

# APPROVED MINUTES

May 14, 2015

## THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

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

#### Members Present:

Jason Sutphin, Chairman\*  
Michele Aubry  
Richard Bierce, AIA  
Christopher Daniel  
John Boland  
Susan Notkins, AIA, Treasurer  
Joseph Plumpe, ASLA\*  
Elise Murray,  
History Commission Liaison

#### Members Excused:

Robert W. Mobley, AIA, Vice-Chairman  
Joy Ortiz, AIA  
John A. Burns, FAIA

#### Staff Present:

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

*\*Left the meeting early*

*\*\*Arrived after the meeting officially began*

Mr. Sutphin opened the meeting of the May 14, 2015 meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) at 6:30 p.m. in Room 2/3 of the Government Center; Mr. Sutphin read the statement of purpose.

#### APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

**Motion: Ms. Aubry made the motion to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. Daniel seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on a vote of 6-0.**

#### INTRODUCTION/RECOGNITION OF GUESTS:

- Karen Washburn, a member of the public and the past chairman of the History Commission, introduced herself as a member of the public in support of David Olin's house on Colvin Run Road. She noted that dormer windows have been used since the times of log cabins, and there are many historic examples of this type of architecture. She discussed that Colvin Mill does not look exactly as it did during its working days, and she asked the ARB to identify what era Mr. Olin should be associating the house with. She described Mr. Olin as a strict preservationist, and she thinks that the current design is harmonious with the community and does not interfere with the historic nature of the overlay district.

#### CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION ITEMS:

1. **Proposal to construct a deck** at 8508 Kernon Court, tax id #99-4 ((6)) 80, located in the Mount Air Historic Overlay District. The 190 sq. ft. rear deck would measure 10' x 19' and extend from the second floor; a previously existing deck was removed. It would be 8' high from grade to deck flooring; a 36" high wood railing would enclose the deck. Materials will be pressure-treated wood. Constructed in 1987

according to county tax records, the Village at Mount Air residential townhouse development was reviewed and approved by the ARB in 1984-1985. Ms. Nerisha Uprety, property owner, represents the application. (Item-ARB-15-MTA-02)

**MOTION: Mr. Bierce made a motion to approve ARB-15-MTA-02 as submitted and presented to the ARB. The motion was seconded by Mr. Plumpe and carried on a vote of 7-0.**

## ITEMS FOR ACTION:

2. **Reconstructed portion of the front porch and proposed installation of signage** at the property located at 13848 Lee Highway, tax id #54-4 ((1))30, in the Centreville Historic Overlay District (HOD). New boards of the type and dimension used in the original deck flooring were installed at the El-shaped front porch; 8' x 38' 8" and 8' x 18.5' sections. New signage is proposed for installation at the south (front) façade. The refaced, double sided, hanging sign would measure 4' x 4' to read *Jireh Café* and hang from an existing 16' 10" high black painted pole. 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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. Dennis Hogge, property owner, and Mr. Sean Na, Jireh Bakery Café, represent the application. (Item-ARB-15-CTV-04)
  - Presentation made by Mr. Na and Mr. Hogge.
    - Sample of the proposed sign material were brought and passed around to ARB members. The material is ½ plastic and ½ wood, which is the same material as the current sign. The deck is comprised of pressure-treated wood, and it will follow all County codes for its safety and construction.
  - Discussion:
    - Mr. Sutphin asked if the sign will be as thick as the samples provided.
      - Mr. Na responded that the sign would be almost identical as the provided samples.
    - Mr. Sutphin asked how long the materials typically last.
      - Mr. Na responded the materials last about two years before the colors fade. Mr. Na also asked if they would need to seek ARB approval if the materials need to be replaced. Mr. Sutphin replied that Mr. Na can maintain the sign without coming back to the ARB.

**MOTION: Mr. Plumpe made a motion to approve ARB-15-CTV-04 as submitted and presented to the ARB. The motion was seconded by Mr. Daniel and carried on a vote of 7-0.**

**3. Proposal for site improvements, lighting and signage at the ARB approved assisted living facility** to be located at tax id #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 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. A landscaped split-faced block retaining wall would be installed parallel to Calla Lily Court, an 8' 8" high brick with metal door dumpster enclosure would be constructed adjacent to the building at the west parking area, 20' high pole mounted lights would be installed at the parking area and coach lighting at the building. A cast stone and brick lighted monument sign 9' 9" X 5'6" high would be installed at the corner of Silverbrook Road and White Spruce Way. Three and one-half inch shade trees are proposed and shown on the conceptual landscape plan. These items were discussed in a workshop at the April 2015 meeting. Ms. Lynne Strobel, Walsh Colucci P.C. and Mr. Gaylen Laing, GHLA, represent the application. (Item-**ARB-13-LOR-02**)

- Presentation by Mr. Sunderland, Mr. Holmes, Mr. Laing, and Mr. Clark
  - Mr. Sunderland explained that corrected elevations have been updated to match the approved elevations, and the exhibits have been revised to show the correct location of the retaining wall curving around the parking lot with the hedgerow relocated to be behind the retaining wall.
  - The next sheet details the lighting plan, in which they have revised the location of the parking lot light poles. The poles were previously located inside islands, and they are now located within the parking lot itself. The plans also now include the locations of building façade light fixtures, and the measurements of light poles were refined to show how the measurements of the base and pole compare.
  - The dumpster design has also been revised to show the correct location of the enclosure door and relocated to accommodate two loading spaces required by code.
  - The monument sign location has now been clearly marked, and the “dot.com” portion of the sign has been removed from the title. Further details in regard to the lighting for the monument sign is also detailed on the provided plans.
- A presentation by Larry Clark (the president of Springhill HOA):
  - Mr. Clark stated that the main issue and concern has always been light pollution, and the team has addressed the problem wonderfully with the berm and retaining wall solution. However, there are 8 houses on Calla Lilly, and some of the residents are concerned about the height of the berm and that it will impede on their viewshed. The HOA requests doing a test section in which one level of the bricks or lower bushes are removed. The HOA does not want to delay this process, but they would like to get an idea of how this berm and wall will function. They are otherwise 100% behind this project.
    - Ms. Blank reiterated the South County Federation support letter. See attachment 1.
- Discussion:
  - Mr. Plumpe asked if the residents are concerned about seeing the cars rather than just being concerned with the size of the wall.
    - Mr. Clark responded that they are more concerned with feeling enclosed by the wall.
  - Mr. Plumpe brought up that people with vans and larger vehicles will be visiting. He then suggested including a height requirement for the vegetation, potentially using an inkberry holly or an evergreen native to Virginia. He also asked if the area will be irrigated.
    - Mr. Laing responded that it will be irrigated.
  - Mrs. Notkins asked if anyone on the ARB had commented on the cap in the sign. She noted that it looks like a chapel sign.

- Mr. Laing responded that the signage is consistent among all of these branded properties.
- Mr. Plumpe mentioned that the sign light is quite large. He asked if there was any way to imbed a light flush mounted with the sign. He mentioned that there are LED linear lights, and the lights can be concealed with a top lens flushed with plants.
- Mrs. Notkins asked if the building light fixture is standard.
  - Mr. Laing stated that it was selected specifically for this project. The light fixture matches the color of light poles and reflects the proportion of the towers.
- Mrs. Notkins stated that one with a square top might be more appropriate for the simple building style.

**MOTION: Mr. Plumpe made a motion to approve ARB-13-LOR-02 as submitted and presented to the ARB with the following conditions:**

- **The corner sign monument lighting be flush at the pre-cast stone plinth of the sign in place of the proposed ground lighting and LED lighting is used. The flush mounting is to be inconspicuous.**
- The hedge row at the wall parallel to Calla Lilly Court be Inkberry Holly
- **The Spring Hill HOA work with the applicant to determine an acceptable height of the Inkberry Holly hedge row, berm and adjacent wall so as to screen headlights from parking area but not so high as to appear “barrier-like” to the residences along Calla Lilly Court with the exact placement and height of these elements to be mutually acceptable to both parties within the area shown on the plans dated April 30, 2015 and submitted to ARB.**

**The motion was seconded by Mrs. Aubry and carried on a vote of 7-0.**

**4. The proposed construction of gates, dining pavilion and tennis arbor** located at 1147 Chain Bridge Rd., tax id # 31-1 ((1)) 1, in the Langley Fork Historic Overlay District. The residence is known as Hickory Hill and identified as a historic property in the overlay district and contributing to the Langley Fork National Register Historic District. A replacement swimming pool and surrounding patio with spa and wading pool was approved by the ARB at its November 13, 2014 meeting; ARB-14-LFK-02. The gates, arbor and pavilion now before the ARB, ARB-14-LFK-01, were deferred at the request of the applicant at the May 8, 2014 ARB meeting. Five foot eight inch high black steel gates would be installed at a partially reconfigured entry drive. The gates would span 14’ 4” and be setback from existing stone piers located at the street. An 18’ x 52’ x 9 ½’ high dining pavilion would be constructed at the east side of the pool; existing bath pool house would be retained. A 31 ½’ x 12’ x 12’ high aluminum-framed tennis arbor would be constructed at the west entry to the existing tennis courts located at the southeast side of the property. Mr. William Channing Blackwell, PE represents the application. (Item-**ARB-14-LFK-01**)

- Presentation by Mr. Blackwell:
  - Gate material samples, brick samples, and samples of the arbor materials were brought and passed around the ARB. Mr. Blackwell noted that the gate would meet code requirements for pool safety.
- The ARB had no questions or comments to discuss.

**MOTION: Mr. Plumpe made a motion to approve ARB-14-LFK-01 as submitted and presented to the ARB. The motion was seconded by Mr. Daniel and carried on a vote of 7-0.**

## ITEMS FOR WORKSHOP SESSION:

**5. After-the-fact review of an addition** at 10010 Colvin Run Road, tax id # 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 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 and April 2015 meetings. Mr. David Olin, property owner, and Mr. Tom Bullock, Bull’s Eye Restoration, represent the proposal.

\*Mr. Sutphin excused himself, and Mr. Boland assumed the Chairman position in the absence of the vice-chairman.

- Presentation by Mr. Olin and Mr. Bullock:
  - Mr. Olin stated that he has lived in this home for nearly 18 years, and that he has spent much time attempting to preserve it without demolishing any historic material. With an expanding family, he sought an architect to expand the home without demolishing any of the original rafters. No architect could accomplish the act of expanding the home while preserving all of its historic characters. He has been working with Mr. Bullock and striving to address Mr. Mobley’s comments. After his roof failed, during the renovation he added an addition to fully fix the problem. He does regret not seeking ARB approval on the second story addition.
  - Mr. Bullock added that the house has its limitations. He noted that small periodic additions will not be cost-effective. He and Mr. Olin are working to create enough usable space without feeling cramped in the home. He was willing to address all questions and hoped to move towards a presentation and action at the next ARB meeting.
  
- Discussion:
  - Mr. Boland asked if Mr. Bullock and Mr. Olin could address Mr. Mobley’s questions in regards to the proposed small setback.
    - Mr. Bullock responded that there was discussion about a vertical trimboard that would define the addition from the existing home. The setback would have a cornerboard to also add to this effect. They are proposing a 3.5 inch setback for the new addition from the existing lower addition.
  - Mr. Boland asked if they agreed or disagreed that a limited setback would provide a limited view from the roadway.
    - Mr. Bollock said if they chose Plan C, which shows adding onto the first floor level, there would be some shielding from the first floor room. Mr. Olin added that a lot of the home is hidden by the existing hill on the south side.
    - The use of additional plantings for screening was noted.
  - Mr. Bierce mentioned that the two projects should not be intertwined, and that the new construction depends on if the previous addition is approved. He stated that legally, we should

being with what was originally added on without ARB approval prior to addressing a new addition. Mr. Bierce asked for clear and labeled elevations of what previously existed from both the front and side views. He suggested clearly separating the two projects.

- Mr. Bullock clarified that they would return with what was existing when the first addition was added onto the home. Then, they would proceed with a presentation solely dealing with the proposed addition. He stated that they would look for an approval on the existing addition at the June ARB meeting with an additional workshop item dealing with the proposed addition.
- Mr. Daniel stated that he is having a difficult time understanding what is old and what is newly proposed. He acknowledged the public input in regards to historic dormers and noted the ARB could take this into account. He asked that the applicants highlight the addition that has been constructed and focus on it. Following ARB decision, the applicants will have a concrete basis to work from.
- Mrs. Blank suggested putting in an application for action on the existing second story addition for the June ARB meeting and having a workshop session for the proposed addition. She noted that it seems the ARB is not suggesting that the addition has to be demolished but could be moving towards being able to approve the addition, potentially with some design changed and/or conditions.
- Mr. Bierce stated that regarding the 2007 2<sup>nd</sup> story addition, there are characteristics that make it subordinate to the original home in size and scale. This subordination characteristic is a critical detail the ARB is looking for in historic homes, and the proposed addition should not overwhelm the original home.
- Mr. Daniel added that the historic property should not be hidden with any additions and that a subordinate structure will help minimize the impact on the historic home.
- Mr. Olin appreciated the guidance, but he stated that he remained concerned about the ability to construct an addition that will not hide this particular portion of the home.
- Mrs. Notkins said that she has not looked at this application carefully, but one of the techniques to maintain the quality of an original building is to separate the addition with something similar to a breezeway. She added that it is very difficult to keep the existing fabric of a historic home when the addition is attached.
  - Mr. Olin responded that the house is already tucked into a hill and that the site is limited. Existing floodplain on the property also further intensifies the limitations.
- Mr. Daniel reiterated that the ARB concerns will be in regards to the south side elevations. He asked Mr. Olin and Mr. Bullock to search for ways to lessen the impact of an addition as much as possible, noting that this will be a focus of the next workshop session.
- Mr. Bierce mentioned that the issue of scale remains the primary issue in addition to how the elevations are treated. He suggested an articulated façade to further setback the proposed addition. Currently, he thinks that the addition overwhelms the mass of the house.

Mr. Mobley was absent for the meeting; however, prior to the meeting, he emailed in the following comments:

- Dormer: The Board has made numerous comments in two prior work sessions regarding this unapproved addition in general and the unapproved dormer specifically. In my opinion, the dormer shown on the unapproved addition is out of context with the historic architectural style of this specific Contributing Property. The Owner proposes keeping this unapproved addition with dormer and has cited two examples as precedent. Of the two examples, neither is a Historic Property or Contributing Property and,

in fact, one is not in the Historic Overlay District. A dormer can be found on one Contributing Property in this HOD but not pictured in the Guidelines. That Contributing Property is the Hendricks House located to the west of the Colvin Mill Property. The photo is attached to these comments. Neither the formal Hendricks House nor its dormer has any architectural relationship to the Money House.

- The applicant is proposing adding to the Unapproved Addition with a first floor addition. This addition is ill proportioned and would cause the Unapproved Addition to be aesthetically distracting to the Historic Front and to not be subordinate to this important Contributing Property.

**6. Proposal to construct an addition at 10010 Colvin Run Road, tax id # 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 south and east elevations of the El addition and the rear of the house. 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 workshop sessions at the March and April 2015 ARB meetings. Mr. David Olin, property owner, and Mr. Tom Bullock, Bull’s Eye Restoration, represent the proposal.

- Please see discussion under Item #5.

Mr. Mobley was absent for the meeting; however, prior to the meeting, he emailed in the following comments:

1. The drawings submitted for this proposal lack clarity:
  - a. The Floor Plans show arrows of different colors with no legend explaining the meaning of the colors.
  - b. The drawings have no scale.
  - c. The drawings, despite 2 previous presentations, still fail to show the Historic Footprint”, fail to show previous additions and fail to clearly differentiate new proposals from existing footprints.
  - d. These comments regarding the clarity of the presentation and others can be found in the minutes of the last meeting.
2. To clarify this addition’s visibility: the right side of this Contributing Property – or South Side – is visible from Colvin Run Road. There exists limited tree screening, most of which is not on the applicant’s property and could be removed at any time by others. Existing trees, unprotected from removal, are an ineffective screen.
3. The South Side Addition is proposed to be set back 3.5 inches from the Unapproved Addition. This insignificant offset will appear to create a continuous 2-story wall approximately 36 ft. long. – A wall grossly out of scale with this Contributing Property.
4. Further comments about the inappropriate proportions and scale of the proposed windows, doors and roof with clerestory windows can be found in the minutes of the last meeting.

I repeat my concern - stated at the previous two meetings - the Additions proposed to this important Contributing Property, especially on the South Side, ignore the scale and proportions of this house and would have a detrimental effect to this property and the Historic District.

## **BOARD AND STAFF ITEMS:**

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

**MOTION- Mr. Bierce made a motion to approve the April 2015 minutes as amended and to pay the secretary for the April 2015 minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Daniel and carried on a vote of 7-0.**

- **Treasurer's Report:** Ms. Notkins
  - Ms. Notkins reported that as of April 30, 2015 the balance was \$10,864.69
- **Discussion/Update Reports:**
  - Design Guidelines (subcommittee)
    - The ARB will be provided with materials on this matter in June.
  - I-66 Tier 2 Phase I archaeological report and Phase I architectural history survey report
    - Mrs. Blank provided materials to the ARB members and made a presentation. Members have until June 4<sup>th</sup> to make any comments on this report. Alternative 1 of the project stays away from the historic district, while Alternative 2A proposes a ramp that would be located within the historic overlay district.
    - Mr. Plumpe asked if there was an option to construct a ramp that would not impact the district.
      - Mrs. Blank responded that she is not sure.
    - Mr. Plumpe requested more information on this report, in which Mrs. Blank further referenced the handouts.
    - Ms. Aubry noted that there are archaeological sites along the road planned to be improved.
    - Mrs. Blank suggested that the ARB states their preference between the listed alternatives, and they could potentially propose mitigation to be completed along with the project.
    - Ms. Aubry stated that the archaeological sites should be evaluated prior to any decisions being made.
    - Mr. Boland said that all comments should be submitted to Mrs. Blank and signed by Mr. Sutphin prior to submission to the required party.
    - Mr. Daniel would like to see any and all alternatives to avoid impacting the historic district; following this discussion, they could then discuss mitigation techniques. At the minimum, he suggested evaluating the archaeological Phase II studies.
    - Ms. Aubry identified all four sites on the map and said none of these sites have been evaluated. All of these sites are dated to the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter of the 18<sup>th</sup> century into the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Information on specifics can be found in page 20 of the handout.
  - Mrs. Blank also discussed the proposed Leland Road extension that will run through an identified archaeological site. Supervisor Frey held a meeting where FCDOT considered alternatives to this location, but the project may still impact the site. She noted that this project will come before the Board of Supervisors as a plan amendment prior to Supervisor Frey leaving office in November, and she believes he would like input from

the ARB to the Planning Commission and Board. If the ARB does not think this extension project should be completed, this should be the ARB's recommendation. FCDOT will be making the presentation to the ARB.

- Mr. Bierce requested that FCDOT materials be sent to the ARB prior to the presentation.

- **Administrative:**

- **Correspondence, Announcements:**

- Mr. Plumpe discussed his submission of a design to the Peace Corps memorial group. Mr. Bierce is working in concert with Mr. Plumpe on this submission.

- **New/other business:**

- Mr. Daniel noted that he has provided Linda draft language to help guide applicants so they can better understand what the ARB expects of them and what they should expect of from the ARB during and workshop sessions.
- Mrs. Notkins noted that Mrs. Blank's time with this board is getting smaller and more responsibilities are given to her. She stressed the need for a full-time staff member for ARB support.
- Ms. Blank indicated that she has supplied a list of duties for an ARB dedicated staff position to Ms. O'Donnell, her supervisor. Ms. Blank stated that the list includes both duties she currently performs along with duties she recommends that a dedicated ARB staff undertake. She stated that she will send the list to the ARB for input.
- Ms. Blank read a statement indicating that she is no longer able to report known or potential zoning violations for inspection action on behalf of ARB members. This is due to the fact that she was the target of a malicious verbal attack by a county resident, intended to impugn her personal integrity and professional ethics. She will provide ARB members with the appropriate county contact to directly report known or potential zoning violations.
  - Members concurred that they will directly report known or potential zoning violations.

**MOTION: Mr. Daniel made a motion to adjourn at 8:23 p.m.**

Submitted by  
Casey Gresham,  
*Recording Secretary*

**South County Federation Resolution Regarding  
RZ 2002-MV-040**

**Whereas**, representatives for Smith/Packett, Med-Com, LLC, the “Applicant” appeared before the South County Federation Land Use Committee to request the South County Federation’s support for their Final Development Plan Amendment for their 2.94 acre property to be developed in the north-east corner of the Spring Hill Senior Campus. RZ 2002-MV-0040 was approved by the Planning Commission on April 30, 2003.

**Whereas**, the Applicant desires to amend the FDP to include a medical care facility as contemplated by the proffers,

**Whereas**, the Proffer 10, c of the Spring Hill Senior Campus states that an applicant can propose to convert the Senior Housing Building to a medical care facility for assisted living purposes,

**Whereas**, the Applicant has done an extensive job with community outreach, meeting with the Spring Hill community and its Board of Directors,

**Whereas**, the community of Spring Hill has supported the inclusion of Smith/Packett’s proposed care facility, which gives priority to Spring Hill residents for applying for admission,

**Whereas**, to the knowledge of the SCF membership, to date there has been no HOA or civic association that as opposed this Amendment,

Now, therefore, be it **Resolved**, the South County Federation supports and the Federation encourages the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors to approve this application as well so that construction can commence.