

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

Alexandria Board of Architectural Review
Parker-Gray District

Wednesday, July 28, 2010

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

Members Present: William Conkey, Chairman
Robert Duffy
Christina Kelley
Richard Lloyd
Doug Meick
Philip Moffat
Deborah Rankin

Staff Present: Planning and Zoning:
Meredith Kizer, Historic Preservation Planner
Al Cox, FAIA, Historic Preservation Manager

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

1. Consideration of the minutes of the public hearing of June 23, 2010.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as submitted, 7-0

On a motion by Mr. Meick, seconded by Ms. Kelly, the minutes were unanimously approved as submitted.

CONSENT CALENDAR

2. CASE BAR2010-0195

Request for approval of alterations at **1226 Oronoco St**, zoned RB Residential.

APPLICANT: Scott and Jennifer Wagner

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as amended, 7-0

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL July 28, 2010

1. That the proposed 3.5' and 6.0' replacement fences must be erected only on the subject property per locations shown on submitted survey.
2. That the wood fences are painted or stained.

SPEAKERS

Ms. Wagner, applicant, responded to questions.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Kelly removed this item from the consent calendar for discussion because a portion was for approval of work completed after the fact. She encouraged staff to complete a new policy as quickly as possible for dealing with fines and penalties for such work.

Ms. Kelly recommended approval of the application with staff recommendations. Mr. Duffy seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

END CONSENT CALENDAR

DISCUSSION ITEMS

3. CASE BAR2010-0196

Request for approval of new construction at **219 N West St**, zoned RB Residential.

APPLICANT: Wanda Carter

BOARD ACTION: Approved portions and deferred portions for restudy, 7-0

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL July 28, 2010

Deferral of the application until September with the condition that:

1. The applicant may file an excavation and foundation permit; and
2. That the applicant work with staff to address the Board's comments to simplify the design and to provide additional construction information for the Board's review.

SPEAKERS

Ms. Carter presented the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Lloyd believed that the false windows and vents were not necessary and that the arched windows and door were too high style for this block of Parker Gray. He confirmed that parking would be on street.

Ms. Rankin said that she was generally in support and noted that there were a great variety of styles on this block.

Mr. Moffat said that he could live with the faux windows but preferred rectangular shape windows on the first floor.

Mr. Meick said that this is new construction and distinguishable from nearby historic structures, so he can support this design. He said that a porch light would be needed.

Ms. Kelly said that this proposal was too high style and that the arched head windows on the first floor were too much. She did not like the faux windows and believed that the first and second floor windows on the rear should align vertically.

Mr. Duffy said that the massing and scale was appropriate but that the door and windows on the façade were too much. He discouraged the faux windows.

Chairman Conkey agreed with the other Board members that the ground floor windows seemed out of place and that fake windows were a bad idea. He did not recognize the proposed roofing product and asked to see material samples next time. He believed that the beam between the first and second floor on the south side porch was out of scale and agreed with others that the windows on the rear elevation needed to align. Staff explained that the beam was uncharacteristically thick at the porch because a 7'-6" ceiling height maximum was used to keep this from being included in the FAR calculation. Finally, he wanted to see details of the hood over the front door.

Mr. Lloyd emphasized that he had no problem with the proposed footprint but that the front and rear windows needed to be restudied and that the beam at the side porch was visually too heavy.

Mr. Duffy supported approval of a footing and excavation permit with a restudy in September of roof materials, cornice brackets, front and rear porch lights and the other items mentioned previously by Board members.

Mr. Duffy made a motion to defer the application until September with the condition that:

1. The applicant may file an excavation and foundation permit; and
2. That the applicant work with staff to address the Board's comments to simplify the design and to provide additional construction information for the Board's review.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Moffat and passed unanimously.

REASON

The Board members believed the proposed design was too high style for this block of the Parker Gray district and needed additional information about the proposed materials.

4. CASE BAR2010-0197

Request for approval of alterations at **419 N Fayette St**, zoned RB Residential.

APPLICANT: Christine Coussens

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as amended, 7-0

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL July 28, 2010

Denial of the application for aluminum-clad wood double-hung windows and vinyl awning-style basement windows and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for simulated divided light, double-hung, painted wood windows on the first and second stories and aluminum-clad wood awning basement windows with the following conditions:

1. That the applicant use full frame replacement windows or sash replacement kits in the existing frame rather than insert or pocket replacements;
2. That the replacement windows have fixed muntin grills on the interior and exterior with a putty glaze profile on the exterior;
3. That the glazing on the glass be tint free;
4. That the dimensions of the replacement windows match the existing window sash including the rails, stiles, and muntins;
5. That the replacement window sash corners be constructed with mortise and tenon

- style, butt joinery rather than mitered, picture frame joinery;
6. That the replacement windows have spacer bars between the glass and that they be a dark matte color rather than reflective silver or gold metallic;
 7. That the applicant submit final window manufacturer spec sheets to staff for approval prior to application of a building permit;
 8. That the applicant may return to the Board in September, based on the outcome of staff's research of prior aluminum clad window approvals.

SPEAKERS

Ms. Coussens presents that application and stated that the shutters should be grandfathered because they were part of the original design and installed prior to formation of the historic district. She also pointed out several instances in the immediate vicinity where the Board had approved the same aluminum clad windows that she requested, sometimes over the objection of staff. She asked for consistency in the Board's actions.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Duffy agreed that the Board needed to be consistent and wanted to hear from members who had been on the Board longer than he had about previous similar applications.

Ms. Kelly agreed with the staff recommendations except for removal of the inoperable shutters because she believed the window head trim would look odd if the shutters were removed. She believed that the only aluminum clad windows approved by the Board in the past were to replace steel sash windows. She had no problem with aluminum clad windows at the basement level but could not support aluminum on the upper levels.

Mr. Moffat supported retention of the existing shutters but recommended a deferral for staff to investigate the history of aluminum clad window approval. He could support wood windows now.

Ms. Rankin believed that the cases cited were 5 to 15 years old and that the Board's policy is now more consistent. She supported retention of the existing shutters.

Mr. Lloyd agreed with staff but was open to weighing the result of additional research on past Board action regarding aluminum clad windows. He moved to approve staff recommendations 1 thru 7 with the applicant's option to return in September based on staff research of prior aluminum clad window approvals. Mr. Moffat seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

REASON

The Board generally agreed with the analysis in the staff report but felt that the shutters were appropriate here because they were original to the Colonial Revival design. The Board also wanted to be consistent and was willing to reconsider aluminum clad wood windows based on a survey of recent prior approvals.

END DISCUSSION ITEMS

5. OTHER BUSINESS

1. 2010/2011 Board officer elections: The Board unanimously reelected Chairman Conkey and Vice-chair Rankin for another one year term.

6. ADJOURNMENT

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

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

The following items have been administratively approved by BAR Staff

CASE BAR2010-0191

Request for approval of roof replacement at **904 Oronoco St**, zoned RB Residential.

APPLICANT: Tom & Ruth Lane

CASE BAR2010-0194

Request for approval of a shed at **708 N Patrick St**, zoned RB Residential.

APPLICANT: Mark Moses

CASE BAR2010-0204

Request for approval of roof & porch repair & replacement at **421 N Fayette St**, zoned RB Residential.

APPLICANT: Mark Mahar

Submitted by:

Al Cox, FAIA
Historic Preservation Manager