger, representing ARHA, spoke in support of the project and reminded the Board about the limited budget of this project.

Deborah Plunkett, resident on North Columbus Street, reminded the Board that the details do matter and affect the community. She expressed surprise at the size and extent of the redevelopment noting that it overwhelmed the existing neighborhood.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. del Ninno appreciated the applicant's effort to reduce the total area of HardiePanel on the upper story and recognized that changing drainage plans would require site work. She suggested having the roof come down to the level of the hyphen/inset which is a bit lower.

Mr. Moffat supported raising the brick to the fourth story at Building 36 and noted that the Board was bound by the Zoning Ordinance and Design Guidelines, rather than economic considerations. The applicant responded that Building 36 is trying to relate to

the adjacent building in the adjacent block to the south and noted that an additional story of brick adds \$20,000 in material costs.

Mr. Slowik thanked the applicant for the changes and supported the application as amended.

Mr. Duffy found it unfortunate that a cost-effective design solution could not be found for Building 36. He believed that replicating the design of the four story part of Building 38 would be a good alternative for Building 36 and supported additional study.

Ms. Kelley noted that although the fourth story area of HardiePanel appears overwhelming in elevation, it might be fine once it constructed and viewed from a grade level perspective.

Chairman Conkey inquired about the status of previous comments he had made, including whether Building 38 could have an occupied space on the roof of the third story portion. Mr. Shron responded that ARHA was concerned about the costs of constructing and maintaining such a roof deck. He also asked about the relationship between the size of the two bands at the top of the fourth floor at Building 37. The architect, Ms. Anand, responded that they are two different sizes. He also asked if the single slope roof drainage can be split on Building 36 to limit the required height for the parapet. Mr. Shron stated that he would investigate the routing of the water from the North Patrick Street side to the private street side but that the current scheme had all the water draining to the private street side due to site constraints.

On a motion by Ms. del Ninno, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the Board voted to approve the application for the multi-family buildings with the conditions noted above, 6-0.

## **REASON**

The Board found the overall design scheme for the multi-family buildings to be appropriate and commended the architect for the work. However, several Board members believed that the vertical expanse of HardiePanel above the fourth-story at the southernmost building (Building 36) was still too large. While the applicant has restudied this issue several times, the Board found that the proportions of this floor level on this one building needed further refinement and added a condition to reduce the actual and/or perceived height of this area with final approval by staff.

### **5. [CASE BAR2012-00023](#)**

Request for construction of 39 townhouses and 4 triplexes in Phase III of the James Bland Redevelopment Project at **918 N Columbus 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: **Multi-family buildings approved, as amended, and Phase III and V townhouses, triplexes and park deferred for further study, 6-0.**

The Board combined discussion of the Phase III and V townhouses, triplexes and park.

### **SPEAKERS**

Greg Shron, representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application, gave an overview of changes/improvements and responded to questions.

Roy Priest, CEO of ARHA, spoke in support of the project and reminded the Board about the limited budget of this project.

Connie Staudinger, representing ARHA, spoke in support of the project and reminded the Board about the limited budget of this project.

Deborah Plunkett, resident on North Columbus Street, reminded the Board that the details do matter and affect the community. She expressed surprise at the size and extent of the redevelopment noting that it overwhelmed the existing neighborhood.

Steve Rudin, resident at 900 North Washington Street, expressed concern that some of the detailing on what has already been constructed is not appealing.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Kelley agreed with the Staff recommendation that the ground floor windows at some of the ARHA units should be raised. She also noted the proposed long expanse and uniformity of townhouses on North Alfred Street and suggested moving some of the units around, adding double windows and the like to increase the variety.

Mr. Duffy noted that the applicant should avoid blank walls and should introduce new color schemes to add variety.

Mr. Slowik agreed with the Board members comments and noted that Lot 31 (Phase V) needed more windows.

Mr. Moffat stated that he preferred the continuation of siding the entire side and rear elevations rather than the HardiePanel “box” form of the loft levels. Due to their visibility, he suggested eliminating lofts on the short block faces. He found that the ARHA units with the Mansard roof appear too visually heavy.

Ms. del Ninno had questions about the overall design scheme and asked the applicant provide background on the architectural composition of the project. She inquired as to why the top floor was continuous when the architecture of the main body of the townhouses was representative of different eras. She suggested that the monitor should be set back from the side elevation to look like a true addition and the wall material of the monitor should turn the corner. She suggested changing the brick end units to have a height wall, including the monitor. She also suggested differentiating the monitor to make it more separate from the rest of the townhouse. She noted that elevations should be carefully crafted so the block face makes sense.

On a motion by Mr. Duffy, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the Board voted to defer the application for the park in Phase V and the townhouses and triplexes in Phases III and V and that the applicant should address all the Board's comments.

**REASON**

The Board found that the townhouses and triplexes needed further refinement to incorporate lessons learned from the previous phases. Several Board members continued to express concern regarding the loft level and general detailing in the project.

---

**IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. An informational presentation was provided by the design team on the new Jefferson-Houston School
2. Chairman Conkey, Matt Slowik and Phil Moffat provided a brief update on the progress of the Parker-Gray BAR Ad-hoc Design Guidelines Work Group.

---

**V. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

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

**CASE BAR2012-0038**

Request for siding, trim, and door replacement at **308 N Payne St**, zoned RB Residential  
**APPLICANT:** Curtis Hamilton

**CASE BAR2012-0039**

Request for roof replacement at **1006 Cameron St**, zoned CD Commercial  
**APPLICANT:** Daniel Coe

---

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Conkey adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:45 pm.

Minutes submitted by:

Catherine Miliaras  
Historic Preservation Planner