

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

Alexandria Board of Architectural Review  
Old & Historic Alexandria District

**Wednesday, January 5, 2011**

7:30pm, City Council Chambers, City Hall  
301 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Members Present: Tom Hulfish, Chairman  
Chip Carlin  
Oscar Fitzgerald  
Arthur Keleher  
John von Senden  
Peter Smeallie  
Wayne Neale

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

The meeting was called to order at 7:40 p.m. by Chairman Hulfish.

---

**I. MINUTES**

Consideration of the minutes of the public hearing of December 15, 2010.

**Approved as submitted, 7-0**

On a motion by Mr. Fitzgerald, seconded by Mr. von Senden, the minutes were unanimously approved, as submitted.

---

**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.

**BOARD ACTION:** On a motion by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Mr. Smeallie, the Consent Calendar, consisting of item #1, was unanimously approved, as submitted.

1. **CASE BAR2010-0356**

Request for replacement gate at **336 N. Pitt St**, zoned RM Residential.

**APPLICANT:** Jane Harter

**BOARD ACTION:** **Approved on the Consent Calendar 7-0, as submitted**

---

**III. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**2. CASE BAR2010-0326**

Request for demolition of storefront at **719 King St**, zoned KR King Street Retail.

APPLICANT: 719 King St LLC

BOARD ACTION: **Approved as amended, by a roll call vote, 4-3**

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

**3. CASE BAR2010-0329**

Request for new storefront and awning and rear door alterations at **719 King St**, zoned KR King Street Retail.

APPLICANT: 719 King St LLC

BOARD ACTION: **Approved as amended, by a roll call vote, 4-3**

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

Approval of the Permit to Demolish/Encapsulate and the Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations with the following conditions:

1. That the existing unused metal scroll bracket at the second story be removed from the building.
2. That the awning and signage be anchored through the mortar joints rather than into the brick.
3. That the applicant select a more discreet light fixture to illuminate the storefront and entrance under the awning, with final approval by Staff.
4. That the new metal door on the rear be painted oxide red to match the adjacent brick wall.
5. That all of the proposed aluminum on the storefront be replaced with wood or a wood composite that is millable, paintable and solid through the core.

**SPEAKERS**

Mr. Tarek Moukalled, applicant, stated that he agreed with the staff recommendations.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Smeallie said that he liked the smaller logo on the new awning and, following additional field review, believed the steep slope of this particular awning would allow the sign to be easily visible from the sidewalk and his earlier concern that the sign should be relocated to a valance was eliminated.

Mr. Neale suggested that the large storefront window should be divided into three segments, to align with the transoms.

Mr. Carlin agreed with Mr. Neale and proposed that the three windows be extended into the sidewalk as a bay window, even though this would require an encroachment ordinance from City Council.

Mr. von Senden did not believe it was necessary to subdivide the storefront window and preferred the flush storefront without a bay.

Mr. Keleher moved the staff recommendation, seconded by Mr. von Senden, which passed 4-3 by a roll call vote.

## **REASON**

The Board generally agreed with the analysis in the Staff report and did not believe a bay window was necessary at this location.

### **4. CASE BAR2010-0354**

Request for demolition/encapsulation at **915 Cameron St**, zoned RM Residential.

APPLICANT: Craig Miller and Lisa Brock

BOARD ACTION: **Approved, as submitted, by unanimous roll call vote, 7-0**

This item was combined with item #5 for discussion purposes.

### **5. CASE BAR2010-0355**

Request for new windows at **915 Cameron St**, zoned RM Residential.

APPLICANT: Craig Miller and Lisa Brock

BOARD ACTION: **Approved, as submitted, by unanimous roll call vote, 7-0**

## **SPEAKERS**

Mr. Patrick Camus, architect, agreed with the conditions in the staff report and offered to respond to questions.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Smeallie moved approval of the application as submitted, Mr. Fitzgerald seconded the motion which passed by unanimous roll call vote.

## **REASON**

The Board agreed with the analysis in the Staff report.

### **6. CASE BAR2010-0358**

Request for demolition/encapsulation at **410 S. Lee St**, zoned RM Residential.

APPLICANT: Robert Lewandowsky

BOARD ACTION: **Approved as amended, by a roll call vote, 6-1**

This item was combined with item #7 for discussion purposes.

### **7. CASE BAR2010-0359**

Request for additions/alterations at **410 S. Lee St**, zoned RM Residential.

APPLICANT: Robert Lewandowsky

BOARD ACTION: **Approved as amended, by a roll call vote, 6-1**

## **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

Approval of the Permit to Demolish/Encapsulate and the Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition with the following conditions:

1. That the fiber cement siding be smooth (rather than with a simulated woodgrain) and that the nails not show in the installation;
2. That the plans be revised to illustrate that the brick wall on the adjacent property will be retained as is as part of the building permit application;
3. The following archaeology conditions shall appear in the General Notes of all site plans and on all site plan sheets that involve demolition or ground disturbance (including Basement/Foundation Plans, Demolition, Erosion and Sediment Control, Grading, Landscaping, Utilities, and Sheeting and Shoring) so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements.
  - a. The applicant/developer shall call Alexandria Archaeology (703/838-4399) two weeks before the starting date of any ground disturbance so that a monitoring and inspection schedule for city archaeologists can be arranged.
  - b. The applicant/developer shall call Alexandria Archaeology immediately (703-838-4399) if any buried structural remains (wall foundations, wells, privies, cisterns, etc.) or concentrations of artifacts are discovered during development. Work must cease in the area of the discovery until a City archaeologist comes to the site and records the finds.
  - c. The applicant/developer shall not allow any metal detection or artifact collection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

## **SPEAKERS**

Mr. Robert Lewandowsky, owner, offered to respond to questions.

Mr. John Hynan, representing the HAF, stated that this addition would create a dark tunnel. He said this was similar to a case on N. St. Asaph Street and asked the Board to differentiate between them.

Ms. Marliese March: owner at 412 S. Lee Street said that a 10' tall brick garden wall on the north side of her property would be removed and quoted from a letter from John Gosling about historic access to sunlight. (Omission of the garden wall was a drafting error in the application. It will not be removed.)

Andrew Macdonald, whose Mother lived at 428 S. Lee Street, spoke about the loss of gardens and open space in Old Town.

Mr. John Kester, 313 N. St. Asaph Street, noted six letters from the neighborhood sent to the Board in opposition to this addition and believed this case was substantially the same as the prior case on N. St. Asaph, which the Board opposed.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Carlin said this application was for a modest addition and, because it was to the north of the concerned neighbors at 412 South Lee Street, that there should be no loss of light in their garden as a result of the addition.

Mr. von Senden suggested that the depth of the addition should be considered but reconsidered when he realized the present proposal was only for a 12.5' extension into the rear yard.

Mr. Fitzgerald said that the previous case referenced on N. St. Asaph Street was much more visible from a public way. He said that the owner had a right to the addition under the zoning ordinance and that what was proposed was modest in size. He suggested raising the brick wall between the properties to allow planting to climb the wall.

Mr. Smeallie said that the facts of the N. St. Asaph case were different but the issue was similar. It varied only by its degree of visibility. While he had no issues with the design, he preferred to retain the open space.

Mr. Keleher said that this was a very modest addition and he had no objections.

Mr. Neale moved to approve the addition with an additional condition that the walls be brick veneer. Mr. Carlin seconded the motion. The application was approved by a 6-1 roll call vote with Mr. Smeallie in opposition.

#### **REASON**

The Board agreed with the analysis in the staff report and found the addition to be modestly scaled, would not diminish the sunlight to the neighbor's garden to the south, and was only minimally visible from a public way.

#### **8. CASE BAR2010-0361**

Request for demolition/encapsulation at **313 S. Columbus St**, zoned RM Residential.

APPLICANT: Norman and Judith Ann Lisy

BOARD ACTION: **Portion approved by a unanimous roll call vote, 7-0, and portion deferred for further study, 5-2**

This item was combined with item #9 for discussion purposes.

#### **9. CASE BAR2010-0362**

Request for alterations at **313 S. Columbus St**, zoned RM Residential.

APPLICANT: Norman and Judith Ann Lisy

BOARD ACTION: **Portion approved by a unanimous roll call vote, 7-0, and portion deferred for further study, 5-2**

#### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

Approval of the application, except for the six historic windows on the main block of the dwelling, with the following condition:

1. The following archaeology conditions shall appear in the General Notes of all site plans and on all site plan sheets that involve demolition or ground disturbance (including Basement/Foundation Plans, Demolition, Erosion and Sediment

Control, Grading, Landscaping, Utilities, and Sheeting and Shoring) so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements.

- a. The applicant/developer shall call Alexandria Archaeology (703/838-4399) two weeks before the starting date of any ground disturbance so that a monitoring and inspection schedule for city archaeologists can be arranged.
- b. The applicant/developer shall call Alexandria Archaeology immediately (703-838-4399) if any buried structural remains (wall foundations, wells, privies, cisterns, etc.) or concentrations of artifacts are discovered during development. Work must cease in the area of the discovery until a City archaeologist comes to the site and records the finds.
- c. The applicant/developer shall not allow any metal detection or artifact collection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

### **SPEAKERS**

John Savage, architect, presented the application and described the 6 windows in question, which were unchanged since they had been altered during the 1983 ARHA renovation. He described the alterations that had been made to the original sash to accommodate a new wood frame and aluminum jamb liner and filling the weight pockets with structural framing.

Mr. John Hynan, representing the HAF, supported the staff recommendation.

Mr. Lisy, owner since 1993, said his wife cannot open the bedroom windows and he is concerned about emergency egress.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Fitzgerald noted options for restoration and operation of the existing windows. He said the Board's mandate was to preserve the historic fabric of Old Town and that these window sash were original and appeared to be in good condition. He observed that the missing sash balance weights were not visible and not before the BAR.

Mr. von Senden commented that the recently approved window policy requires preservation of original windows. He said restoration is difficult but not impossible. He suggested that the sash balances could be installed behind the studs that filled the window pockets.

Mr. Smeallie noted that he has similar windows and no air conditioning. He said he needs to be convinced that the existing windows cannot be repaired and lacks the information to make a determination at this time. He preferred a deferral for restudy.

Mr. Keleher agreed with Mr. Smeallie but suggested that the owner compare the cost of new windows with restoration. He believed that restoration would be less expensive.

Mr. Neale asked whether the same condition existed in all six windows. Mr. Savage believed that it did. In that event, Mr. Neale felt that the windows may have been changed beyond saving.

Mr. Carlin suggested that the existing windows be made single hung with pins in the jamb to locate the lower sash. He commented that this appeared to be a case where a skilled painter or carpenter needed to sand the paint buildup from the jambs and make the existing sash operable.

Mr. Savage asked whether the application for historic window replacement could be separated from the remainder of the work.

Mr. von Senden moved the staff recommendation for all portions of the application except the six historic windows. Mr. Smeallie seconded the motion which passed by unanimous roll call vote.

Mr. Fitzgerald moved to require restoration of the six historic windows. Mr. von Senden seconded the motion.

Mr. Smeallie then offered a substitute motion to defer approval of the six historic windows for restudy. Mr. Keleher seconded the motion for deferral which passed 5-2.

#### **REASON**

The Board agreed with the analysis in the staff report but needed more information before making a determination whether the six historic windows could be replaced.

#### **10. CASE BAR2010-0364**

Request for Permit to Demolish/Encapsulation for alterations and new addition at **408 S. Royal St**, zoned RM Residential.

APPLICANT: Robert & Meredith MacNab by John Savage Architect, P.C.

BOARD ACTION: **Approved as amended, by a roll call vote, 7-0**

This item was combined with item #11 for discussion purposes.

#### **11. CASE BAR2010-0365**

Request for alterations and new addition at **408 S. Royal St**, zoned RM Residential.

APPLICANT: Robert & Meredith MacNab by John Savage Architect, P.C.

BOARD ACTION: **Approved as amended, by a roll call vote, 7-0**

#### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

Approval of the Permit to Demolish/Encapsulate and Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions:

1. That the trim utilized on the addition will be solid through the core, paintable PVC trim.
2. That the fiber cement siding be smooth (rather than with a simulated

woodgrain) and the nails are installed recessed.

### **SPEAKERS**

Mr. John Savage, architect, agreed with the staff recommendation.

Mr. John Hynan, representing the HAF, supported the staff recommendation and asked how many planters in the sidewalk were being removed. Staff clarified that all of the planters in front of 408 S. Royal were being removed and that the planters at the house next door were not part of this application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

On a motion by Mr. Fitzgerald, seconded by Mr. von Senden, the application was approved by unanimous roll call vote, 7-0.

### **REASON**

The Board agreed with the analysis in the staff report.

### **12. CASE BAR2010-0366**

Request for Permit to Demolish/Encapsulation for porch enclosure at **325 S. Lee St**, zoned RM Residential.

APPLICANT: Mitchell Bober by Lewis & Associates LTD

BOARD ACTION: **Deferred for further study, 5-2**

This item was combined with item #13 for discussion purposes.

### **13. CASE BAR2010-0367**

Request for porch enclosure at **325 S. Lee St**, zoned RM Residential.

APPLICANT: Mitchell Bober by Lewis & Associates LTD

BOARD ACTION: **Deferred for further study, 5-2**

### **SPEAKERS**

Mr. Ray Lewis, architect, presented the application. He agreed with the recommendations in the staff report and noted that there would be no change to the historic roof. He pointed out that the glass wall would be easily reversible and that the owner agreed to an easement to protect the historic siding and windows being encapsulated. He understood that there was some concern about the design of the balustrade but said the owner preferred the batten design and offered to paint the wall between the battens a dark color to visually recede.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Chairman Hulfish stated that he did not like the batten design. He preferred that the porch remain open or have temporary glass panels mounted at the back of the posts. He had no problem with lowering the floor but did not want this enclosure to read as a glass wall.



Mr. Fitzgerald asked whether the use of tempered glass would eliminate the need for lowering the floor. Staff responded that the floor had to be lowered to comply with the headroom requirements of the building code. Once the porch is enclosed with glass walls, the previous outdoor space becomes a habitable room and must comply with the requirements of the new use.

Mr. Carlin said that open porches are artifacts of the past and that they are not used the same way today. While he does not object to some enclosure, he did not like the batten scheme and suggests storm sashes on the south side with ventilation openings on the west side.

Mr. von Senden did not care for the batten solution.

Mr. Fitzgerald preferred removable panels with the glass set behind the column.

Mr. Smeallie liked the applicant's original design with battens. Mr. Keleher agreed.

Mr. Neale did not like the battens and preferred that glass be set behind the balusters. He moved to defer for restudy. Mr. von Senden seconded the motion.

Mr. Keleher offered a substitute motion to approve the staff recommendation, seconded by Mr. Smeallie. That motion failed 4-3.

The original motion for restudy was approved 5-2.

#### **REASON**

The Board did not believe the proposed batten baluster design retained the character of the original open porch.

#### **14. CASE BAR2010-0373**

Request for roof replacement at **917 Prince St**, zoned CL Commercial.

APPLICANT: Mark Stevenson and John Schmidt

BOARD ACTION: **Deferred for further study, 7-0**

#### **SPEAKERS**

Pat Cavanagh, with Alexandria Roofing, described the work they had done to locate new or salvage replacement specialty clay tiles for the turret shingles. He estimated that only 10% to 12% of the existing roofing could be salvaged for reuse and that many tiles were broken but, because the roof had been painted 3 to 5 times, this was not readily evident from the ground. He said that the only company they had located who would make replacement tiles wanted \$800 each for the four different size tile molds necessary, plus the cost of the tile, requiring a total of approximately \$15,000 in material alone for this small roof. He explained that the original shingles lack the side lap required by modern

code and that a single ply membrane roof underlayment would leak again within 8 to 10 years.

Mr. Stevenson, owner, described the roof leaks and the number of times it had been repaired unsuccessfully.

Mr. John Hynan, representing the HAF, believed the tiles must be replaced if it were possible to make them, which it appeared to be.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. von Senden did not believe that the shingles needed to be 100% waterproof. He suggested the underlayment could be the waterproof membrane.

Mr. Fitzgerald framed the issue as one of locating a cost effective replacement material. He suggested that an artisan potter might be more appropriate to make the specialty tiles than a large roofing company. If the material cannot be replicated, then he wanted to see a historically appropriate alternative that had been used on historic buildings. He did not like the standing seam copper proposal because it changed the visual character of the roof.

Mr. Cavanagh responded that he could not warrant roofing made by an artist with no experience making clay roof tiles but that he had investigated copper shingles. He repeated that the original clay tile design does not prevent water infiltration and that he believed the underlayment would only protect the framing below for 8 to 10 years.

Mr. Smeallie is not ready to approve or deny this application. If the historic clay tiles cannot be replicated, then he preferred the color and texture of the slate shingle sample.

Mr. Keleher said that, except for the absence of the bumps in the historic clay tile, the slate looked ok.

Mr. Neale asked whether the exterior finish on the bay window below the turret was copper. The owner replied that it was but that it had been painted many years ago. Mr. Neale suggested there was a logical design relationship between the two and urged the applicant to continue to explore copper shingles and possibly strip the paint from the bay.

Mr. Carlin made a distinction between a simple vernacular side gable roof and a large Mansard roof and turret on a building such as this highly visible semi-detached pair of townhouses, which he described as an exemplary example of a full force pair of Romanesque style buildings. He agreed with Mr. Hynan that the roof is a fundamental part of the design of this structure and encouraged the applicant to spend the money to replicate the historic clay tile.

Mr. von Senden made a motion to defer and restudy based on the comments above. Mr. Fitzgerald seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, 7-0.

## **REASON**

The Board was not comfortable approving a substitute roofing material on this highly visible high-style building without first exploring all alternatives.

---

## **V. DEFERRED CASES**

### **15. CASE BAR2010-0011**

Request for Permit to Demolish for construction of new dormers and renovations at **626 S. Lee St**, zoned RM Residential.

APPLICANT: S. Lee & Debra Parker by Lewis & Associates LTD

### **16. CASE BAR2009-0301**

Request for alterations at **626 S. Lee St**, zoned RM Residential.

APPLICANT: S. Lee & Debra Parker by Lewis & Associates LTD

This case was deferred by the applicant, pending approval of expansion of the garage by the BZA.

---

## **VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. A copy of the December 27, 2010 Memo to the City Council regarding Status of BAR Policies for the Appropriate Use of Modern and Sustainable Materials in the Historic Districts was included in the Board's packet.
- 

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Hulfish adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:00 pm.

---

## **VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

### **CASE BAR2010-0357**

Request for signage at **309 S. Washington St**, zoned CD Commercial.

APPLICANT: Holistic Touch

### **CASE BAR2010-0363**

Request for window replacement and alterations at **406 S. Royal St**, zoned RM Residential.

APPLICANT: Paul & Linda Darlington by John Savage Architect, P.C.

### **CASE BAR2010-0368**

Request for roof replacement at **104 Pommander Walk St**, zoned RM Residential.

APPLICANT: Daniel Morrison by Paul Davis Restoration

**CASE BAR2010-0374**

Request for siding replacement at **703 S. Lee St**, zoned RM Residential.

APPLICANT: Kevin Kuntz

**CASE BAR2010-0375**

Request for replacement of front door at **102 N. Fayette St**, zoned CD Commercial.

APPLICANT: Fiber Space

**CASE BAR2010-0376**

Request for signage at **110 S. Columbus St**, zoned CL Commercial.

APPLICANT: Old Town Sign Company

Minutes submitted by,

Al Cox, FAIA, Historic Preservation Manager  
Boards of Architectural Review