# APPROVED MINUTES

**September 10, 2015**

**THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

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

**Members Present:**

Jason Sutphin, Chairman
Richard Bierce, AIA
John A. Burns, FAIA
Christopher Daniel
Elise Murray
John Manganello, P.E.
John Boland*

**Members Excused:**
Robert W. Mobley, Vice Chairman
Joseph Plumpe, ASLA
Michele Aubry
Susan Notkins, AIA, Treasurer

**Staff Present:**
Leanna O'Donnell, *Fairfax Department of Planning & Zoning*
Casey Gresham, ***Recording Secretary***

**Arrived after the meeting began*

Mr. Sutphin opened the September 10, 2015 meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) at 6:31 p.m. in Room 2/3 of the Government Center; Mr. Burns read the opening statement of purpose.

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:**
**Motion made by Mr. Daniel to move correspondence and announcements to the beginning of the agenda; seconded by Ms. Murray**

- **Correspondence, Announcements:**
    - The October 8th meeting will be held in conference rooms 4-5.
    - The ARB then discussed the draft letter to the Board of Supervisors, which focused on surveys of buildings in proximity to the new Silver Line Metro stations and the demolition permit for the Marcel Breuer -designed American Press Institute Conference Center.
        - It was mentioned that the Marcel Breuer building is one of a series of buildings that may be threatened by redevelopment. It is the second property that has architectural significance that is being threated – the first was the Commons of McLean. The county lost the Commons, but it managed to get great documentation prior to its demolition. In their statement included in their permit submitted to the Department of Planning and Zoning for the API building, the applicant stated that there are no known heritage resources on the site (even though they didn't do a survey). The ARB decided to:
            1) Ask that demolition not be allowed to go forward until the status of API building is firmly establish (as a heritage resource)
            2) Request that Fairfax County perform a survey of these

resources throughout the county. Those were the main points of the letter.

**Mr. Burns proposed a motion to empower ARB chairman to send a letter to the BOS and DPZ; 2nd by Mr. Bierce. Unanimous vote of 7-0.**

**INTRODUCTION/RECOGNITION OF GUESTS: None.**

**CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION ITEMS:**

**1. The proposed signage** to be installed at the property located at 5624-A Ox Road in the St. Mary's Church Historic Overlay District. A 10' X 2' internally illuminated LED box sign with green background and white lettering to read *Taeji Sushi Japanese Restaurant* would be installed. Jun Yang, Saeam Graphics, represents the application. (Item **ARB-15-SMC-02**)

**Motion made by Mr. Bierce:** Mr. Chairman, I move that the ARB approve item **ARB-15-SMC-02 for the proposed signage to be installed** at 5624-A Ox Road, and that was submitted and presented to the ARB at the September 10, 2015 meeting. 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 to approve was seconded by Mr. Manganello and passed on a 7-0 vote.**

**ITEMS FOR ACTION:**

- **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. The applicant presented the proposal at a workshop session at the July 9, 2015 meeting. Ms. Debbie Robison, Project Manager, and Mr. Mohsen Rahini, architect SWSG, and Ms. Elizabeth Crowell and Ms. Karen Lindquist, Fairfax County Park Authority, represent the proposal. (Item **ARB-15-HLY-01**)
- Presentation made by Ms. Robison and Mr. Rahini:

- As per the ARB recommendations, the project proposes the same materials that were used in Phase 1, which include eco-stone used on the cart path and concrete pavers used on the trail. The applicants have proposed revisions to the plan that include reducing the slope of the roof on the cart storage building and bringing the height of the building down. They have provided door details for the garage door, included the proposed grading plan, and the received the results of the paint analysis. The analysis showed that all of the layers were white paint, so they will use the same white paint. A cut sheet is now included that shows the proposed lighting fixtures, which includes an emergency light in the roof of the porch. The roofing materials is called revere, and samples were distributed. The applicants did not choose to use a French drain with landscaped rocks, as there were concerns from the Park Authority about potential vandalism with the rocks being thrown into windows. While the gutters are not ideal, they seemed to be the best solution.

- Discussion:
  - Mr. Bierce noted that he was not in attendance at the July meeting but had reviewed the minutes. He asked if the roof was field formed.
    - The applicants responded that yes, it is field formed on-site. They are focusing on replacing the roof as-is and rehabilitating it.
  - Mr. Bierce noted that all of the windows are 20th century windows, but he asked if any of the windows were remnants from the original construction. He also noted that the windows should be aligned with the prevailing dimensions and proportions of the woodwork that was available in 1827.
    - The applicant stated that they know historically that the windows in the front of the building were longer, but they have chosen to use manufactured windows because they do not have the money to pursue custom options. They can look at customization, but they planned on using muntin rather than putty to make the windows appear thinner. The applicant stated that they would evaluate other products but that they need to use a manufactured product that is consistent in scale and profile.
  - Mr. Bierce asked if there has been an archaeology study completed.
    - Ms. Crowell of the Park Authority stated that there has been a previous archaeology study completed, and they have a consultant under contract to do infill on the Phase I for areas that weren't previous studied. Some Phase II work will have to be done as well, and this effort is being coordinated with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.
  - Mr. Bierce suggested that a stepped-down gable roof would be a better roofing option for the shed. A step-down roof would appear more graceful and visually enhance the functional building.
    - The applicant agreed to consider this roofing choice.
  - Mr. Daniel agreed with Mr. Bierce with regard to his windows comment. He added that many companies will go out of their way to meet historic precedents and will try to match the time period as close as possible. With regard to the shed roof, he would also like to see a lowered slope with potentially a step-down gable approach.

- Mr. Burns stated that the porch and the shed have different roof forms, and he believes it is fine to have dissimilar roof forms on new additions that distinguish themselves from the original historic structure.
- Mr. Bierce stated that he supported the gutter in this application.

- **<u>Ms. Murray made the following motion:</u>**
  Mr. Chairman, I move that the ARB defer item **ARB-15-HLY-01 for the proposed rehabilitation and addition at** the Huntley Tenant House, 6918 Harrison Lane, tax map 092-2 ((1)) 8C, to allow the applicant to prepare additional information on the windows and roof gable.

  **This motion was seconded by Mr. Daniel, and it passed on a vote of 7-0.**

**2. 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. At the July 9, 2015 meeting, the ARB approved the completed addition, **ARB-15-CRM-03**, with the following conditions: 1) all applicable Fairfax County permits be obtained for the 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. At the August 13, 2015 meeting the ARB discussed the proposed redesign of the dormer and its window in a workshop. The redesigned dormer and window is being presented for approval. Mr. David Olin, property owner, represents the application. (Item-**ARB-15-CRM-03**)

- Presentation made by Mr. Olin:
  - Mr. Olin focused on designing a window that fits the angle of the gable roof. He chose a mutton window with a single glass pane, which would be the least distracting and the most cohesive with what's existing on-site. This would be a custom-made window using mercury laid glass to match the early windows in the remainder of the building.

- Discussion:
  - Mr. Daniel started by thanking Mr. Olin for submitting another revision and for being reactive to feedback from the ARB. He believes that the application has gotten close to what the Board is looking for, and he would be comfortable with moving forward on this project.
  - Mr. Burns noted that on the elevation, it says that the siding is hardie plank. He asked if this is consistent with the remainder of the house.
    - Mr. Olin stated that it is wood on the remainder of the house, but that there is hardie plank in the back elevation. A majority of the front elevation is wood flat-board siding.
  - Mr. Burns asked why there was a change from the wood.

        - Mr. Olin stated that some of the change was fueled by cost, while the other is maintenance. Wood would have to be power washed constantly and doesn't hold the finish as well; but he would consider changing the hardie plank to wood.
    - Mr. Burns asked if the hardie plank exposure would match the wood paneling on the older portion of the home.
        - Mr. Olin stated that it would, and the only difference would be in the thickness of material.

- **Mr. Daniels made a <u>motion for Approval:</u>** Mr. Chairman, on July 9, 2015, the ARB approved item **ARB-15-CRM-03 for the addition which has been built** at 10010 Colvin Run Road, tax map # 18-2 ((1)) 23, subject to conditions including additional review and approval of a dormer and window.
  I move that the ARB approve the dormer and window as submitted and presented to the ARB at the September 10, 2015 meeting for item **ARB-15-CRM-03.**
  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 Ms. Murray, and the motion carried on a vote of 7-0.**

**ITEMS FOR WORKSHOP SESSION:**

**1. Proposed new addition(s)** at 10010 Colvin Run Road, tax map # 18-2 ((1)) 23, in the Colvin Run Mill Historic Overlay District. Mr. David Olin, property owner, represents the proposal.

- Presentation:
    - Mr. Olin stated that his is proposing a sunroom located off the southern elevation of the home. He has moved the massing and bedroom addition to be located completely behind the house and it is only attached by a small portion. The addition remains to be setback from the plan of the original first floor addition to the point where the roofline hangs flush with the gable wall. Nothing has changed on the remaining portions of the addition than what has previously been presented. He also more carefully illustrated how the structure would be integrated into the hill. The curve in the retaining wall was corrected, and it was noted that the mature trees will all be preserved.

- Discussion:
    - Mr. Sutphin asked what is the dimension that the addition is offset from the home.
        - Mr. Olin stated that is setback about 8 inches.
    - Mr. Bierce asked if the second floor elevation would be continuous in all three sections.
        - Mr. Olin said that the ceiling height has been raised in one of the floors, but it is continuous.
    - Mr. Bierce asked why the ceiling had to be so tall.
        - Mr. Olin responded that it has to do with the way the roof would tie into

the existing gable. The original water tower and outbuilding was well above the home, so they mirrored its scale with this rendition of the addition. The ceiling is 7 feet tall in the center section.

- Mr. Bierce questioned why Mr. Olin needed to go to a 10-foot ceiling height.
    - Mr. Olin said that he chose this approach in order to achieve greater ceiling height since the others are so low.
- Mr. Bierce said that it had more bulk than the other sections. If there was a way to contain the mass in some way, he requested that Mr. Olin do so. If he could work on the ratio of flat wall space to window openings, he would be more comfortable with the addition. The addition has a lot of wall with small windows, and it jumps out in scale as being more mass than the other two portions of the home.
- Mr. Bierce noted that he liked the new entryway much better than the previous proposal.
- Mr. Daniel said the southwest elevation shows the wall more prominently. He liked the gable more so than the hip approach, as the hip was more prominent. If there is a way to reduce the height in any way, it would be preferred.
- Mr. Burns said that the new two story addition is clearly of this century, as it has a more typical late 20th century / early 21st century large wall space with small windows. He asked why Mr. Olin couldn't make this a shed roof that tilted up the hill so there could be taller windows looking out onto the deck. It would make it clear that this is not the historic home and that it's an addition. He added that sometimes it's better to differentiate than to make the addition blend in.
    - Mr. Olin responded that he was concerned about water and leaf debris coming back into the house, but he will look at different options.

**2. 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. The applicant presented the proposal at a workshop session at the July 9, 2015 meeting and returns with more details as requested by the ARB. Mr. Seyed Nabavi, Fairfax County Dept. of Transportation, represents the proposal.

- Presentation: Mr. Nabavi:
    - He stated that he had resubmitted materials hoping to address the ARB's previous

concerns.

- Discussions:
    - Mr. Sutphin summed up the previous concerns and asked Mr. Nabavi to give an overview of the responses to the ARB's questions.
        - Mr. Nabavi noted that while the ARB preferred grass as a trail material for the equestrian path, the Park Authority would like stone dust, and they provided examples of stone dust trails used elsewhere. With regard to drainage, there are no issues regarding the buildings, and the open drainage and ditches will be used. As specified in the proffers, any buildings specified will have to be protected.
    - Mr. Manganello asked if there were any specific BMP/SWM approaches being used.
        - Mr. Nabavi stated that they will be using the site plan and what was approved by the county. The trail was proffered, and any other developments that differ from what was approved (i.e. the amphitheater), will be resubmitted. This is a PI plan not an update to the site plan.
    - Mr. Bierce noted that the horse trail is four feet in width. He said that this may not be wide enough for a horse.
        - Mr. Nabavi responded that this is the standard in the Public Facilities Manual.
    - Mr. Sutphin asked what the trail signage will be like.
        - Mr. Nabavi said that he will check on this. He knows that the Park Authority usually chooses the signage. If it is finalized, he will include it as a part of the application.

**3. Laurel Hill Adaptive Reuse Area:**

1) Proposed lighting plan
2) Adaptive reuse buildings - changes in response to VDHR and NPS historic tax credit review comments
3) Pool area design
4) Proposed conceptual architecture for new single-family detached homes

The Laurel Hill Adaptive Reuse Area is located at tax map 107-1 ((1)) 9. The ARB approved the rezoning of the property at its September 13, 2012 meeting and subsequently approved the Phase 1 site plan at its May 8, 2014 meeting. The ARB approved conceptual architecture for the new townhomes and new retail at its July 24, 2014 meeting (please note that this list of ARB approvals is not all inclusive). The Board of Supervisors entered into a development agreement with The Alexander Company and Elm Street Development on July 29, 2014. The items for discussion have been approved by VDHR and NPS as related to historic tax credit review. Scott Adams, McGuire Woods, Jorge Flores, Lessard Design, Loren Helgason, Studio 39, and David Kaul, The Alexander Company, represent the proposal.

- Mr. Burns recused himself.
- Presentation made by Mr. Adams:
    - This project is a public-private partnership between Fairfax County and developers (The Alexander Company and Elm Street), and it is part of a tax credit

deal, which requires VA Department of Historic Resources and National Park Service approval. The ARB did recommend approval of RZ previously. The group is updating the previously presented items and filling the ARB in on the project details. The BOS approved the RZ and the master development plan of the project. In addition, the site plan for Phase I was approved. The items tonight are pre-conditions for closing on the property, and the group hopes to return in October for approval from the ARB.

1) Proposed lighting plan:
    - Mr. Helgason presented the proposed lighting plan
        - The overarching idea to help define character and enhance the differences between new construction and adaptive reuse.
    - Discussion:
        - Mr. Sutphin inquired about proposed height on street lighting.
            - Lights will be 14 feet in height. The distribution will push light from parking lot onto street, and there will be a backlight cutoff. The will be no light above 85 degrees.
        - Mr. Sutphin asked if the site plan will have a photometric correspondence sheet.
            - Yes, this plan is included in package today.
        - Mr. Sutphin asked if in the adaptive reuse area, if the back sections of the historic buildings have emergency egress or typical lighting.
            - There's a recess can fixture in the rear entrance/exit, and any door that's being used will have a light.
        - Mr. Bierce noted that choice of fixtures is appropriate, and he appreciates that effort.
        - Mr. Daniel asked the applicant to discuss bollard light (Light L).
            - There is a passageway down the center, and while it's close to adaptive reuse, it's obvious that there was never a sidewalk there previously. This is a situation where there's an "old meets new" overlap.
2) Adaptive reuse buildings:
    - Mr. Kaul presented updates to the historic buildings:
        - The project proposes changes to the doors on six shop buildings – they had previously submitted door details, but they have since found historic drawings for the doors.
    - Discussion –
        - Ms. Murray asked for further detail on the door materials.
            - The door will be a solid wood door.
3) Pool building – the main change is the removal of a prison door.
4) Chapel building – the chapel will need a significant amount of HVAC, which includes two large units. The applicant looked at putting them on the roof, but that location and height would make the units visible throughout the site. The next best option was to put them at-grade behind the building. The units will be screened and would not visible from the main entrance road but would be visible from the trail.

- Discussion:
    - Mr. Bierce stated that most changes were perfectly reasonable. He did note that the HVAC units would be located right by the entrance from the parking lot. He asked if they could be submerged behind a retaining wall, as the current option seems to be the most obtrusive.
    - Mr. Daniel agreed that planting around the units seems like an optimistic gesture, but it would not mitigate the sound. If there were some kind of wall to surround the units, it might limit the sound and the view in a more permanent manner than plantings would. He does agree with locating the HVAC units on this side (south) of the chapel, as it keeps the units away from the proposed residential units on the other side.
    - Mr. Sutphin asked where the new access road would be in relation to the HVAC units.
        - The applicant responded that there would be 18 feet between the building and the parking.

5) Proposed conceptual architecture for single family detached homes:
    - Presentation made by Mr. Flores.
    - Discussion:
        - Mr. Boland asked how wide the lots were.
            - Mr. Flores responded that they are 55 feet wide, with the driveway located along the side of the lot to minimize massing.
        - Ms. Murray asked if the homes would be all brick veneer and the same color.
            - Mr. Flores said they were trying to keep the same color of the existing brick manufactured by the inmates as a way to honor what they've done in the past. They would have some variation, but the color pattern would be the same.
        - Mr. Bierce said that he was very disappointed in the proposal. It fundamentally denied the existing context, and the industrial character is ruined. In the design of the townhomes, he approved of and applauded the approach. The proposal for the single family homes does not use the vocabulary of what's historic. He knows it's approved, but the free-standing colonial scale in an industrial context is a failure. The single family homes do not fit the criteria needed to fit into context.
        - Mr. Sutphin noted that the bulk of the structures has changed quite significantly. In doing so, the grading and layout of the site has also significantly changed and is no longer in substantial conformance with what they previously approved. He added that these were big units, and he was quite certain that nothing this large was included on the previous plans the ARB saw. He asked if VDHR and NPS reviewed the site plan and the architecture.

    - Mr. Flores said that there is no change to the grading or site plan, and they are planning within the maximum building footprint allowed on-site.
- Mr. Sutphin said that the sheets included in the package provided to them do not match what they are presenting.
    - Mr. Flores stated that the approved plan shows the buildable area box.
- Mr. Sutphin wished the applicants luck in getting an ARB approval at the next meeting.
- Mr. Sutphin asked if a final submission was made to them, and he then asked why it was not brought to the ARB as well.
    - The applicant responded that this submission was presented late last year, and they did not bring it to the ARB because of additional review by VDHR and NPS. The conceptual architecture was approved in May of this year by NPS.
- Mr. Sutphin asked why the revisions weren't brought back to this board for comments. He stated that numerous revisions were made without ARB feedback, and he was disappointed that they were not kept abreast of the proposals through work sessions.
- Ms. Murray noted that every house looks alike.
- Mr. Boland said it was very disappointing that the ARB was left out of the discussions and the process for a better part of a year, especially since the ARB was asked to approve this proposal at next month's session. After four years of working with this group, he is very disappointed.
    - Mr. Adams responded that he understands the disappointment in not seeing the various iterations, but the applicant did not want the ARB to take to mean that ARB input was not provided to the tax credit review agencies. There was no attempt at cutting this board out of the process, and they tried to include the feedback. There was a lot of back and forth with agencies, and this was the end result. It is a tough situation because it is a tax credit project, and the applicants are beholden to receiving their approval to allow the project to move forward.
- Mr. Bierce said that this is an Architectural Review Board, who reviews design. They have had no input in the evolving design. Their care of historic sites involves all of these elements. This project in its present form defiles the present site. It is the wrong approach and the wrong design. He added that it is the most inappropriate design that the applicants could have possibly come up with.

**BOARD AND STAFF ITEMS:**

- **Review and action on approval of minutes:**
  **Motion: Ms. Murray to authorize compensation to Laura Arseneau for her work on the August 2015 minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Daniel, and the motion carried on a vote of 6-0.**

  **There was a deferral on approval of the August 2015 minutes until Linda Blank has a chance to review.**

  - **Treasurer's Report:** Mr. Sutphin: on behalf of Ms. Notkins stated that the balance is $10,264.69. However, county funding from start of fiscal year this July has not entered the account yet.

- **News/other business: None**

- **Discussion/Update Reports: None**

- **Administrative: None**

**Ms. Murray motions for adjournment at 9:02 p.m.**