

APPROVED

May 12, 2022

THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Virtual Meeting- Using Webex Fairfax County Platform 6:30 p.m. meeting start

Members Present:

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

Members Absent:

Susan Notkins, AIA
Karen Campblin

Staff Present:

Denice Dressel,
*Principal Heritage Resources
Planner*
Grace Davenport,
Heritage Resources Planner
Ryan Johnson,
Recording Secretary

**Arrived after the commencement of
meeting.*

Mr. Daniel opened the May 12, 2022 meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) at 6:32 p.m. using the Webex Fairfax County Platform. Mr. Daniel started the meeting with emergency motions related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

COVID-19 SPECIAL MOTIONS (Summary)

1. A quorum of the ARB must be participating remotely;
2. A vote to ensure that each member of the ARB may be adequately heard and that all members can hear each other;
3. A vote to verify that the usual FOIA procedures cannot be implemented safely or practically;
4. A vote to verify that every item on the agenda is either related to the emergency or necessary to assure continuity in government, or both; and
5. Public comment time limitations.

COVID-19 SPECIAL MOTIONS (Motions)

Mr. Daniel so moved:

To conduct this meeting wholly electronically and to effectuate both the emergency procedures authorized by FOIA the ARB needs to make certain findings and determinations for the record. It's a bit cumbersome, so I ask you in advance for your patience.

1. Audibility of Members' Voices

First, because each member of this ARB is participating in this meeting from a separate location, we must verify that a quorum of members is participating, and that each member's voice is clear, audible, and at an appropriate volume for all of the other members. Accordingly, I am going to conduct a roll call, and ask each ARB member participating in this meeting to state your name and the location from which you are participating. I ask that each of you pay close attention to ensure that you can hear each of your colleagues. Following this roll call, we will vote to establish that every member can hear every other member.

(Mr. Daniel continued with a roll call of Members, in accordance with above instructions):

- **Ms. Aubry- aye, private residence, can hear**
- **Mr. Burns- no response, not present (**joins meeting later**)**
- **Ms. Campblin- no response, not present, unexcused**
- **Ms. Huang- aye, private residence, can hear**
- **Mr. Kulinski- aye, office, can hear**
- **Ms. Murray- aye, private residence, can hear**
- **Ms. Notkins- no response, not present, unexcused**
- **Ms. Orr- aye, private residence, can hear**
- **Mr. Plumpe- aye, private residence, can hear**
- **Mr. Zellman- aye, private residence, can hear**
- **Mr. Daniel- aye, private residence, can hear**

Mr. Daniel passed the virtual gavel to Mr. Zellman, so that he could be heard to make the requisite motion.

Mr. Daniel moved that every member that is present can be clearly heard. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Orr, and passed unanimously.

2. Quorum of ARB members-

Mr. Daniel so moved:

As determined by the roll call, 8 members of the ARB are present and therefore satisfy the ARB quorum minimum. The ARB by-laws state that a minimum of 6 members are required to determine a quorum.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Orr, and passed unanimously.

3. Need for an Electronic Meeting

Mr. Daniel so moved:

Third, having established that each member's voice may be heard by every other member, we must next establish the nature of the emergency that compels these emergency procedures, the fact that we are meeting electronically, what type of electronic communication is being used, and how we have arranged for public access to this meeting. Therefore, I move that the State of

Emergency caused by the COVID-19 pandemic makes it unsafe for this ARB to physically assemble and unsafe for the public to physically attend any such meeting, and that as such, FOIA's usual procedures, which require the physical assembly of the ARB and the physical presence of the public, cannot be implemented safely or practically. I further move that the ARB may conduct this meeting electronically through Webex, a county virtual meeting platform and available for access through the ARB county website or through phone at: 1-844-621-3956 with Access code: 2336 353 0927. It is so moved.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Orr, and passed unanimously.

****Mr. Burns joined the meeting at 6:38 p.m.****

4. Need to dispense with FOIA's Usual Procedures to Assure Continuity in Government/Continue Operations

Mr. Daniel so moved:

Finally, it is next required that all of the matters addressed on today's agenda are statutorily required or necessary to continue operations and the discharge of this Board's lawful purposes, duties, and responsibilities. It is so moved.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Kulinski, and passed unanimously.

- 5. PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Mr. Daniel stated that The ARB needs to determine how long each member of the public will be able to speak during the public comment periods. The public will be allowed to comment after the consent agenda items and after each action item, as is standard ARB practice.

Mr. Daniel moved, and was seconded by Mr. Plumpe, that each member of public will have 3 minutes to speak. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Zellman handed the virtual gavel back to Mr. Daniel.

****Mr. Daniel reminded presenters of a general 8-minute maximum presentation time for new items, including workshop items, and 3-minute presentation time for revised or follow-up items.****

VIRTUAL MEETING WEBEX INFORMATION- Staff (Denice Dressel)

- Ms. Dressel informed all attendees that the meeting is being recorded, and it will be posted online within 10 days. She directed attendees to email her during the meeting, use the Q&A box or chat function in the Webex Platform for inquiries and staff would monitor accordingly. She directed attendees calling in to press "* 3" to notify staff of desire to make public comment. Attendees that are experiencing technical issues should call Webex Technical Assistance at 1-866-799-3293.

**READING OF STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND INTENT OF HOD'S
Mr. Kulinski read the opening Statement of Purpose.**

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA- Chair

Mr. Zellman moved, and was seconded by Ms. Orr, to adopt the draft agenda as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

INTRODUCTION/RECOGNITION OF GUESTS (Based on Webex attendees' list)

Marissa Eyon
Kayvan Jaboori
Barbara Ward
Scott Sterl

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION ITEM: NONE

ITEMS FOR ACTION:

1. **ARB 22-PHC-01 – Pohick Church Sign** - located at 9301 Richmond Hwy, Lorton, tax map 1081 01 0027, in the Pohick Church HOD. The applicant is proposing to install a new freestanding church monument sign with base. Marissa Eyon represents the application. PLUS #ARB-2022-MV-00007. **Mount Vernon District**
 - **Presentation/Discussion**
 - Ms. Eyon presented. Since the workshop presentation, the sign has been slightly revised based on ARB Member feedback:
 - Slightly adjusted the location of the sign. Moved sign for better visibility, and to better address landscaping concerns from workshop.
 - Mock-up colors were updated for presentation to resemble the actual color of the brick-like material more closely.
 - The church will have landscaping designed and planted by a church member.
 - Ms. Eyon showed a physical sample of the sign's brick-like material. The grout will be speckled and closely match that of the existing church building.
 - There will be a spotlight, fully shielded, directed towards sign lettering, and it will be a warm, yellow-type light color.
 - Mr. Daniel asked members of the public for comments: None.
 - Mr. Daniel asked ARB Members for comments:
 - Mr. Burns: When the applicant held up the sample, the back side was grey. Wanted confirmation that it would be a two-sided sign with the brick-like material on each side. Ms. Eyon responded yes.
 - Mr. Plumpe: Questioned the choice of plantings– the hellebore and boxwood are deer favorites. Hellebore needs shade, and the proposal is to have them in an area where there is little shade. Recommended that the landscape person use more deer-resistant and location-appropriate plants.
 - Mr. Daniel: Appreciated the landscape plan, but agrees with Mr. Plumpe regarding the need for better plant choices. The brick-like material looks similar to brick, works well enough with the proposal, and is not an attempt to replicate the historic church brick.

Mr. Kulinski moved, and was seconded by Mr. Plumpe, that the ARB approve action item ARB 22-PHC-01 – Pohick Church Sign, located at 9301 Richmond Hwy, Lorton, in the Pohick Church HOD, tax map number 1081 01 0027, for the proposed freestanding church monument sign with base, as submitted and presented at the May 12, 2022, ARB meeting. Upon review of the materials, the proposal is found to meet the requirements of Zoning Ordinance 3101-HISTORIC OVERLAY DISTRICTS. The motion passed unanimously.

- 2. ARB 22-LFK-01, 1102 Chain Bridge Road, Demolition** - located at 1102 Chain Bridge Rd., Mclean, tax map 0223 01 0057, in the Langley Fork HOD. The applicant is proposing the demolition of the existing dwelling and site amenities on the parcel. Kayvan Jaboori, of KJ & Associates represents the application. PLUS #ARB-2022-DR-00009. **Dranesville District.**

- Presentation/Discussion
 - Mr. Jaboori stated that there have been minor changes to the plans since workshop, mostly unrelated to the demolition item.
 - Mr. Daniel asked members of the public for comments: None.
 - Mr. Daniel asked ARB Members for comments:
 - Mr. Burns: Noted tree-save area on plan, and asked would trees be removed from the HOD portion of the site. Mr. Jaboori responded yes, but the trees to be removed are of lower quality. Met with Urban Forestry Management Division- any trees that are healthy enough will be saved.

Mr. Zellman moved, and was seconded by Mr. Kulinski and Mr. Burns simultaneously, that the ARB approve action item ARB 22-LFK-01, 1102 Chain Bridge Road, Demolition of Existing Dwelling and Site Amenities, located at 1102 Chain Bridge Rd., Mclean, in the Langley Fork HOD, tax map number 0223 01 0057, for the removal of the existing dwelling and associated site amenities, as submitted and presented at the May 12, 2022, ARB meeting. Upon review of the materials, the proposal is found to meet the requirements of Zoning Ordinance 3101-HISTORIC OVERLAY DISTRICTS. The motion passed unanimously.

- 3. ARB 22-LFK-02 - 1102 Chain Bridge Road, Grading Plan** - located at 1102 Chain Bridge Rd., Mclean, tax map 0223 01 0057, in the Langley Fork HOD. The applicant is proposing to remove the existing dwelling and site amenities and construct a new single-family dwelling with amenities. Kayvan Jaboori, of KJ & Associates represents the application. PLUS #ARB-2022-DR-00011. **Dranesville District**

- Presentation/Discussion
 - Mr. Jaboori thanked ARB Members for the approval of the demolition agenda item above.
 - Scope of grading plan:
 - New home, infiltration trench, pool, tree-save area in the rear of property, and driveway along right side of the property,
 - Mr. Daniel asked members of the public for comments: None.
 - Mr. Daniel asked ARB Members for comments:

- Mr. Daniel asked with the grading plan and demolition plan, how would it be field-verified that healthy trees would remain. Mr. Jaboori responded that there would be coordination with Fairfax County Urban Forestry Management, and that contractors would have clear instructions.
- Mr. Plumpe stated it would be ideal to preserve trees in the front yard. He asked Mr. Jaboori if a tree survey had been completed. Mr. Jaboori responded yes. Mr. Plumpe stated it appears the applicant is doing everything possible with regard for the trees.
- Mr. Burns stated that if there is another agency that has a report (such as Urban Forestry), that it should be included in the submission package.

Mr. Burns moved, and Mr. Kulinski seconded, that the ARB recommend approval of action item ARB 22-LFK-02, 1102 Chain Bridge Road, Grading Plan, located at 1102 Chain Bridge Rd, Mclean, in the Langley Fork HOD, tax map number 0223 01 0057, for the grading plan, as submitted and presented at the May 12, 2022, ARB meeting. Upon review of the materials, the proposal is found to meet the requirements of Zoning Ordinance 3101-HISTORIC OVERLAY DISTRICTS.

Mr. Daniel made a friendly amendment that the applicant undertake all efforts as possible to identify healthy trees as indicated on the north side of the property. Mr. Burns and Mr. Kulinski accepted the friendly amendment. The motion, as amended, passed unanimously.

4. ARB 22-LFK-03 - 1102 Chain Bridge Road, New Single-Family Dwelling - located at 1102 Chain Bridge Rd., Mclean, tax map 0223 01 0057, in the Langley Fork HOD. The applicant is proposing the construction of a new single family dwelling with amenities. Kayvan Jaboori, of KJ & Associates represents the application. PLUS #ARB-2022-DR-00011. **Dranesville District.**

- Presentation/Discussion
 - Mr. Jaboori- due to workshop feedback, changed color of roof shingles on house to slate. Lighter color per Mr. Kulinski’s comment.
 - Mr. Daniel asked for public comment. None.
 - Mr. Daniel asked ARB Members for comment.
 - Mr. Kulinski mentioned the 2-dimension drawings are different from the 3- dimension drawings submitted to the ARB for review. The 2- dimension drawings show large window bays truncated into 3 separate narrow windows with pronounced lentils, whereas the 3-dimension drawings show large window bays with one large window in each bay with less-pronounced lentils. Mr. Kulinski prefers the 3-dimension design, given its more modern façade.
 - Ms. Orr mentioned the thickness of the gable on the right side of the front elevation is larger on the 3-dimension drawings than the 2-dimension drawings, and echoed Mr. Kulinski’s comments about the difference in the types of lentils on the different sets of drawings.
 - Mr. Burns agrees with Mr. Kulinski regarding the preference for the 3-dimension drawings. The home has bold massing, which calls for bold

windows. The 3 narrower windows (as reflected on the less-preferred 2-dimension drawings) don't represent the massing of the structure well.

- Mr. Plumpe stated that there should be a final landscape plan, a tree survey, and a tree plan – tree preservation plan, and landscape installation plan.
 - Mr. Jaboori asked what trees should be saved- should it be the PFM standard or another standard. Mr. Plumpe responded, notwithstanding his above comment, that it would be up to the applicant's discretion.
- Mr. Burns stated that, on the 3-dimension drawings, it was unclear how extensive the fencing near the pool would be. Mr. Jaboori responded that fencing already exists on all lot lines except for the front. The existing fence is not of good quality and will be replaced in the same locations with a white fence.
- Mr. Burns asked if there were site lighting details (such as for the pool) and whether they could be added to the landscape plan. Mr. Jaboori responded that lighting details had not been provided.
- A general discussion ensued amongst Members regarding lack of details on the submitted plans:
 - Ms. Dressel provided some clarification—either this agenda item can be deferred for more details to be provided at a future ARB meeting, or the ARB could conditionally approve a landscaping plan with the requested details.
 - Mr. Jaboori commented that the grading plan was already approved under the previous agenda item.
 - Mr. Zellman asked Ms. Dressel about the conditional approval of the landscape plan and what would be the implications. Ms. Dressel responded that the conceptual landscape plan was submitted the day of the ARB meeting and that the conditional approval would depend on the ARB's specific conditions.
 - Mr. Kulinski stated that there is a full architectural set, and the elevations don't align with the 2-or-3 dimensions- elevations.
 - Mr. Burns commented that there is no firm sense of what is actually being approved.
 - Mr. Kulinski asked whether staff could administratively confirm the renderings were correct after an ARB vote. Ms. Dressel responded that an entirely new dwelling is typically in the purview of the ARB, not staff.
 - Ms. Murray recommended deferral given the inconsistency of the materials submitted.
 - Mr. Jaboori stated he would ensure landscaping details would be provided to the ARB.

Mr. Zellman moved, and was seconded by Mr. Burns, that that the ARB defer action item ARB 22-LFK-03, 1102 Chain Bridge Road, New Single Family Dwelling, located at 1102 Chain Bridge Rd, Mclean, in the Langley Fork HOD, tax map number 0223 01 0057, for

the construction of a new single family dwelling, as submitted and presented at the May 12, 2022, ARB meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Jaboori asked a clarifying point about the 3-dimension drawings getting the indication of support. Mr. Daniel responded that the 3-dimension drawings have general ARB support, but there needs to be an understanding of how the structure would be illuminated with outdoor lighting, and a sense of the landscaping program on the site.

ITEM FOR WORKSHOP SESSION:

5. **ARB 22-HOL-05WS – 7423 Saville Ct.** - located in the 7423 Saville Ct, Alexandria, tax map numbers 0933 16 0021, in the Hollin Hills HOD. The project proposed to rebuild and extend deck; replace siding and windows on a single-family dwelling. Carlos Lay Piana represents the proposal. PLUS #ARBWK-2022-MV-00007. **Mount Vernon District.**
 - Presentation/Discussion
 - Mr. Sterl presented- Hollin Hills HOD. Proposing carport at end of existing driveway, replacing gravel driveway material with aggregate concrete driveway. Siding replacement- T1-11 3/8” in-kind. Front door replaced with solid flat door. May have a frosted window in door. Decking- trex material. Elevated screened porch with gabled roof with same shingles as the house.
 - Proposed carport on left side of house. Proposed deck extension- deck is 16’ x 16’. Screened porch is about 15’ x 18’ with steps down to lower level.
 - Mr. Daniel asked ARB Members for comment:
 - Ms. Murray asked about front setback for the deck. The response from applicant was that the deck met the 35’ front setback- R-2 District.
 - Mr. Burns mentioned that the lot is a corner lot with 2 front yard setbacks of 35 feet. Grateful for flat roof carport with minimalist design that does not exceed side yard setback. Mr. Burns asked about the deck extending in to left or right-side yard. The response from the applicant was that it was extending into the left-side yard. Mr. Burns asked whether it was a 2-story screened porch. The response was that the screened porch is anchored at the upper-level but open underneath.
 - Mr. Burns stated that installing a perpendicular attachment to the window wall to affix the screened porch would be a substantial change from the Goodman design.
 - Mr. Burns also asked about T1-11 siding. Applicant confirmed it was not tongue and groove type T1-11. Mr. Burns recommended replacing in-kind if the existing siding has rectangular groove. 3/8” or 5/8” thickness does not matter.
 - Mr. Daniel agreed there will need to be more attention to detail in preparation for the action item- the overarching question is how will all of the proposed work be done in a sensitive way. The carport and other items are not as much as an issue as the screened porch. Any ARB approval would not want to

overwhelm that side of the house. These are designed as 360-degree houses. Mr. Daniel would not like to see the setbacks pushed to the limit.

- Mr. Kulinski thanked the applicant. Flat roof carport very well-done. The proportions of the deck are more important than its overall size. Original deck is square-shaped and the proposed deck is elongated. Cable railings. Front door entry is a Goodman touch. Do not eliminate corner stair- another Goodman touch. The existing gutters are OG, but asked would they be replaced in-kind or replaced with box gutters. The applicant's response was it depends on what the owner decides. Mr. Kulinski stated there is a distinct difference between modern and older T1-11. In totality, when replacing the historic vs modern materials- the connections, the thickness, the attachment to the house- you lose what the house is. Proportionally, the rail heights at 3 feet and the hopper windows are at 30 inches.
- Mr. Burns- current walkway leading to the deck is cantilevered- and proposal is to support from below. Mr. Burns stated, if it were possible, to have supports obscured from the edge of the deck. Response from applicant was it would be possible to set beam back 2 feet. And the posts could be set back 2 feet. Applicant also stated the walkway could be clear-spanned.
- Mr. Daniel mentioned the 2-story screened porch and methodology will be the main issue for action item.
- Mr. Sterl asked about replacing sliding windows under the glass- replacing with an awning window. Mr. Daniel responded by stating that the first question to be asked is if the sliding windows are functional. If so, then its preferred they are replaced in-kind. If no longer functional, then the question is what would be a suitable alternative-type replacement that would preserve the integrity. The second part of that analysis is tougher to answer.
- Mr. Burns asked if the current sliding windows were operable. House was built in 1968. If the house had aluminum windows, many of those were mill-finished, and difficult to slide. Applicant will provide more detail on action item.

PRESENTATIONS: NONE

BOARD AND STAFF ITEMS:

- **Review and action on approval of previous months minutes: April 2022**
 - Mr. Burns provided revisions to the April 2022 draft minutes to staff. Mr. Burns wanted to make sure the minutes accurately reflected his comments particularly with regard to Hollin Hills items.
 - **Mr. Burns moved, and was seconded by Ms. Orr, to approve the meeting minutes for April 2022, with edits as noted, and authorize payment to the Recording Secretary. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Treasurer's Report: Staff \$18,247.77**
- **Administrative:**

- Agenda- Mr. Daniel referred to the email about changes to the ARB meeting process regarding agenda length, presentation times, and Member expectations. Mr. Plumpe mentioned maybe there should be more of a time limit on workshop items. Mr. Daniel stated that workshop items are limited to 8-minute presentations by the applicant. This does not limit the amount of discussion time.
- Transition to Zoom/Potential In-Person: Staff is going to try Zoom at June meeting. Staff will be doing trials with the tool. – Rm. 232 in Government Center if in-person.
- **Discussion/Update Reports:**
 - Lorton Workhouse Master Plan- 4/26/22: Staff , Mr. Plumpe and Ms. Huang went to Master Plan meeting. 4/29/22: Staff and Mr. Plumpe went on tour of the Workhouse campus. 5/20/22: Design Charette.
 - Holmes Run Acres HOD- 6/15/22: Staff meeting with community leading up to the community poll survey. Findings will be presented at end of July at a community meeting regarding HOD boundaries, contributing and non-contributing, defining characteristics, etc. Poll will launch shortly.
- **Correspondence, Announcements:** No comments.
- **Old Business**
 - Bylaws: The Board of Supervisors recently accepted and approved updates to the ARB Bylaws. The Bylaws added a formal Section 106 process. The attendance policy is codified- absences need to be reported to Chair. The Bylaws also authorized the ARB to seek action, in consultation with the appointing BOS Member, against ARB Members who have multiple unexcused absences. Starting in July 2022, email regarding Member attendance will come from Ms. Dressel.
 - Soapstone Connector Section 106 MOA: FCDOT indicated sometime in month of May 2022, there will be a public information meeting to present draft to public. Staff will keep ARB updated.
- **New/other business: Update**
 - **Courthouse Masonry repairs- staff received notification that Fairfax County Capital Facilities is having WRA survey the existing brick and mortar, documenting elevations, and cost estimates.**

Mr. Zellman moved to adjourn at 9:16 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, Principal Heritage Resources Planner, ARB Administrator, Fairfax County Department of Planning and Development (DPD), Denice.Dressel@fairfaxcounty.gov or (703) 324-1383