APPROVED MINUTES

March 12, 2015

THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Members Present:

Jason Sutphin, Chairman
John A. Burns, FAIA
Joseph Plumpe, ASLA
John Boland
Michele Aubry
Robert W. Mobley, AIA, Vice-Chairman
Richard Bierce, AIA
Joy Ortiz, AIA*
Elise Murray History Commission Liaison

Members Excused:

Christopher Daniel
Susan Notkins, AIA, Treasurer

Staff Present:

Linda Cornish Blank, *Fairfax Department of Planning & Zoning*
Laura Arseneau, *Recording Secretary*

**Arrived after the meeting officially began*

Mr. Sutphin opened the March 12, 2015, meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) at 6:29 p.m. in Room 2/3 of the Government Center. Mr. Sutphin read the Statement of Purpose.

Approval of the Agenda:

MOTION- Mr. Mobley made the motion to approve the agenda as presented. Ms. Aubrey seconded the motion. The motion was approved on a vote of 7-0. Ms. Ortiz was not present for the vote.

Introduction of Guests: None.

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION ITEMS:

1. **Proposal to construct a front porch** at 6837 Corder Lane, tax map #99-4 ((9)) 36, located in the Mount Air Historic Overlay District. The porch would measure 33' 5" in length and range from 5' 6" - 7' 6" in width across the front of the house. White fiberglass columns would be installed adjacent to the entry and at the corners of the façade; a white railing would be installed between the columns. The porch roof shingles and gutters would match the existing. Constructed in 1999 according to county tax records, the single family residential development was reviewed and approved by the ARB in 1996. Mr. Jon Benson, Sun Design & Remodeling, and Martha & Albert Delgado, property owners represent the application. (Item-**ARB-15-MTA-01**)

   MOTION- Mr. Boland made a motion to approve the item as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bierce and carried on a vote of 7-0. Ms. Ortiz was not present for the vote.

2. **The proposed installation of signage** at the property located at 13830 #8 Lee Highway, tax map #54-4 ((1)) 28A in the Centreville Historic Overlay District. A 10' long X 26" high illuminated channel letter sign reading *"AllinOne Insurance"* would be mounted on exposed raceway, painted to match the building façade, at the upper façade above the storefront canopy. The lettering would be white with blue outline. Located in the Centreville Plaza neighborhood shopping center which was

constructed in 1990 according to tax records, the property is non-contributing to the historic overlay district. Mr. Samuel Cho, business owner, represents the application. (Item-**ARB-15-CTV-01**)

Discussion: Mr. Bierce noted that illuminated signs are not typically encouraged in the Historic Overlay Districts. Ms. Blank responded that the shopping center was built before its inclusion in the Historic Overlay District and that the ARB has approved similar requests in the past for the center.

MOTION- Mr. Bierce made a motion to recommend approval of the item as submitted. Mr. Burns seconded the motion and the motion carried with a vote of 7-0. Ms. Ortiz was not present for vote.

3. **The proposed installation of signage** at the property located at 13830 #2 Lee Highway, tax map #54-4 ((1)) 28A in the Centreville Historic Overlay District. A 13.5' long X 2' high illuminated channel letter sign reading *"Vaperz Inc"* would be mounted on exposed raceway, painted to match the building façade, at the upper façade above the storefront canopy. The lettering would be red and white with black outline. Located in the Centreville Plaza neighborhood shopping center which was constructed in 1990 according to tax records, the property is non-contributing to the historic overlay district. Mr. James Sung, Led SignToGo, and Mr. Kyle Morris, business manager, represent the application. (Item-**ARB-15-CTV-02**)

   MOTION- Mr. Mobley made a motion to approve the item as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Aubrey and carried with vote of 8-0.

ITEMS FOR ACTION:

4. **Proposal for adaptive reuse of five buildings**, tax map #107-1((7)) B, located within the DC Correctional Complex National Register-eligible Historic District and listed as contributing to the National Register Historic District. The 2001 Lorton Correctional Complex Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) stipulates that the ARB review *undertakings* within the area eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and that the area within the Eligible District is subject to review as stipulated in Section 7-200 of the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance. The five buildings will be adaptively reused in accordance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* and divided into 55 apartments. The area that is the subject of this proposal includes the Commissary Building, R-66, four dormitory buildings R-70 – R-72, gatehouse RT-14 and a structure, a brick air shaft, located in the courtyard between the dorms; all seven are contributing resources to the National Register-listed district. The application was approved with conditions at the December 11, 2014 ARB meeting. The nine conditions of approval are being addressed and materials provided to the ARB as stipulated. Ms. Edna Johnston, History Matters, Mr. David Schultz & Ms. Samantha Brown, Community Housing Partners Corporation, Ms. Donna Rosano, ZA+D architects and Mr. Jack Scanlon, Christopher Consultants, represent the application. (Item **ARB-14-LOR-06**)

   Mr. Burns recused himself from the discussion.

   Presentation by Donna Rosano and David Schultz
   - The proposed project is for the adaptive reuse of 5 buildings on the former Lorton prison site
   - The applicants response to the conditions of ARB approval at the December 23 ARB meeting include:
     - documentation and completed survey of brick paving patterns,
     - steel canopy design,

- confirmation from Cultural Resource Management & Protection Branch that an archaeological survey assessment has been completed,
- door design, type and material,
- landscaping details of benches and trash containers,
- a proposed dumpster enclosure,
- lighting design and type; submitted a photometric plan,
- Existing sidewalk which connects the street to the cross-county trail will be retained in the open space area north of R-66, the Commissary. The proposed sidewalk from the Commissary connecting to that existing walk be constructed. The "ameba-shaped" walkway, walks extending from it, trellis-work and other site improvements shown on plans for the open space area will be eliminated from the plan,
- no signage currently proposed; signage first requires action by the HOA,
- and changed the name of the development to "Lindsay Hill Apartments"

Discussion:

- Mr. Plumpe noted that he does not like the character of the trash can, benches and lights as they do not compliment the character of the existing area or the neighborhood. Mr. Plumpe recommended that the applicant use the same manufacturer of the benches and trash cans that already exist. Mr. Plumpe requested that the locations of the trash cans and lights be designated on the plan and believes there are better examples of industrial looking trash cans and street lights out there.
- Mr. Mobley asked the applicant if they intentionally designed the steel frame canopies over the door with exposed framing. He also noted that gutters are pictured on the flat roofs but there are no downspouts. The applicant noted that design of the canopies was intentional and that downspouts will be added to the design.

MOTION- Mr. Plumpe made a motion to approve the item with the exception that the approval of the landscape elements (benches and trash cans) would be deferred and considered with submission of the sign at a future date. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bierce.

Discussion- Mr. Boland asked if the landscape design includes the "amoeba-shaped" walkway. Mr. Jack Scanlon clarified the status of the development plan currently in review. Ms. Blank responded that the removal of the amoeba-shaped walkway and the trellis work were at the request of the Spring Hill community with agreement from the applicant and that the ARB had previously approved the removal. The "amoeba-shaped" walkway is on the final development plan and they needed an interpretation from the Department of Planning and Zoning to have the change approved. It will take approximately 60-90 days for the interpretation to be reviewed by staff. There is no further ARB action required on this item. The motion carried on a vote of 8-0.

ITEMS FOR WORKSHOP SESSION:

5. **The proposed development of park facilities** to be located adjacent to Lorton and Furnace Roads, tax map #107-3, in the Lorton Correctional Complex National Register-eligible Historic District. The 2001 Lorton Correctional Complex Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) stipulates that the ARB review *undertakings* within the area eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and that the area within the Eligible District is subject to review as stipulated in Section 7-200 of the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance. The Laurel Hill Park Master Plan was approved by the Park Authority Board in July 2004. The plan identified Section G as the Central Green; an area for picnic grounds with pavilions, a play area and trails providing connectivity to the Laurel Hill Greenway. The

trails will also allow controlled access into the meadow preservation areas. This open green area is one of the few large open play spaces for informal recreation in the park system. The interim parking area at the adaptive reuse area is proposed to be relocated to the Central Green adjacent to an existing farm road. At the November 14, 2013 ARB meeting, the proposal was presented and discussed in a workshop session. Ms. Kelly Davis, Park Authority senior planner, represents the proposal.

- Presentation: Kelly Davis, Park Authority
    - Proposed development is on edge of the National Register-eligible Historic District near the Barrett House, Barrel Bridge and Stone Lantern
    - Proposed park includes 4 shelters and a large open lawn area
- Discussion:
    - Mr. Plumpe asked if there is an opportunity to put trees nearer to shelters.
    - Mr. Bierce noted that this project is an architectural and landscaping design opportunity.
    - Mr. Plumpe asked if Barrel Bridge will still be utilized. The applicant responded that the bridge will be used for cars on top and a pathway underneath.
    - Ms. Aubrey asked what the parking spaces north of the Barrett House will be servicing. The applicant responded that overflow parking is needed and this parking will replace other parking areas that are being removed.
    - Ms. Murray asked if the location of the proposed parking lot, very near to the Barrett House, would hurt the chances of the future Residential Curatorship Program's success in that location. She referenced a memo from CRMPB that suggested moving the parking lot. The house would be immediately adjacent to the proposed 200 space parking lot. Ms. Murray also noted that the Barrett House is a contributing structure to the district and needs to be treated with more respect.
    - Mr. Burns asked if the parking lot could be relocated. He noted an existing easement which he confirmed would prohibit landscaping and screening from being installed to prevent a direct line of sight from the house to the parking area.
    - Ms. Aubrey asked if the construction of the parking lot could be delayed until the ball fields were developed. The applicant responded that they need the additional parking as they are losing parking.
    - Mr. Burns inquired if the Barrel Bridge could hold buses that would potentially be parking in the area. The applicant responded that a sign will be placed on that bridge that designates the weight limit and have an alternate service road to the site.
    - Mr. Sutphin asked if the parking lot could be moved to the north of the golf course without the concern of golf balls hitting vehicles.
    - Mr. Mobley inquired on the material of the trails. The applicant responded the trails are 8 feet wide and paved with asphalt. They are no longer stone dust and meet ADA accessibility requirements.
    - Mr. Sutphin asked when the applicant was most likely to return to the ARB. The applicant responded they would return within a couple of months.
    - Mr. Mobley asked the applicant to provide larger plan sets to scale.
    - Mr. Bierce inquired about the architectural design of the bathrooms and canopies. The applicant responded that they wanted them to have a low profile.
    - Mr. Bierce recommended that the roof pitch be lowered, and for the applicant to think of ways to diminish the bulk of the building and to include something that is worthy of going into a historic district.
    - Mr. Mobley commented that he liked the shelter design on page 8. The applicant responded that they had not yet hired an architect.
    - Mr. Bierce asked where the bathroom facilities were located. The applicant responded that they are located at the beginning of the cross country trail.

- Ms. Aubrey asked if there was wayfinding near the trail in the facility. The applicant responded that the history of Lorton and the property are on the wayfinding signs.
- Mr. Burns asked if the restrooms would be self–mulching. The applicant responded that the soils do not perk, so the restrooms will be connecting to the existing sewer line.
- Mr. Burns asked if there would be any site lighting. The applicant responded there would only be parking lot lighting.
- Mr. Burns inquired if any screening or buffering was being installed by VDOT near the road improvements. The applicant noted that if screening was implemented it might negatively affect the viewshed of the historic district.
- Mr. Burns asked if any there would be any light spill from the road. The applicant responded that there will be street lights along Lorton Road.
- Mr. Burns noted some concern for the new uses and the effect on the corn crib, potting shed, turkey barn and the smoke house. Are these to be stabilized? The applicant responded that they are not within the limits of construction and that resource management has been cutting back invasive plant species around the structures.
- Ms. Murray asked what can the ARB could do to champion the threatened buildings. Ms. Blank responded that the ARB can contact the director of the park authority and note their concern about resources contributing to the historic district

MOTION: Mr. Bierce made a motion that the ARB send a letter to the Director of the Fairfax County Park Authority to review the cultural resources, corn crib, feed barn and potting shed, expressing concern regarding the maintenance and stewardship of these resources. Mr. Mobley seconded the motion which carried on a vote of 8-0.

---

6. **Proposal to construct an addition at** 10010 Colvin Run Road, tax map # 18-2 ((1)) 23, in the Colvin Run Mill Historic Overlay District (HOD). The addition is proposed to the "Money House", one of the HOD's contributing properties. The rear section of the addition would measure 12' x 24.5' with the side section measuring 7' x 14'. The proposed two-story addition would extend 26' in height to the roof peak over a rough texture cement foundation stained to match the existing foundation. Roofing would be fabricated metal shingles to match profile and color of existing, lap-siding and trim would be painted to match existing, windows would be double hung sash and a set of six hinged patio doors are proposed at the rear. Material type for siding, trim, windows and doors are under consideration. Mr. David Olin, property owner, represents the proposal.

- Presentation: Mr. David Olin- owner
  - Mr. Olin noted that a previous owner, Ms. Money, built a flat roof addition in the 1920s and the foundation was sound but the ceiling was slanted and created a drainage issue.
  - Mr. Olin came to the ARB looking for guidance for details, trim, and massing of the new addition.
- Discussion:
  - Mr. Mobley stated that the current 6' high front yard fence was not compliant, as a maximum of only 4' in height is allowed. The applicant responded that a part of the current fence is 4' in height. Mr. Mobley asked, "which part".
  - Mr. Mobley noted that the fence is located in a historic district and should be open board.
  - Mr. Olin noted that his fence is a privacy fence and that there is a different provision for privacy fence height in the historic overlay district guidelines.
  - Mr. Mobley noted that if fence is over four feet high, the ARB would have had to review and told him that a privacy fence was not allowed. The applicant responded that he will meet the guidelines.

- Mr. Mobley remarked that the property is opposite of the mill itself and is highly visible to the mill. The applicant asked if there is a type of screening that would be less offensive that would block the rush hour traffic adjacent to the front yard ado that there would be no need to put up a fence over 6 feet in height.
- Mr. Mobley suggested creating privacy with landscaping.
- Mr. Mobley asked the applicant about what parts of the newest addition did the ARB approve. The applicant responded that the ARB did not approve anything about the newest addition. It was put up as in an emergency situation and the applicant was out of town. The applicant knew he would have to comply with the ARB.
- Mr. Mobley asked the applicant for more accurate working drawings, elevations and a floor plan.
- Mr. Mobley asked if the trees are in the VDOT right-of-way or on the property. The applicant responded that he will check.
- Mr. Bierce noted that the additions should be subordinate in scale and size to the original house as that is a criteria for the historic overlay district. Also, the massing and size of the new addition is predicated on pre-existing addition that was not approved. He recommended that the addition needs to be reduced in scale either by setbacks or lowering of the room. He noted that if the mass overwhelms the original structure than it negatively affects the historic house.
- Ms. Murray noted that the ARB reviews the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for historic preservation and encourages differentiating between the existing house and what is new. The applicant responded that he did not want to impact the existing hill topography and does want to preserve the fabric of the original house.
- Ms. Aubrey remarked that the proposed addition would take the existing L-shaped house and make it a square house. She asked about the impact on the existing chimney and fireplace. The applicant responded that this part of the house was a separate addition.
- Ms. Aubrey recommended that the applicant talk to the county cultural resource staff to obtain suggestions on who could do the archeological and curatorial work so it meets the Secretary of the Interior's standards and guidelines for archaeological investigations and for conservation, disposition and curation of artifacts.
- Ms. Ortiz recommended that the applicant bring display boards to illustrate concepts.
- Mr. Sutphin recommended that the applicant return with plans to scale so that the ARB can better analyze the application.
- The applicant asked if the location of the addition was okay.
- Mr. Mobley responded that the ARB needs to know how the house would function after the addition is submitted. The current submission is the most negatively impactful on the original house and as it is blocking windows and is prominent from Colvin Run Road. The applicant responded that the placement of the addition to the southeast of the building would require more architectural care.
- Mr. Burns recommended that if the trim board and wall could be set back from the existing house it would assist in breaking up the solidity of the façade.
- Mr. Sutphin asked the applicant when he wanted to return to the ARB. The applicant responded he would try to return at the April 2015 meeting.

BOARD AND STAFF ITEMS:

- **Review and action on approval of minutes; Authorization of payment to Recording Secretary**

MOTION - Ms. Aubrey made a motion to approve the minutes from February 12, 2015 Architectural Review Board meeting as amended and to pay the recording secretary. Mr. Burns seconded the motion and it carried on a vote of 7-0.

- **Treasurer's Report:** Ms. Blank on behalf of Ms. Notkins
    - Ms. Blank reported that the ARB had a starting balance of $11,064. 69.
    - Ms. Blank had forwarded the letter sent to Ms. Notkins that the county budget is to go to the BOS on April 7, 8, & 9 and will be adopted by the BOS at the end of April.
    - Contribution to ARB suggested is $3,500
    - Mr. Sutphin asked if the budget is covering all ARB needs for training.
    - Ms. Blank responded that Ms. Notkins informed her that training money is not always used. CLG stipulated that ARB members are required to go to training.
    - Ms. Aubry recommended that requests for reimbursement money for training be made in the fiscal year in which the training activity occurred.

- **Discussion/Update Reports:**
    - Design Guidelines (subcommittee)-
        - Mr. Mobley responded he would present something by the May 2015 meeting.
    - By-laws (subcommittee)
        - Mr. Sutphin noted that the by-laws need to be reviewed by the BOS for any modifications
- **Administrative:**
    - Recording Secretary - Mr. Sutphin

      MOTION- Mr. Sutphin made a motion that the Architectural Review Board recess and go into closed session for discussion of matters related to personnel. Such discussion is an applicable exemption from open meeting requirements per *Virginia Code* [Section] 2.2-3711.A.10.

      MOTION- I move that the Architectural Review Board certify that, to the best of its knowledge, only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which closed session was convened were heard, discussed, or considered by the Board during the closed session.

    - Exceptional Design Awards Volunteer- Ms. Blank noted that an ARB volunteer is needed to chair the Exceptional Design Awards Jury which will also present to the BOS. The volunteer is needed for 4 different days for a few hours. Mr. Plumpe volunteered and will review his schedule.

- Correspondence, Announcements:
    - Ms. Blank spoke on the Zoning Ordinance Amendment for the ARB. She noted that the amendment, including Ms. Murray being a voting member, is to be heard by the BOS for authorization March 24, 2015; Planning Commission May 21, 2015 and public hearing to BOS June 23, 2015. Once the amendment is approved it becomes effective the next day. Ms. Murray will be a voting member at the July meeting.
    - Ms. Ortiz noted that she did turn in a letter of resignation from the ARB but has not had a response from the supervisor.

<u>MOTION-</u> Mr. Burns made a motion to adjourn at 8:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Laura Arseneau
ARB Recording Secretary