

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

Alexandria Board of Architectural Review
Parker-Gray District

Wednesday, May 23, 2012

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

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

Members Absent: Doug Meick

Staff Present: Planning and Zoning:
Al Cox, Historic Preservation Manager
Stephanie Sample, Historic Preservation Planner
Joshua Brooking, Senior Planning Technician

The meeting was called to order at approximately 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Conkey.

I. MINUTES

Consideration of the [minutes](#) of the public hearing of March 28, 2012.

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

Consideration of the [minutes](#) of the public hearing of April 25, 2012.

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

On a motion by Mr. Duffy, seconded by Ms. Kelley, both the March 28, 2012 and April 25, 2012 minutes were approved, as submitted, 6-0.

II. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. **[CASE BAR2012-0139](#)**

Request to partially demolish and capsulate at **912 Pendleton St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Charlette Poindexter by Navarro Construction Services

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

This item was combined with Item #2 for discussion purposes.

2. **[CASE BAR2012-0140](#)**

Request alterations at **912 Pendleton St**, zoned RB Residential
APPLICANT: Charlette Poindexter by Navarro Construction Services
BOARD ACTION: **Approved, as amended, by a roll call vote, 6-0.**

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. That the applicant work with Staff to determine whether there is any historic siding underneath the existing vinyl siding on the front elevation and whether it can be salvaged and repaired. If such siding cannot be salvaged, then it must be matched. If there is no original wood siding remaining, then the applicant must work with Staff to determine an appropriate profile and reveal for replacement siding.
2. That if the Board endorses ~~replacement~~ **only the limited patch and repair of synthetic existing vinyl siding on the rear and new porch.** The applicant ~~considers~~ **is required to use** a more durable and higher quality synthetic or composite siding, such as fiber cement, **if the vinyl is completely removed.**
3. That the proposed AC condenser unit be located in non-required open space. **If the unit is located in a minimally visual location, to be determined in the field by staff, then screening may be waived.**

SPEAKERS

Ricardo Navarro, representing the applicant and speaking in support of the application gave an overview of the application and answered questions.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. del Ninno began by agreeing with the staff recommendations. She had a question about the front elevation. Mr. Cox stated that once the vinyl is removed Staff will work with the applicant to determine if there is original, salvageable wood siding. Mr. Cox added that if there is no original, salvageable siding, the applicant will match the original profile with Prime-Lock wood siding. Ms. del Ninno stated concerns about the visible gas lines and suggested that they try and reduce their visibility on the side of the house. Additionally, Ms. del Ninno asked staff why there was an original 6/6 window over an original 2/2 window on the rear elevation. Mr. Cox stated that it was a curiosity to have that window style on the rear of the house and staff would work with Mr. Navarro to investigate the matter. Ms. del Ninno stated that she had concerns with looking at a structure from only an elevation aspect versus as an entire building. Ms. del Ninno stated that she has concerns with adding vinyl siding and noted the long term benefits of utilizing fiber cement siding. She noted that the fiber cement siding will look better with the original windows that the applicant is retaining. She added that if the windows cannot be retained, then there should be an option for the applicant to have an alternative. Chairman Conkey added that staff can administrative approve windows that comply with the Board adopted Window Policy. Chairman Conkey added that use of vinyl siding is an issue being discussed with the Parker-Gray Ad-hoc Design Guidelines Work Group and that an update from the group would be given during Other Business.

Mr. Moffat expressed reservations about vinyl siding, but that under the unique circumstances of this case could support the repair of the vinyl siding. He asked about the maintenance with vinyl siding. Chairman Conkey said maintenance is lower because you

do not have to paint it, but it typically allows for water damage that can threaten the structure as a whole. Mr. Moffat stated that he is aware there is some interest in a lighter regulatory touch, but he does not believe that we should give up on maintaining rear elevations and alley ways.

Mr. Slowik stated that he supported the application as submitted, in particular the applicants option to use vinyl siding.

Mr. Duffy commended the applicant on working to restore the façade and windows. He added that since there is existing vinyl siding that was previously approved (after-the-fact), this is a unique case. He stated that he can support the repair and replacement of vinyl siding as needed.

Ms. Kelley asked for clarification as to whether the applicant was requesting replacement of the vinyl siding on the rear in entirety or just repair in small areas. Mr. Navarro stated that the applicant wished to replace the vinyl siding in its entirety on the rear. Ms. Kelley stated that she could not support the replacement of all the vinyl siding, and stated that she preferred the fiber cement siding on the rear instead.

Chairman Conkey stated that he would like to clarify that the AC condenser is located in the non-required yard. He added that by locating the AC condenser within the non-required yard it would not be visible from a public right-of-way. He stated that he could not support the utilization of new vinyl siding, but he could support the patch and repair. Mr. Cox stated that he understood the application to be patching and repair, not complete replacement of the vinyl siding. Ms. Kelley and Mr. Duffy stated that she could support only the patch and repair of the vinyl siding, not the replacement in its entirety.

Mr. Moffat asked what the short-term and long-term maintenance and price differential for vinyl. Ms. del Ninno stated that typically vinyl siding last for 10 years. Mr. Slowik addressed concerns that the three walls surrounding the AC condenser would create a noise nuisance for the applicant. Mr. Cox stated that the AC condenser must be located within the non-required open space, so the only other alternative would be placement on the roof. Mr. Slowik suggested giving the applicant the option to place the AC condenser on the roof. Chairman Conkey added that the AC condenser must be placed in a minimally visual location on the roof. Mr. Moffat asked the cost for materials and installation of vinyl versus fiber cement. Mr. Navarro stated that the estimate for the vinyl siding is between \$1,250 and \$1,300 and he would estimate fiber cement to be approximately \$3,000. Mr. Navarro stated that the applicant wished to explore the option of fiber cement but, if that is not economically viable, then he would like to utilize the patch and repair of the vinyl siding.

Mr. Cox then read the amended recommendations, based on the Board's discussion.

On a motion by Mr. Duffy, seconded by Mr. Slowik, the application was approved as amended, 6-0.

REASON

The Board found the proposed demolition and alterations appropriate and supported the restoration of the windows and front façade. The majority of the Board did not agree to allow the replacement installation of new vinyl siding.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Update on the status of the Parker-Gray BAR Ad-hoc Design Guidelines Work Group
BOARD ACTION: The Board voted to endorse the proposed fee schedule, as presented, 4-1.

Chairman Conkey gave a brief overview of the Parker-Gray BAR Ad-hoc Design Guidelines Work Group progress and explained how the group came to the proposed fee schedule. Mr. Moffat and Mr. Slowik both felt the Work Group was making positive progress.

On a motion by Mr. Duffy, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the Board endorsed the proposed fee schedule as presented, on a roll call vote, 4-1, with Mr. Slowik in opposition because he supported the Work Group's recommendation to reduce the administrative approval fee.

IV. 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 BAR2012-0077

Request for window replacement at **420 N Henry St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Carmencita Pinentel by Sarah & Emmanuel Pimentel

CASE BAR2012-0086

Request for siding & trim repair, window & door replacement, and new storm door and light fixture at **313 N Payne St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Maria Dillard

CASE BAR2012-0115

Request for siding replacement at **307 N West St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Earsey Mahaffee

CASE BAR2012-0124

Request for door replacement and new screen door at **1603 Princess St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Larry A. Arthur

CASE BAR2012-0125

Request for window replacement at **823 Church St**, zoned RM Residential

APPLICANT: Mark A. Ragland

CASE BAR2012-0128

Request for siding replacement at **409 N West St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: George Thomas

CASE BAR2012-0142

Request for roof replacement at **317 N West St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Katarynia Delisle

CASE BAR2012-0143

Request for alterations at **227 N West St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Keil Gentry

CASE BAR2012-0138

Request for alterations and window restoration at **912 Pendleton St**, zoned RB Residential

APPLICANT: Charlette Poindexter by Navarro Construction Services

V. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Conkey adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:00 pm.

Minutes submitted by:

Al Cox, FAIA

Historic Preservation Manager