

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

Alexandria Board of Architectural Review  
Parker-Gray District

**Wednesday, February 9, 2011**  
7:30 P.M., Council Chambers, City Hall  
301 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Members Present: William Conkey, Chairman  
Robert Duffy  
Christina Kelley  
Deborah Rankin

Members Absent: Richard Lloyd  
Doug Meick  
Philip Moffat

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

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 November 17, 2010.

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted 3-0-1.

On a motion by Mr. Duffy, seconded by Ms. Rankin, the minutes were approved 3-0, with Ms. Kelley abstaining, having not attended the November 2010 hearing.

---

## **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 BAR2011-0004**

Request for trash enclosure screening at **1400 Princess St**, zoned RB Residential.

APPLICANT: Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority

BOARD ACTION: Deferred due to lack of notice. The Board noted the deferral.

---

### **III. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### **2. CASE BAR2011-0002**

Demolition/encapsulation at **927 Oronoco St**, zoned RB Residential.

APPLICANT: Michael Bergner by Stephen Kulinski, AIA

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, by a roll call vote, 4-0.

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

#### **3. CASE BAR2011-0005**

Alterations and rear addition at **927 Oronoco St**, zoned RB Residential.

APPLICANT: Michael Bergner by Stephen Kulinski, AIA

BOARD ACTION: Approved as amended, by a roll call vote, 4-0.

### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. That cellular PVC windows on the addition are changed to be either painted wood or aluminum clad wood windows and be in conformance with the Alexandria Window Performance Specifications.
2. That the balustrades are fabricated out of wood or a paintable synthetic/composite solid-through-the-core high-quality material.
3. That the size, location, height and possible interior shade option for the skylight are provided for staff approval during building permit review.
4. That staff have final approval of integral shades, if the applicant opts to install them on the French doors.
5. That Archaeology conditions appear in the General Notes of all site plans and on all site plan sheets that involve demolition or ground disturbance (including Erosion and Sediment Control, Grading, and Sheeting and Shoring) so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements.
  - a. 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.
  - b. The applicant/developer shall call Alexandria Archaeology (703/838-4399) two weeks before the starting date of any ground disturbance so that an inspection schedule for city archaeologists can be arranged.
  - c. The applicant/developer shall not allow any metal detection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology

### **SPEAKERS**

Steven Kulinski, representing the owner, commended staff on a well-written report and agreed with staff recommendations.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Duffy agreed with the staff report.

Ms. Kelley had questions regarding the use of integral shades on the French doors and recommended that if the applicant elects to install them that staff have final approval.

Ms. Rankin supported the staff recommendations with a few minor adjustments to the conditions.

Chairman Conkey had a question regarding drainage on the neighbor's newly-created valley and Mr. Kulinski assured him that there would be no negative impact.

Ms. Rankin moved approval of the staff recommendation with a few minor adjustments and Ms. Kelley's recommendation. Ms. Kelley seconded the motion which passed unanimously, 4-0.

### **REASON**

The Board agreed with the Staff analysis and clarified the conditions to include that staff have final approval of the skylight and integral shades and that the proposed windows meet the recently-adopted Alexandria Window Performance Specifications.

### **4. CASE BAR2011-0011**

Request for new construction of 21 townhouse units (17 single-family and 4 triplexes), 3 multi-family buildings and park, and waiver of rooftop screening requirement for Phase IV of the James Bland Redevelopment Project at **898 North Alfred St**, zoned CDD #16

APPLICANT: Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority by Kenneth Wire (McGuire Woods)

BOARD ACTION: Deferred for further study, 4-0.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Board deferred approval of the application and asked the applicant to continue to refine the multi-family buildings with the following considerations:

1. Strengthen the differentiation between the end buildings and the center building through the use of architectural details and materials, while still maintaining a family resemblance;
2. Restudy the proposed arch entry feature at the entrances to the courtyards;
3. Strengthen the visual and physical projections on the buildings in plan and elevation and emphasize this through subtly different materials and colors;
4. Restudy the single fire exit doors on the west elevation of the center building to minimize its appearance as a door and to visually coordinate this element with the proportions of the surrounding fenestration.
5. Provide more information on the materials, colors and details of the multifamily buildings.
6. Provide additional information on the materials, colors and details of the townhouses and park.

### **SPEAKERS**

Greg Shron, representing EYA and ARHA, made a brief introduction of Phase IV and noted that

he was seeking comments from the Board rather than an approval at this time.

Smita Anand, architect for the applicant, spoke in support of the application and responded to questions from the Board.

Brian “A.J.” Jackson, representing EYA and ARHA, explained the change from two to three buildings from a financing perspective.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Rankin asked about the townhouse elevations and wanted to clear that the townhouses still need work before the applicant requests approval for them. Mr. Cox explained that the townhouse elevations were only being provided at this time as context for the multifamily buildings. Ms. Rankin thought that all three buildings looked identical and wanted the applicant to further explore ways to differentiate the buildings. She also stated that more differentiation will break up the massing. Ms. Rankin found this scheme to be an improvement over the previous scheme and moving in the right direction.

Ms. Anand responded that they will remove an accent band above the first story windows on the center building so that it is only on the two end buildings, to differentiate the three buildings. She also commented that the fiber cement panels will be different colors on the end buildings. Mr. Cox stated that staff’s goal is to ensure there is no perception of a change in quality of materials among the buildings. Ms. Anand also noted that they will restudy the courtyard arches to make them simpler and relate to the iron grates at the garage entrance.

Ms. Kelley stated that she was pleased with the general direction of the design and stressed that it should be kept simple but wanted to see an increased depth of the projecting elements. She agreed with the staff recommendations. She also advised the applicant to study the windows for these buildings and the townhouses as she is disappointed with the amount of vinyl in the windows that have already been approved in other phases of the project.

Mr. Duffy agreed that this scheme was a significant step forward and agreed with the staff review. He reiterated Ms. Kelley’s window comment. He commented that a change in the projections and recesses would add dimension. He requested details of the balconies. He agreed with the comment to restudy the arches and advised that the applicant continue to study (and simplify) the entrance from the courtyards. He advised the applicant to focus on public spaces and ways to bring the residents together socially.

Chairman Conkey supported the general direction of the plan and liked the three building scheme, commenting that it was a more sophisticated and developed plan. Chairman Conkey had several questions for the applicant. First, he asked about the choice of windows and inquired whether these buildings would have metal windows -- which are generally more appropriate for a multi-family building. Mr. Shron responded that commercial aluminum windows would be too expensive and that the choice of windows will be a challenge because of strict energy requirements and the noise from Route 1. Mr. Shron said they would research the windows further and consider a wood-like fiberglass product or high-quality aluminum-clad. Chairman Conkey stated that the drawings should accurately portray the window type. Chairman Conkey

asked about the split-face concrete masonry unit and said that he personally had an issue with head joints in masonry lintels. He recommended the use of precast heads to avoid joints. He encouraged the use of different brick colors. He was also concerned about the use of HardiePanel because the joint detailing is generally more appropriate for single-family residential use and he would prefer a stucco finish in these locations. Chairman Conkey also expressed concern about the garage screens/metal grills because the noise and odors from the garage tend to kill adjacent street life. He recommended the addition of vegetation and asked if the applicant could show how the sidewalk relates to the screening. Chairman Conkey also offered a recommendation that the building corners be elevated at the parapet to visually reinforce the vertically. He also suggested exploring windows that were two stories in height with a spandrel at the upper levels to recall the scale of factory windows.

On a motion by Mr. Duffy, seconded by Ms. Kelley, the Board voted to defer the application, 4-0.

### **REASON**

The Board generally agreed with the analysis in the Staff report and believed the proposed scheme is a great improvement from the concept review. The Board advised the applicant to consider and study the staff recommendations and their comments.

### **5. CASE BAR2011-0001**

Request for change to previously approved plans for windows at Phase I of James Bland Redevelopment at **808 Madison St**, zoned CDD #16

APPLICANT: James Bland Housing I LP by Kenneth Wire (McGuire Woods)

BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 3-1.

### **SPEAKERS**

Greg Shron, representing EYA and ARHA, spoke on behalf of the application. He explained how the wrong windows were installed due to EYA's error when seeking an energy efficiency upgrade. To meet energy requirement, CPVC windows were installed in place of the approved wood windows. Mr. Shron requested the Board's leniency on the issue. Mr. Shron also stated that he would not request CPVC or vinyl windows for any future phases.

Roy Priest, CEO of ARHA, spoke in support of the application and explained that he was obligated to put the units into service within a certain time frame and that replacing the existing windows would jeopardize his ability to do so.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Duffy said that this is a difficult case and that the Board should apply the window policy that they recently adopted.

Ms. Kelley noted that this case is more difficult because of the work that went into new window policy. However, after visiting the site, she agreed that she was not able to tell a difference between the wood and CPVC sash, especially when the screens were installed. She also noted

that these solid PVC windows were not an inferior or less expensive product and that Board had previously approved CPVC trim and sills for these windows.

Mr. Rankin agreed that this was a difficult situation and that it puts the window policy into jeopardy. She asked that if the CPVC was a better product then why not allow the market-rate units to use it? Mr. Cox explained that the windows approved for Phases I and II were approved before the window policy was adopted and would not comply today.

Chairman Conkey stated that he found the use of vinyl in the alleys to be acceptable since the Board does allow for different materials on secondary elevations. However, he stated that he had a problem with allowing ARHA to use different materials and did not believe that the financial hardship provision was not intended for this situation. Mr. Shron stated that they hoped to mitigate financial losses from this error and to insure that ARHA units were delivered on time to retain their tax credits. Chairman Conkey proposed allowing the vinyl windows only on rear elevations of both market-rate and ARHA units but then felt that was, perhaps, an overly academic and harsh response.

Mr. Duffy commented that the circumstances are unique, that the project is unique and has clear unique financial issues. He said that there were no distinguishable differences, once the two windows were painted, and he was OK with use of the solid CPVC sash windows in the locations proposed for this application only. He did not support PVC windows in future phases.

Mr. Shron confirmed that windows for Phase II would all be wood windows, as approved and that windows for all subsequent phases would comply with the new window policy.

Ms. Kelley said that this installation was clearly a construction mistake and that the two windows are “virtually indistinguishable.” She moved approval of the CPVC windows on the ARHA units and where proposed on the private alley elevations according to the site plan diagram in the application. Mr. Duffy seconded the motion. The application was approved 3-1, with Chairman Conkey voting in opposition.

## **REASON**

The Board recognized that the after-the-fact request for approval of CPVC windows in place of wood windows in Phase I was a very challenging case. The Board members all referred to the window policy and found that this was an exceptional case that warranted the approval of CPVC windows in certain select areas, as proposed by the applicant. Once painted, the difference between these high quality CPVC and wood windows with PVC sills and trim were nearly indistinguishable. The Board also noted that the approved windows were a lower quality than what they had expected and the Board noted that the applicant must proposed windows that meet the recently-adopted window policy for all future phases.

---

## **IV. DEFERRED ITEMS**

### **CASE BAR2011-00003**

Alterations to previously approved plans at **219 N West St**, zoned RB Residential.

APPLICANT: Wanda Carter

Deferred by the applicant for pending receipt of additional information

**CASE BAR2011-0004**

Request for trash enclosure screening at **1400 Princess St**, zoned RB Residential.

APPLICANT: Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority

Deferred due to lack of notice.

---

**IV. ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Conkey adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:10 pm

---

**V. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

**CASE BAR2010-0342**

Request for approval of window replacement at **404 North Fayette Street**, zoned RB Residential.

APPLICANT: Douglas & Ann Hawpe

**CASE BAR2010-0346**

Request for approval of a sign at **516 1/2 Oronoco Street**, zoned RM Residential.

APPLICANT: Dr. Peter Hannah

**CASE BAR2010-0351**

Request for approval to reconstruct original facade at **215 North Payne Street**, zoned CRMU/M Commercial Mixed Use

APPLICANT: Charles Curtis/Chec Soda by Shamrock Enterprises

**CASE BAR2010-0380**

Request for approval for new siding at **808 Pendleton Street**, zoned RB Residential.

APPLICANT: Alabama Avenue LLC

**CASE BAR2011-0016**

Request for approval of siding repair and trim replacement at **237 North West Street**, zoned RB Residential.

APPLICANT: Daniel Schuman & Rosa Lin

Minutes submitted by:

Al Cox, FAIA  
Historic Preservation Manager