

APPROVED MINUTES

July 9, 2015

THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

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

Members Present:

Jason Sutphin, Chairman
Robert W. Mobley, Vice Chairman
Michele Aubry
John Boland
Susan Notkins, AIA, Treasurer
John A. Burns, FAIA
Joseph Plumpe, ASLA*
Christopher Daniel*
Elise Murray, Ex Officio

Members Excused:

Joy Ortiz, AIA
Richard Bierce, AIA

Staff Present:

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

**Arrived after the meeting officially began*

Mr. Sutphin opened the July 9, 2015 meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) at 6:28 p.m. in Room 2/3 of the Government Center; Mr. Mobley read the opening statement of purpose.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

Motion: Mr. Burns made the motion to approve the agenda, with a modification of the order of events of the Board and Staff items. Ms. Aubry seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on a vote of 7-0.

INTRODUCTION/RECOGNITION OF GUESTS:

- Leanna O'Donnell, Branch Chief in the Planning Division, is observing this meeting in preparation for her leading of the September ARB meeting.
- Elise Murray was recognized as a voting member of the ARB with the adoption of the Zoning Ordinance amendment by the Board of Supervisors.

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION ITEMS: None proposed.

ITEMS FOR ACTION:

1. **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"; identified as one of the HOD's contributing properties. A 160 square foot gable roof with dormer second story addition was constructed above an existing c. 1925 one-story flat 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 overhang of the ca. 1925 flat roof one-story addition was retained, and covered with a pent roof. This pent roof surrounds the base of the 2007 addition. The roof

ridge of the 2007 addition is 22" lower than that of the original late 19th century structure. The completed addition was discussed as part of the workshop for a proposed addition at the March, April and May 2015 meetings. Mr. Tom Bullock, Bull's Eye Restoration, represents the application on behalf of Mr. David Olin, property owner. (Item-**ARB-15-CRM-03**)

- Presentation by Tom Bullock:
 - Mr. Bullock stated that he would like to bring the existing addition into compliance at today's session. He had provided photographs of the addition that exists along with what the home looked like prior to the addition. He stated that he was open for discussion and would like an action to be taken by the ARB during this session.
- Discussion:
 - Mrs. Blank further clarified that the proposal contains the addition as-built with changes to all three windows. The windows would now be one-over-one double-hung sash windows, while the opening would remain the same and match the balance of the home.
 - Mr. Mobley wished to discuss the dormer. He had a 2007 photograph, which showed the home prior to the subject addition. Mr. Mobley felt that the addition with the dormer was no longer subordinate to the main historic structure, and he was still just as concerned with the addition now as he was four months ago when it was first discussed.
 - The question was asked if the material of the siding and roofing on the addition matched what was on the main home.
 - Mr. Bullock replied that the metal shingles matched the existing and that the siding is similar to the hardiplank on the house.
 - Mr. Mobley asked if the siding of the home was wood.
 - Mr. Bullock responded that the rear of the home has wood siding, while the front of the home contains hardiplank siding.
 - Mr. Sutphin noted that in comparing the 2007 and current photographs, it seems that there have been changes to the fireplace chimney. It looks to be wider, and he asked if the widening of the chimney was part of the application.
 - Mr. Bullock responded that if the chimney was widened, he would like to address it at tonight's meeting. He was not aware of any changes to it.
 - Mrs. Murray asked if building permits were required to make changes to the chimney.
 - Mrs. Blank responded that if the hole in the roof was changed which is structural, she believed permits are required.
 - Mr. Mobley asked if Mr. Bullock built the addition.
 - Mr. Bullock replied that he did not build this addition.
 - Mr. Bullock stated that it appeared that the chimney had been doubled, as there were two flue tiles coming from the chimney.
 - Mr. Burns stated that he agreed with Mr. Mobley regarding the dormer. He stated that the dormer needs to be lower so as to be in character with the rest of the home. He also asked if the re-siding of the entire home to hardiplank was included in the application.

- Mr. Bullock stated that he was not sure when this work was completed. There was no demolition to the 1890s historic structure itself. He said that a portion of the deck, the handrail, and a post were removed due to deterioration.
- Ms. Notkins asked if the demolition was included in the current addition.
 - Mr. Bullock replied that the demolition was completed during the construction of this addition.
 - Ms. Notkins noted that if any portion of the historic structure was damaged, it may affect this application.
- Mr. Sutphin stated that re-siding of a historic home would not typically come before the ARB. He did include that the ARB could impose conditions as to the demolition if they would like.
- Mr. Burns said that he objects to the small decorative window above the dormer. He suggested that the gable dormer could be lowered.
- Mr. Mobley made a motion to approve the addition providing the dormer was omitted.
 - This motion was not seconded; the motion failed.

MOTION: Mr. Burns made a motion to approve ARB item ARB-15-CRM-03 for the addition which has been built at 10010 Colvin Run Road, tax map # 18-2 ((1)) 23, and that was submitted and presented to the ARB at the July 9, 2015 meeting subject to the following:

- 1) **all applicable Fairfax County permits be obtained for this after-the-fact addition. If permits cannot be obtained for the addition approved by the ARB then the applicant is required to return to the ARB with new plans for review;**
- 2) **that all applicable Fairfax County permits be applied for prior to ARB submission for any other proposed additions (this applies to submission as an action item, not for a workshop discussion item); and**
- 3) **The general massing and configuration of the addition be approved; second decorative window facing street be removed; dormer height be reduced to what is practical. The redesign of the dormer shall be submitted to the ARB for review.**

Upon review of the materials and adherence to the items cited above, the proposal is found to meet requirements of Zoning Ordinance 7-200 HISTORIC OVERLAY DISTRICTS.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Murray, and the motion carried on a vote of 7-1. Mr. Mobley voted in opposition, and Mr. Plumpe abstained.

Following the motion, there was discussion to clarify the dormer restrictions. Mr. Bullock stated that he would study the structural elements of the interior and return to the ARB with how much the dormer can be lowered. Mr. Burns elaborated that the applicant can come back with a dormer proposition, and the ARB can have a discussion on what he has proposed.

2. Proposed new construction and signage at 13890 Lowe Street, tax map #34-2 ((1)) 17E, located in the Sully Historic Overlay District (HOD). The proposed building would house

business offices, a showroom and a warehouse to store plumbing supplies and fixtures. The building would be located approximately 1887' from the Sully historic site. Property access would be from entry drives located at both Lowe Street and Centerview Drive. The one-story, 14,900 square foot building would have a low gable metal roof, be 26.9' in height to top of ridge, with façade materials of concrete split-face block and vertical metal siding. Two over-head doors would be installed at the west façade; one with a fixed awning. Fixed awnings with signage above would be installed at double door glass entrances at the south and west facades. The white lettering on blue background signage would read *Ferguson Waterworks* and is shown to be lighted by a goose neck light. The sign at the south façade would measure 20' X 5' and the sign at the west would measure 7' X 3'. A free-standing sign 5' 9" high X 11' 7" wide is proposed at the Lowe Street entrance. At its December 14, 2006 meeting the ARB approved **ARB-06-SUL-05** for construction of a 23' high, 15,000 square foot single story warehouse sheathed in a concrete masonry veneer with a standing seam metal covered gable roof with the following two conditions: 1) a board-on-board fence be installed at the south and west along Centerview Drive and Lowe Street and 2) the 7,200 square foot building expansion proposed to be constructed at the north end of this building within five years is built so as to match the materials and the architecture design approved for the initial 15,000 square foot warehouse. Ground was never broken for the ARB approved project. Mr. Christopher K. McKneely, AIA, Flanagan Architects PC, represents the application. (Item-**ARB-15-SUL-01**)

- Presentation made by Christopher McKneely:
 - This project was originally presented to the ARB in 2006, and the ARB approval has since expired. The proposal includes a warehouse/showroom and sale facility for a plumbing fixture supply company. The site is screened from adjacent properties with ample vegetation and a board-on-board fence. The company also plans future expansion at the northern end of the building within 5 years of this proposal. The addition includes a one-story building.
- Discussion:
 - Mr. Mobley asked what the site's relationship was to the Sully Plantation.
 - Mr. McKneely responded that the site is 1,887 feet from the Sully Plantation manor house.
 - Mrs. Blank asked about the building mounted signs and if the applicant would clarify the lighting situation of the signs.
 - Mr. McKneely responded that the signs are not internally illuminated and that there is a goose-net type fixture on the southern and western sides. The lighting shown on the architectural drawings for the signage is correct.
 - Ms. Notkins asked the applicant to clarify the materials of the proposed building.
 - Mr. McKneely responded that the building would have a beige masonry veneer, and the northern side would have metal siding to match the beige masonry.
 - Mr. Sutphin asked if the proposal was similar to the surrounding buildings.
 - Mr. McKneely stated that the building would be similar to the other Ferguson building, and this is an expansion for the company.
 - Ms. Notkins asked for a cut sheet for the light fixtures.
 - Mr. McKneely said that the lighting would be wall-mounted and dark-sky compliant.

- Mr. Burns noted that on the plans, there was an indication of a pole located in the stormwater detention pond area. He asked for more details on the height and purpose of this pole.
 - Mr. McKneely responded that it would be a 20-foot pole, and it would serve as the only pole-mounted light on-site. There are four building-mounted lights.
- Mr. Burns asked for the height measurement of the exterior storage racks.
 - The applicant said the height is considerably shorter than the height of the racks located inside the building.
- Mr. Plumpe noted that there were several different light fixtures available for the pole-mounted lighting, and he asked the applicant to provide more details on the lighting elements.
- Mr. Daniel stated that he would be able to support the proposal with lighting clarifications.
- Mrs. Blank noted that lighting conditions could be included or a cut sheet could be submitted by the applicant.

MOTION: Ms. Murray made a motion to approve item ARB-15-SUL-01 for the proposed new construction and signage at 13890 Lowe Street, tax map #34-2 ((1)) 17E, that was submitted and presented to the ARB at the July 9, 2015 meeting subject to the following:

- 1) **No free standing sign is included in this approval because the Zoning Inspections Branch has found that “the proposed new building would not be allowed its own freestanding sign”;**
- 2) **Recognition that the proposed building-mounted signs must be in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance and in substantial conformance with the approved Special Exception; and**
- 3) **Photometric study and all proposed lighting be submitted back to ARB for approval.**

Upon review of the materials and adherence to the items cited above, the proposal is found to meet requirements of Zoning Ordinance 7-200 HISTORIC OVERLAY DISTRICTS.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Daniel. The motion carried on a vote of 9-0.

ITEMS FOR WORKSHOP SESSION:

- Ms. Aubry noted that her husband is a member of the Board of Directors of the Friends of Historic Huntley and also is the Mt. Vernon District representative and chair of the Fairfax County Trails and Sidewalks Committee. She stated that these organizations advocate for, respectfully, Historic Huntley and the county's system of trails and sidewalks, but that there is no financial interest on the part of her family. She made the disclosure so it would be on the record for purposes of the Architectural Review Board.

3. Proposal to construct a trail to be located at tax map #106-4 ((1)) 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. Section 7-200 of the Zoning Ordinance stipulates that plans shall be referred to the ARB for its review and recommendation. The proposal is for constructing a 10' wide paved asphalt trail with an adjacent 4' wide natural surface equestrian trail approximately 3,950 feet in length around the Workhouse Arts Center. The trail would extend around the property from the parking area at the northwest connecting to the entry road for the Occoquan Regional Park at the southeast. A trail traversing the site to the northeast of the workhouse quad and its surrounding contributing properties was consistently shown on the development plans for the rezoning reviewed and recommended for approval by the ARB in 2003- 2004. The proposed trail is consistent with that shown on the development plans. The proposal has been vetted through the Virginia Dept. of Transportation Cultural Resource staff who found the proposal to have no adverse effect on historic properties. Mr. Seyed Nabavi, Fairfax County Dept. of Transportation, represents the proposal.

- **Presentation made by Mr. Nabavi:**
 - This project includes a cross county trail connecting Occoquan Regional Park to Lorton Road. Fairfax County Dept. of Transportation (FCDOT) will build the access road on behalf of the Workhouse Arts Center, and the trail would be a 10-foot wide shared use path. Adjacent to this trail would be an equestrian trail made of stone dust. The construction of the trail is planned to begin in 2017.
- Discussion
 - Ms. Notkins asked if there is an option for pervious trail materials.
 - Mr. Nabavi responded that the best material for these uses is asphalt/concrete for the trail and stone dust for the equestrian trail.
 - Mr. Mobley asked why stone dust was chosen for the equestrian trail.
 - Mr. Nabavi responded that initially, the trail was planned as a grass trail. As the Park Authority is maintaining the trail, they chose to make it composed of stone dust.
 - Mr. Mobley noted the erosion potential for the stone dust.
 - Ms. Notkins asked if there is a stormwater sewer system in the area.
 - Mr. Nabavi stated that as a part of the redevelopment of the site, there is a proposed SWM facility. This facility will be used for the trail. They are also proposing ditches along the way.
 - Mr. Boland asked if there has been a study showing the need for an equestrian trail in this area.
 - The applicant stated that there is an equestrian facility nearby, and the trail is included in proffers for the Workhouse Facility.
 - Mr. Plumpe also noted that this trail is a continuation of an existing equestrian trail.
 - Mr. Plumpe asked if there were concerns about opening this area up to the public if the buildings are not secured.
 - Mrs. Blank responded that within the past 6 months, the County has begun to seriously look at these buildings. They are aware of the condition and

that something needs to be done to improve the buildings in this area. The County's Risk Management staff has been on-site to assess the security.

- Ms. Notkins asked if there had been discussion of using concrete as opposed to asphalt for the trail.
 - Mr. Nabavi responded that the proffer specifically stated it be an asphalt trail.
- Mr. Plumpe asked that at the next workshop, the applicant should bring proposed grading and contours for the ARB to see. It would be helpful to include cross-sections. He also requested photos from the access road to get a better idea of the topography.
- Mr. Daniel recommended also providing the ARB with other trail systems in the area that use crushed stone. He was concerned about the maintenance of crushed stone trails.
 - The applicant could not find any strong examples of crushed stone trails in the county. He stated he would work with the Park Authority and mention the ARB's concern with the material.
- Mr. Burns asked about the layout of the amphitheater in relation to the trail.
 - Mr. Plumpe stated that the workhouse most likely will not need to bring in equipment through the rear of the amphitheater.
- Mr. Burns stated that he was concerned about the end of the trail converging with the entrance road to the Occoquan Regional Park given the amount of traffic on that road.
 - Mr. Nabavi stated that the trail would parallel the road, and a crossing area would be provided at this point.
 - Mr. Daniel mentioned that it would be helpful to provide other trail connections to further demonstrate how these trails will all connect.
- Ms. Notkins requested that the applicant work with VDOT and get more information about the proposed curb-and-gutter in this project, as it may not be the best approach. Natural water flow with a catch basin or dry pond may be a better approach.
- Mr. Sutphin wrapped up the conversation, requesting more details in the next submission on the following:
 - Trail Materials
 - How the Park Authority plans on using the site and how it will interact with the amphitheater
 - Security
 - Stone dust and the reasoning behind selecting this material
 - Grading and impact to vegetation and buildings
 - Concerns about drainage

4. Proposed rehabilitation and addition at the Huntley Tenant house, 6918 Harrison Lane, tax map #092-2 ((1)) 8C located in the Huntley Historic Overlay District. Huntley was established as a historic overlay district in 1976 and is identified as a historic property in that district. It was individually listed in the National Register in 1972. The proposal includes adaptive reuse of the tenant house into a visitor center with museum displays, restroom facilities, and reception area. A garage addition for storage of a wheelchair accessible cart for transporting visitors to Huntley is proposed to be constructed at the north end of the building. The 18' X 8' addition would be brick with a metal shed roof; double wooden doors would be installed at the east façade. The proposed exterior rehabilitation includes brick replacement and repointing, repainting, replacement of the standing-seam metal roof and installation of downspouts and gutters,

replacement of the existing windows, modification to selected window openings, installation of operable window shutters as well as installation of security lighting on east and west elevations. Proposed site related ADA improvements include sidewalk and ADA cart path to the Tenant house as well as a new concrete pad over the existing concrete stoop to provide ADA access to the building. Ms. Debbie Robinson, Project Manager, and Mr. Mohsen Rahini, architect SWSG, and Ms. Elizabeth Crowell and Ms. Karen Lindquist, Fairfax County Park Authority, represent the proposal.

- Presentation made by Debbie Robinson and Mohsen Rahini:
 - The applicants propose a restoration of the exterior of the dwelling for use as a visitor center and museum. The work includes an addition, a new pathway, replacement of a deteriorating metal roof, brick replacement, and new paint.
- Discussion:
 - Mr. Plumpe asked if it was possible to use a French drain with gravel bed as opposed to the proposed gutters as they will cover the brick corbelling.
 - Mr. Rahini does not think the owner would be interested.
 - Ms. Lindquist stated that the overhang is too short for this approach. However, the applicant is still in discussion over how to best accomplish this.
 - Mr. Mobley asked if there is a precedent on-site.
 - The applicant responded that there is a round gutter on the main house. They will bring photos for the next meeting.
 - Mr. Burns asked if the applicant had any pre-fire photos of the structure.
 - The applicant only had photos from the 1960s, but it was assumed that wood-roof architecture was originally in place.
 - Mr. Burns asked the applicant to clarify what a paneswood window was.
 - The applicant responded that they are proposing to include a weather shield window with true divided lights and true wood.
 - Ms. Aubry asked if there would be monitoring and excavation during the process.
 - Ms. Robinson responded that there have been previous archaeological studies, but most of the archaeology has been further away from this location. Also, she noted that a paint analysis will be done prior to any work, and the proposed colors will be brought to the ARB.
 - Mr. Sutphin asked if the doors would be functional without having to significantly alter the grade.
 - Ms. Robinson did note that there is a hill, so the grade will need to be modified and include a swale. However, there will be no significant grading along the front of the structure.
 - Ms. Murray asked if the roof pitch over the addition matched the roof slope of the home. She noted it appeared steep to her.
 - Ms. Robinson responded that they were trying to keep the addition small to accommodate the golf cart. However, they can bring it down to match the slope of the home.
 - Mr. Burns stated that the addition is meant to be accessory and subservient, so he suggested the smaller, the better and agreed with Ms. Murray's comment.
 - Mr. Daniel requested more contextual information.

- Mr. Plumpe was concerned about the recycling container on the backside of the building and its visibility. He asked if there is existing vegetation to screen the container.
 - The applicant responded that there is a six foot wall behind the house, in addition to existing screening to provide coverage from the house.
- Mr. Plumpe requested a proposed site grading plan to be provided, allowing him to get a better idea of the contours. He also would like to see renderings detailing the proposed gutters.
- Mr. Burns asked if there were shutters included on the main home.
 - The applicants replied that there are shutters on the main home.
- Mr. Daniel would like to see cut sheets, light fixture details, brick samples, and the paint study report in the future.
 - The applicant responded that these will all be provided at the next meeting for ARB review.
- Mr. Plumpe asked if there is electricity present.
 - The applicant responded that there is electricity with lights on the lower level, but there is no lighting on the upper lever. Water and sewer are also present.
- Mr. Burns asked the applicant to clarify if the cart path will be porous pavers or the same material as the other on-site walk paths.

BOARD AND STAFF ITEMS:

- **Review and action on approval of minutes:**

MOTION: Ms. Notkins made a motion to approve the May 2015 minutes as amended and to pay the secretary for the May 2015 minutes. This motion was seconded by Ms. Murray and carried on a vote of 9-0.

- **Treasurer's Report:** Ms. Notkins
 - Ms. Notkins reported that as of June 30th, 2015, the balance was \$10,664.69
 - In addition, the Board of Supervisors did approve the requested \$3,500 for the ARB. However, the funding has not been transferred to the ARB's account. Discussion followed regarding an upcoming change to the process and structure of the account. This is under the purview of the county departments of Finance and Management and Budget. Resolution date is unknown at this time.
- **News/other business:**
 - Concern of demise of American Press Institute building. Proposed for redevelopment to housing. Yet another iteration of pressure on mid-century buildings on the silver line corridor. The County hasn't taken any steps to do a survey on what's there and if it has potential historic and/or architectural significance. It might not even come to the ARB; how did we get the Commons in McLean? It would be great to look at this in a different way. Is there something that should be done by the Board to bring to the BOS attention that this is an

unmet need?

- **Discussion/Update Reports**
 - BOS asking for expertise in Resident Curator Program (RCP) – Denice Dressel, RCP project manager, will make a presentation and answer any questions at the August ARB meeting.
- **Mr. Plumpe and Mr. Burns recused themselves prior to the following presentation.*
- **Administrative**
 - In keeping with ARB policy, staff reviewed and approved a change to retaining walls proposed at the **Adaptive Reuse Area at Laurel Hill**. Staff found the following changes to meet the intent of the ARB approval. The changes are: 1) the removal of two walls (#10 right next to the chapel) and a wall by the parking lot adjacent to the Spring Hill development; and 2) the addition of one wall on the Silverbrook Road side (#9). All the same materials that were previously reviewed and approved by the ARB will be used.
 - The ARB will officially take a vote on whether it is in substantial conformance.
 - Mr. Sutphin stated that the changes are consistent with what the ARB has already approved; he added that these changes are fairly insignificant changes and felt comfortable with the proposal.

MOTION: Mr. Daniel made a motion to approve the changes as shown in the Adaptive Reuse Area at Laurel Hill, noting that it meets the intent of the previous approval of this board. This motion was seconded by Ms. Notkins and carried on a vote of 7-0.

MOTION: Mr. Daniel made a motion to adjourn at 9:31 pm