

APPROVED MINUTES

February 11, 2016

THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

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

Members Present:

Jason Sutphin, Chairman
Robert W. Mobley
Richard Bierce, AIA, Vice Chairman
John A. Burns, FAIA
Christopher Daniel
Michele Aubry, Treasurer
John Boland
John Manganello, P.E.
Elise Murray
Joseph Plumpe, ASLA*

Members Excused:

Susan Notkins, AIA

Staff Present:

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

**Arrived after the meeting began*

Mr. Sutphin opened the February 11, 2016 meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) at 6:32 p.m. in Room 4/5 of the Government Center; Mr. Bierce read the opening statement of purpose.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: Mr. Burns made the motion to approve the agenda. Mr. Daniel seconded the motion. The motion was approved on a vote of 10-0.

INTRODUCTION/RECOGNITION OF GUESTS: None present.

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION ITEMS: None proposed.

ITEMS FOR ACTION:

- 1. 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 20' X 24' 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 double-hung windows and operable shutters at the north elevation; 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. At the west elevation there will be a basement level entry door with a Palladian-type window at the first level and double-hung windows at the second floor. Siding will be hardieplank. 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. A new portico entry will be added at the east side of the existing addition. 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. The item was deferred from the January 2106 meeting at the applicant's request. Ms. Stephanie Dimond, Dimond Adams Design Architecture, represents the application. (Item-**ARB-16-LFK-01**)

- Presentation made by Ms. Dimond:
 - The revised application reduced the footprint of the addition and increased the setback from the original residential structure. The panels and the stair tower were eliminated, and the fenestration was reduced. The material of the trim was changed to wood, and the shingles on the roof would match the existing shingles.

- Discussion:
 - Mr. Bierce asked the applicant to clarify the foundation specs.
 - The foundation would be made from true four-inch rough cut fieldstone, which is Carder Rock from across the Potomac River.
 - Mr. Bierce noted that the drawings submitted were excellent, complete, to-scale, and greatly helped the ARB understand the proposal.
 - Mr. Daniel added that the revised addition was clearly differentiated from the existing home, and the height differential was apparent from looking at the plans. It would be very obvious that the addition is not historic. In addition, Mr. Daniel agreed with Mr. Bierce in regards to the quality of the submission.
 - Mr. Sutphin also concurred in regards to the excellent presentation materials.

Mr. Daniel made the following motion:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the ARB approve item ARB-16-LFK-01 proposed addition and alterations at 6435 Georgetown Pike that was submitted and presented to the ARB at the February 11, 2016 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.

Mr. Bierce seconded the motion. The motion was approved on a vote of 10-0.

ITEMS FOR WORKSHOP SESSION:

2. **Proposal to construct a patio and walkways** at the Workhouse Arts Center, 9601 Ox Road, tax map #106-4 ((1)) 58 located in the Lorton Correctional Complex National Register-eligible Historic District. The 2001 Lorton Correctional Complex 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 patio and walk ways are proposed to be located in the Workhouse Central Yard (commonly referred to as the quadrangle), identified in

the National Register as a contributing site, S-07, measuring 500' X 165'. The proposed patio would be constructed at the east and would measure 50' x 100'. Existing walkways would be enhanced with additional walkways for access east to west and north to south across the quad. ARB review of this item is for recommendation as no building permit is required for the at-grade construction. Ms. Ava Spece, CEO/President, Workhouse Arts Center represents the proposal.

- Presentation made by: Ms. Spece:
 - She introduced Kevin Tankersley and David McElhaney. Using the feedback from the ARB's October meeting, the new proposal's intent was to balance preservation and renovation to bring members of the public into the quad's central spaces. This would showcase the workhouse as a cultural asset to the County, and it would incorporate minimal change on-site that could be easily removed in the future. While the historic identity is preserved, the proposal remained complimentary to the historic character of the site. The Workhouse design aimed to promote positive social interaction through art and its education. The site is unique from the penitentiary and reformatory, as it is positioned in view of the public. The quad is currently mostly barren and uninviting, and this proposal brought planting beds, paved areas for activities, and benches and walkways to help activate the space. In response to previous ARB comments, the tent pad was repositioned to the rear of the quad in an attempt to be less intrusive. In addition, to avoid the unsightliness of concrete, the tent pad was now proposed to be composed of brick pavers. The design incorporated three prominent workhouse features: circular design (in the windows, vents, and pathways); arches; and the inclusion of salvaged brick, which was produced on-site. The proposal focused on ADA and wheelchair accessibility, allowing for an easily-traversable surface on the quad.
- Ms. Clifton requested to speak on the application:
 - She stated that she was in favor of this plan. She regularly traverses this quad, and oftentimes she has sank into the grass of the quad. The Workhouse is starting to claw its way back to viability, and this project would increase the outdoor venue space and add to the Workhouse's viability. If in the future the decision is made to revert to the site's original form, the proposed improvements can easily be removed. She was very pleased to see the salvaged bricks being incorporated into the design, as it adds to the cultural timeline between the prison and today. The County has mandated that the Workhouse make its own way, and this proposal would be a perfect start. Several buildings have been lost to County code requirements, and this space could help make up for the lost space. She, as well as the Lorton Heritage Society, were very much in favor of the application.
- Discussion:
 - Mr. Mobley asked what uses are anticipated to utilize the area.
 - The applicant responded that a wide variety of community events would take place here, as well as some private events. The next event is Spring Fest, which occurs every April and brings approximately 2,000 people to the campus. This will be the third year of the Workhouse hosting the

- event.
- Mr. Mobley asked if the patterns of sidewalks and different paving surfaces were conducive to Spring Fest and concerts. He also asked if farmers markets would be using the site.
 - Mr. Tankersly responded that the design proposal intended to allow flexibility for large festivals with multiple events as well as to provide sub-spaces for small events to have a portion of the quad.
 - Mr. Mobley questioned where on the quad a concert would take place.
 - Ms. Spece responded that the new patio would host concerts, and this is where the tent could be erected. The patio would be about 5,000 square feet and could accommodate quite a few people and/or chairs. The space does not restrict people to one area or another.
 - Mr. Mobley asked if the pattern was arbitrary and if the sidewalks were wide enough for art shows. He noted that it might not work for a concert the way it is currently designed, and the sidewalks might be too narrow for their intended purposes.
 - Ms. Spece said the intent of the meeting was to ensure the design and layout made sense to the ARB prior to their proceeding. Pathways would be dimensioned to accommodate a variety of events. The hope was to complete the design before spring.
 - Mr. Mobley stated that when plans are developed to please the eye on a poster, the design might not be functional, especially for the multitude of uses that are being thought of. He also asked where the three colors of brick shown on the plans were coming from.
 - While the applicant has yet to inventory how much brick they have, Ms. Spece responded that all of the red shown on the plans would be re-salvaged brick.
 - Mr. Bierce asked what the gray materials were representing.
 - Mr. Tankersly said the materials would be various types of brick similar in color, and in actuality, there would not be as much contrast.
 - Mr. Bierce questioned the duration on the temporary facilities and added he would like to see this included in the proposal.
 - Ms. Spece responded that the tent would be present for a majority of the season. She added that once additional buildings are included in the Workhouse, activities on-site can be located inside, and the need for the tent would diminish.
 - Mr. Bierce asked if the refectory building would become a performing center.
 - Ms. Spece said that it would eventually become an event center to bring in revenue.
 - Mr. Bierce added that a temporary elevated structure might also be helpful for the Workhouse events. In regards to the lawn surface, he was sympathetic to the situation. He asked if any engineering or drainage is included in the proposal.
 - The intent is to flatten the lawn to ensure durable and stable pavement.
 - Mr. Bierce asked if there had been an archaeological study in the lawn area.
 - The applicant responded that this is certainly something they would need to do due diligence on. In regards to drainage, there have been

- improvements throughout the last few years. There is area drainage in certain areas.
- Ms. Murray asked where the access to electrical outlets was.
 - The applicant responded that there is a source where the tent would be located. The proposal is a far more expensive project than the initial concrete pad, but the goal is to make sure what is underneath the paving is solid.
 - Ms. Murray inquired as to how large the area beneath the tent would be.
 - The tent covers a 5,000 square-foot area of proposed pavement in the middle of the eastern section of the quad. A temporary stage would also be located beneath the tent.
 - Ms. Murray cautioned the applicant about the placement of electrical wires, especially in the area in front of the stage.
 - Ms. Blank added that cultural resources had been contacted about the site's archaeology, and she will find the response. In addition, the current drains were improperly installed ten years ago. These drains will be cleaned out and reset on the property late this upcoming spring.
 - The applicant added that tunnel remediation has been completed as well, which will also help solidify the quad.
 - Mr. Plumpe agreed with Mr. Mobley and Mr. Bierce's points and that the drainage issues need to be resolved. The pathways could also be dug-in at the same time the quad was leveled out. The site could also benefit from the investment in an irrigation system or some type of hardy grass, especially if it is sod and can be used immediately. In regards to the tent pad itself, he suggested the applicant look towards Woodlawn for a design that is aesthetically pleasing and complements the architecture. He added that the plantings and planters installed might need to be mountable by emergency and fire vehicles. He was pleased to not see trees included, and he hoped that the proposed plantings would be of indigenous varieties. Mr. Plumpe thought the brick pattern was too busy and he suggested a subtle difference in paving colors. He would also like to see material samples in the future. He also emphasized the smooth transition between pavers and the lawn, as well as the consideration for any trucks that will be traveling throughout the quad during event setup. In relationship to the buildings, he thought the circulatory patterns worked great. Mr. Plumpe then asked if the walkways were large enough to be functional for pedestrian and booth or event activity.
 - Ms. Spece appreciated all of the comments from Mr. Plumpe and the ARB. She also added that cost is always a consideration, but the intention is to phase this project.
 - Mr. Daniel also agreed with Mr. Mobley and Mr. Bierce, and he asked for further information about potential events on this site, specifically in regards to the larger events and their frequency. He believed there was a way to soften the design, and he asked if there was a reason the event lawn was not located in the center of the quad.
 - The applicant responded that the location was chosen in terms of balance and its relation to the site's architectural features. The intent was not to be

symmetrical.

- Mr. Daniel asked if all of the connections were needed, especially towards the eastern end of the site where many pathways were congesting the area. He added that any site work, site plans, and materials would be helpful to the ARB. In addition, a before and after comparison would be helpful.
- Ms. Aubry appreciated all of the work and was encouraged by it, especially in regards to the discussion of other buildings that will be developed. She suggested that the plantings might be better suited to the periphery of the quad. In addition, she was unsure of the location of the circle and thought it might not be in the right spot. If the circle was relocated, she wondered if the sidewalks could be widened. In regards to the archaeology, she had the understanding that the entire penitentiary had been surveyed. She added that it would be wonderful if specific work could also be completed.
 - The applicant said information would be provided on this.
- Ms. Aubry added that any efforts to use the tent sparingly would be preferable to a long-term tent.
 - Ms. Spece noted that every time the tent is put up and taken down, it costs the Center \$5,000.
- Mr. Burns commented that maintaining the quad's open space is critical. The plantings somewhat intrude on this feeling, and at-grade work maintains the open plane. As other buildings become accessible, there will be less of a dependency on the tent. His opinion was that if an upgraded tent were purchased, there would be more of a desire to keep the tent. The current tent can assist in reminding of the temporary nature of the tent until the other buildings are brought in.
 - The applicant responded that there should be ample performing space between Building 1 and the theater, and they are excited about the possibility of not needing a tent.
- Mr. Burns added that, as a result of providing fire access into the quad, there might be an opportunity to provide a durable surface to allow for access to get event-related equipment into and out of the site. Electrical equipment might also be able to be hidden under this surface. He also said that depending on the size of concerts, the applicant might need two different stage heights. With regard to the historic brick, he asked if the applicant was confident that the brick would withstand the weather.
 - The applicant had not yet investigated the brick's integrity, but this will be analyzed.
- Mr. Daniel asked if the bricks are being saved to repair existing structures, as he would not want to eat into the site's supply of bricks for maintenance of buildings.
 - The applicant responded that even if the bricks were used as a small decorative element, it would still serve the site with its symbolism.
- Mr. Plumpe noted that previously there was a breezeway in the front entrance, but it had to be broken up for emergency and fire access.
 - Ms. Blank added that the ARB had previously approved the arcade, but Fire and Rescue did not also approve of it.
- Mr. Plumpe suggested a bit of an improvement to the tent that the Center

- currently has.
- Mr. Burns said the tent does not need to be purposely tattered, but the tent that they currently own would suffice.
 - Ms. Murray asked if the applicant owned the tent.
 - The applicant does own the tent.
 - Mr. Plumpe asked for a status update regarding the barn.
 - The applicant responded that they have conceptual drawings, but they do not yet have a price tag. At the March ARB meeting, the fundamental pieces will be discussed, including the buildings located on the quad.
 - Mr. Bierce asked if the sculptural elements would be a visual monument.
 - The applicant responded that it is intended to be a temporary exhibit, and they would love to have a strong public art presence.
 - Mr. Bierce said that the design provides many ancillary spaces, and in one or two locations, it might be worth considering a semi-permanent sculpture garden in an appropriate genre and scale.
 - This is on the vision page of who the Workhouse Center is and wants to be.
 - Ms. Murray asked if all of the pathways had a day to day function in tying the buildings together.
 - The proposed paths connect far more than the current paths do. Currently, people must walk over the grass to get to Building 1. The proposal will create much more accessibility than what is currently present.
 - Ms. Murray said she had no trouble with the dropped circle.
 - The applicant added that when on-site, it will not be as noticeable, as it will not be looked at from an aerial viewpoint.
 - Mr. Sutphin wrapped up the comments, notably asking the applicant to consider wider walkways, fire access, and pedestrian accessibility. The planting locations, the duration of the tent, and the complexity of the design should also be considered. He asked if this would be a part of an administrative review process in regards to the site plan.
 - The proposal would require a minor site plan, and no Board of Supervisors review would be necessary.
 - Mr. Boland said that the original site plan on the Lorton Road side contemplated a potential restaurant to generate attraction. He asked if this was still included in the plans.
 - Ms. Spece said the restaurant is still included, but it is still in conversation about where it would be located (especially considering the widening of Lorton Road).
 - Mr. Boland thought that the quad plan would be conducive to facilitating this restaurant idea in the future.

BOARD AND STAFF ITEMS:

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

Mr. Daniel made a motion to approve the minutes and authorize payment to the recording secretary. Mr. Burns seconded the motion. The motion was approved on a vote of 10-0.

Motion made by: Mr. Daniel to approve as revised; 2nd by Mr. Burns; 10-0

- **Treasurer's Report:** Ms. Aubry: \$12,764.69

- **Discussion/Update Reports:**
 - Colvin Run Mill HOD *From Guidelines to Expectations?* Design Guidelines Subcommittee Messers Bierce and Mobley. Discussion of draft full board & staff.
 - There was a need identified for an upgrade, amendment, or replacement to the original 1992 guidelines. There is a capability of this board to establish a direction, baseline, and fundamental components of a revised document to save time and money while utilizing the expertise of the ARB members.
 - Objectives:
 - To clarify who the audiences are (and to create a better instructive document for both applicants and for ARB to address issues consistently)
 - The context, circumstances, and physical reality of historic districts have changed since they were created – this change requires a fresh look and new analysis to protect and enhance the Districts.
 - There has been a shift in how this document is presented. A predominant characteristic and thought is that historic preservation has acquired a negative character. The goal has been to express the guidelines in a more positive and inspiring way – what does the applicant want, and how can we help the applicant to get there. The thought was to give a lot of room to creative people rather than providing narrow guidelines.
 - Charged with identifying threats to historic resources.
 - 1) Board should buy into process of redesigning the document that will be used by public, agencies, etc. Requires active involvement from the ARB.
 - 2) Re-asses every historic district. Look at assets, elements, things that were and were not done. Responsibility to say “x” must happen to preserve or protect a district.
 - 3) Expanded extended detailed discussion of design principles.
 - 4) No need to reinvent the wheel, make resources available to constituents (i.e. Secretary of the Interior Standards).
 - Next steps: support to move forward. Give some thought over the next 30 days, perhaps form another sub-committee to focus on outreach and education to the public. Policy committee, guidelines committee – if a couple more people are interested, it might be helpful. Written comments encouraged from other ARB members as well.
 - Could prepare a talking paper that goes to every BOS member so everybody is on the same page. 1-2 page summary and an annual meeting to provide annual updates. Would also like to provide updates to BOS members when projects are approved (they can potentially include them in their newsletters).

- **Administrative:** Compensation to Recording Secretary (Staff):

Ms. Murray made a motion to increase the payment to the recording secretary to \$325 per set of completed minutes, effective January 1, 2016. Mr. Daniel seconded the motion. The motion was approved on a vote of 10-0.

- **Correspondence, Announcements:**
- **Old Business:** Preservation50 Distribution of HOD framed photographs
- **New/other business:**

Mr. Daniel made a motion to adjourn at 9:25 p.m.