



Adopted: 7/31/19

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
CITY OF FAIRFAX
CITY HALL, FAIRFAX, VIRGINIA
July 17, 2019**

Members Present: Chair Ryan Horner, Vice Chair Marie Cox, Jagdish Pathela, Robert Kalmin, Robert Beaty, James Schroeder

Member(s) Absent: Paul Cunningham

Staff Present: Tommy Scibilia, Planner

Meeting called to order at 7:00 p.m.

1. Discussion of Agenda

MS. COX MOVED TO ADOPT THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED, SECONDED BY MR. PATHELA, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE, 6-0.

2. Presentations by the public on any item not calling for a public hearing

None.

3. Consideration of the meeting minutes of July 3, 2019

MR. PATHELA MOVED TO ADOPT THE MINUTES OF JULY 3, 2019 AS PRESENTED, SECONDED BY MR. BEATY, WHICH CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE, 5-0-1, WITH MR. KALMIN ABSTAINING.

4. Condition compliance regarding material selection for a restaurant building on a property located at 3936 Old Lee Highway as part of case number BAR-19-00272.

Chris Todd of the City of Fairfax Economic Development Authority presented material samples and alternates for the accent brick.

Board, staff, and applicant comments

Mr. Horner asked whether the top of the stone foundation would have a precast ledge to separate it from the brick.

Mr. Todd stated that the top of the foundation stone would be lined with a metal J-channel for rain water.

Ms. Cox expressed concern that the sample of the dark brown accent brick presented at the previous meeting on July 3 and the sample board beside it that Mr. Todd had stated were the same brick, actually vary greatly in appearance. She maintained her previous concerns that the dark brown brick was too uniform in appearance and would prefer something with more variation.

Mr. Todd clarified that the dark brick presented at the July 3 meeting and the one on the sample board were intended to be the same color style, but that they were from different manufacturers, Glen-Gery and General Shale.

Mr. Pathela asked whether the sample board was representative of the full range that could be expected from the manufacturer.

Mr. Todd stated that this was very difficult to say.

Mr. Pathela asked if the builder would send back 25% of the bricks received if they did not meet the architect's standards.

Mr. Todd stated that a much smaller proportion of the bricks may be sent back due to damage.

Mr. Kalmin stated that his preference was for the dark brown brick presented at the previous meeting. He added that its solid coloration and clean appearance would provide an effective contrast to the variation in the stone foundation and white wash brick of the body of the building, to better emphasize the entry feature.

Public comments

No comments.

MR. HORNER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE ACCENT BRICK MATERIAL PRESENTED BY CHRIS TODD, REPRESENTATIVE OF APPLICANT CITY OF FAIRFAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, FOR USE ON A NEW RESTAURANT BUILDING ON A PROPERTY LOCATED AT 3936 OLD LEE HIGHWAY, ASSOCIATED WITH CASE NUMBER BAR-19-00272, WITH CONDITIONS AS FOLLOWS:

1. The majority of the façade will be of the white shaded brick as presented.
2. The brick accent material shall be Glen-Gery brick Molded Series 50-DD Modular.

SECONDED BY MS. COX.

Discussion of the motion

No further discussion.

Mr. Horner called for a voice vote.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE, 5-1, WITH MR. KALMIN DISSENTING.

- 5. Consideration of the request** of Giuseppe Ricciardi, representative of applicant 9917 Joint Venture LLC, for exterior modifications to a building in the Old Town Fairfax Historic Overlay District on a property located at 10426 Main Street and 3981 Chain Bridge Road, case number BAR-19-00329.

Staff presented the staff report, which has been incorporated into the record by reference.

Board, staff, and applicant comments

Mr. Pathela asked for clarification on the rooftop use.

Staff stated that it would be used for maintenance access only. He added that the applicant had expressed an interest to use this space for outdoor gathering in the future, but that no plans had been finalized at this time.

Ms. Cox asked for clarification on the storefront materials proposed.

Staff explained that the new storefront on the Main Street elevation would be wood to match the existing storefront and that the new doors and windows on the Chain Bridge Road elevation would be aluminum.

Mr. Kalmin expressed concerns about the PVC railing and its maintenance.

Mr. Horner expressed that he appreciated the work the applicant put into the revised design to address the Board's work session comments.

Mr. Beaty echoed this sentiment, stating he especially appreciated seeing the removal of the cast stone urns from the design.

Mr. Beaty asked if all of the brick on the Main Street elevation was proposed to be replaced.

Staff explained that most of the brick on the Chain Bridge Road elevation was intended to be replaced, and that none on the Main Street elevation would be.

Mr. Ricciardi added that new brick would be installed on the Main Street elevation for the extension of the stairwell above the roofline and for limited infill.

Mr. Beaty asked whether the new brick was proposed to match the existing brick.

Mr. Ricciardi stated that he was able to locate the exact brick originally used on this building, and that that is what was proposed to be used for new brick and infill brick for this renovation. He added that the existing brick to remain would be washed to return it closer to its original appearance to better match new brick. He stated that the three-and-a-half foot overhang on the Main Street elevation separating the

existing brick of the stairwell and the new brick of the stairwell extension, in addition to the height of the extension above the ground, would make the difference in new versus existing brick negligible.

Mr. Pathela asked whether the roof load could support outdoor gathering, and asked why the elevator extended to the roof if its only intended use is for maintenance access.

Mr. Ricciardi stated that the original intent was to add two stories of residential to the top of the building, but that the structure of the building would not support this. The roof load is 60 pounds per square inch, and according to the applicant's engineer, this could support a gathering area should the applicant choose to pursue this in the future. He stated that if in the future this space becomes a usable gathering space, it is more feasible to have had constructed the elevator to extend to the roof at the outset than to go back and retrofit it.

Mr. Pathela asked if Courtside Thai would be reopening out of the Chain Bridge Road restaurant space.

Mr. Ricciardi confirmed that they had renewed their lease and would be reopening following renovations.

Ms. Cox asked for clarification on the new glass to be used on the Main Street elevation.

Mr. Ricciardi stated that it would be double pane transparent glass to match the existing glass to remain.

Ms. Cox asked if the elevator shaft would be lit.

Mr. Ricciardi stated that the shaft itself would not be permanently lit but that the cab would be.

Ms. Cox asked for clarification on the material of the roof of the elevator shaft.

Mr. Ricciardi stated that the fascia and the soffit material would be cementitious panel.

Ms. Cox asked whether the storefront for the Chain Bridge Road openings would be prefinished or painted on site.

Mr. Ricciardi explained that it would be prefinished to match as closely as possible the proposed "Classic French Gray" color, and if that was not possible that it would be painted on site.

Ms. Cox discouraged onsite painting, stating that if prefinishing in the gray color desired was not possible, that she would prefer to see the framing to remain in a clear anodized finish than be painted.

Mr. Pathela agreed, stating that painting would result in lifespan concerns for the material. He added that the proposed manufacturer, Kawneer, will prefinish in any color, but that there is an associated additional cost.

Mr. Ricciardi stated that he was not concerned with the extra cost of prefinishing in the proposed color.

Ms. Cox stated that she appreciated the changes made to the design of the Chain Bridge Road elevation, and that the proposed design would fit in well with other buildings in this area, citing the recently approved 3936 Old Lee Highway restaurant building as an example.

Mr. Schroeder asked for clarification on why the PVC railing was labeled to be painted tan in the elevations.

Staff clarified that there was a note in the written staff report that some of the labels in the elevations were incorrect, and that the information in the written portion of the report contained the final materials and colors. The color of the PVC railing would be white.

Mr. Kalmin stated that he thought the proposed changes would be an improvement to the building. He stressed the importance of having a good team of builders to make sure the work done is seamless.

Mr. Horner asked for clarification on where infill brick was proposed on the Main Street elevation.

Mr. Ricciardi stated that the only place infill was proposed was between the new at-grade entrance to the stairwell and the rectangular window above where currently a large window exists.

Mr. Horner asked whether the applicant would be amenable to having the infill brick butt jointed with existing brick in this location, and recessed half an inch to create a new wall plane that would play off of the southern exposure light and make the difference between the new and existing brick more intentional.

Mr. Ricciardi stated that he was amenable to this change.

Mr. Pathela stated that he would prefer that the infill brick project half an inch rather than be recessed, but agreed with Mr. Horner about the usefulness of creating a new plane in this area.

Mr. Horner suggested the architect of record make the decision, and that he was fine with either a projection or recess of half an inch.

Mr. Pathela agreed.

Mr. Horner asked for clarification on various discrepancies in the mullions in the different elevations for the Main Street elevation.

Mr. Ricciardi clarified that the extra vertical mullions shown in the proposed elevations on the left side upper level of storefront that had been added was a graphical error, that no new mullions were proposed in this location. He stated that the representations showing a thicker vertical mullion in the storefront of the upper elevator shaft between the two wider glass panels to the left and the narrower one to the right were correct.

Mr. Horner asked if a glass sample was provided.

Staff stated that there was not a sample provided, and that typically staff does not require submission of transparent glass.

Mr. Horner expressed concerns that, due to energy performance standards and building code standards being different now from when the building was constructed in 1955, that the new glass may have a slightly different appearance than the existing glass, stating that new energy performance glass often has a subtle tint to it.

Public comments

No comments.

MR. HORNER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE REQUEST OF GIUSEPPE RICCIARDI, REPRESENTATIVE OF APPLICANT 9917 JOINT VENTURE LLC, FOR EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS TO A BUILDING IN THE OLD TOWN FAIRFAX HISTORIC OVERLAY DISTRICT ON A PROPERTY LOCATED AT 10426 MAIN STREET AND 3981 CHAIN BRIDGE ROAD, CASE NUMBER BAR-19-00329, WITH CONDITIONS AS FOLLOWS:

1. All lighting shall utilize a light source that emits no more than 1000 lumens and has a 3000K color temperature.
2. All new mortar shall match the existing mortar in color, texture, and profile. Portland cement or caulking compounds shall not be used as a mortar replacement.
3. Kawneer aluminum doors shall be prefinished by the manufacturer to be a color similar to "Classic French Gray".
4. Infill brick above the new entrance doors on Main Street shall be butt-joint adjacent to the adjacent brick, and the plane of the brick shall be offset from the face of the existing wall.
5. 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.

SECONDED BY MS. COX.

Discussion of the motion

MR. PATHELA PROPOSED AN AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION TO REWORD CONDITION 4 TO READ AS FOLLOWS:

4. Infill brick above the new entrance doors along Main Street shall be butt-joint adjacent to the existing brick wall, and the plane of the brick shall be offset by one half inch, whether inward or outward to be determined by the architect of record, from the face of the existing wall.

MR. HORNER AND MS. COX AGREED TO THE AMENDMENT.

Mr. Kalmin asked for clarification whether the infill brick would be in the same plane as the new entrance and transom beneath.

Mr. Horner agreed that the planes should be flush, and stated that this would likely be resolved by the architect of record.

Mr. Horner called for a voice vote.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE, 6-0.

6. Consideration of the request of Don Brenits, representative of applicant Sandmar Properties, LLC, for exterior modifications to a shopping center located at 11123-11145 Lee Highway, case number BAR-19-00471.

Staff presented the staff report, which has been incorporated into the record by reference.

Board, staff, and applicant comments

Mr. Pathela asked if the arches previously in the sign band were decorative features.

Staff stated that they were purely decorative.

Mr. Horner asked for clarification on the scope of work to the building itself.

Staff explained that there were no changes proposed aside from the application of EIFS to the sign band, painting of the canopy, and installation of upgraded replacement wall pack lights to the side elevations.

Mr. Brenits apologized for having begun work to the property without the required approvals, stating that he did not know these requirements existed until staff informed them, after which they immediately ceased work.

Mr. Pathela asked if the signs would be put back up in the sign band.

Mr. Brenits stated that the signs would go back up if and when the work was approved by the Board.

Ms. Cox stated that she appreciated the amount of detail in the applicant's submission materials, including the simple but effective diagram of the cornice detail.

Mr. Kalmin stated that he thought the proposal would be an improvement to the appearance of the property and building.

Mr. Horner asked for the applicant's reasoning for making the changes.

Mr. Brenits explained that a new owner had purchased the property and wanted to update it and give it a more modern appearance while addressing neglected maintenance issues. He added that the new EIFS sign band was more conducive to placement of tenant signage than the previous design with the arches.

Mr. Horner stated that, although he believed the changes would not negatively affect the appearance of the building, he preferred the arches. He stated that he believed they added an architectural appeal to the building that he wished had somehow been translated into the new design.

Mr. Horner asked if there was any coping along the top of the cornice proposed and if so what the color would be.

Mr. Brenits stated that there was metal coping to match the color of the EIFS proposed.

Public comments

No comments.

MR. HORNER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE REQUEST OF DON BRENITS, REPRESENTATIVE OF APPLICANT SANDMAR PROPERTIES, LLC, FOR EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS TO A SHOPPING CENTER LOCATED AT 11123-11145 LEE HIGHWAY, CASE NUMBER BAR-19-00471, WITH CONDITIONS AS FOLLOWS:

1. The coping cap to be installed at the top of the EIFS wall shall be painted to match the color of the EIFS.
2. 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.

SECONDED BY MR. PATHELA.

Discussion of the motion

No discussion.

Mr. Horner called for a voice vote.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE, 6-0.

7. Staff Report

Staff discussed administrative approvals since the last meeting:

- Comics & Games Pair O'Dice freestanding hanging sign at Victorian Square – 10385 Main Street

Staff discussed open administrative applications under review:

- 10505 Judicial Drive roof modification and installation of new windows

Staff asked for Board member availability for upcoming meetings on July 31 and September 4.

- Ms. Cox stated that he was unsure if he would be available for the September 4 meeting.

Mr. Horner gave the Board members an overview of what had been discussed at the Downtown Visioning Committee meetings since the last BAR meeting:

- The committee had devised a vision for the downtown: “A destination for all people to live, learn, work, and play.”
- Two meetings remain where goals will be established.
- Following this, the small area plan will be developed.

Mr. Beaty gave the Board members an overview on what has been happening on the Community Appearance Committee (CAC) since the last BAR meeting:

- No CAC meetings held since the last BAR meeting.

Staff discussed BAR training for 2019.

8. Closing Board Comments

Mr. Horner repeated his reservations about the new glass for the Fairfax Plaza Building not matching the existing glass and potentially containing a subtle tint that would be readily apparent in the upper elevator shaft.

Staff stated that they would request a sample and compare it on site, and then ensure that the same glass is shown in building plans once submitted. Staff added that if transparent glass is proposed in future applications to match existing to remain, moving forward staff will require a material sample.

9. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 8:49 p.m.

ATTEST:
Tommy Scibilia, Secretary

