



## Board of Architectural Review

DATE: July 31, 2019  
TO: Board of Architectural Review Chair and Members  
THROUGH: Jason Sutphin, Community Development Division Chief *JDS*  
FROM: Tommy Scibilia, BAR Liaison *TS*  
SUBJECT: **Citidoors**

ATTACHMENTS: 1. Relevant Regulations  
2. Photos  
3. Plans  
4. Renderings

### **Nature of Request**

1. Case Number:	BAR-19-00501
2. Addresses:	3220 Old Lee Highway
3. Request:	Exterior modifications
4. Applicant:	Citidoors LLC
5. Applicant's Representative:	Ahmet Cavus
6. Status of Representative:	Agent
7. Zoning:	CR Commercial Retail, Architectural Control Overlay District

## **BACKGROUND**

The subject site is located on the west side of Old Lee Highway, just south of Fairfax Circle, between a Shell gas station to the north, a retail center to the northwest, and a vacant convenience store building to the south, sharing walls with buildings on the latter two properties. The building was constructed in 1968 with a brick body, large rectangular windows and aluminum swinging doors with anodized aluminum framing, and shingle shed-style awning lining the roofline of the east (front) elevation. Several tenants have occupied the building including an electronics retailer and the Lamb Center, a local homeless shelter, which relocated to a new building in the City in 2016. The building has remained vacant since.

Since its construction, the City has several documented modifications to the exterior of the building:

- 1994 – An internally-illuminated vinyl awning was approved to be attached to the edge of the shingle canopy.

- 2001 – Rooftop mechanical equipment and gray plastic screen walls to appear as standing seam metal were approved.
- 2001 – A garage door on the right side of the front (east) elevation was approved to be replaced with a window and infill brick veneer.
- 2006 – A burgundy standing seam metal awning was approved to replace the shingle awning. Black gooseneck lighting fixtures were approved to be installed beneath the new awning.
- 2007 – An administrative review of a similar more structurally sound awning of the same style and color was approved by staff in conformance with the 2006 approval.
- 2010 – An electric meter form the north side of the building was approved to be relocated to the far right side of the front/east elevation.
- April 2019 – Staff administratively approved façade modifications including infilling of one entrance with brick, and removal of the standing seam metal awning.

See photos of the building as it exists today in Attachment 2. The removal of the awning earlier this year has exposed a 4'4" concrete block surface that runs the length of the east façade, and which includes a 2'2" parapet wall. Black metal coping along the roofline has recently been replaced by the applicant.

## PROPOSAL

The resulting changes and maintenance over the years have resulted in a variety of brick types on the walls, which the applicant is proposing to paint over to give the building a more uniform and finished look. The brick portions of the building are proposed to be a dark gray color called "Shadow Mountain" by Behr. The concrete block portions at the top of the east elevation are proposed to be painted black by Behr. This surface is intended to act as a sign band. No changes are proposed to the windows, doors, or any portion of the site as part of this application.

Paint samples are included in Attachment 3. The plans of the proposed renovations to the building for a new tenant fit out to accommodate a door showroom and retail store can be found in Attachment 3. Staff has prepared a rendering to illustrate the proposal more clearly in Attachment 4.

## ANALYSIS

### *City of Fairfax Design Guidelines:*

The following excerpts from the Design Guidelines are relevant to this application.

*Painting, Color & Finishes, ACOD-4*

*Guidelines, ACOD-4.2*

*Brick is intended to remain unpainted; however, if the brick has been painted in the past or the brick is aesthetically unattractive, use a masonry paint product. Masonry is intended to breathe and inappropriate paint coatings can cause moisture issues.*

*Select a coordinated palette of colors for each property that includes site elements in addition to the building itself.*

*Set the color theme by choosing the color for the material with the most visible area, such as a brick wall area or a metal roof, and relate other colors to it.*

*Select natural tones instead of overly bright and obtrusive colors.*

*Treat similar elements with the same color to achieve a unified rather than overly busy and disjointed appearance.*

*For most buildings, the numbers of paint colors are typically limited to three: a wall or field color, a trim color, and an accent color for signs, doors, etc.*

*After using other scale reduction techniques discussed earlier in this section, also consider using color variation to break up the mass of a building and provide visual interest.*

Although brick is typically encouraged to remain unpainted, this building has undergone a unique series of renovations which have resulted in a disjointed appearance of the building materials. Staff is therefore supportive of the painting work to give this building a more uniform and finished appearance, noting that the color could be changed in the future. Staff recommends that the applicant use a paint that is designed specifically for use on masonry that will allow the underlying brick to breathe. Staff finds the proposed gray color to be appropriately neutral in tone and contemporary in nature, with the black color for the sign band acting as a subtle accent at the roofline.

***Comprehensive Plan:***

The following excerpts from the 2035 Comprehensive Plan are relevant to this application.

*Chapter 2 – Land Use*

*Community Design and Historic Preservation Goal 1 – Require high-quality, sustainable design.*

*OUTCOME CDHP1.2: Attractive buildings, inviting public spaces, and welcoming gateways that contribute to our economic vitality and unique character. (64)*

Staff finds that the proposal to improve and unify the look of this building, while giving it a contemporary look that will draw appropriate attention to this space and the new business operating out of it.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff finds the proposal to be consistent with the provisions of the City's Design Guidelines and the Comprehensive Plan, and therefore recommends approval of the major certificate of appropriateness with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall use a paint product specifically formulated for use on masonry surfaces.
2. Scuppers and downspouts shall be painted black to match the upper wall surface of the eastern elevation.
3. Electrical meters shall be painted to match the color of the adjacent wall surface.
4. The proposed modifications shall be in general conformance with the review materials received by staff and included in the staff report, as modified through the date of this meeting, except as further modified by the Board of Architectural Review, the Director of Community Development and Planning, Zoning, or the Building Official.

## RELEVANT REGULATIONS

- Attachment 1-

### §3.7.4. Architectural control overlay district

#### B. Certificate of appropriateness required

Except as specified in §3.7.4.C, below, all development in the architectural control overlay district shall be subject to the approval of a certificate of appropriateness in accordance with the provisions of §6.5.

#### C. Exceptions

The architectural control overlay district shall not apply to signs, unless otherwise specified, or to the following uses:

1. Single-family detached;
2. Duplex dwellings, after initial approval and construction; and
3. Townhouses, after initial approval and construction.

### §5.4.5. Powers and duties

#### B. Final decisions

The board of architectural review shall be responsible for final decisions regarding the following:

1. Certificates of appropriateness, major (§6.5)

### §6.5.1. Applicability

Certificates of appropriateness shall be reviewed in accordance with the provisions of §6.5.

#### A. A certificate of appropriateness shall be required:

1. To any material change in the appearance of a building, structure, or site visible from public places (rights-of-way, plazas, squares, parks, government sites, and similar) and located in a historic overlay district (§3.7.2), the Old Town Fairfax Transition Overlay District (§3.7.3), or in the Architectural Control Overlay District (§3.7.4). For purposes of §6.5, “material change in appearance” shall include construction; reconstruction; exterior alteration, including changing the color of a structure or substantial portion thereof; demolition or relocation that affects the appearance of a building, structure or site;

### §6.5.3. Certificate of appropriateness types

#### A. Major certificates of appropriateness

##### 1. Approval authority

###### (a) General

Except as specified in §6.5.3.B.2(b), below, the board of architectural review shall have authority to approve major certificates of appropriateness.

###### (b) Alternative (in conjunction with other reviews)

Alternatively, and in conjunction with special use reviews, planned development reviews, special exceptions or map amendments (rezoning), the city council may approve major certificates of appropriateness.

#### §6.5.6. Action by decision-making body

##### A. General (involving other review by city council)

After receiving the director's report on proposed certificates of appropriateness, which do not involve other reviews described below, the board of architectural review (BAR) shall review the proposed certificates of appropriateness in accordance with the approval criteria of §6.5.7. The BAR may request modifications of applications in order that the proposal may better comply with the approval criteria. Following such review, the BAR may approve, approve with modifications or conditions, or disapprove the certificate of appropriateness application, or it may table or defer the application.

##### B. Other reviews

1. Prior to taking action on special use reviews, planned development reviews, and map amendments (rezoning), the city council shall refer proposed certificates of appropriateness to the BAR for review in accordance with the approval criteria of §6.5.7.
2. In conjunction with special use reviews, planned development reviews, special exceptions and map amendments (rezoning), the city council may review the proposed certificate of appropriateness in accordance with the approval criteria of §6.5.7. The city council may request modifications of applications in order that the proposal may better comply with the approval criteria. Following such review, the city council may approve, approve with modifications or conditions, or disapprove the certificate of appropriateness application, or it may table or defer the application.

#### §6.5.7. Approval criteria

##### A. General

1. Certificate of appropriateness applications shall be reviewed for consistency with the applicable provisions of this chapter, any adopted design guidelines, and the community appearance plan.
2. Approved certificates of appropriateness shall exhibit a combination of architectural elements including design, line, mass, dimension, color, material, texture, lighting, landscaping, roof line and height conform to accepted architectural principles and exhibit external characteristics of demonstrated architectural and aesthetic durability.

#### §6.5.9. Action following approval

- A. Approval of any certificate of appropriateness shall be evidenced by issuance of a certificate of appropriateness, including any conditions, signed by the director or the chairman of the board of architectural review. The director shall keep a record of decisions rendered.
- B. The applicant shall be issued the original of the certificate, and a copy shall be maintained on file in the director's office.

#### §6.5.10. Period of validity

A certificate of appropriateness shall become null and void if no significant improvement or alteration is made in accordance with the approved application within 18 months from the date of approval. On written request from an applicant, the director may grant a single extension for a period of up to six

months if, based upon submissions from the applicant, the director finds that conditions on the site and in the area of the proposed project are essentially the same as when approval originally was granted.

§6.5.11. Time lapse between similar applications

A. The director will not accept, hear or consider substantially the same application for a proposed certificate of appropriateness within a period of 12 months from the date a similar application was denied, except as provided in §6.5.11.B, below.

B. Upon disapproval of an application, the director and/or board of architectural review may make recommendations pertaining to design, texture, material, color, line, mass, dimensions or lighting. The director and/or board of architectural review may again consider a disapproved application if within 90 days of the decision to disapprove the applicant has amended his application in substantial accordance with such recommendations.

§6.5.12. Transfer of certificates of appropriateness

Approved certificates of appropriateness, and any attached conditions, run with the land and are not affected by changes in tenancy or ownership.

§6.5.13. Appeals

A. Appeals to city council

Final decisions on certificates of appropriateness made may be appealed to city council within 30 days of the decision in accordance with §6.22.

B. Appeals to court

Final decisions of the city council on certificates of appropriateness may be appealed within 30 days of the decision in accordance with §6.23.