

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
September 19, 2019
DRAFT MINUTES

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: Michael Cheselka and Patty Hanley; Roy Baldwin was absent. 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 Paul Layer, Michael Cheselka, and Patty Hanley being present and Roy Baldwin was absent.

MEETING MINUTES:

Ms. Hanley stated her vote of the September 2017 work session minutes were to be corrected to abstain.

Mr. Cheselka made a motion to approve the August 2019 meeting minutes with the correction.

Ms. Hanley seconded the motion.

Motion:	Cheselka
Second:	Hanley
Approved:	3-0
Absent:	Baldwin

ITEM NO. 1:

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

Mr. Nate Robbin was present to represent the application.

Ms. West gave an opening statement referencing the list of the items that the Board had requested of the applicant.

Mr. Layer asked Mr. Robbins to begin with the lighting plan, and Mr. Robbins began with the lighting plan of the entire site. Mr. Layer asked if the values had changed, Mr. Robbins stated everything was the same with additions. Mr. Robbins stated lighting was added at the garage entry way and explained the lumens to foot candles. Mr. Robbins showed where lights were added when entering the driveway area. Lights were also added to every stairway due to concern for the lighting at the stairway.

Ms. Hanley asked if the fixtures for the added lighting were listed somewhere, Mr. Robbin stated yes and showed the Board where the fixtures were listed, they type of fixtures, and where they would be located on the site. Ms. Hanley asked about the color, Mr. Robbins stated they had not picked a color as

of yet awaiting the Boards feedback. The Board stated black would be the best color, and Mr. Robbins stated they would use black. Mr. Layer reviewed standards for illumination based on the Illuminating Engineer Society and then explained that he wanted to make sure the areas were not under lit or over lit. Ms. West brought the Boards attention to the photometric planned that had been provided to staff the day of the meeting. More lamps were in the area of concern and photometric data was brought toward the building. Mr. Layer asked to review the pole lights at the entry of the parking garage. Mr. Layer asked for the Kelvin and Lumen levels. Ms. West stated the Kelvins were 3000, the lumen levels did not show. Mr. Layer reviewed the foot candles with the Board in place of the lumens. Mr. Layer discussed the locations that were individually lamped and expressed that part of the motion should contain reviewing lighting at a later date to ensure lighting areas are not under lit. Ms. West stated that during certificate of occupancy review the lighting could be reviewed and possible changed if more lighting was needed. Mr. Layer agreed that part of the motion could indicate that lighting would be looked at during the occupancy review time to add lighting if needed. There was additional discussion about what could be done at time of occupancy regarding lighting. Mr. Cheselka asked about the curb lighting on Maple and Pleasant and the placement and sizes of some the street lamps. Ms. West stated the street light placement is decided by Dominion. She also stated the "cobra" light noted on the corner must be an error based on the Fairfax County which does not apply for the Town of Vienna. Mr. Layer asked if there would only be "acorn" lighting and Ms. West stated that was her understanding. There was continued discussion regarding lighting in the right of way. Mr. Robbins pointed out that lighting was added in the stairwells, 4 to 5 locations in total. Ms. West pulled up the stairwells parallel to Maple Ave which had wall packs added. There was discussion about the color and it was decided black would be best. Ms. Hanley asked about if the lights outside the retail fronts were exterior fixtures. Mr. Robbins stated yes they were as they would not be designing the interior lights. Ms. Hanley asked if they had a fixture selected. Ms. West stated it was fixture "H" on the left and "H1" on the right. The Board spot checked the lighting levels at different places in the stairwells.

The Board moved on to the landscaping. Landscaping, in planter boxes, was added to the commercial area. Mr. Robbins discussed the different types of plants that will be in the planters. Mr. Layer asked who would be responsible for caring for the plants. Mr. Robbins stated it would either be the tenant or the owner of the podium. Ms. Hanley stated the planters near the steps going down in the retail sidewalk would be better served by the step area as it can be a tripping hazard. Defining the steps would create better functionality. Moving the planters would also allow for the plants to get water and sun as they would not be under the overhang. Ms. Hanley stated the purple fountain grass would end up being an annual. Ms. Hanley suggested a Japanese Holly, Dwarf Juniper, or Dwarf Cypress' as it was evergreen to have one plant in every planter to be green all year. Mr. Layer asked that the suggestions be made part of the motion. There was some discussion about the stairs where the planters would be relocated. Mr. Layer asked if Ms. Hanley was requesting to relocate the planters to the stairs or add planters. Ms. Hanley stated she wanted to move them and Mr. Layer stated he preferred to add two. Ms. Hanley stated her preference would be to wrap the knee wall around and add a railing going down. Mr. Robbins stated he would talk with the landscapers.

The Board moved on to the elevations and Mr. Robbins mentioned it was for the NVR buildings with the added brick on the backside of the buildings. Mr. Layer asked if the brick was added up to the balcony, Mr. Robbins stated it was at the level of the strong line carried around the corner of the building. The Board looked at the 3D renderings from the August meeting in reference to the updated elevations. Mr. Robbins mentioned that the brick color was close to the siding color so it is difficult to see the difference and Ms. Hanley commented that the break is at the water table. Ms. Hanley asked to look at the rendering showing the lanai. Mr. Robbins stated that NVR did make an opening in the lanai as requested by the Board. Ms. Hanley pointed out the railing had also been returned (taken around the side) as discussed in the August meeting too.

The last item was the brick selection for the commercial. Mr. Layer mentioned the wire cut brick and felt it was inappropriate for the building as it was traditional and wire cut bricks are not traditional. He did state that he understood applying the mural paint to a variegated surface would be difficult. Mr. Layer stated that the designated areas for the mural could have the wire cut #1 brick in those areas to be the canvas for the paint allowing it to adhere. Ms. Hanley asked if the brick going on the retail was brick or brick facing. Mr. Robbins stated it would be veneer / facing. He followed up stating it would be a full concrete structure with brick facing. Ms. Hanley asked if the retaining wall against the backside where the townhomes would be the same, Mr. Robbins stated yes. Mr. Cheselka asked about the mural size. The Board members agreed that the entire wall driving in could be a different material than the building as it was different than the building, and would give it depth. Mr. Layer inquired about the brick size on the commercial retail. Mr. Robbins stated it would be a full concrete structure, with hangers, that the one course full brick will sit on showing as a veneer. It will look like a brick structure, but will be supported by concrete. Mr. Layer asked if it was full brick and Mr. Robbins stated he believed it was full brick. Mr. Robbins commented that the thought behind the wire cut brick was that the "Townes" were a more traditional type and the wire cut would create contrast. Mr. Layer stated it would be more congruent to stay away from the wire cut brick, as it would be viewed in conjunction with the other surfaces. Mr. Robbins let the Board know he had material samples with him for the Board to review. Ms. Hanley asked about the sizes of the brick, and Mr. Robbins stated they would be the size of the material samples brought to the meeting that night. Mr. Cheselka spoke on the aspects of painting the brick for the mural as the steps required for painting brick is important. He also asked about if the brick would be washed with muriatic acid in preparation of painting the brick. Mr. Robbins stated he had not heard that. Mr. Cheselka stated it was still used in the industry. Mr. Robbins stated if it is an industry standard it would be done by their masons. The Board had additional discussion in preparation of the motion referencing the following:

- the light fixtures needing to be black
- the lighting levels be reviewed at time of occupancy
- mitigation of light at the corner of the brick entryway to the driveway
- the corner looked at with a resolution to the cobra / acorn light discrepancy
- at the commercial level a cheek wall running adjacent to the steps returning and returning to the wall behind it for the purpose of the planter at a minimum size of 2 feet.
- the brick choice of color number three for the commercial.
- wire cut brick on the mural wall at the driveway entry (with the train in the rendering) all the way to the corner with the pillars having brick #3.
- wire cut brick in the second mural area (railroad crossing signal in the rendering) and can have two different types of brick, stopping at the 3rd rustication mark.

There was additional discussion regarding the mural and the need to go back before the Board when ready to submit for the mural.

Ms. 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 Avenue W., Docket No. 21-19-BAR, as follows:

1. Clarification the light fixtures selected would be the black finish
2. Staff evaluate the Eastern most sidewalk to ensure adequate lighting making appropriate adjustments if offsite lighting is not adequate
3. Staff, prior to occupancy, evaluate lighting at night to ensure lighting is adequate for intended use.
4. Staff note any corrections to the approved plan in regards to the cobra light shown in the right of way near the Pleasant St intersection.

5. Two planters at the commercial stairs in the midpoint of the building enter the retail sidewalk and return, and return back to the wall creating a 2x2x2 planter, inside dimension, with a railing attached in similar material as the railings around the building.
6. The brick choice for the commercial space be #3 except wire cut brick #2 at the rear wall of the driveway inside the pillars flanking that wall
7. Wire cut brick #2 above the rustication at the railroad sign which is mural location #2 with the rustication on the side of the stairwell / elevator shaft be three sections high.
8. The Dwarf Junipers will be considered and the Japanese Holly to replace the Purple Fountain Grass. Reporting to staff the replacement landscaping.

Motion: Hanley
Second: Cheselka
Approved: 3-0
Absent: Baldwin

DRAFT