

APPROVED MINUTES

June 9, 2016

THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Lake Anne Village Center Reston Community Center, Joanne Rose Gallery

Members Present:

Jason Sutphin, Chairman
Richard Bierce, AIA, Vice Chairman
Robert W. Mobley
John A. Burns, FAIA
John Manganello, PE
Michele Aubry, Treasurer
Susan Notkins, AIA*

Members Excused:

Joseph Plumpe, ASLA
Christopher Daniel
Elise Murray
John Boland

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 June 9, 2016 meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) at 6:37 p.m. in the Joanne Rose Gallery of the Reston Community Center; Mr. Manganello read the opening statement of purpose.

Mr. Burns made the motion to approve the agenda; Ms. Aubry seconded the motion. The motion was approved on a vote of 6-0.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

INTRODUCTION/RECOGNITION OF GUESTS:

Ms. Blank introduced Meredith Cooke, Heritage Resources Planning Tech who started May 31. Ms. Cooke just graduated from GW University with a Masters in American Studies, emphasis in historic preservation. She has had experience working for a firm completing tax credit applications. She will be working with Stephanie Goodrich, Historic Preservation Planner on Reston survey. Very excited to have her abroad. Members welcomed Ms. Cooke.

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION ITEMS: None proposed.

ITEMS FOR ACTION:

- 1. Proposal for use of the property** as a home child care facility located at 9077 Two Bays Road, tax map # 108-1 ((9)) 136A in the Pohick Church Historic Overlay District (HOD), SP 2016-MV-026. The Zoning Ordinance stipulates that applications for special permits (SP) shall be referred to the ARB for its review and recommendation. The tax records indicate that the two-story frame townhouse was constructed in 2001; the property is non-contributing to the HOD. There are no modifications proposed to the existing building or to the site as part of the SP application. Mr. Salim Dakwala, represents the application.

(Item-ARB-16-PHC-02) Mt. Vernon Supervisory District
(This item was moved to later in the agenda as the applicant was not present when the item was called.)

- Presentation by Mr. Salim Dakwala explained that the day care was existing and that the special permit application was for increasing the number of children at the home child care. He stated there is no proposed exterior construction or exterior changes and no signage is proposed.

Mr. Mobley made the following motion:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the ARB approve item ARB-16-PHC-02, recommending approval of SP 2016-MV-026 for a home child care facility located at 9077 Two Bays Road, that was submitted and presented to the ARB at the June 9, 2016 meeting.

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 7-0.

ITEMS FOR WORKSHOP SESSION:

- 2. Proposal to construct an access road** to the Workhouse Arts Center to be located at tax map #106-4 ((1)) in the Lorton Correctional Complex National Register-eligible Historic District. The 2001 Lorton Correctional Complex Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) stipulates that the ARB review *undertakings* within the area eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and that the area within the Eligible District is subject to review as stipulated in Section 7-200 of the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance. Section 7-200 of the Zoning Ordinance stipulates that plans shall be referred to the ARB for its review and recommendation. The proposal is for constructing a 600 linear feet access road from the entrance stub on Lorton Road to the existing roadway on the Workhouse Arts Center site and to provide a maintenance plan for the approximately 1,150 linear feet existing portions of the access road on the Arts Center site. Mr. Seyed Nabavi, Fairfax County Dept. of Transportation, represents the proposal. **Mt. Vernon Supervisory District**
- Mr. Seyed Nabavi introduced himself as FCDOT project manager for the access road. He was presenting the proposal on behalf of the Workhouse Arts Center. This road would give the Workhouse a 2nd access off Lorton Road which that construction has created an entrance stub. The new part of the access road is approximately 600 linear feet with the remainder of the road shown in mustard constructed several years ago in connection with the development plan under the re-zoning; this section will be milled and top-coated. At Lorton Road there will be three lanes and transition to two lanes to tie into the currently existing two lane road. There will be re-grading of 6'-8'. The trail will be added to this access road project.
- **Discussion:**

- Mr. Burns asked if the original access road in this area had been destroyed. Ms. Blank confirmed that it had been. He asked the relationship in height of the road to the greenhouse which is a contributing property to the NR district.
- Mr. Rosenbach, Rinker Design, indicated that the greenhouse was 8'-10' higher than the road.
- The question of the speed limit was raised. The posted speed will be 20 mph.
- Mr. Rosenbach, said that the posted speed will be 20 mph and explained that due to the elevation and presence of a hill, they will ensure sight distance works at 25 miles per hour.
- Mr. Sutphin asked for details regarding the stormwater design.
 - The alignment of stormwater facilities had been included in the Stormwater Management (SWM) plan, and water would be captured with two separate facilities. The applicant plans to either use nutrient credits or the Workhouse's stormwater retention pond.
 - Mr. Nabavi also added that the facility at the Workhouse would be used, as it has excess capacity. If the proposal exceeds capacity, the applicant would purchase credits or construct an additional facility.
- Mr. Sutphin asked when this would be completed.
 - It would occur at the time of the intermediate design phase.
- Mr. Sutphin preferred that the applicant use the existing and designed facility.
- Mr. Burns asked what Photo #2 showed.
 - The Lorton Road project was shown in this photo.
- Mr. Burns then asked if materials for the project were stored on Workhouse property.
 - There is an existing easement on the Workhouse property.
- Mr. Sutphin asked what the next step was.
 - The applicant wanted to see if there were any concerns from the ARB at this stage and then would seek ARB approval. The project would then be submitted to Land Development Services at the County, and if the design is completed and permits are obtained, they could potentially use the same contractor used in the Lorton Road project to construct this proposal.
- Mr. Sutphin asked if they would return to the ARB in the next couple of months.
 - The applicant planned to return in August and could add tonight's discussion items in the submission materials.

3. 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. The applicant presented the proposal at a workshop session at the May 12, 2016 meeting. Chris Fox, Vice President Architectural Design for Van Metre Homes, and Ms. Candy McCracken, Vice President-Operations for Van Metre Homes represent the proposal. **Mt Vernon Supervisory District**

*Prior to the presentation, Mr. Burns recused himself.

Greg Regal gave an introduction to the project:

- This proposal is a part of a multi-year process with a series of approvals that have narrowed the scope of the project as it has progressed. The ARB will be the first and last agency to review and approve the project. The applicant sought comments in response to revised materials, and the proposal will then be brought to tax credit agencies before returning to the ARB for final action.

Presentation by Mr. Fox and Ms. McCracken, and Ms. Hareda:

- Mr. Fox presented a PowerPoint presentation to the ARB, which addressed previous comments. Regarding the townhouses, the following comments were addressed:
 - Comment 1 – Mix the types of brick: The applicant included color renderings, which mixed and alternated between Annapolis, St. Lewis, and Wirecut brick types. In addition, brick along the rear of the homes was raised and continued along the rear façade.
 - Comment 2 – reduce the height of the stair tower and make it flat roofed: The height of the stair was reduced to the code minimum of 7 feet in height, which was a reduction of 2 feet.
 - Comment 3 – select a window that is more sympathetic with the historic nature of the site: the vinyl windows had been replaced with metal-clad windows, which contained aluminum on the outside. This provided an urban feel. In addition, two types of front door entrances were proposed, and the light fixtures had been changed to a Burgess light.
 - Comment 4 – specify plant species: species had been added with a note based on seasonal availability. The plants were also included in the renderings.

Discussion on Townhomes:

- Mr. Sutphin asked if the applicant had selected a mortar.
 - It would be a light gray mortar.
- Mr. Sutphin followed up by asking if it would be used throughout the proposal.
 - Yes, it would be used for both the single family homes and the townhomes.
- Mr. Mobley added that the drawings needed to identify what color is proposed where. He was also curious about the color of the penthouses.
 - They would be artic white on the top of the penthouse. However, the penthouse would not be seen from the street.
- Ms. Notkins questioned what the scale was, and she requested the renderings to be in 11x17 format.
 - The applicant would add the location of the colors with respect to the hardiplank system and would label which bricks would be located where.
- Mr. Mobley had previously looked favorable at the townhouses, and he was very disappointed in the presentation. He did not see how the ARB could approve this with a drawing that does not clearly show the colors. He did not have a quarrel with the proposed architecture, but he did with the presentation.
- Mr. Bierce asked how the windows fit and what the relationship was. He needed to see these details, including the level of recess, nature of the reveal, etc.
 - This information could be added to the drawings.
- Mr. Mobley asked if the windows were flushed with the brick, and he requested further information on the relationship of the windows to the brick.
 - They would be flushed with the hardi-system, and the brick would be slightly sticking out.
- Ms. Notkins did not recall how the color white was chosen for the windows and doors, but she thought that white would stand out prominently.
 - The applicant was not sure if there was a precedent, but white was chosen because it's typically paired with masonry.
- Mr. Mobley asked what colors the windows were on the historic buildings.
 - They are white windows.
- Mr. Bierce noted that the windows were the same size and level, and generally windows should become less prominent as you go up. It would add some dynamic sense of moving up the scale if the windows were to vary. He asked if the applicant had considered casement windows as an alternative.
 - The applicant had not considered this.
- Mr. Bierce added that it might make the building look closer to industrial. In addition, he thought the windows dominated and would make the walls disappear. He thought the proposal had moved away from the industrially-inspired townhomes proposed last year.
- Ms. Notkins thought the white windows were not industrial, and she agreed that the proportions of the windows would be better if they were varied. She asked if the cast stone was white or green.
 - It was white.
- Ms. Notkins was disturbed by the “white hats” that the buildings had because they would be visible from various viewpoints. She preferred to see another tone for the penthouses.
- Mr. Bierce asked where the penthouse railings were.
 - The railings were set back behind the parapet.
- Mr. Bierce asked the applicant to also provide information on the size of the parapet.

- Mr. Sutphin asked the applicant to provide clearer copies to the ARB, as the current copies included striations.
- Mr. Mobley was comfortable with the architecture, and he thought the black and white renderings better explained the proposal than the color renderings. The applicant should include a scale in future renderings. In addition, making the renderings more 3-D would better assist in understanding the proposal.
- Ms. Notkins said the white windows worried her the most, and dark tones should be explored.
- Mr. Bierce said the canopies were not identified with what materials were proposed. The railings should also be dark. The issue of studying proportions of the windows and the relationships with the walls was still present. He requested that the applicant bring all of the information together in one set of plans that included annotations and a scale.
- Mr. Mobley liked the color of the penthouses and was comfortable with the scale. He thought white was appropriate to use. However, he did think the presentation was weak and effected the improvement of the design.
- Mr. Manganello wouldn't mind seeing a perspective view to show how the proposal fit in with the existing complex.
- Ms. Aubry thought the industrial look of the townhomes was consistent with the historic prison, along with the proposed white windows. She originally did not like the penthouse, but by using white and pushing it back, it almost disappeared.
- Mr. Sutphin also agreed that white was an appropriate color given the context.

Presentation on Single Family Homes:

- The main comments previously received from the ARB were the need to add individual character to the designs, incorporate brick influence from the historic site, and extend the canopies to cover the stoops. The applicant showed four new designs to include roofed porches, brick added to the sides of garages, and new light fixtures. Seasonal plants were also added to the landscaping plan. A streetscape showed all elevation options.

Discussion on Single Family Homes:

- Mr. Mobley asked which areas of the homes were recessed and which were projecting? He thought the shadowing included on the renderings made it difficult to tell, and no floor plan was provided.
 - The middle of the home would be projected in the elevation being discussed. There were different floor plans for each of the elevations.
- Mr. Mobley asked how far the canopy would project.
 - It would be 8 feet over the porch.
- Mr. Mobley also asked which canopy only projected 4 feet.
 - The canopies were covering the entire porch in each design.
- Ms. Notkins wondered why railings were not included.
 - Per the grading plan, railings were not required by the code.
- Ms. Aubry thought the light fixture seemed southern and an inappropriate style.
 - Previously, the ARB had requested the lighting to be the same style as the fixtures included in the townhome proposal.
- Mr. Sutphin noted the same issue with striated printed copies was present on the single-family exhibits. He requested the materials to be labeled as well as the colors, but he

would still support where they were heading with the design. He thought improvements had been made in response to ARB comments.

- Mr. Bierce thought the roof was shown as a blank plane on every drawing, and it might help to include texture based on the roofing system in the drawings. He also asked for the materials of the porch and windows.
 - The posts were wrapped with white hardi-plank, and the windows were the same.
- Ms. Notkins asked how tall the light fixture was.
 - 13 inches wide and 35 inches tall.
- Ms. Notkins thought this was out of scale and monumental in nature. It would be better to use a longer, simpler, rectangular light, as the light fixtures should be less intense. She still would prefer darker colors for the windows.
- Mr. Mobley was reluctant to the approval of the single-family design, but the ARB had moved past his objection previously. He had anticipated problems with scale, rhythm, and massing. He thought it would be a challenge convincing him that the proposal was compatible with the overall development. He had tried to suggest little changes, but he realized the changes he wanted were much more severe. He would not be in favor of these, and he did not believe the applicant was making progress on changing the looks of the homes. He thought the only saving grace was not having a front-facing garage.

BOARD AND STAFF ITEMS:

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

On page 10 of the May 12 minutes, it was suggested that the word “funny” be changed to “uncomfortable.”

Mr. Mobley made a motion to approve the May 12, 2016 minutes and to pay the recording secretary. This motion was seconded by Mr. Manganello. The motion was approved on a vote of 7-0.

On Page 8 of the May 24 minutes, Mr. Burns officially withdrew his motion, with the concurrence of a second by Ms. Murray.

Ms. Murray made a motion to approve the May 24, 2016 minutes and to pay the recording secretary. This motion was seconded by Mr. Burns. The motion was approved on a vote of 7-0.

- **Treasurer’s Report:** Ms. Blank reported the balance to be \$11,389.69; following tonight’s approval, the balance will be \$10,739.69
- **Discussion/Update Reports:**

Design Guidelines Subcommittee Messers Bierce and Mobley:

- Mr. Sutphin brought up that the ARB had wanted a meeting to discuss the design guidelines, and this could potentially be followed up with a community engagement activity as well. Something could be sent in the mail following ARB discussion and they could reach out to people who live in historic districts.
 - Mr. Bierce thought that once the draft was complete and met the consensus of the ARB, then they could reach out to the public. He also thought meetings should be held in the historic districts as well.
 - Ms. Blank would like to follow up about having a meeting to focus on what had been done, receive comments and feedback, and then get a facilitator to help move the process forward. This information needed to be provided to DPZ regarding how the ARB wants the process to go (i.e. public meetings, the style, and how the information should be presented). The ARB should also recognize that a consultant would be needed.
 - Mr. Bierce thought the initial step was to have a facilitator who would take meeting notes. They needed a scribe who would understand what they were talking about, and he thought they should hire someone who has done this commentary and would be able to put it into the correct context.
 - Ms. Blank said if the ARB wanted a special meeting, they would need to put a timeline to it. A short scope should be prepared to help the ARB understand where they were heading.
 - Mr. Bierce would contact the facilitator/scribe he had in mind.
- **Administrative:** Langley Fork HOD expansion (Staff):
 - Ms. Blank distributed a memo about the plan amendment proposed for the Langley Fork Historic Overlay District. This memo included background information, as well as the complete inventory nomination for the Mackall-Hall House. Maps and photographs were also included. She requested that further discussion be had at the July ARB meeting and she would be looking for ARB action at that time.
- **Correspondence, Announcements:**
 - Mr. Mobley said that the Great Falls Historical Society (GFHS) was raising money for a historian to write a report to place buildings in the Colvin Run HOD, along with the remains of a bridge that crosses Difficult Run, to be added to the National Registrar. This request also included three buildings at the top of the hill that were not in the HOD. It appeared that the group would be successful in raising money, and he wondered if this would lead to a future expansion of the HOD to include the additional buildings.

- Ms. Blank said this could be looked at, and there had been interest in the late 90s to expand the District. The County has access to the VA Resource Information System, and if someone would be hired to do the survey work and documentation for the National Registrar, the County could put this information into the VCRIS. This had been discussed a GFHS representative in late April or early May.
- **New/other business:** Dedicated ARB staff FY18 budget
 - Ms. Blank passed out materials regarding the FY18 budget. DPZ would look at a new staff position for dedicated ARB staff, but the ARB would need to provide DPZ with information for a budget request. The deadline would be the August 11th ARB meeting. The ARB needed to form a committee or make a decision on how they would like to move forward. They would need to provide brief information and make a justification for dedicated staff. She suggested Mr. Sutphin send Mr. Selden an email saying the information would be provided to him and that the ARB understood their responsibilities. The DPZ budget would be due the first week of September. Mr. Daniel had already volunteered to spearhead this effort with Mr. Sutphin.
- **Old business/Other:**
 - Fort Belvoir Military Railroad Virginia Landmarks Register nomination; ARB recommendation
 - No comments had been received from the ARB

Mr. Burns made a motion that the ARB recommend that the Board of Historic Resources approve the nomination of the Fort Belvoir Military Railroad for the Virginia Landmarks Register. This motion was seconded by Mr. Mobley. The motion was approved on a vote of 7-0.

- API Building; site visit report, other discussion:
 - Mr. Burns said the PC members he had spoken to were impressed with the quality of the design of the building and thought it was still in good condition, but in general, his impression was that the PC thought “how did we miss this?” and “what could we do about it?” Some were concerned and felt in a bind, and as Mr. De La Fey pointed out, the property was not in the inventory or Comprehensive Plan, so the PC had no authority here. Mr. Burns argued that the Comprehensive Plan changes had been flawed, as Heritage Resources were not taken into account. In the long run, if the Planning Commission defers it, they still have the problem of finding a use for the building.

- Mr. Mobley asked if there was a presentation made by the developer.
 - Mr. Burns said three former employees from the API group were speaking with the PC members, and they explained the building and pointed out notable features.
 - Mr. Sutphin was contacted by the library committee for the Reston Library. They were looking to relocate, and the API was a potential relocation spot. This was a preliminary conversation, but there seemed to be some interest. Funding has been earmarked to the tune of \$10 million.
 - Mr. Mobley had responded to the library and spoke of Mr. Hughes' passionately supporting keeping the API building. He had done many Fairfax County libraries, and he suggested that the library contact Mr. Hughes.
 - Ms. Riordan (former API employee) added that there was an online petition, and she thanked the ARB for their efforts in spreading this information. She was optimistic for the PC meeting. During the PC tour, she thought it was productive and positive. She asked if there was anything else that should be submitted to the PC.
 - Ms. Blank said unless new information was present, most likely everything has been sent onto the PC that would be needed.
- **New Business:**
 - Ms. Aubry told the ARB that Supervisor Storck had set up two meetings with his appointees, and he had created a set of guidelines and expectations of what he expected from the appointees of his district. These included a 10-year term limitation. She thought the BOS should all be looking into a document with these guidelines laid out.
 - Mr. Bierce thought that with a regulatory board that works with staff, continuity was necessary. This term limit seemed arbitrary, and given the way the ARB worked, members were just getting warmed up by year 10. He thought Commissioner Storck needed to look at the functions of each board and where people with the qualifications and commitment were coming from

Mr. Mobley made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:01 p.m.