127 Center Street South
Vienna, Virginia 22180
p: 703.255.6341
TTY 7111

Town of Vienna

Meeting Minutes

Board of Architectural Review

Thursday, August 15, 2019 **8:00 PM** **COUNCIL CHAMBERS-VIENNA TOWN HALL**

1. Roll Call

The Board of Architectural Review met in regular session in the Vienna Town Hall, 127 Center Street, South Vienna, Virginia, with Paul Layer presiding as Chair. The following members were present: Roy Baldwin, Michael Cheselka, and Patty Hanley. Andrea West, Planner, and Sharmaine Abaied, Board Clerk, were present.

Mr. Layer opened the meeting for the Board of Architectural Review and asked for the roll to be called.

ROLL CALL:

Ms. Abaied called roll with Roy Baldwin, Paul Layer, Michael Cheselka, and Patty Hanley being present.

2. Approval of Minutes

MEETING MINUTES:

Mr. Cheselka made a motion to approve the July 2019 meeting minutes.

Mr. Baldwin seconded the motion.

Motion: Cheselka
Second: Baldwin
Approved: 4-0

3. Regular Business

515 Maple Avenue West - Soleil Nail Spa - Signage

Request for approval of one wall sign and one tenant panel replacement for Soleil Nail Spa located at 515 Maple Ave W, Docket No. 38-19-BAR, in the C-1 Local Commercial zoning district; filed by Le Pham, business owner.

Ron Hamed of R P Sign was present to represent the application.

Mr. Cheselka stated he was not fond of the box signs anymore and would like to see the phased out.

Ms. Hanley asked if the dimension of the sign would allow the blue to come through. Mr. Hamed stated it was a box with white lettering. Mr. Layer stated that Ms. Hanley suggested the space behind the sign, the façade of the building, is showing with the previous sign and it does not show with the new sign. He then asked if the sign would go from the trim of the window to the trim above. Mr. Layer stated that an inch and a half

above and below the sign should be part of the motion and the revision should be presented to staff for verification. There was continued discussion regarding the placement of the sign on the façade.

Ms. Hanley made a motion that the request for approval of one wall sign, and one tenant panel replacement for Soleil Nail Spa located at 515 Maple Ave W, Docket No. 38-19-BAR, be approved with the proviso that staff verifies that there is at least 1 ½ inches above and 1 ½ inches below between the sign and the trim.

Motion: Hanley
Second: Baldwin
Approved: 3-1
Nay: Cheselka

1009 Moorefield Hill Grove SW - Exterior Modifications - Solar Panels

Request for approval of exterior modifications (solar panel installation) located at 1009 Moorefield Hill Grove SW, Docket No. PF-39-19-BAR, in the RTH Townhouse district; filed by Solar Energy World on behalf of homeowner.

Mr. Jose Magana Rendon was present the represent the application. He gave a brief description of the solar panels that were proposed to be installed, and stated he did have his HOA's approval.

Ms. Hanley asked about the process for those types of applications. Ms. West mentioned the code did require the application was required to go before the Board. Discussion continued.

Mr. Baldwin made a motion that the request for approval of exterior modifications (solar panel installation) located at 1009 Moorefield Hill Grove SW, Docket No. PF-39-19-BAR, be approved as submitted.

Motion: Baldwin
Second: Hanley
Approved: 4-0

703 Hunter Court SW - Exterior Modifications - Solar Panels

Request for approval of exterior modifications (solar panel installation) located at 703 Hunter Ct SW, Docket PF-40-19-BAR, in the RTH Townhouse district; filed by Solar Energy World on behalf of homeowner.

Mr. Paul Skorochod was present to represent the application.

Mr. Baldwin inquired about the location of the solar panels.

Mr. Cheselka made a motion that the request for approval of exterior modifications (solar panel installation) located at 703 Hunter Ct SW, Docket PF-40-19-BAR, be approved as submitted.

Motion: Cheselka
Second: Baldwin
Approved: 4-0

711 Hunter Ct SW - Exterior modifications - Fence

Request for approval of exterior modifications (fence) located at 711 Hunter Ct SW, Docket No. PF-41-19-BAR, in the RTH Townhouse district; filed by Se & Sue Kang, homeowner.

Ms. Sue Kang was present to represent the application.
Ms. Hanley inquired about the existing fence, which Ms. Kang stated was the neighbor's fence. Ms. Kang also stated she would be using what the HOA required.

Mr. Baldwin made a motion that the request for approval of exterior modifications (fence) located at 711 Hunter Ct SW, Docket No. PF-41-19-BAR, be approved as submitted.

Motion: Baldwin
Second: Cheselka
Approved: 4-0

245 Maple Avenue West - Vienna Market

Request for approval of Vienna Market, a new mixed-use project, at the former Marco Polo Restaurant site, located at 245 Maple Ave W, Docket No. 21-19-BAR, in the MAC Maple Avenue Commercial Zone zoning district; filed by Nate Robbins of Northfield Development.

Mr. Nate Robbins and Glen Sutter were present to represent the application. Mr. Robbins began with the rendering that the architectural firm designed which showed the town houses, the landscaping plan, the park, and how the retail will look.

Mr. Robbins pointed out the changes by elevation.

The Maple Avenue view: the color of the retaining wall was changed, different scheme numbers, which corresponded to the material boards (for clarity of materials used at which elevation), the location of a future mural, and a small wall adjustment at the edge of the retail. Several windows had been added to the side to address Maple Avenue, angled bay windows, varying cornice detail, and the height and shape of the bay windows on the townhouses. Mr. Robbins also stated each doorway was special with unique designs.

The Rear Side of the townhomes: parking garage areas for cars and entrance to homes, doorways if walking up the backside, wrap around brick at the edges of the townhouses, aluminum railings were added, and varying heights of the buildings and cornices.

The Townhomes Side elevation: differing cornice details at the parapets on the front and sides, added a significant number of windows to the side, angled bays on the sides to show projection. The utility shed on the sides doors were changed from flat panel door to a six-panel door. The addition of a deck on top of the shed with a door, two windows, and intricate rail detail.

The Pleasant Street view: five of the 4-story elevations, 2 of the 3-story elevations. Every unit has a front bay projection, not flat fronts. There are flat roofs and mansard roofs, as well as traditional dormer windows and barrel dormer windows. The front veneers are brick with pre-cast, and painted brick colors. Some of the straight window and door pre-cast head features have added elevations with angled features to give it interest. All front doors are recessed allowing a covered entry to each unit, and each door is different to add interest. Brick rustication was added to further distinguish each unit.

The Rears of the townhomes: All the rears have Hardie siding and Hardie trim, flat panel garage doors with not windows. Rear covered porch with aluminum Trex railing, and black architectural shingle.

Mr. Robbins pointed out the retaining wall block used to hold the dirt back more effectively changing the first column to brick.
Mr. Sutter stated that at the rear view the rear brick water table was extended from the exterior side of the end unit to the entire end unit and is the same at both ends of every building. The details for the different cornices and trim details being used were explained as well as the different window sections and differing entry details. The materials for the railing at the rear of the townhomes, the garage door, and the windows for the townhomes were shown to the Board. Mr. Sutter showed the changes to the differing roof structures and revised railings for town over retail.

Mr. Robbins stated a significant amount of vegetation had been added to the park and a crosswalk had been removed from the renderings per the BAR's request.

Mr. Sutter stated the color schemes were on the material boards, and each unit was shown with its corresponding color scheme. There were 6 color schemes, but 9 differences because there were "B" color schemes that correspond to a base brick.

Mr. Layer asked that the applicants connect the actual material boards with their corresponding elevations.

The Board stepped down from the dais to look at the material boards and color schemes with their corresponding elevation renderings.

Mr. Cheselka asked if the bricks would be site painted of factory colored. Mr. Sutter stated the brick would be painted on site.

Ms. Hanley asked what type of brick was used. Mr. Sutter stated there were two types of brick that would be painted, and the type used was based on local availability. He also said that one of the brick types should be Cordova.

Mr. Layer stated there were paints that were designed to be painted on brick and if that was the way the specification would be written, then the Board would like paint appropriate to be painted on brick. Mr. Sutter stated the paint used was exterior grade paint and Mr. Cheselka explained that it was mason paint. Mr. Layer stated it would be sufficient to have documentation stating it was done appropriately. There was continued discussion regarding the paint application to the brick. The Board continued reviewing the material samples.

There was an inquiry about the difference in color from the Hardie panel material sample, and what was shown on the screen. Mr. Robbins stated the architect may have missed the color as had been done with the shingles and that they could have him correct the color.

Mr. Layer stated; previously the Board felt it was too abrupt to go from brick one side to siding. Their request was to pick up elements from the side towards Maple Ave. Mr. Sutter asked what exactly the Board was looking for. Mr. Layer stated that anything to the public view should have some relationship to what is on the front or side and there needed to be integration. Mr. Sutter stated that there would not be a possibility to brick the lanais. Mr. Layer stated the motion would be conditioned to include the public view changes.

Ms. Hanley stated her concern with the brick in the commercial area making that area

look drab as it would be a lot of that brick color. Mr. Layer stated it would be the entire façade at the ground level facing 123. Ms. Hanley stated it was also the color of the brick at the 13-foot wall that was at the back side of the entrance to the garage and in the public plaza.

Mr. Layer stated that the motion may contain the need for a few other examples of brick that could go on the front of 123 to be submitted using the criteria that they would be compatible and harmonious to the color schemes. Mr. Layer stated using redder hued as the basis to give a more earth tone quality with surface texture and color variation that would yield a deeper richer color brick. Ms. West asked if the brick could be severed from the motion as a new material was being requested and would need to be brought back to the Board to be reviewed and the applicants and the Board agreed to that change.

The applicant's commercial study was brought up for review. Mr. Layer stated he understood the engineer's response to benches was that it would interfere with the walkway. Mr. Layer then asked if had been suggested that the deuces (two seating space tables) were interfering as well. Mr. Robbins stated the tables needed around 5-7 feet and the passage is only 5 feet and 6 feet of clearance is what the town code requires. There was additional discussion regarding the potential for deuces. Mr. Robbins stated the study showed what could be put in and it would be up to the business in the commercial space to choose. Mr. Layer asked if the storefront and alcoves part of the structure above or was it all storefront. Mr. Robbins stated it was storefront. Mr. Layer asked if the platform projected out over the alcove. Mr. Robbins stated it was pretty well in line and that there was a metal awning that hung over. Mr. Layer encouraged pushing back the alcoves one foot to give it 6 feet of clearance allowing the deuces to fit in the alcoves. Mr. Robbins stated they were building for a 3rd party so they would have to get approval before committing to a change in retail. The third party had asked for it to be built the way it had been presented and the architectural and civil are mostly approved. The change would require a lot of revision to add the foot. Mr. Robbins asked for it to be optional, as he could not commit for the third party. Mr. Layer then asked about removing that from the motion to investigate enlivening the space with landscaping. Mr. Robbins stated he agreed with that and appreciated the consideration. There was continued discussion regarding the potential for new landscaping.

Ms. Hanley felt the rendering for the commercial space was a little misleading due to the height of the wall and the railing. There was discussion regarding steps that had been in the middle of the retail leading the public sidewalk and that they had been removed to satisfy the ADA compliance. Ms. Hanley inquired about planters on either side of the entry where the steps had been removed.

Mr. Charles Anderson, 125 Pleasant St NW, came forward to speak. He thanked the Board for all of the work on that specific project. Mr. Anderson mentioned the letter submitted to the BAR and then gave a brief history of who designed their home. He explained that their architect believed a building is not just for the owner but for everyone and should address all four sides. Mr. Anderson then spoke about the points within his letter, which is part of the record. Mr. Anderson asked a site related question regarding his trees and Mr. Robbins answered the question.

Mr. Baldwin asked Mr. Anderson about his letter; and what he meant about the materials. Mr. Anderson explained his opinions about the materials. There was additional discussion regarding the materials being used, and the context of the code sections mentioned in Mr. Andersons letter.

Ms. Hanley asked if the end unit lanai's s on the edge of Church St could return the

railing and keep it open. Mr. Sutter stated it would look good, but it would offer no degree of privacy. Ms. Hanley asked about the angle bays that were not shown on the site plans on the Pleasant St side. Ms. West stated it had not been taken care of yet, but would be when they finalize the review with the BAR. Ms. Hanley asked which she was to use since there are some inconsistencies. Ms. West stated that site plans are provided to the BAR as an information document that will have to match what is approved, but at the time an application goes before the BAR it may not match exactly. If there was a significant site plan change the applicants would have to go before the BAR again for review of that change. Ms. Hanley asked questions for clarification regarding the roof regarding the color and if the material would wrap. Ms. Hanley asked about the pillar on the retaining wall and railing. Mr. Robbins and Ms. Hanley discussed what would work better for the termination of the wall rather than the pillar. Ms. Hanley continued with the park plaza and the steps that would go down into the retail and asked if railing could be added and Mr. Robbins stated it could. Ms. Hanley asked about the pad on the landscape plan shown at the backside of the park. Mr. Robbins stated Dominion said they had to put a transformer at that location. Ms. Hanley stated pictures were missing from the onsite lighting and that lumen levels were not showing. Mr. Robbins stated that only public lighting was included, streetlights and common area lights. They would not have control over whether the individual homeowners would have a light or even use the light. Mr. Robbins asked if they Ms. Hanley would like the builder to show on their plans the townhouse lighting. Ms. Hanley indicated yes, and the garage door lights as well as the commercial garage lighting as there was nothing called out. There was additional discussion regarding lighting.

Mr. Cheselka gave a statement regarding Mr. Anderson's letter to the Board.

Mr. Layer stated the Board should separate the motion approving some items with conditions and the other items would need to go back before the Board. The Board discussed which items would remain in the motion and which would need to go back before the Board.

Mr. Hanley made a motion that the request for approval of Vienna Market, a new mixed-use project, at the former Marco Polo Restaurant site, located at 245 Maple Ave W, Docket No. 21-19-BAR, be approved with the provision for the following items to be confirmed by staff:
1. The paint spec colors of the Hardie panels on the backs of the towns over retails
2. The brick selection is provided to staff with a choice of like materials
3. The pillar at the end of the retaining wall along Bank of America close to Church St. ends with a more substantial pillar
4. Confirm the center steps along the front of the retail are eliminated
5. Verify the color and the materials of the railing coming from the park plaza down into the retail sidewalk area be consistent with the materials of the railing
The following items are to be excluded from the approval:
1. The lighting / photometric plan include all lights on the residential and commercial section be combined into one photometric plan with the specs as needed
2. The landscape plan of sidewalk area in front of retail be developed and brought back before the Board.
3. The brick on units 1, 13, 28, and 29 wrap around into the private street and a design is presented to further enhance the architectural feel of the units
4. Resubmit options for the retail brick

Mr. Baldwin seconded the motion.

Motion: Hanley
Second: Baldwin
Approved: 4-0

4. Approval of Work Session Minutes

September 17, 2017 Work Session Minutes

Ms. Hanley made a motion to approve the September 17, 2017 work session minutes for 380 Maple Ave W., Mr. Baldwin seconded the motion.

Motion: Hanley
Second: Baldwin
Approved: 2-0
Abstain: Layer, Hanley

December 18, 2018 Work Session Minutes:

Ms. Hanley made a motion to approve the December 18, 2018 work session minutes for 380 Maple Ave W., Mr. Baldwin seconded the motion.

Motion: Hanley
Second: Baldwin
Approved: 3-0
Abstain: Layer

May 25, 2018 Work Session Minutes:

Ms. Hanley made a motion to approve the May 25, 2018 work session minutes for the Sunrise project, Mr. Cheselka seconded the motion.

Motion: Hanley
Second: Cheselka
Approved: 4-0

January 11, 2019 Work Session Minutes:

Ms. Hanley made a motion to approve the January 11, 2019 work session minutes for the Sunrise project, Mr. Cheselka seconded the motion.

Motion: Hanley
Second: Cheselka
Approved: 4-0

5. New Business

6. Meeting Adjournment

Mr. Cheselka made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Hanley seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 10:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,

Sharmaine Abaied
Board Clerk

THE TOWN OF VIENNA IS COMMITTED TO FULL COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT STANDARDS. TRANSLATION SERVICES, ASSISTANCE OR ACCOMMODATION REQUESTS FROM PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES ARE TO BE REQUESTED NOT LESS THAN 3 WORKING DAYS BEFORE THE DAY OF THE EVENT. PLEASE CALL (703) 255-6304, OR 711 VIRGINIA RELAY SERVICE FOR THE HEARING IMPAIRED.