

# APPROVED MINUTES

January 14, 2016

## THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

---

### Fairfax County Government Center Conference Rooms 4 & 5, 6:30 PM

#### Members Present:

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

#### Members Excused:

Joseph Plumpe, ASLA  
Susan Notkins, AIA,  
Michele Aubry, Treasurer

#### Staff Present:

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

*\*Arrived after the meeting began*

Mr. Sutphin opened the January 14, 2016 meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) at 6:31 p.m. in Room 4/5 of the Government Center; Mr. Burns read the opening statement of purpose.

#### APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

**Motion: Mr. Boland moved to approve the agenda. Ms. Murray seconded the motion. The motion was approved on a vote of 7-0.**

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

**CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION ITEMS:** None proposed.

#### ITEMS FOR ACTION:

- 1. The proposed installation of replacement signage** at the property located at 13826 Lee Hwy, tax map #054-4 ((1)) 28B located in the Centreville Historic Overlay District. An existing LED pylon sign would be replaced with a 10' high X 9' 3" wide X 2' 8" long X 2' 1.25" thick internally illuminated pylon sign reading "PNC BANK". The lettering would be white and blue with orange and white company logo. In review of the application, Zoning found two unpermitted signs located on the property. These signs are not eligible for sign permit approval; Zoning recommends removal prior to sign replacement or new installation. Located at an out lot to the Centreville Plaza neighborhood shopping center, the building was constructed in 1986 according to tax records. The property is non-contributing to the historic overlay district. Mr. C. P. Leopold, SignGraphx, represents the application. (Item-**ARB-16-CTV-01**)

- Presentation made by Mr. Leopold:
  - He stated that he had nothing else to add to the proposal.
- Discussion:
  - Mr. Sutphin noted that two signs on the building were ineligible for permit approval. He then asked what the plans for their removal were.
    - The applicant responded that two of the signs are freestanding, and after speaking with the Zoning Inspections Branch, the plan was to bring the non-permitted signs into compliance through revision of their size. They would be re-manufactured and re-installed.
  - Ms. Blank also noted that if the new signs required any sign permits, the signs would come back to the ARB for review and approval. However, according to the Zoning Inspections Branch, they do not believe these signs will need permits.

**Motion: Ms. Murray made the following motion:**

**Mr. Chairman, I move that the ARB approve item ARB-16-CTV-01 for the proposed signage to be installed at 13826 Lee Hwy, (replacing existing pylon sign with new pylon sign) that was submitted and presented to the ARB at the January 14, 2016 meeting subject to compliance with all applicable Zoning Ordinance sections.**

**This ARB approval action applies only to that sign reviewed by the ARB under this application.**

**The ARB recommends that all signage located at 13826 Lee Hwy be brought into compliance with all applicable Zoning Ordinance regulations.**

**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.**

**Mr. Manganello seconded this motion. The motion was approved on a vote of 7-0.**

2. **Proposed grading plan with landscaping** for Summerhouse Landing, 11801 Leesburg Pike tax map #s 006-3((1))0033 and 006-3((1))0033A partially located in the Dranesville Historic Overlay District (HOD); Plan #**4548-SD-001-1**. The ARB recommended approval of the SE application at its October 2014 meeting, **ARB-14-DRT-01**; limited redesigned site layout was presented to the ARB at its January 2015 meeting as being in substantial conformance with the layout approved in October 2014. The SE was approved by the Board of Supervisors in June 2015. The subdivision, lot layout, storm water management facility location and building footprints shown on plan #**4548-SD-001-1** are in-keeping with the ARB October 2014 recommendation for approval. This application is for recommendation on the improvements shown on this final subdivision plan. The applicant will return to the ARB for review of the individual lot development and architectural design for the single family houses. Mr. Michal Hummel, H2 Companies, represents the application. (Item **ARB-16-DRT-01**)

- Presentation made by Mr. Hummel:
  - The applicant gave an overview of the presentation information, noting that it first came to the ARB in October of 2014. The Special Exception was approved by the Board of Supervisors, and the ARB had also recommended approval. The commercial entrance and all of its signage within the Historic Overlay District currently on the site will be completely removed. Since the most recent review of the subdivision plan by staff to

insure compliance with ARB approval in August, the applicant has been involved in site plan review. The application in front of the ARB involved the new landscaping plan. The staff memo of August 2015 indicated to either relocate the asphalt trail out of the historic district or to return to the ARB for review of this element; the trail has been moved out of the HOD. Any homes that will be constructed in the future will come individually in front of the ARB for approval prior to their construction.

- Discussion:
  - Mr. Mobley pointed out that the stormwater maintenance pond had a steep elevation without vegetation, and he asked what currently exists in this area.
    - The applicant replied that it's currently a wooded area.
  - Mr. Mobley asked if there are different ways of retaining stormwater without creating a hole or pond.
    - Ms. Blank responded that the ARB has recommended approval of the location of the pond. In the past, the ARB has occasionally required more plantings around the perimeter of the pond.
  - Mr. Mobley referenced the guidelines, noting that the backs of homes should not be facing public streets. While the backs of homes will not be included within the historic district, the remainder of the subdivision ignores this guideline. It appears that dozens of homes will have their backs facing Route 7. While technically this application follows the letter of the law, the general spirit of the historic district is being ignored.
  - Mr. Manganello asked if the application was under the new Stormwater Regulations or the old regulations.
    - The applicant responded that it meets the new regulations.
  - Mr. Manganello asked if the applicant had considered a dry pond for stormwater purposes.
    - The applicant stated that they had worked on stormwater issues for months during the Special Exception stage of the application, and the current location was the only location that staff could agree upon for the stormwater.
  - Mr. Sutphin asked if Fairfax County allowed grasses to be planted within a dry pond.
    - The applicant responded that the dashed line on the plans showed the restrictive planting easement. Beyond this easement, the applicant had proposed landscaping.
- Brady Cashen with NV homes spoke to the proposed homes in the application as an introduction (this was scheduled as part of the action item):
  - The application intended to let buyers customize their homes to an extent, and the applicant will offer four different house types with a few different elevations to choose from. The plan is for the homes to have a brick front elevation with siding along the side and rear elevations, but the buyers have the option to include an all-brick façade or hardie plank along the sides and rear. The applicant asked for feedback and recommendations so they could take these into consideration.
- Discussion:
  - Mr. Sutphin told the applicant that it might be hard to provide full feedback, as the materials were just received by the ARB that night.
  - Ms. Murray noted that the application will not be visible from the historic tavern or from the public streets.
  - Mr. Mobley added that while the plan includes trees and vegetation to screen the application from the tavern's view shed, vegetation dies and the screening could be lost. Architecture always lies beyond the screening. He also noted that the buildings exceed

the Building Restriction Lines with the proposed options.

- The applicant responded that they were including the largest home in this rendition as an example.
- Mr. Sutphin warned of running into compliance issues with the Special Exception that was granted, and he urged the applicant to ensure the homes do not extend into the building restriction lines.
- Mr. Daniel stated that it was important to look at the guidelines and to ensure the design speaks to the guidelines. This application is sitting on the doorstep of the historic overlay, and the applicant needs to look at the iconic resource present.

**Motion: Mr. Boland made the following motion:**

**Mr. Chairman, I move that the ARB approve item ARB-16-DRT-01 recommendation for the proposed grading plan with landscaping at 11801 Leesburg Pike that was submitted and presented to the ARB at the January 14, 2016 meeting.**

**And I further move that with respect to Development Condition #35, SE 2014-DR-052 stipulating ARB review of the architecture that the applicant understands this requirement and for purposes of subdivision plan approval, review of the architecture has been initiated, with a formal application to be submitted in the near future for the proposed architectural design.**

**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.**

**Mr. Manganello seconded the motion. The motion was approved on a vote of 7-1 (with Mr. Mobley in opposition).**

3. **Proposed addition and alterations** at the property located at 6435 Georgetown Pike, tax map #22-3 ((1)) 56B located in the Langley Fork Historic Overly District (HOD). A two-story with basement addition measuring 17' X 25' would be constructed at the west side of an existing addition to the house; the addition will replace an existing raised terrace with foundation. The roofing at the side gable addition will be asphalt shingle, with casement windows extending across the north façade; casements will be at the second floor of the south façade and clad doors with sidelights at the first floor. The exposed foundation will be stone-faced. An enclosed stairwell 7' X 8' would provide access to all levels with the exterior access at grade. New windows would be installed at the existing addition's south and north elevations; asphalt shingle roofing would be installed with a shed dormer constructed at the south (rear) elevation. According to tax records, the main block of the residence was built in 1891; the western addition was added in 1986. The property is non-contributing to the HOD and is outside the boundary of the National Register Historic District. Ms. Stephanie Dimond, Dimond Adams Design Architecture, represents the application. (Item-**ARB-16-LFK-01**)

- Presentation by Ms. Dimond:
  - The applicant provided further documentation of the windows and lanterns that would replace the existing features and that would be present on the new addition. The house sits very far back on the lot away from Georgetown Pike, and it is screened by existing shrubbery. The proposed addition would be located in an area already disturbed by an existing terrace, and the grade would not be altered. The entrance doors for the new addition would face the rear of the property. The proposed materials include hardie plank siding and operable wood shutters. The application seeks to replace the windows and

doors from the 1980s addition. The building was originally Victorian, but it was moved from its original site near the intersection of Georgetown Pike and Chain Bridge Road and colonized during its renovation in 1986. The addition that is being proposed straddles Victorian and Colonial.

- Discussion:
  - Mr. Bierce noted that the history of the home has evolved, and Ms. Blank did not find any review of the 1986 addition in her research.
  - Mr. Bierce thanked the applicant for a clear, well-scaled, and complete set of drawings, as it is much easier to understand the intent and the proposal. However, he noted that one of the fundamental guidelines is simplicity, and the two-part addition begins to add a high degree of complexity to the overall design. The verticality of the addition contradicts the fundamental horizontal approach to the design. He also added that additions should be subordinate to the principle masses. The proposal brings up a massing conflict, where the roofline is unusual. It should be possible to incorporate the roofline without significant overall massing changes. He was also concerned with the use of PVC material in a historic district. In addition, while the staircase is simple, it adds a degree of complexity. He suggested eliminating the three windows and the horizontal band boards to diminish attention from it.
    - The applicant asked if Mr. Bierce would prefer a simple horizontal siding with simple windows.
      - Mr. Bierce responded that he would prefer it.
    - The applicant also stated that she intended to change the materials to differentiate the old structure from the new. She does not mind using wood, but the material is tough to maintain.
  - Mr. Bierce agreed that it does require maintenance, but PVC is too smooth. However, he could live with hardie plank instead.
  - Mr. Mobley agreed with Mr. Bierce, notably with the fact that the massing is an issue in this application. He liked the concept in taking a more contemporary approach, but he was bothered with the superficial windows. He asked the applicant to lower the addition and to look to the 1-1/2 story part of the main home for inspiration. He also asked if there was a stream present on-site.
    - The applicant replied that it is a creek. She had already checked with the county on any applicable regulations.
  - Mr. Daniel also agreed with Mr. Bierce and Mr. Mobley in that the addition does not appear as an addition. He, too, had an issue with the windows and panels, as it made the addition stand out so much that the attention is taken away from the actual home itself. He added that the simpler the addition, the better. Because of the narrowness and the windows in the staircase, it makes the addition feel taller. He noted that reducing the façade elements might help eliminate this feeling.
    - The applicant asked if the preference was to see no windows in the stairwell.
      - Mr. Daniels responded that at least on the front façade, it would be better to eliminate the windows.
  - Mr. Burns was confused with this design, as there are multiple stories ranging throughout the structure.
    - The applicant responded that the slope of the roofline is not changing, but she could bring the roofline down through lowering the bearing point
  - Mr. Burns stated that the proposal looks like a new façade was put on a historic point of the home. He also added that the stair tower looked like an office building with the stairwell pushed out to the side. He asked the applicant if she had considered a tall thin window.

- The applicant responded that she was afraid this approach would be too modern.
- Mr. Burns suggested that the applicant come back for a workshop, as he could not support the proposal at that time.
- Mr. Sutphin asked the applicant if she would like to defer the action from tonight.
  - The applicant requested deferral of the action.
- Mr. Sutphin summarized the thoughts discussed, including Mr. Burns' statement concerning a point of confusion with competing themes. The original house has morphed styles over time, and it may be presenting a false sense of history. With the additions proposed, there is very little articulation or depth. The middle section being taller than the other two sections draws the viewer's attention away from the main house. Mr. Sutphin recommended a slightly different fenestration pattern, the exclusion of panels on the bottom, and a little less ornamentation. He asked the applicant if the interior space would accommodate the stairs being relocated to the rear.
  - The applicant responded that she would look into its feasibility.
- Mr. Sutphin asked how much space under the taller addition was usable space.
  - The applicant stated that the attic has a flat ceiling and it was aligned with the other additions. The ductwork needs to be connected so a unit can be installed above the second floor. The height could be reduced.
- Mr. Sutphin suggested that the taller section be pushed back, as it could diminish the competitive nature between the additions.
  - The applicant responded that the main reason for its location is that it is on existing disturbed area. She would look into this possibility.
- Ms. Murray said that a simple approach would differentiate the addition. The current proposal is not harmonious and does not match within itself.
- Mr. Daniel added that bringing the height down would help in subtly differentiating the addition. The relocation of the stairwell to the rear along with a new approach to the windows would help significantly.
- Ms. Murray noted that there has been a history of *colonializing* in this district.

**Motion: Mr. Burns made a motion to defer item ARB-16-LFK-01 for resubmittal at a later time. Mr. Daniel seconded the motion. The motion was approved on a vote of 8-0.**

**ITEMS FOR WORKSHOP SESSION:** None scheduled.

**BOARD AND STAFF ITEMS:**

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

**Motion: Mr. Burns made a motion to approve the minutes as modified tonight and to authorize payment to the recording secretary. Mr. Daniel seconded the motion. The motion was approved on a vote of 8-0.**

- **Treasurer's Report: \$13,364.69**
- **Discussion/Update Reports:**

- Received a response from Mr. Selden in response to the API Building and silver line corridor.
- **Administrative:**
  - Ava Spence, President & CEO, Workhouse Arts Foundation, Inc. will appear at the March Meeting and present/discuss
- **Correspondence, Announcements:** April 14 meeting will be at the Workhouse Arts Center; with the tour to begin at 4:30.
- **Old Business:**
- **New/other business:**

**Motion: Mr. Daniel made the motion to adjourn 8:13 P.M.**