

APPROVED MINUTES

May 12, 2016

THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Colvin Run Mill, 10017 Colvin Run Road Great Falls, VA 22066 Colvin Run Barn, 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
John Boland
Elise Murray
Joseph Plumpe, ASLA*

Members Excused:

Michele Aubry, Treasurer
Susan Notkins, AIA

Staff Present:

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

** Arrived after the meeting began*

Mr. Sutphin opened the May 12, 2016 meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) at 6:30 p.m. in the Colvin Run Barn at Colvin Run Mill; Mr. Sutphin read the opening statement of purpose.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

Mr. Burns made a motion to approve the agenda. Mr. Manganello seconded the motion. The motion was approved on a vote of 8-0.

INTRODUCTION/RECOGNITION OF GUESTS: The ARB thanked the Park Authority staff for the tour and for hosting the ARB's meeting.

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION ITEMS:

1. Proposal to install signage at 13830 #12 Lee Highway, tax map #54-4 ((1)) 28A in the Centreville Historic Overlay District (HOD). One sign would be round, 47.58" X 47.58", reading *SIROO Korea cake & food* in red lettering on a white background. The second sign would read *SIROO & JOOK STORY* in red and green lettering and measure 164.8" X 42.43". Both signs would be mounted to a metal raceway and installed at the upper façade above the storefront canopy. The property was included in the Centreville HOD when the district was expanded in 2007. Located in the Centreville Plaza neighborhood shopping center which was constructed in 1990 according to tax records, the property is non-contributing to the HOD. Mr. Harry Yang represents the application. (Item-ARB-16-CTV-04) **Supervisory District Sully**

Ms. Murray made the following motion:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the ARB approve proposed consent calendar item **ARB-16- CTV-04 for proposed signage** at 13830 Lee Highway, Centreville Plaza center, as submitted and presented to the ARB at the May 12, 2016 meeting provided that all signage elements comply with provisions set forth in the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance.

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

The motion was seconded by Mr. Burns. The motion was approved on a vote of 8-0.

2. Proposal to install signage at, 13830 #5 Lee Highway, tax map #54-4 ((1)) 28A in the Centreville Historic Overlay District (HOD). Individual channel letters of white plexiglass measuring 20” high X 12.5’ long reading KUNG FU TEA would be mounted on exposed raceway, painted to match the building façade, at the upper façade above the storefront canopy. The property was included in the Centreville HOD when the district was expanded in 2007. Located in the Centreville Plaza neighborhood shopping center which was constructed in 1990 according to tax records, the property is non-contributing to the HOD. Mr. Ed Moy represents the application. (Item-**ARB-16-CTV-05**) **Supervisory District Sully**

Mr. Daniel made the following motion:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the ARB approve proposed consent calendar item **ARB-16- CTV-05 for proposed signage** at 13830 Lee Highway, Centreville Plaza center, as submitted and presented to the ARB at the May 12, 2016 meeting provided that all signage elements comply with provisions set forth in the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance.

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

The motioned was seconded by Mr. Burns. The motion was approved on a vote of 8-0.

ITEMS FOR ACTION:

3. Revisions to previously approved plans for one residential dwelling located at 7180 Lyndam Hill Circle, tax map # 108-1 ((17)) (2) 1 in the Pohick Church Historic Overlay District (HOD). At its March 13, 2014 meeting, the ARB approved the construction of the 2 single family detached dwellings, open space, site amenities, landscaping, entrance signage, fencing and retaining wall for that part of Lyndam Hill II located within the HOD. The rear façade design of the dwelling at Lot 1 approved by the ARB in 2014 was not consistent with that approved by the Board of Supervisors on February 6, 2004; Final Development Plan FDP 2003-MV-060. The requested revisions to the rear façade are: eliminating the one-story shed bay and installing a single door walkout; installing brick across two-thirds of the entire façade with a brick belt course below the 2nd story windows and adding a horizontal window at the upper façade. Ms. Ines E. Vega, D.R. Horton, Inc. and Mr. Steve Crowell, VIK A represent the application. (Item-**ARB-16-PHC-01**) **Supervisory District Mt. Vernon**

Presentation made by Ms. Vega:

- This property is in the Pohick Church Historic District. It came before the ARB originally in 2013 and 2014, and the elevations that were approved at this time were found to be inconsistent with those approved in association with the 2006 zoning application. The only change that the applicant proposed at this time was on the rear elevation, which included brick across the bottom. The zoning application has brick vertically rather than only along the first floor. The applicant also presented views from Telegraph Road showing other homes in Phase I that have brick in a vertical configuration rather than a horizontal configuration. She also displayed material samples and colors to the ARB.

Discussion:

- Mr. Boland asked if there were any changes to the color scheme.
 - The color scheme was unchanged.
- Mr. Mobley did not think this proposal was consistent with the Historic Overlay District.
- Mr. Bierce added that it sounded like the Zoning process is driving the design, and he was not sure if the ARB would have voted for this if they had seen the proposed designs.
- Ms. Blank did not disagree with Mr. Bierce, and as she recalled, design suggestions were implemented. She wasn't sure what happened, but the proffers written dealt with the design of the brick without input from the ARB. When the applicant went to pull a building permit, Zoning said that despite ARB approval, the Zoning plan was inconsistent. The option was to pursue an interpretation and to return to the ARB for an approval that matched the Zoning application approval.
- Mr. Mobley said it was not fair to the applicant, but the ARB needed to think about the people who live in the Historic Overlay District. He asked if it was fair to these people to approve something completely out of context.
- Mr. Daniel felt that the process was upside down. While the pictures provided by the applicant show that the house is the first one as you approach, the view of the neighborhood already disrupts the overlay. He agreed it was not the right design, but he was not sure how the ARB could change this at this point in the process.
- Mr. Burns said it appeared the family room was removed from the original design.
 - The applicant responded that this was based on the rear setback.
 - Ms. Blank noted that the proffer actually dealt with the amount of brick and its configuration on the rear façade.
- Mr. Burns asked if specified percentages of brick along the rear of a building was routine proffer language.
 - Ms. Blank said she had not seen this approach in 13 years with the County. While the proffer doesn't specify the amount of brick, it does require conformance with the approved elevations.
- Mr. Burns asked if the applicant had considered continuing brick across the side façade at two stories with a wooden gable.
 - The applicant responded that she would have to speak to zoning on if this would be permitted as consistent.
- Mr. Burns said that the facades were independent of each other.
 - The applicant added that the front and side facades remained unchanged from the original approval.

- Mr. Sutphin asked if the floorplan had been flipped.
 - The floor plan and the unit were the same as previously approved.
- Mr. Daniel asked if there was any flexibility in the proffer. As the applicant was back again seeking approval, they needed guidance on how to augment the design and make it workable and approachable. It might be worthwhile to explore continuing the brick pattern around the side of the home and coming back to the ARB with a resubmission. The current brick and siding façade was jarring.
- Mr. Mobley said he was not looking for consistency with the other homes that have been built, but he was trying to protect the Historic District and the proposal's compatibility with the District.
 - The applicant responded that previously the ARB felt it was appropriate with the District, and the system is really upside down at this point.
- Mr. Daniel asked about the flexibility in the proffer. He was trying to find a middle ground between Zoning and the ARB.
- Mr. Burns asked if there was a restriction on the materials on the side elevations.
 - The applicant would have to look at the approved Zoning plans to see if side elevations were provided. She did not believe side elevations were submitted.
- Mr. Manganello thought that if there was no textual reference or side elevations, the materials could be altered.
 - The applicant responded that if the brick on all sides would be approvable by zoning, they would be willing to commit to this. If it was not in conformance with Zoning, they would be willing to come back to the ARB.
- Ms. Murray was curious as to why the windows were dropped from the side elevations.
 - The side areas with windows might be future bathrooms, and for privacy reasons, the windows were removed from the house type.
- Mr. Mobley asked if the elevation was altered.
 - The applicant responded that the houses do change from time to time, but the configuration materials are the same. The concern she was hearing was the desire to wrap brick around up to the level of the gable.
- Mr. Sutphin said the ARB could provide this as a condition of approval.
- Mr. Plumpe asked if it was possible that a chimney insert could be brick.
 - The applicant was not sure if brick could be applied to it, as the chimney lacked the foundation.

Mr. Burns made the following motion:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the ARB approve item ARB-16-PHC-01 revisions to previously approved plans for a residential dwelling at 7180 Lyndam Hill Circle, in the Pohick Church Historic Overlay District, as submitted and presented to the ARB at the May 12, 2016 with the following condition:

- 1. The side elevation facing the entrance street be clad up to the second story in brick to match the front and rear elevations, with the gable above to be vinyl siding.**

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

The motion was seconded by Mr. Mobley. The motion was approved on a vote of 8-1 with Ms. Murray voting in opposition.

4. Proposal for alterations, new construction and repairs at the Colvin Run Mill miller's house, 10017 Colvin Run Road, tax map # 18-2 ((1)) 24 in the Colvin Run Mill Historic Overlay District (HOD). The miller's house is identified as a historic property in the HOD. A workshop was held with the ARB at its December 10, 2015 meeting; the application responds to suggestions members made at that meeting. The proposed work includes: demolition of existing accessible ramp at the northeast elevation (front) of the building replacing it with a new wood stoop, constructing a raised path extending along the front of the building to provide accessible entrance at the east (side), replacing and repointing brick as needed, replacing 20th century doors with six-panel wood doors, installing a new wood roof and wood shutters and painting the exterior wood elements at the two-story portion of the building. Ms. Debbie Robison, Project Manager, and Mr. Mohsen Rahini, architect SWSG, represent the application. (Item-**ARB-16-CRM-01**) **Supervisory District Dranesville**

Presentation made by Ms. Robison and Mr. Rahini:

- The ARB had previously asked the applicant to eliminate the ramp and consider alternatives, so a civil engineer was hired and found a graded option could work. This could be completed without hand rails, and the materials would be chip seal (which is gravel-imbedded asphalt). The trail would be the same width as the existing one. The applicant was also asked to look at the front porch, and rather than having a white paint finish, Frank Welsh recommended natural wood with a preservative treatment. The addition of wood shutters is also included in the packet. Per his analysis, Frank Welsh recommended shamrock green shutters, a brown door, and white exterior trim. The roof was altered from fish scale to butt end style. The applicant also decided they did not want to include standard water-proofing cement. The shrubbery proposed was American Boxwood.

Discussion:

- Mr. Plumpe asked if a walkway to the steps would be provided.
 - Yes, the walkway would be chip seal as well.
- Mr. Plumpe also asked if the air vent shown was existing or if it could be relocated.
 - The air vent is existing, although it's not being shown in the exhibit.
- Mr. Mobley wondered what the front porch would be finished with and if it would be stained or painted.
 - The front porch would have a wooden preservative, and it would be a natural wooden color.
- Mr. Mobley asked if the porch would be allowed to weather.
 - The preservative was intended to be reapplied.
- Mr. Plumpe asked if the black shutters would be the same color as the shutter stays.
 - They would be the same color.

- Mr. Daniel said the applicant did a great job in responding to the ARB’s previous comments. The fact that the applicant is now proposing a grade elevation change is an improvement and is greatly appreciated. He understood the stoop to be very basic.
- Mr. Bierce echoed Mr. Daniel’s thoughts regarding the applicant’s response. From the site visit and knowing that the existing frame elevation on the northern façade will someday go away, it seemed logical that at the time of the addition, the public access should be at the shortest most upper level. He suggested that between new fitting and construction, there be a separation so the reversibility would be easy and clear so the original grade can be restored. With respect to the detail of the waterproofing against the brick, he requested that the waterproofing not be brought all the way to the top, but it should be brought up to protect the vulnerable portion of the brick that has been subjected to a lot of moisture. He thanked the applicant for the specifications, but he did not see a roof material specification.
 - The document wasn’t handy, but the applicant did have a sample.
- Mr. Bierce said it should be clarified on the drawings and specifications. With respect to the stoop, minimal details should also be included on the drawings, as it should be considered part of the construction document. During the removal of the ramp, he requested that hand work be utilized rather than the use of power tools. He also asked if there was a quantification or intent to add any mortar.
 - If the mortar was not effecting the brick, the intention was to leave it.
- Mr. Bierce asked if in any of the original pointing, the mortar was pulled back from the edge of the brick.
 - The applicant was not sure, as much of it was deteriorated or repointed.
- Mr. Bierce added that if the mortar is already at the corner and the joint isn’t as crisp, the applicant needed to ensure the seal is completed. In regards to the shutters, he asked if they were louvered.
 - Yes, they were louvered.
- Mr. Burns looked at the brick wall during the tour where the ramp crossed the façade up to the front door, and he noticed evidence of moisture. With the plaster being pushed off on the inside wall, moisture would get directly into the brick and the whole wall. He also asked how the brick on the northern elevation would be protected from moisture from the side door around to the front first window.
 - The instillation board would be continued around and would follow the ramp, and there would not be splash (as the ground will be grass covered, not a hard surface).
- Mr. Bierce said that doors being called “new” should be detailed on the plans in regards to thickness, hardware, etc.
- Mr. Mobley asked if there would be a walkway included and if there was any non-grass path to access the garden.
 - There was no proposed walkway, and the grade prevents many from walking in this area.

Mr. Daniel made the following motion:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the ARB approve item ARB-16-CRM-01 proposal for alterations, new construction and repairs at the Colvin Run Mill miller’s house, 10017

Colvin Run Road, which was submitted and presented to the ARB at the May 12, 2016 meeting subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Include roof specifications on the drawing;
- 2) Existing ramp at the northeast elevation (front) be removed manually; use of power tools for this item to be removed from the scope of work;
- 3) Insulation board around the brick to follow the ramp entirely;
- 4) Provide door detail on plans including thickness and hardware;
- 5) Provide front stoop detail on plans; and
- 6) Provide shutter detail to complement shutter dog and hinge detail currently shown on plan sheet A1.

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

The motion was seconded by Mr. Bierce. The motion was approved on a vote of 9-0.

ITEMS FOR WORKSHOP SESSION:

5. Proposal for architectural design of new townhouses and single-family detached dwellings at the Laurel Hill Adaptive Reuse Area, tax map 107-1 ((09)). The ARB recommended approval of the rezoning of the property at its September 13, 2012 meeting and subsequently recommended approval of 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 and for the single-family detached homes at its October 8, 2015 (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 proposed architectural design and details for the new residential construction are being brought to the ARB prior to returning to the VDHR and NPS as related to historic tax credit review. One-hundred fifty four townhouse units total, to be located in seven block-sections clustered at the southwest section of the site adjacent to the entrance drive off Lorton Road and at the southeast section of the property adjacent to the central green, have received ARB approval of the conceptual architecture. The three-story townhouses are five variations of one style depending upon their location on the site. Fourth floor penthouses are limited to those units outside the direct viewshed of the contributing properties. Twenty-four dwellings, to be constructed at the south and southeast perimeter of the site in areas recommended for new construction by the reuse area design guidelines, have received ARB approval of the conceptual architecture. ARB approval stipulated that *proposed exterior building materials, treatments, design details, fenestration, hardscape treatment, patterns, scale, rhythm, and massing to the greatest extent feasible are subject to review and approval by the ARB*. These dwellings are proposed to be constructed at the area and within the building envelope recommended for approval by the ARB at the rezoning and approved by the Board of Supervisors. Chris Fox, Vice President Architectural Design for Van Metre Homes, represents the proposal. **Supervisory District Mt. Vernon**

Presentation made by Mr. Greg Riegle:

- The two main topics of the presentation were a first look at the final architecture of the single family residential portion of the project; the second topic was an introduction to the Comprehensive Sign Plan (CSP). In regards to the residential components, the ARB has the opportunity to see everything first and last. With respect to the signage, the operative word had been “comprehensive.” The rebranding and signage would be shown and approved for the totality of the project.

Ms. Candy McCracken:

- The townhouses and single family detached homes would be constructed during Phase I, which was planned to begin in the spring of 2017. The ARB originally saw conceptual elevations for the townhomes in July of 2014 and again in October of 2015; these were approved with the condition that elevations and design details be brought back to the ARB for a work session.

Mr. Chris Fox:

- The proposal included 107 lots in Phase I. The proposed brick colors matched the hues present on the Laurel Hill site, and the brick was documented with an in-house mason. Three bricks were selected to represent the overall intent of the building. Bays and cable awnings were included to contrast with the historic site. The townhouses included a 20-foot wide option as well as a 24-foot wide option. The single family detached homes also had two different floor plans with eight different elevation options. The applicants sought approval of the designs, and they noted that no two elevations could be repeated for every six units.

Discussion on Townhomes:

- Mr. Bierce noted that with respect to the 24-foot wide townhouses, there was considerably more contrast between units, while the 20-foot wide units seemed to be monolithic. The drawings did not show color or tonal differences in the brick.
 - The applicant responded that the same brick had been shown on the elevation, but the intention was to mix some of the bricks found on-site that complemented existing buildings rather than utilizing the same brick colors across the entirety of the front elevations.
- Mr. Bierce asked what the window panels would be made out of.
 - They would be vinyl.
- Mr. Bierce then asked why vinyl, as the site was industrial, and he did not believe vinyl fit the nature of the site. He also asked what the spandrels would be made out of.
 - They would be hardiplank siding.
- Mr. Bierce requested more details on the materials. He also asked what the white elements shown on the elevations were.
 - These were cast stone, which were load supporting of the brick itself.
- Mr. Bierce wondered what the canopies were made out of.
 - The cable was a metal system that supported the porch roof, but the roof was wrapped in hardi-system.

- Mr. Bierce added that hardi did not strike him as industrial like steel would.
- Mr. Mobley referred to Elevation Drawing #5 and inquired as to why the penthouse had a flat room and pitch roof, and why it could not be lower.
 - The angle came from the concept drawings, and the staircase came up to the landing around 8 feet all. About 5 feet would be exposed from the parapet line, and the applicant was not sure if it could be lowered too much. However, if the form could be changed, the overall angle could potentially be lowered.
- Mr. Mobley added that lower and flatter would be more in scale with the proposal and would be less visible. In regards to the rear elevation on Drawing #6, he asked what the intent was.
 - The top elevation was from the preliminary drawings (where the brick is on the end units and is hardi in the central units); the proposal wraps brick all around the townhomes. They would like the ARB's feedback on this.
- Mr. Mobley said it might look simpler to align the brick with the parapet. He would like to see elevations with the different bricks that had been chosen. He was also surprised that vinyl was chosen for the windows. Drawing #4 of the Front Elevation was discussed, and he asked if the white line on the fourth and fifth townhomes was a bay.
 - Yes, this was a metal-wrapped bay with a maximum 2 foot projection.
- Mr. Mobley asked for further details on the species of the landscaping.
- Mr. Daniel agreed in regards to the landscaping details. He also noted that on pages 6 and 12, a full brick façade on the rear elevation was limiting, and he suggested a mix of materials. The intent should be to break up the design in a unique mosaic, and the full brick façade should be considered.
 - The applicant's thought was that the rear façade would face an alley and would only be visible to the residents, but they understood and proposed a compromise with a brick water table.
 - Mr. Daniel said he was flexible in regards to the materials, but a mixture and variety was deliberately included.
- Ms. Blank clarified that because the applicant was going back to the tax credit agencies, the intent was to get suggestions from the ARB. There was no intention to make a motion, but the suggestions should be articulated for the applicant.
- Mr. Sutphin asked if more finite plans would be taken to the tax credit agencies, or if these plans would be taken with the ARB's suggestions for their feedback.
 - The applicant intended to incorporate the suggestions and make changes to the plans.
- Mr. Sutphin was concerned about these changes, as the ARB might not be on board with the amended plans. He also asked about the timing.
 - The applicant planned to go to the tax credit agencies in the next 30-60 days.
- Mr. Bierce stated that there were still other issues the ARB might be interested in commenting on, and they were not in a position to give specific feedback, as much of the information was given to them tonight verbally in response to questions that had arisen.
- Mr. Sutphin added that the applicant was heading on the right track with the buildings, but some elements might need further refinement.

Discussion on Single Family Homes:

- Mr. Mobley's opinion was that the single family homes had not changed much since the last ARB discussion.
 - The applicant clarified that brick siding elevations would be proposed, and the front of the façade had shrunken. In addition, the garage was set further back, and the footprint of the overall homes had changed.
- Ms. Murray asked if there were any more detached garages included in the proposal.
 - No, all garages are proposed to be attached.
- Mr. Mobley asked if the canopy would be fully covering the stoop.
 - This might have been a misrepresentation, but unless posts were to be included, the canopy could not structurally cover the entire stoop. Some elevations (that include posts) do cover the stoop, but not all of them do.
- Mr. Mobley was uncomfortable with the canopies not covering the entirety of the stoop, as well as the lack of railings.
 - The stoops would be less than 30-inches high, so no railings were required.
- Mr. Mobley continued to be disappointed with the elevations, specifically with the massing, scale, or rhythm. He recommended on bringing new elevations back to the ARB.
- Mr. Manganello asked if a site plan had been developed, and if stormwater was addressed.
 - The detailed site plan had already been through the ARB for approval, and the stormwater was a central treatment plan.
- Mr. Daniel was concerned about the stoop. It might look odd to have a 3-foot projection over an 8-foot stoop. He asked the applicant to reconcile this; however, he did like the variety of the porch frontages. He added that pattern variations might be good to consider. The façade felt vacant, and window variation could potentially help to bring life into them. He added that it should be a written commitment that two of the same home designs cannot be next to each other. More information should be provided in regards to the fixture materials as well, and a variety of lighting fixtures should also be considered. He really encouraged the statement included in the agenda of what the ARB approved last year, and it was a real opportunity for the applicant to come back and make the single family detached homes stand out like the townhomes did.
- Mr. Bierce was uncomfortable with the basic façade of the houses. It was a direct contradiction with the secretary standards. The proportions were off for a domestic scale.
- Mr. Mobley was not as uncomfortable with the 8-foot window and door heads. However, he did think it created an awkward scale from the outside.
- Mr. Bierce added that the three windows in the pediment on the $\frac{3}{4}$ elevation looked out of place.
- Mr. Daniel suggested the applicant take a closer look at some of the buildings within the historic properties to see what details could be pulled into the facades to give them life and to bring the spice of the townhomes into the single family dwellings.
- Ms. Murray thought they looked like military base housing, and they seemed emptier than they did previously.
- Mr. Mobley was looking for a statement in the presentation where the existing on-site buildings were used for inspiration. He asked the applicant to bring in photographs of what inspired them for the proposed housing.

- Mr. Sutphin added a slide showing the different bricks would be helpful along with the variation of windows, arches, arcades, round windows, different styles / sizes / heights / colors.
- Mr. Mobley reiterated that the new architecture should not copy but should reflect that of the existing architecture.

6. Proposal for signage at the Laurel Hill Adaptive Reuse Area, tax map # 107-1-((09)). 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. A Comprehensive Sign Plan is proposed for the property containing a variety of signage types to help promote and navigate the site. Comprehensive Sign Plans are a zoning mechanism permitted in planned zoning districts to allow flexibility and coordination of signage. Specific signage is proposed for entry and wayfinding, retail and commercial uses, and residential uses. The Comprehensive Sign Plan is being brought to the ARB in lieu of ARB review of individual sign permits on the property. The applicant plans to will return to the ARB seeking ARB approval prior to the Planning Commission public hearing. Mr. Scott Adams, McGuire Woods, represents the proposal.

Supervisory District Mt. Vernon

Mr. Adams provided a PowerPoint, showing a variety of the signage types, colors, locations, and sizes.

Discussion:

- Mr. Mobley appreciated the professionalism of the presentation, and he thought the logo was very strong and appreciated the addition of a symbol for the project. He had no comment on the typeface, but he did add the logo could have been used more throughout the project.
- Mr. Daniel liked the logo as well. He also asked how the retail pylon would be lit.
 - Individual letters would be illuminated and each tenant square (the box and the text) would glow.
- Mr. Daniel said that with the historic reformatory background, the applicant could think about playing this background up with the lighting. He also added that adding the logo in wherever possible would be helpful. He thought the powerhouse signage was cool, and he hoped a successful tenant could be found. He was concerned about the chapel and about what signage would be included on the façade.
- Mr. Bierce said with respect to the lift of the plan, he was concerned that if the ARB accepted the general plan, they might not see it again.
 - This plan would be taken to the tax credit agencies and would come back to the ARB.
- Mr. Bierce said that with respect to the historic building, the sign guidelines part of the discussion really deals with the sign-able area of historic structures. Some areas were clearly acceptable for signage, but a generic sign plan took away from the design relationship with the buildings. Once a particular client is brought in, the ARB might not get to see the actual signage.

- The flexibility is in retail/other areas where the signage is dependent upon finding the final tenant.
- Mr. Bierce asked how the applicant would deal with a national brand.
 - For areas where retail tenants would be coming in, the CSP allows a national brand to use its branding within the CSP guidelines as long as the sign meets the parameters.
- Mr. Daniel said that any client should have the CSP in hand and needs to show how their sign would fit into the CSP.
 - Each permit would be routed to Ms. Blank for her review to ensure it was in conformance with what was approved.
- Ms. Blank said that whatever is being proposed, the applicant has to show what it would be and the space it would take up. Tenants can come up with the design in the approved size and format. If the CSP only proposes location of signs, the signage would need to come back in for ARB approval.
 - The applicant was willing to add the level of detail needed to make the ARB more comfortable.
- Mr. Bierce agreed with the CSP system, but he thought some specific buildings needed scrutiny. He asked if the font would be the same in all signs.
 - With the exception of the tenant-specific signage, it would be uniform.
- Mr. Bierce asked if the applicant had looked at historic fonts.
 - The applicant said some signs on-site were made in DC, and these had generic lettering.
- Mr. Bierce liked the strength of the guard tower and appreciated the irony of calling the proposal Liberty with a guard tower logo.
- Mr. Sutphin thought the signage was well-executed and that it added vibrancy. He asked if there were any historical markers.
 - As a part of the RZ, the Park Authority is coming up with historic signage. These signs do not require permits, so they are not included in the CSP. There will be two roadside county markers with the text to be approved by the History Commission.
- Mr. Sutphin asked if there were areas on-site that had previously had identification markers that could be replicated.
 - The applicant was unsure, but they could look into this.
- Mr. Sutphin appreciated the rectangles drawn to limit signage to specific sizes and locations, as he did not want to see signage take over architectural elements. He asked if the applicant was proposing any signage coming off or leading down to the trail.
 - The applicant was not sure about the specific trail signage, but they would look into this.
- Mr. Sutphin liked the pylon signs and the transparency along with the industrial feel of the signage. He asked if the Liberty sign above the wall would be seen as reversed from people looking on from the other side.
 - The main view shed would be people entering the site rather than leaving, the sign would be box letters illuminated internally. The white color would be the same on the front and back.
- Ms. Murray said it would make sense to have the signage backlit if it would be individual letters.

- Mr. Daniel would like to see Page 2 show the signage, as the Liberty sign is fairly pronounced.
- Mr. Manganello thought it was nice to provide parameters of the CSP to potential tenants. He thought it might be cool to make bollards out of the guard tower logo.
- Ms. Murray added that the CSP packet was great.

The applicant for workshop items 7 and 8 was not in attendance so no discussion was held.

~~7. Revisions to previously approved plans for the property located at 1101 Chain Bridge Road, Langley Ordinary, tax map #22-3((1)) 63A, in the Langley Fork Historic Overlay District (HOD). The property is identified as a historic property in the HOD and contributing to the Langley Fork National Register Historic District. The proposed revision is to reduce the hyphen between the main house and carriage house due to the amount of damage during winter months and rain months as the flat roof cannot handle the precipitation. The goal would be to reduce the 10' wide gap to 2' with a performing scupper system that would not allow water to accumulate. At its December 2011 meeting, the ARB approved a two-story, wood sided, addition connected to the existing building at the south (side) façade by a 10' wide one-story breezeway. At its September 13, 2012 meeting the ARB approved revisions to that approval to change the roof material from black standing seam metal to a charcoal asphalt shingle and the wood siding paint color from blue to white. Mr. Doug DeLuca, property owner, represents the proposal. Supervisory District Dranesville~~

~~8. Proposed hardscape and shed for the property located at 6349 Georgetown Pike, tax map #22-3((1)) 63B, in the Langley Fork Historic Overlay District (HOD). The ARB last approved the construction of a single family residence for this property at its August 17, 2015 meeting. The approval was for construction of a two-story, wood sided single family dwelling with a footprint measuring 62' X 119', heights ranging from an average of 31' 5" to 39' at midpoint of the gable and connected to a 3-car garage by a 1-story, shed roof enclosed gallery with vehicular access at a semi-circular driveway from an outlet road off Georgetown Pike; ARB-15-LFK-01. At its November 10, 2011 meeting, the ARB recommended approval of the application to subdivide the property into two buildable lots. Mr. Doug DeLuca, property owner, represents the proposal. Supervisory District Dranesville~~

BOARD AND STAFF ITEMS:

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

Mr. Daniel made the motion to approve and pay the recording secretary. This motion was seconded by Mr. Mobley. The Motion was approved on a vote of 9-0.

- Treasurer's Report: (Staff): \$11,389.69

Discussion/Update Reports:

- **Soapstone (ARB comment to Fairfax County Dept. of Transportation)**
- Please provide these comments to staff so they can be incorporated into a letter. The ARB agreed that next week, FCDOT will be getting a letter outlining the ARB thoughts.

- **Design Guidelines Subcommittee Messers Bierce and Mobley**
- Mr. Bierce sent around a slightly tweaked copy of earlier recommendations on the proposed guidelines. At some point, he suggested the ARB needed a conversation on the guidelines.
- Ms. Blank added that the ARB had talked about doing it this summer, and she could send out an email to have a special meeting in July or August. The ARB had also indicated that a facilitator could be brought in.
- Mr. Sutphin thought it might be good to have a facilitator. He was also thinking of ways to get the community engaged in the process, specifically the people that would use the guidelines (i.e. property owners, business owners, residents).

Administrative: ARB Budget FY17 (Chairman and Staff)

- Ms. Blank said that the ARB budget is being increased from \$3,500 to \$9,200, DPZ will cover the difference for the first year which begins July 2016. Then, when she submits the ARB budget request for the next fiscal year's budget this fall, the request will be for \$9,200. The following was outlined for the budget:
 - \$3,900 a year for recording secretary;
 - \$300 per board member for training for each member;
 - Membership dues for \$1,500;
 - \$500 for special projects.
- Mr. Sutphin had a discussion with Mr. Selden on outreach, mailings, and public meetings that can't necessarily be funded. The ARB might need to think about these items with future budget requests, as they can't do much more than operate and do some trainings. Other boards engage with communities, have design charrettes, etc.
- Mr. Mobley asked if the ARB could let the balance continue to accumulate.
 - Yes.
- Mr. Daniel said to be careful about letting it accumulate in fears that the budget could get slashed down.
- Mr. Burns asked if it was possible for ARB members to get preservation forum stuff. Need a subscription.
 - Ms. Blank will ask.

New/other business:

- Starting with the May meeting, staff sent the ARB agenda to BOS members and chiefs of staff in an email with background information and will follow up with action agendas the week following the ARB meeting. Will be doing this on a regular basis.
- DPZ has started putting the minutes on the web – currently have a complete set of minutes through 2015.
- June 9th meeting – a tour at 4:30 at Lake Anne, likely to meet at the Reston Museum. Places to eat there, and the meeting will be at 6:30.

- Mr. Sutphin – in regards to house in Pohick, embarrassing that ARB heard this and had the rug pulled out from under them.
- Mr. Bierce – Dan Storck has called a meeting for all board members in Mt. Vernon to develop a set of expectations for the appointees to provide to the citizens
- Mr. Burns – collecting comments for the Ft. Belvoir military railroad historic district, asked for the ARB to please provide comments.

Old business/Other: API Building; site visit report

- Mr. Burns – level of detail, accessible, additions were done with great deference to the original design. Clearly a purpose-built building, many meeting rooms of various sizes. Stunned at the integrity of the interior. Stairs detailed as well, interior signage of newspaper members of the institute. Condition of the building quite good.
- Mr. Mobley – letter received today.

Mr. Daniel made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:00.