FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD 2009

Chairman: John A. Burns, FAIA
Vice-Chairman: John Boland
Treasurer: Mark Searle

September 10, 2009

Dear Mr. Caperton:

This letter is to provide comment from the Architectural Review Board (ARB) on the Revised Master Plan for the Laurel Hill Adaptive Reuse Area of the former D.C. Reformatory and Penitentiary at Lorton. The ARB appreciates the opportunity you afforded us for review and comment on the plan proposals at four ARB meetings held between June 2008 and May 2009. We support the efforts which have been made to develop a master plan for the adaptive reuse of the D.C. Reformatory and Penitentiary and acknowledge the complexity of the project.

As you know, the ARB's responsibility is "to advise and assist the Board of Supervisors in its efforts to preserve and protect historic, architectural, and archaeological resources in the County". It is with this responsibility in mind that the ARB provided review and comment on the proposed plans at its October 2008 and May 2009 meetings.

At its June 11, 2009 meeting the ARB opted not to take a formal up or down vote on the revised master plan. However, members felt they have a strong obligation to spell out their concerns and provide this letter as a formal response to the issues they raised.

One of the documents that the ARB referred to as it reviewed the proposed master plan was the *Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings and for new Construction in the Laurel Hill Adaptive Reuse Area*. In particular, the ARB referred to the locations for new construction identified in the document on Map 5, page 65. The proposed master plan identified many of these same areas for new construction. While it was not necessarily anticipated that new construction would take place in every location the standards and guidelines identified as possible locations for new construction, we believe that the proposed master plan adheres to these guidelines.

The ARB supports the concept of a mixed use development for the adaptive reuse area. However, the ARB continues to have concerns with the effect of master plan on the historic properties and impact on the historic character of the site. The concerns raised by the ARB are:

1. Penitentiary wall: The amount of the Penitentiary wall that is shown on the revised master plan to be demolished and removed. Members have indicated that they can not support a proposal that removes the amount of wall shown on the revised master plan. We understand that the amount and location of wall removal will impact access to the site. We further understand that access to the site is required. We do not support the access as shown due to the amount of wall that would be required to be removed.

2. Use integration: The location and lack of the integration of retail and residential components. Residential and retail uses appear too separated. Retail is concentrated at the edges of the site and not at the interior of the site with the reuse of historic buildings. Retail use at the interior of the site would be a way to bring people into the site to experience the historic buildings.

3. Parking: Parking type, amount and location. Proposed amount of surface parking is problematic, negatively affecting the historic character of the site. Parking does not appear well integrated into the site and appears remote in relationship to the use it is proposed to serve.

We believe that comments made by ARB members during the discussion of the proposed plan are helpful to further understand the concerns listed above as well as highlighting comments from individual members. To provide that information, the minutes from the ARB meetings of June 12 and October 28, 2008 and May 14, 2009 are attached along with a summary prepared by Fairfax County staff of the comments by ARB members at the May 14, 2009 ARB meeting regarding the proposed master plan.

We believe that the three concerns stated above must be resolved and addressed in a manner more compatible with the historic character of the site and that these concerns can be addressed and resolved during the development review process. We request that the Project Advisory Committee consider the following in its recommendation to the Board of Supervisors:

1. Penitentiary wall: More of the Penitentiary wall should be retained than what is currently shown on the revised master plan. The ARB can not support a proposal that removes the amount of wall shown for demolition on the revised master plan. The access through the wall as shown with the extent of wall proposed for removal be restudied.

2. Use integration: The retail and residential components should be better integrated. Do not separate the residential and retail uses to the extent shown on the revised master plan. Concentrate more of the retail at the interior of the site rather than at the edges of the site and use historic buildings at the interior of the site for retail.

3. Parking: Restudy the parking type, amount and location. Reduce the amount of surface parking to protect the historic character of the site. Integrate parking into the site. Locate parking so it does not appear remote in relationship to the use it is proposed to serve.

We understand that adaptive reuse of historic properties requires some flexibility to accommodate new uses. However, we believe that unless the ARB's concerns cited above are addressed, that the master plan will fall short in protecting the historic resources and historic character of the adaptive reuse area.

Again, the ARB thanks you for the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed plan. The ARB continues to support the concept of a mixed use development for the adaptive reuse area. We also support you in your efforts to develop a master plan that will best protect this historic property. The ARB looks forward to continued participation in the review of this project during the development review and re-zoning process.

Sincerely,

John Boland
ARB, Vice-Chairman

cc: Supervisor Gerald W. Hyland

Enclosures: (4)
ARB meetings minutes: June 12 and October 28, 2008 and May 14, 2009
Summary document of the May 14, 2009 ARB meeting

APPROVED MINUTES

June 12, 2008

THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Members Present:

John A. Burns, FAIA, *Chairman*
John Boland, *Vice Chairman*
Mark Searle, *Treasurer*
Richard Bierce, AIA
Peter Juanpere, AIA
Bob Mobley, AIA
Elise Murray, *Ex-Officio*
Susan Notkins, AIA
Joy Ortiz, AIA

Members Excused:

Pamela Cressey, PhD, RPA
Joseph Plumpe, ASLA

Members Absent:

Staff Present:

Linda Blank,
Fairfax Department of Planning & Zoning
Beth Iannetta,
Recording Secretary

Mr. Burns opened the June 2008 meeting of the ARB at 6:30 p.m. in Room 4/5 at the Government Center. Mr. Bierce read the Statement of Purpose.

> **Motion to Approve Meeting Agenda:** Ms. Notkins moved that the ARB approve the June 12, 2008 meeting agenda as submitted. The motion, seconded by Mr. Juanpere, was approved. (7-0)

PRESENTATION ITEM:

- **Master Development Plan for the Adaptive Reuse Area of the Former Lorton Prison Reformatory and Penitentiary at Laurel Hill:** The Alexander Company, selected by the county to create a master development plan for the Adaptive Reuse Area of the Former Lorton Prison Reformatory and Penitentiary at Laurel Hill, provided information and solicited input from the ARB. The Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ) staff provided an introduction and overview. Natalie Bock, Senior Development Project Manager and Tom Miller represented The Alexander Company. Chris Caperton, Laurel Hill Project Coordinator, and Leanna O'Donnell, Senior Planner, represented the DPZ.
    - Mr. Chris Caperton provided background and overview of the master development process. He explained that the master developer was in the process of soliciting input from stakeholders of which the ARB is one.
    - Ms. Natalie Bock gave a brief overview of the company and a selection of projects The Alexander Company has worked on that relate to the adaptive reuse area project. She highlighted Fox River Mills in Appleton, Wisconsin, Central Station in Memphis Tennessee, and the National Park Seminary in Silver Spring, Maryland.
    - Mr. Tom Miller discussed some of the preliminary analysis the project team had worked on to date. The company's experience has shown historic buildings are great for housing but are not as feasible for reuse as commercial spaces. Residential units are best designed for 1-2 bedroom and do not attract high volumes of families. The larger project team visited the site and focused on issues of ingress and egress and zones of use. They plan to explore the best potential for tax credits and adhere to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. According to the diagram/map displayed several zones had been designated for specific uses. Zone 1 and 2 would be primarily residential. Zone 3

would be mixed us. Zone 4 appears to be a main street corridor but it would be difficult to access. The consultants view this as a transition area. Zone 5 would be for new construction areas. Moving forward from the zoning diagram the project team would establish critical view corridors, ingress and egress points and a general circulation patterns. They envisioned infill between buildings to introduce residential courtyards. Off site access of Silverbrook Road will be difficult to address as the plan develops. Less character-defining buildings or less important ones could be removed. Mr. Miller discussed openings in the penitentiary wall varying in widths from wide openings to perforations. Reduction of the wall height should be considered. After the preliminary findings, the floor was open for ARB questions.

- Mr. Bierce felt the presentation was a good informative start. The zoning concept needed more development along the Silverbrook Road edge. He inquired how the automobile would be handled considering it was never an integral part of the overall site. He commented the wall is critical. Introducing architectural elements within the wall is less favorable in his opinion.
- Mr. Mobley asked if they considered structural parking. They confirmed they are still exploring that option. Mr. Mobley stressed the importance of the penitentiary wall. The space that is currently open might jeopardize the character of the site. The rhythm of the buildings is very disciplined. Any new elements would have to be comparable. Mr. Bierce added the architecture of new construction would be a struggle of compatibility versus harmonious contrast. Mr. Mobley agreed they are off to a very interesting start.
- Mr. Bierce asked how they characterized their approach to new construction.
- Mr. Miller suggested that both compatibility and harmonious contrast be considered. He noted that compatibility of scale, proportions, rhythm and materials is important but the resulting design can be harmonious contrast. He emphasized the importance of quality character for new construction.
- In regards to commercial development, Ms. Notkins suggested they reaffirm if it would be allowed for the general public or whether it must be restricted to residents use only. She recalled that this was an issue at the workhouse site for LAF. Staff advised that this would be looked into.
- Mr. Burns inquired about the consultant's timeline. The master plan process is expected to take 6-8 months. They anticipate delivery around December 2008. In terms of financial issues, they have initiated discussions with federal and state agencies regarding tax credit options and they will be meeting on-site with these agencies and county staff.
- Mr. Caperton said they are looking for a buy-in from citizens, the ARB and the PAC. This will not be adopted by the Board of Supervisors at this point. A financial analysis with an emphasis on minimizing the burden on the tax payer will be part of the product.
- Mr. Boland asked if they envisioned the site to be a destination or a neighborhood development. Currently they are geared toward a village type development.

ACTION ITEMS:

- **Review and recommendation for landscaping and site features** for the property located at 13928 Lee Highway as stipulated by SE 2005-SU-031 development conditions. The ARB must review and comment on the landscaping plan which is to include site lighting and internal pedestrian connections and on the architectural surface treatment of all retaining walls.

APPROVED MINUTES

October 28, 2008

THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Members Present:

John Boland, *Vice Chairman*
Mark Searle, *Treasurer*
Richard Bierce, AIA
Peter Juanpere, AIA
Bob Mobley, AIA
Elise Murray, *Ex-Officio*
Susan Notkins, AIA
Joseph Plumpe, ASLA

Members Excused:

John A. Burns, FAIA, *Chairman*
Pamela Cressey, PhD, RPA
Joy Ortiz, AIA

Members Absent:

Staff Present:

Linda Blank, *Fairfax Department of Planning & Zoning*
Chris Caperton, *Fairfax Department of Planning & Zoning*
Leanna O'Donnell, *Fairfax Department of Planning & Zoning*
Beth Iannetta, *Recording Secretary*

Mr. Boland opened the October 28, 2008 meeting of the ARB at 6:30 p.m. in Room 7 at the Government Center. He explained this special meeting is being held for review and comment on the draft master plan for the Adaptive Reuse of the former Lorton Prison Reformatory and Penitentiary as prepared by The Alexander Company. As stated at previous ARB meetings, Mr. Burns, the ARB Chairman, would recuse himself from any discussions regarding this application. He was not in attendance for this meeting and discussion.

PRESENTATION ITEM:

- **Alexander Company Presentation**: Review of the Draft Master Plan for the Adaptive Reuse of the former Lorton Prison Reformatory and Penitentiary. The Alexander Company, selected by the county to create a master development plan for the Adaptive Reuse Area of the Former Lorton Prison Reformatory and Penitentiary at Laurel Hill, has prepared a draft master plan and summary of findings to date. The Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for the Lorton Correctional Complex stipulates that the ARB will be invited to give comment on redevelopment or adaptive use strategies for private development in the adaptive reuse area. Input from the ARB was sought in accordance with the MOA. Chris Caperton, Laurel Hill Project Coordinator, and Leanna O'Donnell, Senior Planner, represented the Department of Planning & Zoning.
    - Chris Caperton, of the Department of Planning and Zoning staff, opened the discussion with introductions. He distributed an overview memo regarding the site including the recommendations contained in the county's Comprehensive Plan. He explained that the Task Force has made several recommendations. Based on the proposal to date, some new construction may be needed in the future. He turned the discussion over to Mr. Tom Miller, of the Alexander Company.
    - Mr. Miller recapped the plan as discussed at the October 9th ARB meeting. He hoped the ARB members had more time to review the information in order to provide detailed comments. He welcomed their responses and feedback.
    - Mr. Bierce began by acknowledging the complexity of the project. He stressed that the Comprehensive Plan recommendations were guidelines and not limits. They should be considered a threshold for what the site could be today and for the foreseeable future. With that in mind, he offered a few thoughts on the proposal. An important topic to

consider is how to incorporate new, contemporary architecture into the overall design. For the stakeholders involved, the proposal lacks a sense of place that will be crucial to its success. The site lacks connectivity, not just within its borders, but with the surrounding community. The team should rethink how the site relates to the places next door to it. The remaining open space seems unusable. There is no clear understanding or relationship, no hierarchy or meaning. He recommended that any new construction be contemporary in design and not imitative. The pedestrian circulation needs to be strengthened throughout the entire complex. In terms of vehicular circulation he perceived lots of cars with no real effort to incorporate public transportation in and around the site. Zone 1 seemed sufficiently appropriate and he was not particularly opposed to row-townhouses. The key is not to be intrusive on the existing historic character. The chapel within this zone needed to play a more definitive role. The main street concept becomes a critical area to the overall community. Zone 2 had more complexity given its location. He recommends shifting the proposed housing to the southwest to an area that is under-utilized. This would be less intrusive to the existing ball field. Zone 4 was the most troublesome of the others. Lots of time was spent discussing the corner building's proposed design in previous years. The retail component is extremely suburban in nature. He strongly urged the consultant to increase the creativity and ingenuity to provide a bold statement that reflects and responds to its critical location. He considered the parking component excessively suburban in nature. He recommended they break it up, or find another alternative to deal with it. The retail center contained within the penitentiary walls is understandably necessary, but he believed its success is attainable without tearing down as much of the wall as currently shown. This aspect needs the most work and restudy. Overall, Mr. Bierce supports the efforts made to this point, but the Alexander Company just isn't there yet. (Mr. Bierce submitted written comments which are part of the record.

- Mr. Mobley commented that he considered the Comprehensive Plan numbers to be flexible. The proposed density needs more imagination. He suggested one way to address this is to go vertical with some buildings. He was concerned the site had only surface parking lots. In his opinion, the proposed parking is killing the overall character of the site. It is just inundated by paving. Mr. Mobley said he was less optimistic about the design challenges than Mr. Bierce seemed. He felt if structured parking is a possibility, it needed to be seriously considered. He wasn't comfortable with "the knuckle" component of the design. There might be an opportunity to construct terraced residential units that play off the existing grades of the site. He thought that too much of the wall was proposed to be removed. He questioned if the best use of the chapel was residential.
- Ms. Notkins commented there appeared to be the same amount of parking lots as there were buildings on the site. She agreed with Mr. Mobley regarding an opportunity to use the steep grades in order to hide layers of development or parking structures in them. She would not be supportive of a proposal with the amount of penitentiary wall loss shown currently. It needs more thought and study. She inquired about the public transportation considered for the site (i.e. shuttle buses paired with satellite parking lots). The pedestrian circulation is forced and not responsive to how people will really move through the buildings and zones. She suggested that they make an effort to build a relationship with the Lorton Arts Foundation group as they progress with their plans. She suggested they

look at the development along P Street in Washington DC as an example of how to truly maximize uses within a building.

- Mr. Plumpe was concerned over the lack of quality retail within the surrounding community and he hoped this site would offer the opportunity to provide it. As mentioned before, the parking needs some creative rethinking. If surface lots are used, then he recommended they include some quality streetscape elements to help break them up. The pedestrian linkage needs more thought as well. The proposed retail seems geared to the people who are going to live there. There needs to be a well thought out approach as to how they will access these services. The central green area needs to be larger. The proposal seems to have "short-changed" it. He stressed that they should not overlook the access points to Lorton Road and also the connections to the high school, Spring Hill community, and across Silverbrook Road. From personal experience he commented that there are no great dining experiences in the area. Opportunities for restaurants or a "food court" could really raise the "wow" factor if it's designed and incorporated correctly. He cited Easton, Ohio, Reston Town Center, Shirlington, and Bethesda Row as places to look to for ideas.
- Mr. Searle was not clear on how the ball field fits into the proposal. He saw it as a missed opportunity and he wasn't really buying into the idea of the townhouse element providing the sense of place that the site deserved. Mr. Mobley agreed with his comment. He added that a sense of place should be provided at the retail components and not at someone's house. Mr. Mobley suggested switching the elements around by placing the residential at the ends of the site and relocating the retail in "the knuckle".
- Mr. Juanpere commented that the vehicular circulation trumps all the other elements that have been proposed. As it is designed currently, people would drive over, hop out, and pick up what they needed and then drive back home. He suggested they look at places like the Fairfax Corner development that have some elements that pedestrians can relate to. It's a place where people can say, "I'll meet you at the fountain" and everyone knows what they are referring to when going there. This proposal doesn't have those special kinds of elements.
- Mr. Boland felt from a previous presentation they are trying to create a destination type of place. He considered the design interesting but very disjointed in trying to accomplish this. He suggested they pull the mixed use elements closer to the residential so they can balance each other out.

Public Comments:

- Mr. Neil McBride, of the Lorton Heritage Society, thought that the plan should be deferred for additional comment. The main issues of concern were alternate housing options at the ball field location, the impact of the new tree preservation ordinance, and opportunities to provide workforce and magnet housing. He suggested that they also explore any opportunities they can for land swaps that have been used in recent years.
- Mr. Tim Sargent, an At-Large member of the Planning Commission, cautioned against comparing this site to many of the examples given (Fairfax Corner, Reston, etc.), since those examples are developed at higher densities without historic preservation restrictions. . While he wasn't in favor of having the application deferred, he did like hearing that the ARB was supportive of trying to create a destination place and hub of activity for the community to enjoy. He was also supportive of the idea of increased height and exploring the sloped areas as an additional opportunity.

- Mr. Boland inquired about the Alexander Company's next steps seeing how this meeting felt more like a Workshop Session. There appears to be other stakeholder input that needs to be submitted for consideration. Mr. Miller stated that they anticipate another design submittal for review either at the end of 2008 or sometime early next year.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately at 8:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Beth Iannetta
Recording Secretary

APPROVED MINUTES

May 14, 2009

THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Members Present:

John A. Burns, FAIA, *Chairman*
John Boland, *Vice Chairman*
Mark Searle, *Treasurer*
Bob Mobley, AIA
Elise Murray, *Ex-Officio*
Joy Ortiz, AIA
Joseph Plumpe, ASLA

Members Excused:

Richard Bierce, AIA
Peter Juanpere, AIA
Susan Notkins, AIA

Members Absent:

Staff Present:

Linda Blank,
Fairfax Department of Planning & Zoning
Beth Iannetta,
Recording Secretary

Mr. Burns opened the May 2009 meeting of the ARB at 6:40 p.m. in Room 4/5 at the Government Center. Ms. Ortiz read the Statement of Purpose.

Approval of the Agenda: Mr. Plumpe moved that the ARB place item **ARB 09-SUL-01** to the consent calendar and approve the May 2009 Agenda as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Searle and approved.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

- **ARB-09-HLY-01: The proposed enclosure** of an existing carport located at 7140 Harrison Lane in the Huntley Historic Overlay District. The existing 10' 10" X 21' 3" gabled-roof carport would be enclosed to construct a bedroom and bath. The façade is proposed to be white vinyl siding to match existing. The mid-20th century rambler is a non-contributing property in the district and is not visible from Huntley.

- **ARB-09-SUL-01: The proposed installation** of HVAC units located at 3675 Centerview Drive in the Sully Historic Overlay District. Additional HVAC ground units would be installed adjacent to the west façade of the building. At its February 12, 2004 meeting, the ARB approved (ARB-04-SUL-01) for the construction of a one story 22' high, 20,400 square foot, addition and site improvements at the property. The site improvements included constructing a new access drive to Centerview Drive, a security fence, landscape plantings, expanding the existing asphalt parking area, constructing concrete sidewalk, and concrete pad for housing mechanical units and installing free standing light poles and wall mounted lighting.

> **Motion to Approve:** Mr. Mobley made a motion to approve items **ARB-09-HLY-01** and **ARB-09-SUL-01** on the Consent Calendar with no further discussion. The motion, seconded by Ms. Ortiz, was approved. (6-0)

ACTION ITEM:

- **ARB-09-LOR-01: The proposed construction** of five new multifamily residential units at a portion of the former Lorton Correctional Facility, "Spring Hill Senior Campus", a graduated care residential community. At its March 10 and April 14, 2005 meetings, the ARB approved

five multi-family, three story units above parking. At its January 8, and March 12, 2009 meetings the ARB approved a new application to construct five multi-family, four story units with garage entries at the two side elevations of the first level with the condition that the actual materials samples be presented to ARB for review and approval. Ms. Inda Stagg, Walch Colucci, PC, and Mr. Griffith, from Pulte Home Corp., represented the application.

- The materials and color samples were submitted for review. Several small drawing detail errors were pointed out by Mr. Mobley for the applicant to be aware of and to correct.
- The roof pitch had been sloped from the front to the back of the building. The previous suggestion by Ms. Notkins to move the downspouts around the corner of the building and out of sight could not be accommodated as originally hoped. Mr. Griffiths distributed pictures from a similar project to demonstrate what the final design would look like. Mr. Plumpe requested the 4" downspouts be painted with a satin finish and not gloss. Mr. Burns asked for a clarification on the balcony railings. The applicant explained they proposed a cable railing.

> **Motion to Approve:** Ms. Ortiz made a motion for the ARB to approve application ARB 09-LOR-01 with the recommendation to paint the downspouts with a satin finish. The motion, seconded by Mr. Searle, was approved (6-0).

- **ARB-09-CTV-01: The proposed demolition** of a residential building located at 5709 Mount Gilead Road in the Centreville Historic Overlay District. The c. 1940 structure is non-contributing to the historic overlay district. The single story frame dwelling is unoccupied and boarded up. The property is now owned by the Fairfax County Park Authority and is located in the Historic Centreville Park. Ms. Karen Lindquist, FCPA, represented the proposal.

- The derelict building has been vandalized since it's been boarded up. It is located directly across the street from the Sears-Spindle House but it not a contributing structure to the historic overlay district. Minimal archeological work is planned for the site. Some Royal Oaks still remain on the property. The Park Authority plans to leave the lot as open space after the proposed demolition for now. The lot was not included in the Historic Centreville Park Master Plan. Since the Park Authority is now the property owner on record, the master plan would be revisited if the lot were to be included.

> **Motion to Approve:** Mr. Boland made a motion for the ARB to approve item **ARB-09-CTV-01** as submitted. The motion, seconded by Mr. Plumpe, was approved. (6-0)

PRESENTATION ITEM:

- **Review of the revised Master Plan** for the Adaptive Reuse of the former Lorton Prison Reformatory and Penitentiary. The Alexander Company, selected by the county to create a master development plan for the Adaptive Reuse Area of the Former Lorton Prison Reformatory and Penitentiary at Laurel Hill, has prepared a revised master plan. The Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for the Lorton Correctional Complex stipulates that the ARB be invited to give comment on redevelopment or adaptive use strategies for private development in the adaptive reuse area. At its special meeting on October 28, 2008, the ARB provided comment on the first draft of the master plan. Input from the ARB was again sought in accordance with the MOA.

- Mr. Burns turned the meeting over to Mr. Boland and recused himself from any and all discussion and left the room.
- Ms. Blank recommended the ARB submit their written comments like their comments were submitted for the Lake Anne Village proposal. The comment summary process worked well and could be beneficial for this application. No formal ARB action is required for this presentation item.
- Mr. Caperton, of DPZ, relayed the request of the Laurel Hill Advisory Committee that written comments be submitted from all stakeholders.
- The Alexander Company representatives (Brad Elmer and Tom Miller) began the presentation with a quick overview of the work they have accomplished in the year they have worked on the project. Several revisions have been made based on the feedback they received to date. The biggest change was the bi-axial approach to the proposed Great Lawn, Central Park and the North Green areas within the site. Various levels of circulation were depicted on the master plan including a main roadway that would be the spine or backbone of the area. The mid-point of the site is the Central Park area. This open space would be reserved for recreational space, neighborhood gatherings and farmer's market type of events. New residential units were proposed along the main roadway and Central Park. These areas also tie into the Greenway bicycle/recreational trails located on the north and south of the site and into the overall circulation pattern. The entire site has a variety of housing styles that provide greater flexibility of what types get placed where. The proposal currently calls for 53 magnet housing and 118 market-value units for a total of 171 rental residential units within the existing historic buildings. In addition to those units, 181 new residential units are proposed for a total of 352 units on the site.
- Retail and mixed-use areas were proposed closer to the Silverbrook Rod entrance. The Penitentiary wall would be modified by removing portions of the north, south and east walls. Parking would be located near the remaining walls and adjacent to the proposed new retail buildings. A grocery store could be located within the existing historic dining hall building and neighborhood office type uses could occupy the historic cell block buildings along the arcade.
- Based on discussion from previous presentations, they looked into structured parking but it proved to be cost prohibitive.
- Nine contributing structures are proposed for demolition as part of this proposal.
- The Alexander Company ran some initial cost estimates for the revised proposal. The estimated project cost is $148 million with $29 million of that for site work alone. The estimated federal and state historic tax credit is $16.6 million and the estimated housing tax credit is $6.1 million. Based on these estimates, $8-12 million would still be needed in order to cover the estimate total project cost.
- Mr. Boland inquired on the master plan timeline and if fully funded how long would it be before dirt would be turned on site. The master plan process is coming to a close. The Advisory Committee next meeting is June 15 to review the revised plan and comments that have been received. In terms of actual construction, it would be several years out in order to draw up construction documents, get review approval and secure permits.
- **Public Comments:** Mr. Neil McBride, on behalf of the Newington Forest Community Association, read a letter from Mrs. Jan Throckmorton and submitted it for the record.

- **ARB Comment:** Ms. Murray asked the applicant to clarify the proposal for the existing guard towers on site, in particular tower #8. The applicant confirmed all existing towers would remain. At least one is proposed to be renovated as a viewing tower.
- Mr. Mobley commented that the proposed entrance through the north wall is forced. He would prefer the circulation pattern find another way around instead of just taking down walls to move traffic through the site. He was not comfortable with removing as much of the wall as they propose and getting so little in return for it. The North Green area is completely chopped up by vehicular traffic. Overall the vehicular traffic patterns need to be restudied- the site seemed overloaded with roadways. The townhouse area is where creativity really needed to happen and this plan falls short. Several parking lots seem located in random locations that it is unclear which use they are supposed to serve.
- Mr. Plumpe commented that the proposal is too suburban in nature and it needs to be more urban. He understood their vision was to bring a unique community to the area, however one side of the site seems off limits if you don't live there. Last time he recommended "restaurants, restaurants, restaurants" but this proposal falls short on the types of things that would make this site a destination. He recommends the applicant hold a real design charette with the community instead of just a presentation. He agreed with Mr. Mobley that the proposed parking seemed too remote for the uses. Overall he was disappointed. The proposal is still missing that "wow" factor- it's just okay. The townhouse design has all the driveways and garages along the front façade and that just diminishes the urban character entirely. He suggested they look toward an alley-style townhouse unit.
- Ms. Murray commented that the History Commission was opposed to the restaurant pad location. The existing wall was reduced to a series of pillars which diminishes its character completely. On a personal level, she feels baseball diamonds are unfriendly places to be when not in use. She preferred the space be more of a pick-up game type of park that would adapt to more sports than a formal baseball diamond would. Overall the proposal needs more public interest uses deeper within the site.
- Mr. Searle was curious about the History Commissions position on the proposed demolition of the nine contributing structures. Ms. Murray reported they defer to the ARB on the issue at this time.
- Ms. Ortiz agreed with most of the comments made already. The site needs more retail integrated throughout the site. A true mix of residential and retail is still lacking in the proposal.

WORKSHOP ITEM:

- **Workshop session** on the proposed refuse enclosures and associated landscaping at "Spring Hill Senior Campus" Ms. Inda Stagg, Walch Colucci, PC, and representatives from Pulte Home Corp. represented the workshop item.
  - The proposed enclosures are three sided brick structure with panel doors. They are generally located on the right rear side of each building. The materials would be the same as used on the nearby buildings which have already been approved. Evergreen vegetation is proposed to help screen them from view.
  - No major issues were raised at this time and Mr. Burns recommended they submit the item for the Consent Calendar once it has received its required VDHR review.
  -

SUMMARY OF AGENDA ITEM May 14, 2009 MEETING
THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD (ARB)

PRESENTATION ITEM:

5. Review of the revised Master Plan for the Adaptive Reuse of the former Lorton Prison Reformatory and Penitentiary. The Alexander Company, selected by the county to create a master development plan for the Adaptive Reuse Area of the Former Lorton Prison Reformatory and Penitentiary at Laurel Hill, has prepared a revised master plan. The Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for the Lorton Correctional Complex stipulates that the ARB will be invited to give comment on redevelopment or adaptive use strategies for private development in the adaptive reuse area. At its special meeting on October 28, 2008, the ARB provided comment on the first draft of the master plan. Input from the ARB is again being sought in accordance with the MOA.

Meeting Summary prepared by Fairfax County Department of Planning and Zoning staff on May 15, 2009. This summary was reviewed by ARB members for accuracy. The ARB has taken no formal action to approve this summary.

John Boland

1. What is the projected timeframe for the project?
   The Alexander Company and staff are preparing to take the plan to the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) in June. The PAC will make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors this summer. Upon completion of a development agreement and the hiring of a developer, the development review process will begin. This process (rezoning, site plan review) is estimated to take approximately two years to complete.

Elise Murray

2. Tower 8 is missing from the diagram – will it remain or be demolished?
   Tower 8 (R-61) is a metal tower that sits along the patrol road. It is not planned for demolition. It would not be part of the planned tower tour. It was stated that all towers on the site will remain.

3. Support a community green over a baseball use in the ball field area. Need a use to draw people further into the site. (Ms. Murray noted that her individual view on this item differed from that of the History Commission.)

4. History Commission voiced concern about the northern pad site and the potential to block the views of the wall. Concern was also voiced about the pilasters as indicators of the wall location rather than preserving more of the wall. Commissioners were also concerned about the loss of the ballfield.

5. The History Commission made no statement about the proposed demolition of buildings, but their formal and final comments have not been compiled.

Robert Mobley

6. Believe the entrance through the wall at White Spruce Way is being forced and another way into the site should be considered. Not clear about what is being accomplished by coming in at this point through the wall when there is another access point proposed off of Silverbrook Road.

7. Not comfortable with the amount of wall removed. Retaining pilasters as only remnants of prison wall does not work.

8. The northern green area is crossed three times by vehicular traffic which is too disruptive.

9. Parking is too far from the townhomes.

10. Vehicular traffic flow and location of roadways requires further study.

11. Reconsider the road through the ball field area.

12. Too many roads make it appear unsafe for pedestrians.

13. How many stories are the various uses – retail, townhomes, and commercial?

14. The townhouse components are the best opportunity for creativity and it appears that an opportunity has been lost.

15. Townhouses with garages are not the most attractive and will receive negative feedback from the ARB. Not pedestrian friendly to have driveways at sidewalk.

16. Consider another type of housing unit.

17. All of the proposed streets may not be allowed.

18. Consider more density and locate more buildings south of the Penitentiary buildings in the area shown for parking.

Joe Plumpe

19. Looks suburban in nature. Pad site at Silverbrook suburban.

20. Needs more retail and unique retail. Consider looking at the retail in a 4-mile radius to see what is needed.

21. Consider bringing retail deeper into the site – at the old laundry building, for example, or around the central green area.

22. Consider expanding the restaurant base on the site. A restaurant like Mike's American Grill would work at this location, perhaps in the Power Plant.

23. Activated retail at the site would work on a ground-floor level in combination with residential or commercial space

24. Has there been a design charrette with the neighborhoods? Suggest conducting one with people bringing in ideas of restaurants and retail they would like to see.

25. Liked the "fingers" that joined the Reformatory dorms in the previous draft master plan.

26. Consider live/work space around the central green to activate the area.

27. The power plant is a good opportunity – 4 stories – for retail.

28. Consider the demolition of the Administration Building (R-67) to open the views from the quadrangle to the golf course.

29. Parking seems remote from the commercial buildings.

30. Need good pedestrian connection to the Spring Hill community.

31. Overall, slightly disappointed; wish the plan was denser and more walkable.

32. Suggest use of alleys for accessibility, this design more urban.

33. Parking is always an issue. Structured parking is expensive but Pulte is doing it. Consider tucking the parking under the buildings. This may take care of some of the surface parking.

<u>Joy Ortiz</u>

34. Need more integration of the retail and residential components of the site, now they seem too separated.