

APPROVED MINUTES

September 18, 2023

THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Fairfax County Government Center
12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035
Conference Rooms 2/3
6:30 P.M.

Members Present:

Christopher Daniel, Chairman
Jason Zellman, Vice Chairman
Michele Aubry, Treasurer
Samantha Huang
Elise Murray
Kaye Orr
Joseph Plumpe, ASLA
Steve Kulinski

Members Absent:

Susan Notkins, AIA
Karen Campblin
John A. Burns, FAIA

Staff Present:

Daniel White,
ARB Administrator, Heritage Resources
Stephanie Newman,
Planner, Heritage Resources
Corinne Bebek,
Recording Secretary

Mr. Daniel opened the September 18, 2023, special meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) at 6:37 p.m. Mr. Daniel started the meeting with 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. Zellman read the opening Statement of Purpose.

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

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA- Chair

Ms. Murray moved, and was seconded by Ms. Aubry, 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: None.

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION ITEMS: None.

ITEMS FOR ACTION: None.

ITEMS FOR WORKSHOP SESSION:

1. **ARB-23-ROB-01WS – Richert Waterwheel at Robey's Mill** located at 12124 Popes Head Rd Fairfax, tax map 0673 01 0010B, in the Robey's Mill HOD. The applicant is proposing to install a decorative wood waterwheel on Robey's Mill to restore the original appearance of Robey's Mill. Allyn Richert represents the application. **PLUS # ARB-2023-SP-00045. Springfield District.**

Presentation and Discussion:

Allyn Richert provided an overview of the proposal, including existing conditions and the proposed upgrades.

Ms. Orr: Will water be diverted from the Piney Branch to get water to the mill? Mr. Richert described that there would be a pipe with pump conveying the water from Piney Branch, the pump would have an on/off switch.

Mr. Plumpe: Commends the project and asked how often the wheel would be turned on, the applicant indicated there is not an anticipated schedule but likely overnight. Mr. Plumpe asked additional clarification questions regarding the fencing shown and proposed. Mr. Daniel agreed with the concern and raised fence location questions regarding the perimeter of the mill.

Mr. Daniel: indicates that the fence should be larger to give more space to the mill and Piney Branch to allow for increased safety buffering. Requesting an application package that includes fencing information and details shown on a plan. Additional questions raised regarding the design inspiration for the proposed mill, Mr. Richert described the mill shown on the cover of the workshop materials and indicated that the spacing shown is accurate. Mr. Daniel indicated that there is a fixed area to work in for the mill since the structure is existing. Mr. Daniel asked what is planned for the stone wall shown, Mr. Richert indicated the wall is structurally stable and repointing may occur but otherwise no work is anticipated or required. Mr. Daniel requested additional clarification on the stone and masonry work that will occur to match in-kind as best as possible with a formal application so as to not damage the original stone wall. Mr. Richert indicated that he would request the additional clarification for the stonework.

Mr. Kulinski: also commends the project. Raised a question regarding the proposed materials (western red cedar, cedar, and white painted fences) and requested consistency in materials between the fence and the wheel, or new fence and existing. Mr. Richert indicated that some of the site materials and changes were due to road expansions but indicated that he would look into this.

Mr. Plumpe: indicated that the white fence may tie in nicely with the existing fence but Mr. Richert indicated there would need to be additional safety fencing if the same white fence is used for the mill. Mr. Richert indicated that this would be under consideration prior to submission of a formal application. Mr. Kulinski indicated that a cedar or western red cedar fence would age naturally into the landscape and serve as background to the mill rather than a white fence.

Mr. Daniel: requesting a plan view of the fence with the formal application submission and any information on the approach from the mill designer would be helpful. The ARB expressed interest in visiting the site once the mill is completed.

2. **ARB-23-SMC-04WS – 5640 Ox Road New Single-Family House** located at 5640 Ox Rd Fairfax Station, tax map 0771 01 0057, in the St. Mary’s Church HOD. The applicant is proposing infill construction of a two-story single-family house. Sunny Raheja represents the application. **PLUS # ARBWK-2023-SP-00027. Springfield District.**

Presentation and Discussion:

Mr. Raheja provided an overview of the proposal and the changes from the previous submission in January 2023 and indicated that he has samples of the proposed building materials.

Mr. Daniel: appreciates the changes made and finds the proposed design an improvement over the previous submission.

Mr. Plumpe: indicated a preference for the currently proposed garage area over the line drawing shown in the presentation. Ms. Orr asked a clarification question regarding the proposed garage area and the arching shown in the line drawing, Robert Sastro, project architect, provided clarification that the line drawing and elevations are not consistent and what is proposed is the architecture drawing elevation provided. Mr. Daniel indicated that for a formal application submission should not include conflicting images in the materials as this has caused issues with past proposals.

Mr. Daniel: indicated there are a lot of cornices proposed with the structure with other soft features. Expressed concern with the horizontal lines shown above the garage opening, Mr. Sastro clarified that this is actually showing the floor behind the wall. Requested that a rendering not be provided unless it is consistent with the elevations provided.

Mr. Sastro requested ARB input on the design of the garage entryway. The ARB indicated that this is an improvement over the prior design and is setback from the front of the house.

The ARB raised questions regarding the potential window detailing. Mr. Raheja indicated that the specific windows have not been selected yet.

Ms. Orr: indicated if a gray palette is selected then black framed windows could be used, Mr. Raheja indicated that there is a brown that matches the potential brown palette of the house. Mr. Daniel indicated that the sample materials could be provided in a document for the formal application submission. Mr. Kulinski indicated that permit-ready drawings are needed for the application submission. Mr. Plumpe requested that a lighting plan be provided with the formal application. The ARB requested that the application package include the approved site plan (for reference).

3. **ARB-23-OAK-01WS- 4716 Wakefield Chapel Rd Solar Panel Installation** located in the 4716 Wakefield Chapel Rd Annandale, tax map numbers 0701 16 0285. The applicant is proposing to install solar panels on the roof of their residence, which is not in an HOD. The property, known as Oak Hill, has an easement requiring that “changes are approved in writing by

the Park Authority and, when deemed appropriate by the Park Authority, by the Fairfax County Architectural Review Board.” The solar panels are considered as an option to reduce the energy consumed by a large historic building, and along with previous repairs to the portico roof of the building, will be claimed as part of the solar tax credits. **PLUS # ARBWK-2023-BR-00029. Braddock District.**

Presentation and Discussion:

Laura Braceland provided an overview of the proposal.

Mr. Daniel inquired regarding the county provided guidance for the proposal. Ms. Braceland indicated that she has researched NPS and other projects for guidance regarding solar panels on historic structures.

Mr. Daniel: asked about the original roof. Ms. Murray indicated that the roof was colonial revival architecture that was more vernacular. Mr. Daniel indicated that solar panels on historic structures are beneficial to the continued use of the structures and supports the proposed design – recommending a discreet profile, indicated the larger concern is the visual impact of the connection to the grid.

Ms. Murray: requested clarification on the oldest part of the house. Ms. Braceland indicated that the original front dates to 1792 and other elements of the house were added over the years, most recently a connection was constructed in 1970 between the garage and home. Ms. Murray indicated that since there are so many different eras of architecture, panels on the garage and middle (newer portions) would be supported.

Mr. Plumpe: requested roof pitch clarification, Ms. Braceland indicated that the pitch of the roof is the same across the house with a shallower addition and indicated that she has requested information from the solar companies she’s working with to address the question. Mr. Plumpe indicated that the front of the house should not have panels, and asked if panels on the garage are necessary and requested that further exploration for the feasibility of the panels on the back of the house. Ms. Braceland indicated that she would get clarification on this.

Ms. Huang: indicated that the garage area is very visible from the front of the house based on a quick web search.

Mr. Kulinski: indicated that the easements are very specific and strict. The modern elements should be on the back of the house, solar panels on the flat roofs are acceptable, however the visible panels should not be on the front of the house to work within the easement. Consideration to an on-the-ground solar far should be given. Ms. Braceland indicated that there is an existing concrete pad from previous owners (approximately 20’x20’) where potential work could be considered but has not been explored. Mr. Kulinski indicated that solar seems to be the wrong solution and geothermal may be a better solution (via a vertical well in a 5’x5’ area of disturbance). Is not supportive of visible modern elements on the structure, more inclined to accept modern elements on the 1940s addition but not the 1790s.

Mr. Zellman: indicated that every effort needs to be made to put the panels in an area that's not visible, requested that alternatives for minimizing visual impacts be explored prior to Ms. Braceland's return to the ARB.

Ms. Murray: indicated that others from the community are very interested in this property and recommends that Ms. Braceland should bring this idea to the community. ARB discussion of previous solar panel applications ensued. Mr. Kulinski indicated that the structural condition of the roof needs to be assessed by a structural engineer prior to solar panel construction, Ms. Braceland indicated there was an easement when the portico was repaired.

Ms. Orr: concurs with Mr. Kulinski that the easement is restrictive and should be upheld.

Mr. Daniel: indicated the primary ARB concern is if the proposed solution is the best fit for the property. Alternatives to solar as well as alternate solar panel location should be explored with detailed description. Full detailed drawings, line of sight drawings, perspectives of the house elevations, and materials need to be provided with a formal submission. Mr. Daniel indicated that a second workshop session for the proposal may be beneficial.

Ms. Braceland indicated that there will be an open house tour of the structure for Oak Hill Day on September 30, 2023.

General ARB Discussion: solar panels may need to be considered within design guidelines and consistency among recommendations is necessary. General questions and discussion related to ARB purview on property with easements similar to the one seen this evening.

PRESENTATION: None.

BOARD AND STAFF ITEMS:

- **Announcements:** Reminder that the October 12, 2023 ARB meeting will be at the Lorton Workhouse Arts Center. Mr. Kulinski and Mr. Plumpe are in the nominating committee. The conservation easement for Drovers Trust has been granted, the Northern Virginia Conservation Trust has indicated a future site visit to the property is available to the ARB.
- **Old Business:** Two budget-related items needing ARB input (1) tablets and (2) second monthly meeting. The ARB indicated support for tablet request in budget. The ARB is supportive of a second meeting for workshops and prefers the Thursday/Monday distribution although the details will be worked out at a later date.
- **New/Other Business:** 2024 Schedule, schedule is set in December and will now include an additional meeting date which can be cancelled as needed. The ARB thanked Ms. Aubry for the service to the ARB.

Mr. Zellman made a motion to adjourn at 8:48 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, Daniel White, ARB Administrator, Fairfax County Department of Planning and Development (DPD), at (703) 324- 1380.