

APPROVED MINUTES

July 14, 2016

THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

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

Members Present:

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

Members Excused:

Susan Notkins, AIA
John Manganello, PE

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 July 14, 2016 meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) at 6:30 p.m. in Rooms 4 & 5 of the Government Center; Mr. Sutphin read the opening statement of purpose.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Mobley made the motion to approve the agenda; Mr. Daniel seconded the motion. The motion was approved on a vote of 7-0.

INTRODUCTION/RECOGNITION OF GUESTS: None.

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION ITEMS: None proposed.

ITEMS FOR ACTION:

- 1. Proposal to replace existing signage and sign band and establish a sign plan** for the Fairfax Station Square Shopping Center, 5614 Ox Road, tax map #77-1 ((1)) 32B, in the St. Mary's Church Historic Overlay District (HOD). A 2' 5.5" high sign band running a length of 237' above the store fronts replacing signage for the existing six businesses would be installed. This aluminum tenant sign band would be green with consistent white lettering for each tenant sign to be divided from the other by 1' wide black with white outline element. Proposal includes sign plan design for future tenants; adherence to spacing, lettering type, color and placement as proposed in this application would constitute adherence to the proposed sign plan for the center. Mr. Matt Higgins, Concept Unlimited, Inc., is the applicant. Ms. Kathy Baker represents the application. (Item-**ARB-16-SMC-01**) **Springfield Supervisory District**

Presentation made by Mr. Higgins:

- The proposal was to keep the existing sign in place, but it would be resurfaced

with metal panels. The existing sign was all acrylic, but if the seams came apart, there would be gaps of light. The same colors were proposed, and the only change would be the addition of accent panels over the columns, which would be painted dark bronze.

Discussion:

- Mr. Sutphin asked if tenants would be able to replace their sections within the black areas.
 - The applicant responded that they would be able to.
- Mr. Daniel asked if all future signage would be conforming to this style and format.
 - If any future signage did not conform, they would have to come back through the hearing process for an amendment.

Mr. Daniel made the following motion:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the ARB approve item ARB-16- SMC-01 for proposed signage and establishment of a sign plan for the Fairfax Station Square Shopping Center at 5614 Ox Road, as submitted and presented to the ARB at the July 14, 2016 meeting provided that all signage elements comply with provisions set forth in the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance. Approval of this sign plan by the ARB provides for administrative staff approval of future tenant signage that adheres to the spacing, lettering type, color and placement as approved by the ARB for this application.

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 9-0.

2. **Proposal to replace existing community identification signage** at the southeast corner of the intersection of Adare Drive and Ox Road, tax map #77-1 ((12)) 37A, in the St. Mary's Church Historic Overlay District (HOD). A 4' 4" high X 7' wide X 1' deep sign identifying the Fairfax Club Estates neighborhood would be installed. A stone veneer would surround a 1" recessed sign plate measuring 1' 8" high X approximately 6' long. The sign would be downlighted, a flat cap installed and a landscaped planting bed would surround the sign base. The Fairfax Club Estates Home Owners Association (HOA) is the applicant. Mr. Jim Thompson represents the application. **(Item-ARB-16-SMC-02) Braddock Supervisory District**

Presentation by Mr. Thompson:

- The existing sign was constructed in 1983, and it was in poor condition and needed to be replaced. The current sign said "Fairfax Club," and the posts were wooden with cement around the outside. St. Mary's Church had no direct view from Route 123 of the sign. The proposal included a sign with stone, and it would be in the exact same position. Mr. Thompson thought the contact was going to replace the current light, but it would remain the same as the existing light.

Discussion:

- Mr. Mobley noted that the existing sign had an arched top, but from the exhibits it looked like the new sign had a flat top. Also, the new signage's lettering did not correspond with the presentation. In the designs submitted, the new signage said "Fairfax Club Estates."
 - The new signage would have a flat top as opposed to the arched top. In addition, the graphic saying "Fairfax Club Estates" was incorrect, and it should read "Fairfax Club."
- Mr. Mobley also added that no colors were designated in the submitted exhibits.
- Mr. Burns inquired about the font style.
 - Mr. Thompson did not have this information.
- Mr. Plumpe asked what the sign material was.
 - It would be metal.
- Mr. Plumpe also asked what the material of the lettering would be.
 - Mr. Thompson was not sure of the materials.
- Mr. Mobley requested to see a sample of the stone.
- Mr. Daniel added that typically when the ARB received a submission, the plan from the contractor would include more information, such as the style of the font. This plan seemed a little too simple. The stone, whether a sample or a cutsheet was brought in, would be useful information for the ARB to consider. The current plans did not provide enough information for an ARB analysis.
- Ms. Murray noted that there was very large shrubbery located on the left side of the sign. The landscape plan shows this shrubbery cut out.
 - The shrubs would not be cut out, especially because they hide a telephone pole. The new sign would be narrower than the existing sign. There would be no gap between the posts and the actual sign itself.
- Mr. Plumpe said if the plants were in healthy condition, he would accept them. If the width of the sign would be narrower, this needs to be reflected on the plans. He asked if there were any conflicts with the plants and the overhead lines.
 - There were no issues, and all utility easement issues had been resolved.
- Mr. Plumpe added that it looked like the sign was closer than 10 feet from the right-of-way line. He asked the applicant to ensure the sign would be out of the 10-foot setback.
 - Ms. Blank said it was her understanding that the applicant had already met with zoning on the placement of the sign.
- Mr. Burns said that the applicant had mentioned a narrower sign, but he asked how the new signage height compared to that of the existing sign.
 - Mr. Thompson would need to come back with this information.
- Mr. Burns also asked if the sign would be centered and what the material of the cap would be.
 - The sign would be centered, and the cap would be made of flagstone. He would send copies of the photos and plans ahead of time.
- Mr. Plumpe also requested information on the backside of the sign as well.
 - According to the drawings, the material on the back of the sign would be the same as the front. But there would not be any signage on the back.

Mr. Plumpe made a motion to defer item ARB-16-SMC-02 to a date chosen by the applicant when he was ready to return. The motion was seconded by Mr. Daniel and approved on a vote of 9-0.

- 3. Proposal to replace an existing roof mounted sign and reface an existing free standing sign** at 13848-A Lee Highway, tax map #54-4 ((1)) 30, in the Centreville Historic Overlay District (HOD). The existing signage was approved by the ARB at its January 12, 2012 meeting. The one-story flat roof, frame structure with hipped parapet is a contributing property to the HOD. Constructed ca.1930 and known as the “Centreville Restaurant” building it was relocated ca.1945 from the adjacent parcel on Lee Highway that the “Payne’s Restaurant” building now occupies. The roof-mounted sign internally illuminated box sign would measure 36” X 120” X 5” deep and the internally illuminated re-faced pole sign would measure 3’ 4” X 11’ 10”. Ms. Asma Rupani represents the application. (Item-**ARB-16-CTV-06**) **Sully Supervisory District**

Presentation made by Ms. Rupani:

- They would be a new tenant at the former AT&T building, and they would like to replace the existing roof-mounted sign with a roof-mounted internally illuminated box sign, and the existing monument sign would be refaced. The colors would match up with the existing Title Max sign next door.

Discussion:

- Mr. Mobley asked if essentially, the signs would be placed where the existing signs are now.
 - Yes, and the monument sign would be refaced.
- Mr. Mobley asked for more details on the roof.
 - Currently, the roof signage was channel letters. However, the proposal is to replace the letters with a box sign.
- Mr. Bierce did not have a problem with the sign, but given the setback of the building, he believed that what was proposed would not be legible from a moving vehicle. The little slogan located below the name would not affect the customer’s decision to come to the store, but a big sign with the name of the business would probably achieve this outcome. He suggested to simplify the design and to heighten the contrast.
 - Customers get confused on where A, B, and C are located within this center. She was willing to make the address smaller or remove it altogether.
- Ms. Murray did not think the sign needed “Centreville, VA” or “Lee Highway” included. It could be made more prominent with fewer letters.
 - It might be best to remove the address.
- Ms. Murray suggested the applicant do more to enhance “home of fixing the impossible.”
- Mr. Burns said the sign’s location and shape were approvable. He did not think the ARB needed to help dictate what the signage should say as long as it met County and ARB regulations.

Mr. Burns made the following motion:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the ARB approve item ARB-16-CTV-06 proposal to replace an

existing roof mounted sign and reface an existing free standing sign at 13848-A Lee Highway, as submitted and presented to the ARB at the July 14, 2016 meeting provided that all signage elements comply with provisions set forth in the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance.

The ARB has made some suggestions for text and content changes that might improve the design for purposes of marketing the business. The approval allows flexibility for implementation of these changes should the applicant so choose.

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 Ms. Murray and approved on a vote of 9-0.

ITEMS FOR WORKSHOP SESSION:

- 4. Proposal to demolish houses** at 5607 and 5701 Vogue Road, tax map #77-1 ((1)) 30 and 31, in the St. Mary's Church Historic Overlay District (HOD). The two houses are identified as contributing structures to the HOD. A 1990 review of the HOD indicates both single family frame dwellings were built in the 1920s. At that time, both were reported as covered in aluminum siding. The Foundation for the Catholic Diocese of Arlington, Inc. is contemplating purchasing the property, removing the existing structures and consolidating the property with Saint Mary's Church. It is anticipated that the property would be used for expansion of the existing Church cemetery and possibly a columbarium. Ms. Lynne Strobel, Walsh Colucci Lubeley & Walsh PC, represents the proposal. **Springfield Supervisory District**

Presentation made by Ms. Strobel:

- While the application said the applicant was the Foundation of the Catholic Diocese, it should be corrected to read Catholic Diocese. The properties were developed with two homes, and the Diocese sought to add the properties to St. Mary's Church. They had met with Brent Krasner in DPZ and would need to go through the Special Permit process. They anticipate to remove the two residential properties and expand the existing cemetery. This would be an opportunity to add land area to the historic church. The diocese had already hired an architectural historian to begin preliminary investigations to determine if the removal of structures would or would not compromise the historic nature of the site.
- Ms. Anna Maas (architectural historian) was presented and said she had interviewed current land owners and georeferenced historic maps. She pinpointed that one home dated to around 1900 and the other dated to 1937. The National Historic Register nomination for St. Mary's Church focused on the Civil War era, and the houses were built after the timeframe that made this area special. St. Mary's aimed to enhance its environment and prevent any development from encroaching.

Discussion:

- Mr. Bierce prepared a variety of points to consider for both the removal of these two historic structures as well as points to consider for retention of these structures. His notes

are as follows:

Preface: On why vernacular architecture is important, concluding comments from a talk "Cultural Influences on the Development of Local Architecture" by CRB, 2-28-98:

"These buildings, the anonymous, the plain, the utilitarian, the comfortable, speak to us as documents of our past or our neighbors past, and many continue to exercise their subtle processes of moulding us. We must acknowledge them, even as they disappear at an increasing and alarming rate; we must understand them, their virtues, their civilizing scale, and their roles past and present in our lives and communities. And when and where possible, we must seek ways to ensure that they will continue to teach and enrich us."

The fundamental conclusion is that each has a story to tell and our task consists of extracting, recording, understanding and sharing that story. The paradox in this instance is that the greater stories related to the properties in question may be fully revealed only if the structures themselves are removed. How can this be?

Points to consider for removal:

- Basic premise of proposed project to expand an historic land use, appropriate to sits, fundamental to significance;
- Removal of these houses would recapture some partial aspects of historic open setting around church, thus conforming to original purposes of HOD to preserve & protect Church and environs;
- Properties constructed o/s of period of significance in 20th c.;
- Integrity of site and HOD affected by incompatible incursions;
- Concur w/ assessment of no justification for including houses in NRHP; architecturally insignificant, no known historic association/significance;

Points to Consider for retention:

- Initial assessment for creation of HOD identified these as 'contributing', but without elaboration as to significance, or contributing to 'what'?
- 1993 HOD Guidelines suggested a secondary purpose for the district to include preservation of the vestiges of the historic village but without elaboration as to what these vestiges were, nor acknowledgement that more may survive o/s of current HOD boundaries; no known follow-up with respect to survey and research to substantiate and validate the concept;
- In all likelihood, "contributing"/locally significant designation was made based upon an imprecise or incomplete understanding of extent and integrity of the historic village and surviving features such as structures, landscapes & topography, roads, archeological resources;
- But "Contributing" they are so designated and thus ARB is obligated to consider that in responding to conceptual request for demolition;
- Another recent windshield survey hinted at intriguing possibilities that suggest more research and intensive analysis of the areas adjacent to but outside of the St. Mary's Church HOD may yield data to warrant consideration of expansion of the District;
- (Sidebar for ARB: Consider in context of 'Expectations' process)
- If such data were to emerge, the viability the survival of these houses would then be

measured against a different set of Criteria than req' d for NRHP;

Validation of "Contributing" status in an expanded historic village model:

In my professional opinion, they would not contribute to the historic integrity of a mid-19th village for the same ineluctable reasons as cited above;

- Underwhelming lack of any architectural significance;
- No known historic significance or associative values; dates of origin well outside of the period of historic significance;
- Their close and intrusive presence into the immediate setting and open space that defined the landscape around the Church in 1862.
- And, their setback from road frontage varies considerably from the deeper, more traditional setbacks evident in earlier development;

The Story that Might be Possible:

Barring miraculous discovery of data that would establish a significant story for the houses or for their owners/occupants, a much larger and nationally significant story might then become accessible for discovery, study and dissemination upon their removal.

Given the nature and sober importance of the conditions and events that focused on the church and its ground in the aftermath of the 2nd Battle of Manassas in August of 1862, it is highly possible that these two properties were integral parts of the scene and share characteristics of sacred ground as the very setting for some of the chaos and carnage witnessed there.

Furthermore, as it is unknown, but unlikely that these private properties were ever surveyed archaeologically, there well may be unmarked and unknown burials of Federal, and possibly Confederate, soldiers awaiting discovery.

If this project does move forward, I urge that the site be studied thoroughly, carefully and respectfully in every regard, and all data pertaining to its historic and spiritual significance be considered as strong determinants affecting all future design and planning decisions to prepare the land for its future uses.

Partners for Progress?

Clearly a comprehensive study of the site such as this may be undertaken as noted above would be valuable, but costly. Given the site's international and national significance as the locus and founding crucible of the American Red Cross, it is not unreasonable to expect collaboration and assistance from that organization to fulfill a shared responsibility to honor and preserve the legacies and lessons from the history that lives there.

If it should be the will of the Church to pursue this relationship, I offer to assist in any way possible to explore contacts with relevant Red Cross officials in Washington and Fairfax. My wife has served the organization over 30 years as a staff member at national headquarters and is strongly attuned to the historical import and potential of this project.

- Ms. Murray asked if the Church did not purchase the property, what could potentially be built on-site.
 - A home could potentially be built, but they would need to come through the ARB for permits. The site was zoned R-C, so one house could be built on each lot.
- Mr. Daniel commended the report and materials, including the aerials and maps showing how developed the District had become since 1954. If the ARB was present when the

homes were constructed, they probably would have fought the construction, as they encroached on St. Mary's open space. The key point was the archaeological concerns. If the ARB opposed the project, it would most likely be because of these concerns.

- The homeowner had noted that Civil War artifacts were found during the tilling of the garden.
- Mr. Mobley asked if the Church was making the commitment to only expand the cemetery and to not build anything.
 - That was the plan at this point in the process.
- Mr. Plumpe asked if this could be the plan for perpetuity.
 - The Special Permit process would bind the applicant to whatever plans were proposed until any future amendments were made.
- Mr. Mobley asked for further details on the cemetery plans.
 - The Church had not yet invested in planning the project, but Ms. Strobel's understanding was that the cemetery would be expanded and potentially enclosed by a fence in-character with the church. The Church would need to acquire the property and then investigate what they would like to do with the space. Following this acquisition, they would go through the Special Permit process and come back to the ARB with these plans.
- Ms. Blank did not know the applicant's time frame, but the ARB's approval for demolition would only be for a period of two years. She also did not think it would be inappropriate for the applicant to come to the ARB first (even during the SP process) to answer questions about the parking and the archaeological study. It might be helpful to come to the ARB to get details worked out and to hear suggestions along the way. Basically, coming to the ARB with a concept plan that is informed by an archaeological study so that areas could be avoided as may be necessary.
 - When they met with ZED, the discussions were mainly from a land use perspective, which shouldn't raise concerns. However, Ms. Strobel recognized that the biggest issues would be making sure the historic process is followed correctly.
- Mr. Boland noted that the ARB rarely got an opportunity to see limitation on the use of a property within a district that could potentially limit the use of the property in perpetuity, while simultaneously highlighting the pastoral nature of Fairfax County from that era. Considering the history of the houses, how they became contributing structures was a mystery as well. He found it interesting that there was a prospect of enhancing the district, and he was inclined to have a favorable view of the proposal.
- Mr. Mobley said that based upon the ARB's discussion, he would be inclined to be favorable as well.
- Mr. Burns said it appeared as though there might be more historical value if the houses were removed than if they remained. The potential for archaeological discoveries meant they could have significant features. He asked for further explanation on the columbarium.
 - This would be modest in size, and it had not been proposed or designed at this stage. If included in the project, it would be modest in size. The applicant would return with a site plan, which would document graves and the Civil War dead who were buried there.

Mr. Burns added that there might be more than just graves, and a survey would be

needed. He asked if the research had been done to see when the properties were subdivided.

- The research has just begun, but an intensive level survey could also be done.
- Mr. Bierce was encouraged to hear this discussion. As an observation, he noted that the maturation of the landscape screening was working as a barrier to the shopping center.
- Ms. Blank would check into if a building permit was required for a columbarium, and it might be included in the design review. It should also be shown on the initial submission, as she believed the ARB would need to approve its design.
- Mr. Daniel thought it was overall a unique reaction from the ARB. When demolition usually occurred, the proposal was inappropriate and offensive to the site. This, however, was more consistent with the HOD. These two unfortunate buildings were brought in because they were less offensive than everything else around it. The more information (site-plan wise) that ensures the protectiveness of the site is maintained, the better. This could meet the internment needs of the church with a subtle columbarium.
- When Ms. Aubry first read the materials she said her first concern was about the potential for archaeological resources on the two house lots as the potential in the vicinity of the church is so great. She also wondered about how the two houses were contributing structures. In her mind, she didn't have a problem about seeing these two structure come down, as they don't seem to be related to St. Mary's. She thought it would be great to have the opportunity to see the archaeological resources there before any further work was done.
- Mr. Sutphin concurred and would be interested in the process.
- Mr. Burns suggested doing the archaeology before the design so they could see what needed to be avoided.

5. Proposal to rehabilitate buildings W-2 and W-2A 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. W-2 is identified in the National Register as contributing; W-2A is not identified separately in the nomination. The proposed building renovation, part of which will house the Workhouse Museum will include: restoration or replacement of the three windows and installation of a full glass door at the front façade; installation of three windows and one door insert in the four arched window openings located in the connector wall facing the colonnade between buildings W-2 and W-3; restoration or replacement of 63 windows at the side facades with retention of the vertical metal prison bars; and the restoration or replacement of 7 other windows and 4 doors at the side and/or rear facades. Ms. Ava Spece, CEO/President, Workhouse Arts Center represents the proposal. **Mount Vernon Supervisory District**

Presentation by Ms. Spece with Mario Limos and Nick Pasonela:

- The vision for this building and for Building 2A was to house a museum focused on the local history of Lorton while also telling the national story of the suffragettes. The front portion would contain exhibit space and artifacts, while the back portion would have the 38 cell blocks retained. The space would be cleaned out so visitors could walk through the area. They asked for ARB guidance regarding the windows and doors, as well as the gutters and handrails.

- Mr. Limos wanted to match the windows and glass doors to those previously approved by the ARB for other buildings on the quad. They proposed doors with glass and an aluminum frame. All handrails in existing stairs would also be replaced with a black steel tube.
- Ms. Spece said everything in the initial design mirrored what was present on the remainder of the campus. The small difference was the front door would be a double door to allow for artifacts to be brought in and out. The intent was for windows on the back of the cellblock to be restored or replaced (if needed). The gutters were mostly intact, but some segments needed to be replaced as well as some of the downspouts. They hoped to replace them with a material that mimicked copper.

Discussion:

- Mr. Daniel asked if the original door was a cell door. He said if it was steel and would now be glass, it might not accomplish the prison feel.
 - There were gated doors located inside the structure, but they were unsure about the original doors. They would salvage the doors and keep them inside the museum, and the primary objective was matching the remainder of the campus.
- Mr. Daniel said his preferred replacement for the windows was an in-kind replacement and to match them as closely as possible. He would be looking for cutsheets of what the windows were, how they matched, and what materials would be used. They seemed to have some flexibility since some of the windows had already been replaced. He asked to also provide details and cutsheets on the proposed gutters.
 - The gutters would match the existing, but they had issues with theft of copper gutters previously.
- Mr. Plumpe asked about the progress of the small courtyard in the back of the building.
 - It was not included in the application. But they would eventually like to return it to the original blacktop material.
- Mr. Burns was confused as to how the cellblock would convey the suffragettes' story.
 - The exhibit would be adjacent to the cellblock.
- Mr. Burns was concerned that people would come away with the idea that the suffragettes were housed in these cells as well. He was disappointed that there was not more of the building footprint dedicated to their portion of history.
 - Their story was a period of 6 months out of a 100-year span. There was a vast amount of history to cover. They aimed to honor that piece of history as well as the entire history of the site.
- Ms. Murray noted that there would be a suffragettes memorial down the hill by the river, which would also tell their story.
 - They had contacted a museum design company to go through the exhibit design process, and renderings were included in the packets.
- Mr. Plumpe asked if the cellblocks would be removed in a portion to show the building pre-cellblock.
 - The 10 other buildings on-site would demonstrate this.
- Mr. Bierce would be against the glass door, as the glass was used throughout the site for the other buildings that were being used for new purposes. He also thought the windows should be restored if possible and replaced if necessary. He requested larger plans to clearly demonstrate the proposal. He thought that the message of the 1960 cellblocks

could be portrayed with a third of the footprint rather than the 60% being proposed.

- The intention was to include artifacts, exhibits, and models in the spaces and cellblocks. Part of the thinking was the compelling experience of walking down the long corridor of cellblocks.
- Mr. Bierce thought this was the fundamental learning spot, and it should have authenticity. It might not be being presented to the ARB coherently enough to show what the actual proposal intended.
 - They were trying to strike a balance between viability and a quality educational experience.
- Mr. Bierce added that the Progressive Era encompassed a significant historic movement.
 - This would be portrayed in the exhibit space.
- Mr. Plumpe asked if the applicant had considered a timeline, starting with how the building was used and progressing the timeline throughout the exhibit.
- Mr. Daniel asked if there were any photographs of the front of the building, and he asked if there were doors located on the rear side of the building. He also asked if there was an opportunity to maintain the original doors on the front and widen the rear opening to allow for artifacts coming into and out of the building.
 - The applicant thought this would change the historic structure and layout of the cellblock more than the front entrance would, as a cellblock would need to be removed.
- Mr. Daniel reminded the ARB that they were here to focus on the architecture. They needed more information on what the main façade and door looked like, as it was a drastic change from a steel to a glass door. The space was trying to teach about a broad period of history, and it was a challenge to interpret that history in this space. It needed to be considered, as well as more information provided on the plans. The plans were hard to read.
- Mr. Bierce thought the early doors were wooden, and he did not think the proposed doors fit the context of what was intended to be preserved. He thought it should be a prison door entrance.
 - The intent was to start the experience in the interior of the structure through a vestibule. That's where the prison experience began for the prisoners.
- Mr. Bierce thought the prison door should be worthy of consideration.
- Mr. Daniel agreed that the whole experience should be that of going to a prison. The applicant should definitely think about this.
- Mr. Mobley said it did not sound like anybody present at the meeting knew how that room was really used. He asked if the prison door was necessary to enter the vestibule.
 - An interior room had a bar gate and was used as a holding room. The next room was the start of the intake process, and they would be assigned to a cell from here.
- Mr. Mobley was not sold on the idea that there needed to be a prison door on the entrance.
 - The applicant had intended to honor the gallery before the prison experience began.
- Mr. Burns suggested that if they could take the whole next building over and make that the workhouse and leave this as the prison, they could have a steel door on the cell building with a wooden door on the workhouse building. He also asked if the windows were ever strengthened or barred once cells were built in the building.

- They windows were barred, and they would be kept.
- Mr. Pasonela added that of the 41 windows, there were 6 pane windows, 9 single windows, and 9 double windows. They would like to know how the ARB felt regarding the mix of panels.
 - Mr. Daniel said they would need to know why a window was being replaced. It would need to be a strong argument for its replacement, not simply because it is old.
 - Ms. Spece thought a number would be replaced, as many were in bad shape.
 - Mr. Daniel thought if windows were being replaced, they should be replaced with a six-pane window.
- Ms. Spece added that the railings were being replaced as well.
 - Mr. Bierce suggested that the applicant use materials to make them match the historic railings. The same style should be used to meet the current code. He asked them to show the approved railings that are located throughout the site in their resubmission.

In addition to the above discussion with the applicant, Irma Clifton gave a brief overview of the history, clarified details, discussed suffragettes' museum, etc.

BOARD AND STAFF ITEMS:

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

Mr. Mobley – page 5: last discussion of single family housing, canopy would project 8 feet over porch not under.

Mr. Mobley didn't understand Ms. Notkins – “houses are intense and lighting fixtures should be less intense.”

Pg. 6 – much more “severe” instead of “sever”

Mr. Burns made a motion to approve the minutes, as amended, and to pay the recording secretary. This motion was seconded by Mr. Mobley and approved on a vote of 8-0 (Mr. Plumpe was absent from the room during this vote.)

- **Treasurer's Report:** (staff) \$13,364.69. Have received \$3,500 from contributory funding for 2017 fiscal year.
- **Discussion/Update Reports:** *Designing Guidelines* Special Meeting (Mr. Bierce and staff):
 - Mr. Bierce suggested a date in October.
 - Ms. Blank chose two dates, Oct. 15 and 29th from the response so that a quorum would be present.
 - Discussion ensued regarding the need for a quorum as no action would be taken.
 - Ms. Blank indicated that was being used so that the greatest number of members possible would be at the meeting.
 - Mr. Wagner would be paid from the ARB budget.
 - Mr. Bierce said if the ARB could tell Mr. Wagner a date in advance, he could make the meeting work.
 - Saturday, Oct. 15 was decided upon.

- **Administrative:**
- **Correspondence, Announcements:** FY17 budget funding (staff)
 - The ARB has received the fiscal year contributory amount of \$3,500.
- **New/other business:** Dedicated ARB staff FY18 (Messers Sutphin and Daniel)
 - Mr. Sutphin said the ARB has asked the County to adequately staff the ARB with dedicated staffing. He eagerly invited any comments/thoughts on the matter. He was ultimately looking for a nod yes or no to go ahead and meet with DPZ to push for additional staff person.
 - Mr. Daniel added that additional documents were also provided. He saw this as DPZ has to ask for the staffing position, and while the ARB couldn't tell DPZ how to solve deficiencies, they could point out where the ARB has needs or requirements. He thought Ms. Blank was inadequately supported, and by that nature the ARB is deficient in their needs.
 - Mr. Sutphin and Mr. Daniel would be meeting with Fred Selden, Dept. Director and Marianne Gardner, Division Director and he wanted to make sure they were all on same page that a dedicated person needs to be provided.
 - Mr. Bierce said this had been needed for so long, and in past conversations with higher ups, they've figured out ways not to do anything. If there was a way to strongly state how the public isn't being served and the ARB can't fully do its job and fulfill its public duties, it might be the most effective and help strengthen the message. There might be some parsing of these functions, and maybe a contractor could do some of this work directly related to architecture. A lot of new projects take months if not years in the process.
 - Mr. Daniel thought one thing the request might be lacking is an overarching statement. It was great on individual duties, but maybe the lack of fully serving the public needed to be included. A meeting with Fred would determine a lot of where the ARB could help show him how to advocate for us. The ARB also needed someone on the BOS to be their advocate too, and this was the next hurdle.
 - Ms. Murray considered asking Supervisor McKay or Supervisor Foust, as Supervisor McKay had been helpful on other items.
 - Mr. Mobley also said Supervisor Gross seemed to be very excited about architecture and the ARB.
 - Ms. Blank thought this was something the ARB really needed to think about.
 - Mr. Daniel added that a breakdown of the job description of the current Heritage Resource planners would be helpful.
 - Ms. Blank thought it was important to include that the ARB is a regulatory board and to remind the BOS and DPZ of this. Also, the ARB worked with people so that cases were not eventually appealed to the BOS.

- Mr. Daniel – would be valuable to know the number of cases (administrative) that Linda is doing.
- **Item for Action:** Langley Fork HOD expansion (staff); ARB recommendation to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors

Ms. Murray made a motion to recommend approval of Plan Amendment PA 2016-II-M1 to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for the expansion of the boundaries of the Langley Fork Historic Overlay District to include the Mackall-Hall House located at 1013 and 1011 Turkey Run Road, tax id# 022-3((01) 51 and 50.

Mr. Burns seconded the motion, and the motion was approved on a vote of 9-0.

- **Old business/Other:** API Building; Board of Supervisors public hearing 7-26-16, 4:30 pm, other discussion.
- Ms. Murray said there would be a movement to celebrate 275th birthday of Fairfax County, next year in June.
- Mr. Daniel extended his apologies for not being present at the API special meeting.
- Mr. Bierce asked if Ms. Blank was involved in the Mt. Vernon High School discussion.
 - Ms. Blank said she was. She would remind people again of the Mr. Bierce’s letter and the ARB’s interest in being involved. At a very minimum, the original high school, library, and gym will be retained. There are no physical changes to the building proposed.
- Mr. Bierce noted that six townhouses on Harrison Lane approved by the ARB were completed and did not have the proper screening.
 - Ms. Blank would follow up on this.
- Mr. Burns asked if the ARB was going to attend and / or make a statement at Sekas / API public hearing.
 - Ms. Blank distributed the ARB letters and motion directly to BOS, and she would be happy to do it again.
 - **Mr. Daniel moved that ARB staff collect and collate previous correspondence and forward to the BOS, including a summary of this correspondence that staff would prepare. This motion was seconded by Ms. Murray and approved on a vote of 9-0.**
 - Mr. Burns would be in attendance, but he would not speak representing the ARB but rather as an individual.
- Mr. Plumpe chaired the Fairfax County Exceptional Design Awards jury. He highlighted several projects including an adaptive reuse of an office building to a school by Fairfax County.

Motion made to adjourn by Mr. Daniel at 9:18