

APPROVED MINUTES

April 14, 2016

THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Workhouse Arts Center, 9518 Workhouse Way, Lorton, VA 22079
Building W-16, McGuire Woods Gallery, **6:30 PM**

Members Present:

Jason Sutphin, Chairman
Richard Bierce, AIA, Vice Chairman
Robert W. Mobley
John A. Burns, FAIA
Christopher Daniel
John Manganello, PE
Susan Notkins, AIA
John Boland

Members Excused:

Elise Murray
Joseph Plumpe, ASLA
Michele Aubry, Treasurer

Staff Present:

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

Mr. Sutphin opened the April 14, 2016 meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) at 6:30 p.m. in Building W-16, the McGuire Woods Gallery, at the Workhouse Arts Center; Mr. Daniel read the opening statement of purpose.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

Ms. Notkins made a motion to approve the agenda. Mr. Daniel seconded the motion. The motion was approved on a vote of 8-0.

INTRODUCTION/RECOGNITION OF GUESTS: DPZ staff: FCDOT transportation staff; Stephanie Goodrich, Heritage Resources Planner, and Sandi Wagner, Administrative Assistant

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION ITEMS: None scheduled.

ITEMS FOR ACTION:

- 1. 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. Benches, hedge rows and location for potential sculpture display are proposed at strategic locations; grading will direct runoff and allow for adequate drainage. ARB review of this item is for recommendation on a minor site plan as no building permit is required for the at-grade construction. This item was discussed in workshop sessions at the February and March 2016 ARB meetings. Ms. Ava Spece, CEO/President, Workhouse Arts Center represents the proposal. (Item-ARB-16-LOR-01) **Mount Vernon Supervisory District**

Presentation made by Ms. Spece:

- While many upcoming projects at the Workhouse were discussed during the tour (including the museum, event center, theater, and restaurant), the main intent of the improvement of the quad is to make a level and usable space that is ADA accessible. In the most recent proposal, a few changes were made, but the overall design remain the same as the March proposal. Regarding the use of the historic brick, due to the irregularities, it would be difficult to incorporate in terms of a walkable surface. However, the applicant designed bench pads where the bricks would be utilized as a border. In terms of the courtyard lawn, the applicant planned to re-sod and rework the lawn to smooth it out. While the applicant had begun investigating the stormwater management situation, the intention would be to incorporate an underground facility if warranted. Lighting was also discussed, and no new lighting would be proposed in this application. The existing lights would remain and would light up the façade at the end of the courtyard.

Discussion:

- Ms. Notkins assumed electrical services would be provided to the tent, and she asked how this would be done.
 - The applicant responded that the tent would be used in the rear portion of the quad, so it would be less visible. The electrical would have to be relocated, as there is currently an in-ground box in the rear of the quad.
- Ms. Notkins asked if the courtyard would be used after dark.
 - The applicant responded that eventually it would be, but it currently is used mostly during the day. Second Saturdays go after dark, so they would love to see an increase in the lighting at some point; however, no increase was associated with this project.
- Ms. Notkins noted that if the applicant was able to use retrofit LED lighting, they would not have to worry about replacing bulbs as often. She believed this would be a worthwhile expense from a maintenance perspective.
 - The applicant added that recently, they had turned on the lights in Building #1, which lit up a significant area and assisted in lighting the quad.
- Ms. Notkins added that for safety reasons, the applicant should think about further lighting if planning on using the quad in the evening. She requested that should lighting be required for review by Fairfax County, it should be brought forward to the ARB for review.
 - The applicant responded that with the current proposal of improving the quad, more motion and activity will move from the perimeter to the center of the quad. Following this improvement, the applicant will be able to encourage interior quad movement.

Mr. Daniel moved to approve Item ARB-16-LOR-01 as submitted and presented to the ARB on April 14, 2016. No conditions were included.

Mr. Burns 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

On page 9, it was noted that there was no response from the applicant in regard to Mr. Daniel's question regarding tree canopy.

Ms. Notkins made the motion to approve the March 2016 minutes and to pay the recording secretary; Mr. Daniel seconded the motion. The motion was approved on a vote of 8-0.

- **Treasurer's Report:** (Staff)
- Ms. Blank stated that the plan was to come up with a different system, as currently the reports are not being triggered. Ms. Wagner was working on a better process to receive the treasurer's report.

Discussion/Update Reports:

- Soapstone (Fairfax County Dept. of Transportation Staff)
 - The ARB decided to each independently review the proposal and to provide comments back to staff or to compile a letter in response as a group.
 - Mr. Bierce believed the report provided to them was inadequate. The ARB had approved the office building in this area, and relative to the general quality of the architecture, the building had the potential to be an outstanding example of its time. He would like to register his thoughts officially on this matter, and Ms. Notkins seconded this notion.
 - Ms. Blank asked the ARB to explain their concerns to the members of FCDOT present. In addition, she added that it might be helpful to form a committee of a few people to compile comments to return to the transportation department.
 - Mr. Burns was glad that the letter to the BOS was included in the packet, but he was disappointed to be included in the process so late in the game. He did note that DHR asked for the ARB's involvement prior to DPZ asking for its involvement.
 - Ms. Blank responded that DPZ (heritage resources) was not involved at all until VDHR requested that DPZ be consulted.
 - Mr. Burns added that the ARB would likely get more projects of this nature, and in order to do its job and to keep the BOS informed, the ARB needed to be brought into the process and the discussions. Surveys that have been completed have an inherent bias because of who is paying for these surveys (i.e. the developer). He has driven up both roads on either side of the toll road, and these roads have the character of late 20th century office campuses. It has a distinct cultural landscape. He asked who had decided the historic boundaries of the Sunset-Wiehle Historic District.
 - Ms. Blank responded that VDHR most likely had this information in its files.
 - Mr. Burns asked when the Soapstone Connector planning began.
 - Ms. Bandy of FCDOT introduced herself as the project manager for the Soapstone Connector. The initial process began with a study of the crossing of the Dulles Toll Road. The idea was further fledged out with a feasibility study that ended in 2013. The idea of extending Soapstone Road was solidified by this feasibility study, and a good portion of the preliminary planning began at this point. There were originally about 30 alternatives of where a road and a bridge could be located, and this was narrowed down to 5 to 6 alternatives. A hybrid alignment was studied further and brought to the BOS as a preferred alternative; the BOS then approved to further the study for this alignment. The next step is to conduct an environmental assessment, which is the current stage. The NEPA process included a cultural resource assessment.
 - Mr. Burns asked when this furtherance of the study was approved by the BOS.
 - Ms. Bandy believed it was in 2014.
 - Mr. Burns asked if the 30 original alternatives were located in this approximate location.
 - Ms. Bandy responded that they were.

- Mr. Mobley asked what was included in a feasibility study.
 - Ms. Bandy said it included an overview of what was in the area, and it was not a detailed analysis. The current stage required detailed analysis to begin, including where the footprints of buildings are located and the potential for archaeological findings.
- Mr. Burns asked if it was normal practice to choose a preferred alternative prior to a cultural resource study.
 - Ms. Bandy said it was standard practice.
- Mr. Sutphin asked if public meetings were held.
 - Ms. Bandy responded that multiple meetings were held, including open houses for Reston and Hunter Mill.
- Mr. Sutphin asked when the community outreach began.
 - Ms. Bandy responded that it started during the feasibility study, so most likely in 2012.
- Mr. Sutphin asked why there was not a county policy of including a professional board during this outreach process, especially when it involved a large case that was going through the public process. He said that a lot of projects come to the ARB at the tail end of the designing stage, and the ARB needs to follow up on the larger issue of not being included in the County's process.
- Doug Miller introduced himself as the environmental specialist. He stated that the overarching goal of the Reston Area Metro Study was to plan for the proposed metro station and how people will get to and from this station. They began looking at grades, elevation, traffic analyses, etc., and the BOS chose a preferred alternative. Now the goal was to decide how to design the connection. The environmental assessment also looks at alternatives. While the first two alternatives are essentially identical, the third alternative is to not build this at all. He respectfully disagreed with the ARB that this was towards the end of the process, and he would say this is the beginning of the road design process. Early scoping coordination letters were sent out to governmental entities that had a professional interest in the historic aspects of the project. This input will go into the report that is submitted to DHR. They are still in the draft early stages, and now is the perfect time to provide input. Once input is collected, another public hearing will be advertised and held. And once the NEPA document is finalized, they will then move into the design stage of the process and will eventually go to the BOS for adoption.
 - Mr. Daniel asked if they were integrating Section 106 in the NEPA process.
 - Yes, they would be.
- Mr. Daniel wanted to avoid being involved with Section 106. He did add that clearly an identification issue was occurring in this part of the County and further up the corridor, and he felt it is important that the BOS gets comments regarding identification concerns. This tied into planning concerns that the identification of properties and areas of historic interest need to be addressed sooner rather than later.
 - Ms. Blank responded that this is the general policy in the County, not just in this geographic area. If the ARB wanted to be involved earlier in the process, it is a policy issue that the ARB needs to talk to the BOS about.
- Mr. Boland noted that part of the problem is that the County does not have a sufficient inventory. He asked how the ARB would be notified early enough in

the process to get its foot in the door if the inventory is not comprehensive. It could be as simple as when DOT sends out a notification of a public meeting, the ARB is also notified. This issue could present itself anywhere in the County.

- Mr. Miller responded that this was a good point, and it would have been very appropriate to inform the ARB about the feasibility study.
- Mr. Daniel said public notifications are always a challenge, and this issue today continues to point towards the need for a full-time dedicated staff member for the ARB.
 - Ms. Bandy would hate to inundate the ARB with every public meeting, and she believed it would be hard for them to sift through the notices and find which meetings would be of significance to them.
- Mr. Sutphin responded that the ARB needs to be involved in the planning process in general, and there needs to be an inventory that allows staff to incorporate or plan around key sites throughout the County. This should be available to everybody that is working on a project in the county. The ARB misses the entirety of the process until the end and is asked to evaluate a plan that, in some places, has already been completed.
- Mr. Daniel pointed out that the ARB was becoming more of a consulting body rather than one providing meaningful input at an early stage.
- Mr. Burns respectfully disagreed with FCDOT staff that the ARB was getting involved relatively early in this process, and he felt the ARB was mostly dealing with how to mitigate the impact of an already chosen alignment. With BOS approval on a preferred alternative, this alignment is essentially set in stone. The issue is that the ARB and bodies representing historic preservation in general do not get to sit at the grown-ups table. Nobody is representing cultural resources, history or archaeology, and the ARB is only involved when something will be damaged.
- Ms. Notkins commented on the feasibility study, and she assumed FCDOT knew there was no wetlands problem at this stage. She also thought this alternative was a done deal at this stage.
 - Ms. Bandy disagreed, saying it was a long process and the work was really just beginning with many more years to go. The alignment was chosen, but this is a general alignment. Now the goal was to learn what are and are not concerns for this alignment. The only aspect the BOS approved was continuing to study this alignment. She wanted to ensure that the ARB had a say at this stage.
- Mr. Mobley asked how FCDOT assessed historic districts and if it was common practice to avoid them in projects.
 - Mr. Miller responded that he was involved when Centreville Road was widened. The three key words in avoiding any resource is to avoid, minimize, and mitigate. In addition to historic structures, the ARB might make some recommendations involving aesthetic treatment to the bridge if it is built to make it less intrusive or more harmonious with the existing conditions and area.
- Mr. Burns noted that five alternatives were mentioned, but it was also mentioned that other alternatives were being considered.
 - Ms. Bandy said that from the 30 initial alternatives, 5-6 were chosen on if the connection could be made. Then one was chosen, brought to the BOS, and it was asked if they could continue studying this location. The entire feasibility study can be found on the FCDOT website, as well as

- any announcements regarding public hearings.
 - Mr. Bierce believed that FCDOT is close to be ready to start designing. In his experience, when the process was at the designing stage, the talking was over.
 - Mr. Miller responded that in order to finish the NEPA study, FCDOT needed to know generally where the road would be proposed, where the Stormwater Management facilities would be going, other features, etc.
 - Mr. Bierce was hearing that the path was being narrowed. In the future, the position of the ARB on proposed alternatives to projects should be known in advance. He agreed that this is another reason why the ARB should have a voice in helping the County define what could be done in these types of projects.
 - Ms. Blank added that this goes back to a policy discussion with the BOS.
 - Mr. Sutphin noted that the state had asked the ARB to look at this, and they did not have much time to do so. They had two options:
 - 1. Each member forwards comments to Ms. Blank or a subcommittee and these comments be compiled.
 - 2. Inform all entities involved that issues have been denied, and that the ARB needs 30 more days to look at the project and put together a letter from the ARB.
 - Ms. Bandy was willing to extend the May 2nd deadline for comments from the ARB.
 - Ms. Notkins asked if this would be state or county owned.
 - FCDOT responded it would be state owned.
 - Mr. Daniel recommended that the ARB members formally submit comments to be collected and compiled into one letter.
 - Mr. Sutphin would draft a letter to comment on at the May ARB meeting. He would send this letter on the May 13th or May 16th.
 - Mr. Burns asked if the ARB could request FCDOT could present at a future meeting as well.
 - Mr. Miller would also send scoping documents to the ARB regarding the widening of Route 1.
- Meeting with Dept. of Planning and Zoning Directors, report out; (Messers Sutphin and Daniel)
 - Messers Sutphin and Daniel met with Mr. Selden, Ms. O'Donnell, Ms. Blank, and Ms. Gardner in the Department of Planning and Zoning to discuss the budget and payment of recording secretary. In addition, they discussed funding for training, hiring consultants, etc. Mr. Selden seemed very receptive to the comments and concerns. The process in general was discussed, and it was suggested that Mr. Sutphin contact the CFO of the County and discuss the budget items. Mr. Sutphin had a great conversation with the CFO, which included suggestions for the interim period until next year's budget planning.
 - Mr. Sutphin also discussed having a dedicated staff person with DPZ. The ARB needed to be ready to fight for this in the next budget cycle. Bringing in more interns for survey work was also discussed.
 - Mr. Blank said that they were already looking into starting the planning for the next budget cycle, and Mr. Selden would support trying to get another staff member. However, he was very clear the request will be closely scrutinized, so the ARB needed to be very involved. In the end of August, DPZ will be done with their budget. The ARB needed to request an increase of the contributory fund to bump up the budget to \$10,000.

- Mr. Sutphin added that the ARB might need an advocate in the BOS to ask for the small appropriation to be added.
 - Mr. Daniel stated that maybe money from the DPZ budget could be utilized for improving the Guidelines. He said the conversation was overall very positive.
 - Ms. Blank said that another intern would be hired to work on conducting survey.
 - Mr. Daniel said DPZ normally uses the inventory for the Comprehensive Plan, but other departments would be relying on newly compiled survey work as well (i.e. FCDOT).
 - Ms. Blank noted that she asked transportation for funding for survey work about three years ago, and they declined. However, she believed they should be involved with the funding.
- Resident Curator Program status/update (Messers Burns and Daniel)
 - Mr. Daniel stated that the program is going well, and they recently discussed a project team that would review the submissions being received. This would require County staff as well as a qualified historic architect. There was a discussion where the History Commission rewrote the team make-up to have a History Commission member on the board, but no ARB member would be required. He asked the ARB for their thoughts.
 - Mr. Bierce asked if it had to be a certified professional architect or a certified historical architect.
 - Mr. Daniel said it was a certified historical architect.
 - Mr. Burns thought it was more important to define the criteria than it was to define if the person evaluating these submissions was from the History Commission or the ARB.
 - Mr. Daniel preferred to keep it vague rather than define where the member comes from.
 - Mr. Sutphin responded that volunteers put a lot of time into being on boards, and he was not sure if volunteers would want to serve on another board. If you require a History Commission or ARB member to be on it, it might be too specific and nobody from that specific board might be interested in joining.
 - VDHR Architectural Review Board March 28 Training (Messers Mobley & Sutphin, staff)
 - Mr. Sutphin went to this training, and he said it was convenient, free, and there were four training opportunities. They discussed other jurisdictions and how each one is handling its issues. He felt there was value to getting other perspectives from the greater Northern Virginia region.
 - Ms. Blank added that she wanted to recognize and thank Mr. Mobley for his discussions.
 - The next training would be held June 15th at the Lloyd House in Alexandria.
 - Design Guidelines Subcommittee Messers Bierce and Mobley

- Mr. Bierce stated there had been no further discussion on this topic since February, and the general approach was a proactive rather than reactive approach to put forth a positive visual of historic preservation. He asked the ARB what the thoughts were going forward.
 - Mr. Mobley added that written comments received were very helpful.
 - Mr. Bierce asked the ARB if they could commit to an hour of discussion so they could start working on specific ARB input. If need be, an additional public meeting could be held for more intensive scrutiny from the collective group.
 - Ms. Notkins preferred to include expectations and emphasize the importance of the quality of work in these guidelines. She believed many members of the public did not understand the expectations of the ARB and the quality of work that was being presented in some projects was lacking.
 - Mr. Daniel thought it was a great idea to have an extended meeting or another meeting so Mr. Bierce wasn't saddled with all of the extra work. He believed the only way to move forward with this idea was to have collective input at a creative session. Maybe this could occur at the prior to the meeting to avoid late nights. In addition, there needed to be a strong legal look at it too and to stick within the ARB bylaws. He agreed that there should be a performance expectation on the designer while still meeting the requirements. He thought the summer would be a good time to have these discussions.
 - Mr. Sutphin said he would send another email asking if everyone wanted to participate and that members could provide feedback.
 - Mr. Bierce added that the ARB had \$12,000 and they could pay a facilitator who is not personally involved. In the previous discussions, not many of the specifics were recorded, so it would be nice to have somebody professionally trained that could understand what the discussions included and could record them.
- **Administrative:** Langley Fork HOD expansion (Staff)
 - Ms. Blank said that on April 5th, Supervisor Foust authorized that two properties be studied to be included in the Langley Fork Historic Overlay District. These properties were recently included in the Fairfax County Inventory. The property owner has specifically requested this, and she wrote a letter to Foust to begin this process.
 - **Correspondence, Announcements:**
 - Exceptional Design Award Jury Chairman (Staff)
 - Need a volunteer from the ARB to attend the BOS hearing at the end of September, as well as attend the Jury in July sometime.
 - April 16 Preservation50 County symposium (Staff)
 - **New/other business:**

- ARB part of the systematic land use plan (Mr. Sutphin)
 - Fairfax Committee of 100 – this could be an opportunity for an outreach program to get the ARB stronger involvement in the planning process. Mary Anne Gardner is one of the speakers, and it might be a good idea to reach out to say the ARB would like to be a group involved in this process.
- Minutes on the web (Staff)
 - Starting with last year’s minutes, they will now be uploaded onto the website.
- Agendas and Action Agendas to the Board of Supervisors (Staff)
 - In response to the ARB’s request, DPZ will send the BOS ARB agendas and action agendas saying what the ARB voted on as a follow-up every month so they can know what’s happening in the districts and they can disseminate info in their newsletters.
- **Old business/Other:** API Building; site visit, upcoming public hearings.
 - Five members able to attend – Tuesday the 26th at 11:00. May 5th public hearing for the PC for this case.
- Ms. Blank recognized Ms. Aubry for donating funds for a cultural resource intern at Huntley for the tenants’ house to monitor the archaeology.

Motion to adjourn made by 8:34 by Mr. Burns