

APPROVED MINUTES

September 8, 2016

THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

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

Members Present:

Richard Bierce, AIA, Vice Chairman
Michele Aubry, Treasurer
Susan Notkins, AIA
John A. Burns, FAIA
Christopher Daniel
John Manganello, PE
John Boland*

Members Excused:

Elise Murray
Joseph Plumpe, ASLA
Jason Sutphin, Chairman
Robert W. Mobley

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. Bierce opened the September 8, 2016 meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) at 6:37 p.m. in Rooms 4 & 5 of the Government Center; Ms. Aubry read the opening statement of purpose.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

Move #4 proposal to install a fence to consent calendar.

Mr. Burns made a motion to move Item #4 of the agenda (Item ARB-16-HLY-02) to #1 to the Consent Calendar Action Items; this motion was seconded by Ms. Notkins and approved on a vote of 6-0.

INTRODUCTION/RECOGNITION OF GUESTS: None.

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION ITEMS:

1. Proposal to install a fence and play equipment, relocate playhouse and remove trees at 2735 Oakton Park Court located at tax map #48-1 ((50)) 9. RZ/FDP 2001-PR-032 proffer #4 dated March 18, 2002 stipulated that the applicant establish a conservation easement on the property to “ensure the preservation and maintenance of the grounds and exterior appearance of the house and garage for historic and scenic purposes. The easement shall be perpetual and require the prior approval by the Board of Supervisors, or its designee, of any proposed changes to the exterior of the house, the garage or the grounds . . . , including removing existing trees or other plant materials as depicted on the CDP/FDP.” A wooden 4’-5’ high fence is proposed to be installed to enclose the rear yard where an existing playhouse would be relocated off a storm drain easement, play equipment would be installed and two holly trees removed to accommodate the structures. Mr. Ryan Corle, property owner represents the application. (Item ARB-16-PRO-01) **Providence Supervisory District**

Mr. Burns made the following motion:

Mr. Chairman, I move that item ARB-16-PRO-01 be approved as a consent calendar item with the following condition:

With regard to RZ/FDP 2001-PR- 032 proffer #4, the ARB stipulates that Zoning Evaluation Division review assigning the Director of the Department of Planning and Zoning as designee for all future review and approval authority and that zoning report back to the ARB. Said work shall comply with the applicable proffers and easement.

With regard to RZ/FDP 2001-PR- 032 proffer #4, the ARB stipulates that Zoning Evaluation Division review assigning the Director of the Department of Planning and Zoning as designee for all future review and approval authority and that zoning report back to the ARB. Said work shall comply with the applicable proffers and easement.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Notkins and approved on a vote of 6-0.

ITEMS FOR ACTION:

- 1. Revisions to previously approved plans** for the Huntley Tenant house, 6918 Harrison Lane, tax map #092-2 ((1)) 8C located in the Huntley Historic Overlay District. Huntley was established as a historic overlay district in 1976 and is identified as a historic property in that district. It was individually listed in the National Register in 1972. At its October 8, 2015 meeting, the ARB approved the adaptive reuse of the tenant house as a visitor center with museum displays, restroom facilities, and reception area with a new garage addition; **ARB-15-HLY-01**. At its August 11, 2016 meeting approval was given to install an aluminum/zinc-coated steel roof. The current revisions to previously approved plans are to retain the existing window openings at the south façade and to delete installing shutters. Ms. Debbie Robison, Project Manager SWSG, represents the application. (Item **ARB-16-HLY-02**) **Lee Supervisory District**

Presentation by Ms. Robison:

- The application proposed two changes: the first change was to remove the shutters from the plan; the second change was instead of lengthening the windows as previously proposed, the applicant elected to leave them at their existing length. The applicant was unable to prove that there were previously shutters on the house, so VDHR did not agree that shutters could be included. On the windows, they went to the site and found that the windows on the southern elevation (facing the street) were not original, and there had not been any windows on that side. As such, lengthening them would not be appropriate.

Discussion:

- Mr. Bierce visited the site and concurred with Ms. Robison's assessment on the windows.

Mr. Daniel made the following motion:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the ARB approve item ARB-16-HLY-02 for revisions to previously approved plans for the Huntley Tenant house, 6918 Harrison Lane, tax map #092-2 ((1)) 8C located in the Huntley Historic Overlay District to retain the existing window openings at the south façade and to delete installation of shutters.

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 and approved on a vote of 6-0.

2. **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. The proposal was discussed in a workshop at the July 14, and August 11, 2016 ARB meetings. 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 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 of 63 windows at the side facades with retention of the vertical metal prison bars; restoration of 7 other windows at the side and rear façades; repair or in-kind replacement of 4 doors at the side and rear facades with a new concrete pad at one side entry; installation of 3' high black steel railing at three rear entrances with existing concrete stairs to be repaired; and installation of copper gutter section at the east and 3 downspouts gutters and downspouts. Ms. Ava Spece, CEO/President, Workhouse Arts Center represents the proposal.
Mount Vernon Supervisory District (Item ARB-16-LOR-02)

Discussion by Ms. Spece:

- The updated proposal contained two minor changes. The first change was that only two of the 63 windows located around the back cellblock would need serious restoration. The applicant planned to restore rather than replace these two. The other change dealt with gutters and downspouts. The difference in cost between copper and the alternative material was about \$1,500, so the applicant would utilize copper. The remaining pieces of the project involving the arches and doorways remained unchanged, and the side windows would also remain unchanged other than the removal of mesh.

Discussion:

- Mr. Burns asked if the high-level windows were operable and if they would remain operable.
 - Yes, and they would remain operable.
- Mr. Daniel appreciated the work that the applicant had done. He thought the packet looked great and covered everything the ARB was looking for.
- Ms. Aubry asked about the lighting fixtures, specifically as they were shown in Exhibit #3.
 - These fixtures had been previously approved. However, in the area with the concrete pad, a light would be replaced.

Ms. Notkins made the following motion:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the ARB approve item ARB-16-LOR-02 for the proposed rehabilitation and renovation at buildings W-2 and W-2A which will include windows, doors, rear and side entries, lighting, downspouts and gutters as detailed in the submission materials.

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. Manganello and approved on a vote of 6-0.

3. 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 was discussed in a workshop at the June 9, 2016 ARB meeting. 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 to include re-surfacing (or mill-overlay). Mr. Seyed Nabavi, Fairfax County Dept. of Transportation, represents the proposal. (Item **ARB-16-LOR-03**)**Mount Vernon Supervisory District**

Presentation made by Mr. Nabavi:

- The intent of the project is to tie the road into the existing parking lot, which would require 600 feet of new roadway construction. It was previously suggested by the ARB that a retaining wall be constructed to protect the nearby building. They have since shifted the asphalt walkway towards the road, and a retaining wall would no longer be necessary. No other changes had been made.
- Ms. Blank added that there was a letter included in the ARB's packet with comments from VDHR, who had no issues with the proposal. The letter noted that an existing greenhouse was a contributing resource, and the construction limits appeared to be quite near to it.
 - Mr. Nabavi responded that as a part of the Workhouse's site plan proffers, any construction activities would need to be 10 feet away from historic resources.

Discussion:

- Mr. Manganello asked if there was a soil report showing any marine clay?
 - A geotechnical report was done with the site plan, and they would include the report with this project.
- Mr. Daniel asked the applicant to re-explain how the protection would be provided for the greenhouse.
 - As a part of the proffers, any construction activity has to be 10 feet away. If the construction was any closer than 10 feet, a structural engineer would have to verify that the construction would not damage if historic structure. In this case,

they would ensure construction was no closer than 10 feet. Also in the proffers, fencing was required around the structure prior to the commencement of construction activities.

- Mr. Burns noted that the whole site was a heritage resource.
 - Regarding the 10-foot setback, the proffers specifically spoke to historic contributing structures and resources.
- Mr. Burns felt the construction was awfully close. He was worried about a backhoe or a piece of large machinery taking a chunk out of the building. He asked the applicant to please take steps to ensure this wouldn't happen.
 - This will be stressed in the site plan and at the pre-construction meeting to protect this facility.
- Mr. Bierce inquired about the possibility of using jersey barriers to protect the building.
 - As required by the proffers, a 6-foot chain-link fence would be constructed.
- Ms. Aubry noted that the letter from VDHR ended with a statement about consulting about any archaeological resources in the area.
 - Ms. Blank said when Ms. O'Neill contacted VDHR, Cultural Resources was contacted. After their review, there was no additional comment provided.

Mr. Daniel made the following motion:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the ARB recommend approval of item ARB-16-LOR-03 for the proposed construction 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 to include re-surfacing (or mill-overlay) with the condition that adjacent contributing resources are adequately protected during construction and construction remains at least 10' away from the contributing resources to avoid damage and/or destruction.

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 and approved on a vote of 7-0.

- 3. Proposal to reconstruct** 7 buttresses and repair one buttress of the penitentiary wall at the Adaptive Reuse Area, tax map #107-1 ((9)) H 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. The penitentiary wall is identified as a contributing structure, PT-01, to the DC Workhouse and Reformatory National Register Historic District. The eight buttresses are located at the north and west sides of the wall. The buttress reconstruction and repair will use salvaged brick and matching mortar in accordance with lab analysis of mortar type. Mr. Mike Lambert, Assistant Director Fairfax County Real Estate Services, represents the proposal. (Item **ARB-16-LOR-04**)**Mount Vernon Supervisory District**

(Mr. Burns recused himself)

Presentation by Mr. Lambert:

- During the summer of 2015, staff noticed that bricks were missing from the wall and multiple columns did not seem stable. It was determined that seven columns had to come down, as they presented a safety threat to the public. The applicant wanted to reconstruct these buttresses. They had salvaged all of the bricks and would use them to complete the reconstruction. The brick would be cleaned, and the buttresses would be rebuilt based on photographs and blueprints. The color of the mortar and the composition would also be matched. Testing had been done to determine appropriate mortar. Coordination would be needed with VDHR with regard to tax credits.

Discussion:

- Mr. Bierce thought the nature of the buttresses seemed to be an afterthought; he asked if they were original, and he asked what the applicant planned to do to ensure they did not fail again.
 - There has not been an analysis yet on exactly how the original buttresses were constructed.
- Mr. Bierce felt that these questions were fundamental, and this information needed to be included in the decision making process.
- Mr. Daniel asked how the applicant determined what mortar samples were use, and he also asked if they were replicating other buttresses or if the sample was taken from the wall.
 - They were not certain where the sample came from the wall.
- Mr. Bierce asked if the applicant was sure that the buttresses were an original feature.
 - They had not completed an analysis on this.
- Ms. O'Donnell added that there was no information saying the buttresses weren't original to the wall, and they were mentioned in the National Register report. In 2007, the County was contracted to do a structural analysis of the wall itself. It was found that the wall wasn't built with enough room for expansion. There were 49 buttresses around the wall, and there were a series of historic drawings recovered. Irma Clifton believed they were original to the wall, although they were unsure of how this could be confirmed.
- Mr. Daniel was less concerned as to whether they were original or not, but his bigger concern was not knowing where the mortar was coming from. The buttresses would stand out if the wrong mortar was used, and the ARB needed this information.
 - The in-house mortar lab would complete an analysis to get the basic materials, sand sizes, and aggregate sizes. As well as the color, this would be trial and error. There was no pigment in the mortar.
- Mr. Daniel said that this information was typically provided to the ARB for them to analyze, and this empirical data would assist them in making a decision.
 - The mortar mock-up had been done next to the wall, but it had not been done next to the buttress.
- Mr. Bierce added that the joint profile was critical in terms of analysis.
- Ms. Notkins asked if the buttresses were original.
 - Ms. O'Donnell said that many repairs were made during the operation of the prison, and a photo showed one buttress that was repaired. It was not repaired

with matching mortar or matching bricks, and it was not capped properly. There were various levels of incorrect repairs completed.

- Ms. Notkins asked if the ARB were to assume that the original buttresses matched the wall,
 - Yes, this was the assumption.
- Mr. Bierce requested that if an engineering analysis was completed 9 years ago, it should be provided to the ARB.
- Ms. Notkins said that if the assumption was that the buttresses were original, presumably the mortar matched the wall too.
 - It could possibility be determined if the buttresses were integral with the wall.
- Mr. Bierce inquired about the cause of the structural failure.
 - The assumption was moisture infiltration.
- Mr. Daniel had some unease about going forward with an approval because he had a feeling VDHR would disapprove the current proposal for VDHR tax credits, as there was not enough information provided.
- Mr. Bierce concurred with Mr. Daniel, and he thought many of the ARB's questions could be answered readily with a one-day consultation with a masonry conservationist. From an archeological standpoint, he asked if there was a new footing requirement for each of them. He also asked if there was an opportunity to survey or monitor this.
- Mr. Manganello asked if there was any though in talking to a structural engineer regarding meshing the buttresses into the wall. He thought it would make a better foundation, and the situation might as well be improved while it's being rebuilt.
 - The applicant would have to consult with Elm Street to ask if they had looked at this option.

The applicant agreed to defer the case to a later date.

ITEMS FOR WORKSHOP SESSION: None scheduled

BOARD AND STAFF ITEMS:

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

- Page 2 regarding the discussion item: Mr. Burns made some changes to be clarified.

Mr. Daniel made a motion to approve the August 11th minutes, as submitted and revised, and to pay the recording secretary. The motion was seconded by Ms. Notkins and approved on a vote of 7-0.

Treasurer's Report: Staff: \$13,365 at the fiscal year start; \$12,715 after recent payments.

Discussion/Update Reports:

- Designing Guidelines Review Special Meeting Agenda; October 15, 2016; 10 AM (Mr. Bierce):
 - The issues of how the ARB addresses expectations, what the guidelines will deal with, etc. should be dealt with the most, and the most time should be spent upon these topics. There was time for modification, but not for redesign. The guidelines were still an

incomplete draft, and the comments from other ARB members will be shared.

- **Correspondence, Announcements:**

- November ARB meeting date November 17 (Staff) – It will be the third Thursday of the month.
- October 13th – Aubrey Von Lindern (VDHR Staff) will be attending meeting for our 4-year CLG check-up. Also, the ARB mentioned that they wanted to do some training in Fairfax County in 2017. Ms. Von Lindern has indicated that VDHR would like to do training here next year so it might be a good idea to ask her about this and her ideas.

- **Administrative:**

- LFHOD expansion – voted in July to support the expansion. Goes to PC then BOS.
- The quest for dedicated staff member continued, and DPZ staff was tasked with gathering information from surrounding jurisdictions regarding number of employees, staff reports, etc. Meredith Cooke had compiled this information, and it would be available shortly and would be provided for meetings with BOS members.

- **Old Business:**

- Mr. Burns said the demolition permit was issued for API building, and the demolition was expected to begin early next week.

- **New/other business:**

- Information items: Laurel Hill and Floris upcoming for October 13 ARB meeting. (Staff)
 - A letter dated August 12 from VDHR regarding review of the new construction was provided. The ARB should have recalled that following last workshop in June, the applicant took ARB comments, and incorporated them into what was submitted to VDHR and National Parks Service. They had approved the design with a stipulation, and this would be presented to ARB for action at October meeting.
 - Floris National Historic District – The rezoning proposes an academy design in a historic district. A workshop is scheduled, and the applicant will be making presentation. The staff coordinator will also be in attendance. Staff has contacted VDHR, requesting VDHR review the proposed development to determine if it would affect the status of the listing of the district. This district was created as mitigation for widening of Centreville Road and its impact on the then-eligible district. The concern was regarding the impact of the development on a National Register District that Fairfax County was a signatory to the Memorandum of Agreement. DPZ management staff has decided to use Section 19 of the Zoning Ordinance and ask for ARB review.
 - Mr. Burns said that unless there were federal funds involved, Section 106 would not apply in this case. Second, it was extremely rare for a building or property to be de-listed for something that happens to part of it.
 - Linda noted that there was a permit required regarding the wetlands on the site, which was triggering a separate review by VDHR.

- Site visit Minor Hill (Mr. Bierce, Staff)
 - In packets, there was a cover that staff prepared indicating the good work done by Ms. Robison and Mr. Bierce, who went to the site, did measurements, drawings, and made recommendations regarding what kind of follow-up would be done.
 - Ms. Robison said that the History Commission voted to fund up to \$2,000 for dendrochronology.
 - Ms. Blank said that regarding HABS level 1, she did not know if there was money to conduct the work; however, she left a message for developer to get onto the site.
 - Originally staff had been contacted by the President of the HOA and asked to document this site.

- Other? (ARB members)
 - Mr. Bierce said it was John Boland's last meeting as a member of the ARB. He and the ARB thanked Mr. Boland for his service.

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Burns at 7:47 p.m.