

APPROVED MINUTES

July 17, 2023

THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Fairfax County Government Center
12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035
Conference Rooms 4/5
6:30 P.M.

Members Present:

Christopher Daniel, Chairman
Jason Zellman, Vice Chairman
Michele Aubry, Treasurer
John A. Burns, FAIA
Samantha Huang
Elise Murray
Joseph Plumpe, ASLA*

Members Absent:

Susan Notkins, AIA
Karen Campblin
Steve Kulinski
Kaye Orr**

Staff Present:

Denice Dressel,
*Branch Chief, Heritage
Resources*
Corinne Bebek,
Recording Secretary

**Arrived after the commencement of meeting.*

***Joined meeting but was dismissed due to technological issues.*

Mr. Daniel opened the July 17, 2023, special meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) at 6:33 p.m. Mr. Daniel started the meeting with motions related to remote participation by an ARB Member, and public comment time limitations.

1. **Remote Participation:** None.
2. **Public comment time limitations:** No public comment for workshop sessions.

READING OF STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND INTENT OF HOD'S

Mr. Burns read a disclosure statement – Attachment 1

Mr. Zellman read the opening Statement of Purpose.

Mr. Daniel stated that the meeting is being recorded and will be posted online within 10 days.

Mr. Daniel began to read the Remote Participation Motion for Ms. Orr's approved remote participation due to a family matter; however, this motion was not completed due to technological issues experienced by the remote participant. Since physical quorum was met, Ms. Orr was dismissed and there were no remote participants present for the July 17, 2023 ARB meeting.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA- Chair

Ms. Murray moved, and was seconded by Mr. Burns, to approve the agenda, as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Daniel mentioned that presentation time should be limited 8 minutes for first presentations, and 3 minutes for resubmissions.

INTRODUCTION/RECOGNITION OF GUESTS

Ms. Dressel stated that there were no notable guests present.

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION ITEMS: None.

ITEMS FOR ACTION: None.

ITEMS FOR WORKSHOP SESSION:

- 1. ARB 23-HOL-29WS - 7318 Rippon Rd Alternative**, located in the 7318 Rippon Rd, Alexandria, tax map numbers 0934 05 0008, in the Hollin Hills HOD. The applicant is proposing a one-story addition to an existing house. Carlos Lay Piana represents the application. **PLUS # ARBWK-2023-MV-00023. Mount Vernon District**

Presentation and Discussion:

Scott Sterl gave an overview of the proposed changes for the one-story addition and recent discussions with the Zoning Evaluation Division regarding the type of application filed; Zoning Ordinance Determination is being pursued. Setback changes described and overview of revised elevations to include roof detailing highlighted.

- Mr. Daniel: Indicated that this is an improvement over previous design, requests a comparison between the original and the variance for a formal submission for informational purposes. Appreciates the distinguishment and butterfly roof; additions in this area shouldn't be the main attraction.
- Ms. Huang: Appreciates the flow of the horizontal line work, can accept this proposed scheme but is still warming to it. Acknowledgement of the difficult project.
- Mr. Burns: Houses should not be built to lot lines, some additions seem to build to lot lines and lets the houses be defined by property lines. The proposed design (option 2) is taking the house back, recognizing the geometry, and continuing original lines and keeps it an orthogonal property, likes this but is concerned regarding the cantilever. Applicant confirmed that it is not in the setback because the façade doesn't reach the lot line. Mr. Burns suggesting alternate slope for the roof to have better view to the surrounding views, applicant clarified that the window is in the proposed bathroom. Mr. Burns indicated agreement with Mr. Daniel's comments.
- Ms. Huang: Indicated that the 2 floorplans are very different, and asked which the applicant prefers. The applicant prefers the previous floorplan option and noted that it is cheaper.
- Mr. Plumpe: The modification creates a nice courtyard.
- Mr. Daniel: Noted that it seems the ARB is supportive of the changes made to the application, agrees with Mr. Plumpe on the hidden benefits of the second option and notes that the house

appears more cohesive; the original house in Hollin Hills HOD is what is sought to be preserved. Second concept is preferred option to first.

- Mr. Burns: Raised a question regarding the zoning determination, the applicant clarified it was related to vertical plane and setback for existing Variance approval. Mr. Burns noted that this seems like a subjective judgement and questioned the decision since no height restriction was listed on the easement, the applicant noted this is why they are seeking a Zoning Determination.
- 2. ARB 23-LFK-05WS - 1100 Chain Bridge Rd**, located in the 1100 Chain Bridge Rd, Mclean, tax map numbers 0223 01 0061, in the Langley Fork HOD. The applicant is proposing the demolition of the existing dwelling and site amenities and construction of a new dwelling. Kayvan Jaboori of KJ & Associates represents the application. **PLUS # ARBWK-2023-DR-00024. Dranesville District**

Presentation and Discussion:

Mr. Jaboori provided a presentation highlighting the changes to the proposal from the April 2023 ARB meeting. Footprint of house and garage reduced by approximately 2,000-square-feet (approximately 25%). Requesting ARB feedback on 6 different elevations for proposed dwelling using the design guidelines. Mr. Yussefi, project architect, provided an overview of the 6 elevation options.

- Mr. Plumpe: Is there a site plan for how this project fits into the site or were only elevations submitted. The applicant provided paper copies of this to the ARB.
- Mr. Burns: Impossible to comment on this without understating the context, the relationship with the historic properties, and site information.
- Mr. Daniel: Clarified that the elevation shown is the one that will be facing Chain Bridge Road. Appreciates reduction in square footage of dwelling since previous proposal took up entire lot. Generally needs more information on heights to understand size of windows and proposed elevation options. Mr. Daniel initially liked Option 1.
- Mr. Zellman: Requesting information on what surrounding dwellings in area look like – recessed windows, balconies, etc. Mr. Yussefi noted that the surrounding dwellings feature a variety of these details and that’s why they were selected.
- Mr. Daniel: Requested clarification if the pool would still be included, the applicant noted that the pool is still proposed.
- Mr. Plumpe: Georgetown Pike and Chain Bridge Road traffic volume concerns, façade concerns from road (wall of siding), prefers Option 1 which seems more in context with surroundings. Dormers way too small, should not be included. Appreciates the repositioning and is looking forward to the site and landscape plan submissions.
- Mr. Daniel: The shutter option seems to go too far and are nonfunctional, proportionally doesn’t work since shutters are tiny. The surrounding properties feature a prominent porch, a subdued porch may be a good addition to the design.

- Mr. Jaboori: Screening will be provided with the site design; the intent is for the house to not be visible from either road – intended to be screened by trees 8’ minimum height.
- Mr. Plumpe: Interested in materials that will be selected for building design.
- Mr. Daniel: Acknowledged the difficulty of the project based on the lot.
- Mr. Burns: Option 5 includes windows the size of a single car garage door opening. Option 5 breaks up the massing rather than a flat façade. This is an improvement from the original design, but the size of the house is out of scale from the surrounding historic properties. Need to ask the applicant to break up the façade massing. Wants ARB to understand how large the house really is. Would be nice to have comparison between the front elevation of an existing historic property in the area and this front elevation in comparison. Mr. Daniel raised the front porch idea to break up the façade. Mr. Burns noted that Option 6 diminishes the geometric break up of the mass of Option 5. Personal favorite of Mr. Burns is 5.
- Mr. Plumpe: Likes Option 5 but with smaller windows – incorporate spacing perhaps.
- Mr. Daniel: The ARB preference is Option 1 with Option 5 peak in center of façade. Next critical steps are the side façade and site layout/improvements. Mr. Jaboori noted that the applicant will be providing existing conditions and is not proposing changes to the initially provided limits of disturbance. Notes that the clients in this area prefer certain amenities on the properties.
- Mr. Daniel reiterated the importance of screening from Georgetown Pike and additional site features (proposed and existing). ARB is very interested in type of window that will be selected.
- Discussion and clarification of road elevation and grading with ARB and applicant.
- Mr. Burns: Requested clarification on the retaining wall height. Mr. Jaboori noted its between 0.5’ – 6’ and does not count as a fence since it is a retaining wall. Mr. Burns noted that this house is set in the landscape and is no longer defined by the property lines which is an improvement over the previous design as well as the reduction in size.
- ARB and applicant discussion of future workshop session versus immediately returning for an application.
- Mr. Plumpe: recommended bringing context information to the next session this applicant attends.

PRESENTATION:

Lake Anne Economic Visioning Study Final Presentation – Elizabeth Hagg and Daquan Zhou, Community Revitalization Section, DPD, presented the consultant’s findings from the Lake Anne Economic Visioning study.

Discussion:

- Mr. Daniel: Noted that Ms. Huang and Mr. Daniel were on stakeholder committee; the problem noted was the layers to get through to accomplish things – requests that the county makes it clearer/easier for Lake Anne to evolve. People love Lake Anne but unclear on who is in charge of maintaining buildings.
- Mr. Burns: Referenced aging condos and COA responsibilities. Concerned with the Crescent looming over Lake Anne potentially with changes. Wondering if anyone questioned ability to expand HOD over the Goodman Homes and other clusters.
- Mr. Daniel: Further discussion on the Crescent and involvement in process and planning. Laurel Hill example as historic property conversion for Lake Anne.
- Mr. Plumpe: Questioned where money for the improvements is coming from. Ms. Hagg clarified that through this process the county could provide information on potential options. Mr. Plumpe questioned if the county is going to take over the plaza maintenance. Ms. Hagg referenced the easements, maintenance agreements, and existing buildings/systems – seeking to propose solutions.
- Ms. Murray: Key to this is parking, people need to get there. Ms. Hagg highlighted the multiprong solution needed to accomplish this.

BOARD AND STAFF ITEMS: None.

Discussion:

ARB discussion of attendance and quorum; the enforcement of attendance bylaws and full participation of ARB. Time management of meetings and meeting room selection questions were raised.

Mr. Zellman made a motion to adjourn at 8:15 p.m.

The ARB Administrator will stamp and sign copies of approved drawings or other application documents following the meeting at which approvals are granted, or at such time as drawings amended to reflect ARB actions are received by the administrator. Applicants may be required to submit additional copies of approved drawings or other application documents. Applicants may request copies of meeting minutes within 2 weeks of the meeting at which the ARB approved the minutes. Stamped drawings, letters from administrator documenting ARB action or copies of relevant minutes are required prior to projects being approved by county review and permitting agencies.

For further information contact, Denice Dressel, Chief, Heritage Resources Branch, ARB Administrator, Fairfax County Department of Planning and Development (DPD), at (703) 324-1380.

ATTACHMENT 1: Mr. Burns' Disclosure Statement

I, John Burns, under Virginia Code Sec. 2.2-3112(B)(1) and 2.2-3115(H), declare my personal interest in transactions brought before the Architectural Review Board involving the Hollin Hills HOD and specifically state the following for the July 17, 2023, ARB meeting:

- (i) Action items ARB 23-HOL-27 – 7309 Stafford Road grading plan, ARB 23-HOL-28 – 7411 Recard Lane site, grading, and landscape plans, ARB 23-HOL-26 – 7411 Recard Lane renovation, involve the Hollin Hills Historic Overlay District;
- (ii) The nature of my personal interest is that I own and reside in a home that is valued at over \$5,000* and is located in the Hollin Hills HOD;
- (iii) I am a member of a group of three or more persons who are members of which are affected by the transaction; and
- (iv) I am able to participate in the transactions fairly, objectively, and in the public interest.
- (v) Regarding action items ARB 23-HOL-23 and -24 – 7211 Rebecca Drive for a special permit and an addition, I am personal friends with the applicants and will recuse myself from the review of their application.