

APPROVED MINUTES

April 9, 2015

THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Fairfax County Government Center Conference Rooms 2 & 3, 6:30 PM

Members Present:

Jason Sutphin, Chairman
John A. Burns, FAIA
Michele Aubry
Robert W. Mobley, AIA,
Vice-Chairman
Richard Bierce, AIA
Joy Ortiz, AIA
Christopher Daniel
Elise Murray,
History Commission Liaison

Members Excused:

Susan Notkins, AIA, Treasurer
Joseph Plumpe, ASLA
John Boland

Staff Present:

Linda Blank,
*Fairfax Department of
Planning & Zoning*
Casey Gresham,
Recording Secretary

Mr. Sutphin opened the meeting of the April 9, 2015 meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) at 6:30 p.m. in Room 2/3 of the Government Center; Mr. Burns read the opening statement of purpose.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

Motion: Ms. Ortiz made the motion to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. Burns seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on a vote of 7-0.

INTRODUCTION/RECOGNITION OF GUESTS:

- Denice Dressel, FCPA, Resident Curator Program Project Manager
- Carmen Bishop, Staff Coordinator in ZED, is working on Item #6 of today's agenda and wanted to come and learn more about the ARB process.

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION ITEMS: No items proposed.

ITEMS FOR ACTION:

- 1. Proposal to construct a deck** at 11111 Fairfax Station Rd., tax map #77-1((1)) 17, located in the Saint Mary's Church Historic Overlay District (HOD). The rear deck would measure 32' X 16' and extend from the first floor replacing an existing deck. Stairs would connect to a 54 ft. sq. section at the side of the dwelling connecting to the garage with a second set of stairs to the rear yard. A 36" high railing would enclose the deck and serve as a hand railing at the stairs. Down lighting would be installed at stair raisers. Constructed in 1925 according to county tax records, the single family dwelling is identified as a contributing property to the HOD. Mr. Henry Villanueva, Prince William Home Improvement, represents the application. **(Item ARB-15-SMC-01)**
 - Presentation by Henry Villanueva:
 - Mr. Villanueva stated he had nothing to add to the materials that had been mailed, and he

asked for any questions from the Board

- Discussion:
 - Mr. Burns asked how the size of the proposed deck compares to the size of the existing deck.
 - The applicant responded that the new deck is proposed with the exact same dimensions as the existing deck.

MOTION: Mr. Daniel made a motion to approve ARB-15-SMC-01 as submitted and presented to the ARB. The motion was seconded by Mr. Burns and carried on a vote of 7-0.

2. **The proposed installation of signage and an awning** at the property located at 13814 Lee Highway, tax id # 54-4((1)) 26A in the Centreville Historic Overlay District (HOD). Painted building signage reading “*Bowl*” on each façade would wrap the northeast corner. An awning with signage reading “*AMF Bowling*” would be installed at the main entrance at the east façade. The ARB approved a wall mounted channel letter sign “*AMF Centreville Lanes*” at its April 2013 meeting and an aluminum cabinet pylon sign “*AMF Bowling Co*” at its May 2014 meeting. The free standing building was constructed in 1983 according to tax records. The property is non-contributing to the HOD. The Moore Sign Corp. represents the application. **(Item-ARB-15-CTV-03)**

- At the time the case was called, the applicant was not present. There were no objections from the Board to move it to the end of the meeting.
- Presentation made by J. W. Hill with Moore Sign Corporation:
 - The applicant wished to paint the building per the drawings submitted to the Board and to install an awning. The current lettering was never approved by the ARB, so the applicant desired to modernize the lettering with approval for the new design.
- Discussion:
 - Mrs. Murray asked what aspects of signage and painting has the ARB reviewed before.
 - Mrs. Blank responded that the wall-mounted channel lettering sign is the only signage on the building that has been approved, and the existing lettering was completed without sign permit or ARB approval. Mr. Hill’s company was not involved in the previous violation.
 - Mr. Burns asked from county perspective, what is the distinction between painting letters and an actual sign?
 - Mrs. Blank responded that the square footage of the painted letters is assessed from the County’s perspective, and painting a building does not require a building permit. The ARB is considering all work in this case as a package, including the awning, signage, and the painting.
 - The applicant stated that the proposed graphics are all painted rather than decals.
 - Mrs. Murray thinks the painting scheme is a tad busy.
 - Mr. Bierce approves of the proposed painting scheme.
 - Mr. Sutphin states that he lives in district, and there are a number of colored lights that flash at night. He asked if zoning has comments or concerns with these lights.
 - Mrs. Blank states that the current lights are considered uplighting and that directionally shielded lighting is permitted under the Zoning Ordinance, despite the differing colors. Zoning is only concerned with strobe lighting. A Zoning Inspection in November 2014 did not state that they were strobe lights. Mrs.

Blank suggested that the ARB can make it a condition of approval that they should not flash if the ARB is concerned comparing it to the ARB review of the church signage in the fall of 2014.

- Mrs. Murray asked what the applicant planned on doing with the lights.
 - The applicant responded that the business owner would like to keep the existing lights.
- Mr. Sutphin stated that he does not believe the lights were proposed tonight as a part of the application package.
- Mr. Burns asked if there are existing uplights surrounding the entire perimeter.
 - The applicant responded that he is not familiar with the night lighting, but he believes the only lights are those along Route 29.
- Ms. Ortiz stated that the red color on the left-hand side is a much different color than the other red, and she asked if this differentiation was intentional.
 - The applicant responded that it was intentional, as the logo includes multiple reds.
- Mr. Sutphin asked for clarification as to what the building should look like and what has been approved.
 - The applicant responded that only the AMF channel letters should be on the building, and that it would look like the photographs minus the big BOWLING text.
- Mrs. Murray asks if the back of the building is remaining the same.
 - The applicant responds that they are planning on doing the same themed striping in an effort to tie the three sides together with the existing proposal

MOTION: Mr. Daniel made a motion to approve Item-ARB-15-CTV-03 as submitted and presented on today's date. No information on lighting has been presented in today's application so is not part of the approval as that item was not submitted for action. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bierce, and there was discussion that all lighting is to receive applicable permits. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

ITEMS FOR WORKSHOP SESSION:

3. **Proposal to reconstruct part of the front porch and install signage** at the property located at 13848 Lee Highway, tax id #54-4 ((1))30 in the Centreville Historic Overlay District. New boards of the type and dimension used in the original are proposed for installation at the front porch. New signage is proposed for installation at the south (front) façade. The two-story, front gable, frame building is a contributing property to the HOD. Constructed c. 1930, Payne's Store housed a grocery and general merchandise store serving the Centreville farming area; gas pumps were added later. The Payne's lived in the 2nd floor apartment. The store closed in 1973; this building is the last remaining of the three Payne's stores located in Fairfax County. The Jireh Bakery Café is the current occupant. Mr. Sean Na, Jireh Bakery Café, represents the proposal.
 - Presentation made by Mr. Sean Na of Jireh Bakery Café.
 - The applicant stated that the proposal is to reface the sign of the bakery café, as the current sign is aging and has an outdated logo. They plan to include a new logo with a different appearance. No materials will be changed, and the size will also remain unchanged. In addition, the existing deck in front of the building was altered without ARB approval or a building permit, and the applicant is seeking after-the-fact approval.

The new deck was constructed with the exact same material, and the new deck simply replaced the decaying deck. The dimensions were also unchanged from the previous deck.

- Discussion:
 - Mr. Mobley asked about the materials of the deck.
 - The applicant responded that it is a pressure-treated deck. He does not have a photo of the old deck, but the only difference is that the old deck was painted brown.
 - Mr. Mobley asked to further clarify what the proposal is.
 - The applicant explains that he is asking permission for the deck that was already constructed. They would be happy to make it the same color as the old one.
 - Ms. Ortiz asked if the original application was approved.
 - The applicant responded that it was approved, and they wished to update since the previous approval.
 - Mr. Daniel stated that he lives right near this property, and he confirmed that the previous deck was in a rough painted state. He also stated that the new deck looks identical and is in the same format.
 - Mr. Sutphin remembers discussion of the cleaning of the pole from which the sign is hanging in the original application.
 - The applicant responded that the pole is cleaned up, and there is a new photo of the pole included in the packet.
 - Mrs. Blank asked to clarify that the sign is 4x4.
 - The applicant responded that yes, it's a 4x4 sign.
 - Mr. Sutphin stated that the proposed sign will help and improve the look, and he has no real issue with deck. He asked if the applicant did structural work with the deck as well.
 - The applicant responded that he replaced the top part of the wood, and there were no structural changes with the deck,
 - Mrs. Ortiz asked if the sign is painted.
 - The applicant responded that it will be vinyl letters, but he was not sure if blue backing will be 100% vinyl.
 - The applicant expects to return at the May meeting for approval. He also stated that it would be appreciated if the ARB could provide input on a type of shading that would be appropriate in front of the building. He previously had a white tent, but it was not an appealing look.
- Ms. Ortiz: suggested umbrellas.
- Mr. Sutphin recommended the applicant discuss allowable shading with Zoning to meet required setbacks. Then the applicant can circle back for a response from ARB from a design standpoint.
- Mrs. Murray asked if the applicant had thought of grass.
 - The applicant will consider grass and vegetation.

4. **After-the-fact review of an addition** at 10010 Colvin Run Road, tax map # 18-2 ((1)) 23, in the Colvin Run Mill Historic Overlay District (HOD). The addition was constructed to the "Money House"; one of the HOD's contributing properties. A second story addition was constructed above an existing 1920s

one-story shed roof addition at the southwest side of the dwelling sometime after May 2007. The addition did not have benefit of permitting or ARB review. The proposal is to expand the first and second stories of the addition to the southwest to join up with a newly proposed addition; see item #5. The completed addition was discussed as part of the workshop for a proposed addition at the March 2015 meeting. Mr. Tom Bullock, Bull's Eye Restoration, represents the proposal for Mr. David Olin, property owner.

- Presentation made by Mr. Tom Bullock of Bull's Eye Restoration:
 - Applicant stated that he understands it was inexcusable to build this addition without ARB approval. The style of the added dormer was collected from other local homes, and the applicant had copied adjacent property's dormer style to keep it compatible with adjacent homes.
- Discussion:
 - Mr. Sutphin asked if the addition was structurally sound and constructed per code.
 - The applicant responded that it was structurally sound.
 - Mr. Mobley asked the applicant to show on the provided plans which portions are existing which parts are proposed. He does not think the proposed addition is in character with the home, nor is it subordinate to the existing home. He states that the proposal is almost the same length as the existing home. In regards to the appearance of the addition and the proposed addition, the dormers are not compatible with historic properties, and there are no dormers on contributing properties (**multiple comments were made by the Board in regards to the dormers; many believed the dormers are not historically compatible**). The main redeeming feature of the existing addition is that it is clearly subordinate.
 - Mr. Mobley stated that the plans are very clear in showing the proposal from Colvin Run Rd. However, as he worked his way around the house, the plans lack clarity about what is existing, what was built without permit, and what is being proposed.
 - The applicant responded that the homeowners are looking to expand for more conveniences, but the way the house was constructed on the lot has made it difficult to make this expansion.
 - Mr. Mobley stated that in the elevation drawing of south side, the addition is covering all of the existing house. He does not think the elevation has been considered carefully enough. In regards to the existing addition, he is comfortable with the scale and proportion. The new addition needs more work in its proportion, how it relates to the existing historic building, and the windows need to be correctly sized. He also believes the French doors are inappropriate, as they would be seen from the street view. Mr. Mobley had questions in regards to what will happen with the existing retaining wall.
 - The applicant states that the new addition cantilever at the retaining wall.
 - Mr. Mobley stated that the drawings do not seem coordinated with each other. He expressed that when an applicant is dealing with a highly visible contributing property in the Colvin Mill District, he must exhibit more sensitivity to scale and guidelines of the historic home. He is concerned that existing house is being completely enveloped by new walls.
 - Mr. Bierce stated that before going forward with the application, we should approve or deny existing addition before moving on to new addition.
 - Mr. Sutphin responded that the Board is dealing with the applications in two separate pieces.

- Mr. Bierce also stated that the dormer is out of character and scale. He is also confused with the scale of the windows as shown in provided plans.
 - The applicant responded that a double hung sash window is currently present, so it is wider than it is higher.
- Ms. Ortiz stated that it would be helpful to color code the plans to show different stages of additions.
- Mr. Sutphin agreed with the points made, and he emphasized that more work needed to be done in regards to the proportions and setback appearance. The proposal must better conform to historical overlay requirements.
- Mr. Mobley believed that maybe the owner is asking too much of the proposed additions; and he suggested that the second floor addition be less ambitious.
- Ms. Ortiz said she was not as familiar with the site, but maybe if the provided site plan was clearer, the applicant could find another place to add onto the existing building rather than along Colvin Mill Run.
- Ms. Murray suggested the applicant focus on what can be seen from the road. She stated that the Board needed to have a sense of what a car can see through foliage and what they cannot from Colvin Mill Road.
- Mr. Daniel would like the applicant to provide the Board with the existing and proposed square footage calculations. His major concern is that the new proposal is overtaking the existing home.
- Mr. Mobley would like the provided site plan to be enlarged.
- Mr. Sutphin would like to see how the grade changes on the site.
 - The applicant responded that there would be no excavation except for the foundation. The retaining wall would not be changed, and the addition would be built up to the retaining wall.
- Mr. Sutphin concurs with the points made by the Board, and he wrapped up the discussion by saying that the proposals need to be consistent from one sheet to another. The applicant should provide consistent geometries, as well as a clear timeline of the progression from the original home to the existing addition to the proposed addition.

5. **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. A two-story addition is proposed at the southwest to extend from the existing addition; see item #4. The one-story front porch would be extended across the two additions. A side, rear addition would be constructed at the southeast. 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 side. Material type for siding (Hardi-plank or wood), trim (wood or PVC), windows and doors (wood or vinyl clad) are under consideration. The proposal was discussed in a workshop sessions at the March 2015 ARB meeting. Mr. Tom Bullock, Bull’s Eye Restoration, represents the proposal for Mr. David Olin, property owner.

- Please see discussion under Item #4.
- Mr. Mobley asked if the fence has complied with Zoning.
 - The applicant responded that the fence has been lowered, and it now meets all Zoning requirements.

6. **Proposal for site improvements, lighting and signage at the ARB approved assisted living facility** to be located at tax map #107-1 ((7)) E in the Lorton Correctional Complex National Register-eligible Historic District. At its July 2013 meeting, the ARB approved the construction of an approximately 75,000 sq. ft., 113 unit, 3-story facility to be located adjacent to Silverbrook Road at the entrance to the Spring Hill community and adjacent to the Adaptive Reuse Area with conditions, (ARB-13-LOR-02). The ARB approval conditions are: 1) the details for the trash collection area, the retaining wall along Calla Lily Court, and the separation between the existing fence and proposed building separation near the security gate all be restudied and resubmitted to the ARB and 2) the shade trees be increased to a 3.5-4 inch caliper and a 10-12 feet height. The applicant is proposing site improvements as conditioned by the ARB for the trash collection area, the retaining wall and the treatment of the separation between the fence and building near the security gate along with lighting and signage. Mr. Jeffrey Sunderland, Walsh Colucci P.C., represents the proposal.
- Presentation made by Mr. Jeffrey Sunderland of Walsh Colucci P.C., and Mr. Gayland Lang, architect:
 - The current proposal is to build an assisted living and medical facility on a currently unfinished lot. The site was originally approved for a 4-story independent living facility, and the applicant submitted a FDPA application in November 2014. The proposal received approval for its design from the ARB in July of 2013 with conditions. The applicant was asked to return for review and approval for a few final specific items.
 - Mr. Gayland Lang went on to describe that previously, the ARB was concerned with cars parking in the parking lot would disturb the adjacent residential properties with their headlights. In order to address this issue, the applicant has now included a landscape masonry wall in character with the prison. These landscape barriers would shield any potential car headlights.
 - Discussion:
 - Mr. Mobley asked for clarification on how the berm tapers at the end of the parking lot.
 - Mr. Lang responded that they will need to turn the wall back a short distance as it tapers down and this will be added on both ends of the landscape wall.
 - Ms. Ortiz asked if there are additional lighting features other than those proposed on the plans.
 - Mr. Lang responded that in addition to the lights within the parking lot, there are street lights along Calla Lilly Court.
 - Second part of Presentation, made by Mr. Lang:
 - The proposed dumpster is 8'8" tall, and it would be clad in the same brick as the existing building. There would be pre-finished steel panes on the dumpster gate, and the dumpster would be tucked back as close to the building as possible.
 - The monument sign would be the same brick with cast stone material. All signage would be engraved into this stone.
 - In regards to the street lights, there would be one at the alleyway, one at the center, and one at the corner of Calla Lilly Court.
 - Discussion
 - Mr. Mobley asked if the existing streetlights are Metal halide.
 - The applicant responded that he is not sure, but he will confirm before he comes back.
 - Mr. Sunderland included the landscape plan to confirm that the proposed shade trees will be 3.5 caliber trees, per ARB condition of approval. He had also included a zoomed in civil drawing detailing the security gate along Mountain Larkspur Drive.

- Mr. Lang stated that there was a comment at the previous meeting that the gate was wider than the road, and the fencing comes within four feet of the building. The previous concern was about the proximity to the building. However, the applicant has not been able to find a way to distance the fencing from the building any more than they already have. However, the applicant wanted to discuss this if the Board still had issue with the location.
 - Mr. Mobley asked if the drawing elevation had been approved by the ARB.
 - The response was yes, it had been approved.
 - Mr. Mobley stated that there were discrepancies in the elevations.
 - The applicant responded that the colored version of the plans is final approved section.
- Mr. Mobley would like confirmation that the height matches up in all elevations and plans. He also asked about the “.com” being included on sign and would like further clarification
- Mr. Sutphin asked if the maximum height of the light poles shown were including a concrete base.
 - The applicant responded that the height shown on the plan is accurate and does not include a concrete base.
- Ms. Murray thinks that the applicant has done a nice job in regards to the lighting.
- Mr. Burns asked the applicant to match up the detail sheets in regards to the location of the dumpster doors.
- Mr. Burns suggested dropping the “.com” on the major entrance feature.
- Ms. Murray asked if the monument sign was lighted.
 - The applicant responded that there will be two small lights on the sign, but they will be ground-lit. He will provide more details at the next ARB meeting.
- Mr. Daniel asked for details on the location of the monument sign.
 - The applicant responded that the exact locations as not been agreed on. It is currently on the corner of Mountain Larkspur, and he will add this to the plans.
- Ms. Murray asked if there are any health and safety issues in four foot clearance between building and the fencing.
 - The applicant responded that they are meeting all fire marshal requirements.
- Mr. Sutphin asked the Board if there were any comments on specific items that had to come back.
 - Mrs. Blank stated that the applicant needs to get zoning review on proposed sign details prior to coming through the ARB again.
 - The applicant stated that they will do this right away, and they plan on returning for the May ARB meeting.
 - Ms. Aubry asked for clarification about proposed lighting at the building's main entrance and the two exterior patio areas. Mr. Lang responded that, yes, there will be lighting in those areas and they will provide details on the proposed fixtures at a subsequent ARB meeting.

BOARD AND STAFF ITEMS:

- **Review and action on approval of minutes/ Authorization of payment to Recording Secretary:**
 - Mrs. Blank included comments received from Ms. Aubrey and Mr. Mobley.

- **MOTION**- Mr. Burns made a motion to approve the March 2015 minutes as revised and to pay the secretary for the March 2015 minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Aubrey and carried on a vote of 7-0.
- **Treasurer's Report:** Ms. Notkins (Made by Mrs. Blank in the absence of Ms. Notkins)
 - Mrs. Blank reported that as of March 31, 2015 the balance was \$11,464.69;
 - There are outstanding checks to Beth and Laura; once these checks are paid, the balance will be \$10,864.69.
- **Discussion/Update Reports:**
 - Design Guidelines (subcommittee)
 - Mr. Bierce—no further progress at this point.
 - Mr. Sutphin proposed taking a stab at the changes in zoning ordinance vs. bylaws; he would like to make sure they are compliant with one another.
 - Next month, the PC will make recommendation on proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments. The BOS will make its decision on June 23rd.
- **Administrative: None**
- **Correspondence, Announcements:** Mr. Plumpe has volunteered to Chair the Exceptional Design Award Jury & make presentation to the Board of Supervisors
 - The ARB may not have a Quorum on May 14th, as it will be down 4 members.
 - Rt 28/66 VDOT plans – most members have an issue with these plans, as they are not showing historic sites that will be affected. This may be due to the distinction between federally and locally recognized historic resources.
 - Draft motions were discussed in order to standardize motions.
 - Discussion to consider developing a policy for workshop guidelines.
 - The ARB should work on defining what a workshop should be and what should be provided to the ARB prior to the meeting.
 - Important to remember that quality of the feedback from the ARB is dependent on the quality of materials submitted. This should be emphasized to the applicants.
- **New/other business:** Ms. Casey Gresham, New ARB Recording Secretary
- **MOTION**- Mr. Burns made a motion to adjourn at 8:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Casey Gresham,
Recording Secretary