



Town of Vienna

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

Meeting Minutes Board of Architectural Review

Thursday, May 17, 2018

8:00 PM

COUNCIL CHAMBERS-VIENNA TOWN
HALL

Regular Meeting

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, Laine Hyde, Michael Cheselka, and Patty Hanley. Staff members Michael D'Orazio, Deputy Director of the Department of Planning & Zoning, Andrea West, Planner, and Sharmaine Abaied, Board Clerk were present.

Before the meeting started Mr. Layer informed the audience of the agenda on the podium as well as stating the sign-up sheet was available for agenda item 4. Mr. Layer also stated those who wanted to speak would be allowed to speak. He also requested that those who came up to speak would need to state their name and address.

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

2. Approval of the Minutes:

Mr. Cheselka made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from April 2018

Mr. Baldwin seconded the motion

Motion: Cheselka

Second: Baldwin

Approved: 5-0

3. Regular Business:

Vienna Design Kitchen and Bath

ITEM NO. 1:

Request for approval of façade sign for Vienna Design Kitchen and Bath located at 394 Maple Avenue East, (Docket No. BAR-25-18), in the C-2 General Commercial zoning district; filed by Murat Turhan, business owner.

Mr. Murat Turhan was present to represent the sign.

Mr. Layer asked if the lamps inside the box would be changed. Mr. Turhan said they would stay the same.

Mr. Cheselka inquired about the words in the upper left part of the sign as it was not as visible from the road. Mr. Turhan stated it was his logo and he could not increase the size.

Mr. Cheselka made a motion that request for approval of façade sign for Vienna Design Kitchen and Bath located at 394 Maple Avenue East, (Docket No. BAR-25-18), be approved as submitted.

Motion: Cheselka

Second: Hyde

Approved: 5-0

Ben and Jerry's

ITEM NO. 2:

Request for approval of façade sign for Ben and Jerry's located at 136C Maple Avenue West, (Docket No. BAR-29-18), in the C-2 General Commercial zoning district; filed by Kyle Hosch, sign agent.

Mr. Kyle Hosch (Ben & Jerry's) and Haley Amy (Rappaport Property Management) were present to represent the application.

Mr. Hosch stated that he had alternates to his original submission if there was any issue with the original.

Mr. Layer asked the differences between the signs. Mr. Hosch stated the illumination and letters would stay the same and only the background changes in efforts to match with other signs in the center. Mr. Layer asked if the first one was his preference and Mr. Hosch stated it was. Mr. Layer asked if the first choice was an awning and Mr. Hosch stated it was not. He continued stating the background was wood and painted blue and the channel letters are mounted to that. Mr. Layer asked if it was an actual wood and Mr. Hosch stated it was. Mr. Layer asked what the background of the 2nd alternate would be and Mr. Hosch stated it would be an aluminum composite material. Mr. Layer then asked what the final alternate would be for the background and Mr. Hosch stated there would be no material change; it would just be painted gray.

Ms. Hanley asked if the wood was pine and Mr. Hosch stated it was pine. Ms. Hanley then stated her concern about the wood deteriorating. Mr. Hosch stated they could pick something else and Ms. Amy stated they could use hardiplank. Ms. Hanley asked if there was an understory where the store would be located and Ms. Amy stated yes. Ms. Hanley then asked if the awning would be an extension of that. Ms. Amy stated yes and that it would be similar to the Panera. There was more discussion regarding the two alternates.

Ms. Hyde stated that she didn't like the Ben & Jerry's awning next to the Panera awning in alternate #1.

Mr. Layer stated the longevity of the aluminum would outlast the alternatives as well as discussing illumination of the sign. Mr. Layer also asked which sign was most preferable to the applicant and if there is a desire for a material change it would need to be suggested to the board for the motion and vote. Mr. Hosch and Ms. Amy discussed and Mr. Hosch decided he would like the first sign with hardiplank rather than wood background.

Ms. Hyde made a motion that request for approval of façade sign for Ben and Jerry's located at 136C Maple Avenue West, (Docket No. BAR-29-18), be approved as to option 1 and that the background material (cementitious product that is pre-finished) be submitted to staff for approval.

Motion: Hyde
Second: Hanley
Approved: 5-0

Cadence on Center

ITEM NO. 3:

Request for approval of exterior modifications for Cadence on Center located at 135 Center Street South, (Docket No. BAR-59-17), in the RM-2 Multifamily, Low Density zoning district; filed by John Sekas, developer.

Mr. Brian Deege was present to represent the application.

Mr. Deege presented the proposed pavilion to be built as well as color selections which tied into the existing approved color selections for the facades, roof, and paint. Mr. Deege also presented the proposed benches.

Mr. Baldwin asked about a color rendering and Mr. Deege stated they had not submitted one. Mr. Baldwin continued by having Mr. Deege confirm the pavilion height, width, materials, colors, and benches.

Ms. Hanley inquired about a gutter that showed in the plans and Mr. Deege said there would not be a gutter as it would be a detraction.

Mr. Layer asked if there would be trusses and Mr. Deege said they would not have trusses.

Mr. Baldwin request for approval of exterior modifications for Cadence on Center located at 135 Center Street South, (Docket No. BAR-59-17), be approved as submitted

Motion: Baldwin
Second: Cheselka
Approved: 5-0

West Maple Ave - 444 Maple Ave W

ITEM NO. 4:

Request for recommendation to Town Council regarding compliance with requirements of Article 13.1 of the Town Code for the proposed 444 Maple mixed-use building, as part of Maple Avenue Commercial (MAC) Zone application, located at 430-444 Maple Avenue, W, (Docket No. PF-08-18-MAC), in the C-1 Local Commercial zoning district and RS-16 Single-Family Detached Residential zoning district, pending approval for rezoning to the Maple Avenue Commercial Zone; filed by Sara Mariska, on behalf of Vienna Development Associates, LLC.

Mr. Chris Bell was present to represent the application.

Mr. Bell began the meeting sharing his thoughts on the project and then brought up Mr. Chip Baker to discuss more details of the project.

Mr. Layer commented that the audience may not have seen the most recent drawings and asked that they indicate the changes from the time of the work session to the time of the meeting so it was clear what had been changed.

Mr. Baker gave a brief overview of the location of the project and its current state. Mr. Baker then reviewed some of the details of the proposed project:

- Addition of 29 trees
- 4 story building with retail parking and 20,000 square feet of retail
- Open air garage
- Covered access points to retail
- 85 retail parking spaces
- 200 residential parking spaces

Mr. Baker continued by showing the different cities that were the inspiration for the project and why. Mr. Baker continued stating some of the other features of the project. He also stated the recurring comment from multiple parties was the project would be the gateway to Vienna. Mr. Baker continued discussing the changes that were made in relationship to comments made as well as other items they had reworked. Mr. Layer asked if they would like to hear comments from the audience and then respond and Mr. Bakerl stated they would like that.

The list following is the speakers and their concerns and options for their concerns:

Stephen Potter, 400 Roland St SW:

Concerns:

1. size of the building
 - a. foot print is larger than a football field
 - b. site is currently occupied by 3 buildings
 - c. longer than an average city block
 - d. only allows 5 feet of designated sidewalk
2. lack of significant height differential
 - a. gives perception of huge elongated box
 - b. no transition of scale or buffer for neighbors in the rear of the building
3. lack of public accessible green space - no public access to green space

Options for concerns:

1. Utilize stair stepping building heights or varying roof forms to avoid the appearance of elongated building mass.
2. Reduce story height at the back of the building by eliminating at least one row of top story apartments to make the building less compromising to the abutting neighborhoods
3. Set the building back on Nutley St side to widen the narrow sidewalk.
4. Create a break in the 315 foot length of wall facing Maple Ave and lower existing greenspace to street level to allow public access to an interior courtyard

Estelle Belisle, 200 Ceret Ct SW:

Concerns:

1. Building height – varying heights is in the 15% additional height (7½ feet) for functional and decorative elements (parapets).
2. Elongated building
3. Setbacks – Front and side

Jayme Huleatt, 413 Roland St SW:

Concerns:

1. Building height
2. Nutley street sidewalk width
3. Not enough open public space

Sharon Pott, 134 Wade Hampton Dr SW:

Concerns:

1. The prettiest corner entering Vienna will be under development
2. 3 buildings of the hospitality industry will be replaced
 - a. Popular Mexican restaurant
 - b. Vienna's only hotel

- c. (3rd not mentioned)
- 3. Months of digging, dirt, concrete, cranes, confusion, noise, pedestrian and vehicular traffic

- 4. Building is suited to a city scape

Joseph Daly, 412 Roland St SW:

Concerns:

- 1. Architecturally huge
- 2. Consistent with a city not town
- 3. Creates parking and visual problems
- 4. Create water problems

Jay Crestwell, 404 Millwood Ct SW:

Concerns:

- 1. Massive building
- 2. Parking, traffic, water problems
- 3. Maxing out number of cubic feet of leasable space

Suggestions:

- 1. Take one side off each courtyard and bring entire courtyard down to street level for open space
- 2. Consider modifying the two-way streets behind the building
- 3. Raise dividing wall to 10-12 feet high

John Pott, 134 Wade Hampton Dr:

Concerns:

- 1. 3-D isometrics are not to scale, 25% off
- 2. Issues when project is completed
 - a. Huge building – 6-story normal apartment block (6 feet)
 - b. Nutley sidewalk – 5 foot sidewalk
 - c. Open dining space – vehicles sharing same covered space as dining area
- 3. Pedestrian friendly open plazas are contrary to the MAC and comp plan

Suggestions:

- 1. Reconfigure the building per letter written to the Mayor
- 2. Drop one courtyard to street level
- 3. Reduced the max out number of apartments to reduce parking requirements
- 4. Open up fortress like building
- 5. Insist the public access pedestrian and green space

Toni Potter, 400 Roland St SW:

Concerns:

- 1. Be another Falls Church, Ballston, Mosaic, Wharf, Tysons, Arlington and lose character
- 2. Building doesn't reflect small town vision

Pete Zouras, 408 Millwood Ct SW:

Concerns:

- 1. Size of the building
- 2. How much time will it take to build
- 3. How will it change the complexion of the neighborhood
- 4. Trees on either side of brick wall (contrast in trees)
- 5. Doesn't like that SFD and TH are treated differently (townhomes are called transitional)
- 6. Wants an environmental impact study to address issues of traffic (Wade Hampton and Roland) and parking (Millwood Ct)

Mr. Baker came forward to respond and started by saying that as a licensed architect they are charged with ensuring that they have the most accurate images possible with the technology and software available. Mr. Baker then stated the height of the building is not

measured by the sidewalk, but by the average grade.

Mr. Bell came forward to speak on the comments made as well. He responded to the maxing out of the MAC and said that they have proposed 160 units and they could get up to 235 units and additional retail. Mr. Layer stated that a visual explanation would be beneficial as some may not understand what a “maxed out” proposal would look like. Mr. Baker brought up a slide that showed what they could do by rite, the max of the MAC zoning, and then the final which showed what they proposed. Mr. Bell also spoke on it being walkable and not an “urban place” which is why the parking not the biggest or first thing seen.

Mr. Layer asked them to touch on the three basic points that had been of concern by those who spoke. The points are as follows: setback on Nutley, imposing length of building on Maple, and open space. Mr. Layer then asked for the MAC regulation was regarding how much open space is offered as a requirement. Mr. D’Orzaio stated it was 15% of the site. It was then discussed that the corner plaza, the interior courtyards (on the 2nd story), and the areas surrounding the building. Mr. Layer asked if there was any MAC requirement for any open public space. Mr. D’Orazio stated the MAC gives criteria and states it should be open space to the users of the building. Mr. Layer asked if the public areas were around the perimeter of the building and he also inquired about a comment made that the eating areas are only open to residents. Mr. Bell and Mr. Baker both state the eating areas were open to the public. Mr. Layer also asked if the spaces were open so that a person could cut through the parking lot and Mr. Bell stated yes. Mr. Layer then asked if the courtyards would only be accessible to residents and Mr. Bell stated yes. Mr. Layer asked for the MAC requirement for Nutley Street and Mr. D’Orazio stated 15 feet. Mr. Bell stated there was 4 feet of planting, 5 feet of sidewalk, and another 6 feet of sidewalk adjacent to the building. Mr. Layer spoke with the audience regarding buildings and parking in the past and how Vienna had been trying to find a way for a different type of development that creates a streetscape. He also stated it’s not easy for the developer, residents, or staff which is why it should be brought together in a reasonable manner. Mr. Layer then stated it may not be reasonable to ask that a building be radically changed in a way that the regulations do not ask them to do. Mr. Layer asked how long the MAC regulations took. Ms. Hyde stated it was 2 ½ years of 17 town meetings. Mr. Layer explained to the audience that the BAR’s purview is based on aesthetics, and longevity not zoning. He continued stating the different criteria with the MAC the BAR must accept that staff has reviewed as well as other organizations in town, but not the BAR relating to zoning (setbacks, parking counts, open space, etc). Mr. Layer continued stating that what the BAR looks at is how the building interacts with its neighbors, and the feel at ground level.

Mr. Baker reviewed the sidewalk from what was stated earlier by Mr. Bell (4 feet of planting, 5 feet of sidewalk, and another 6 feet of sidewalk adjacent to the building). He continued stating the building has been setback from the curved bay to the curve of the sidewalk approximately 45 feet which he felt was much safer than the current 4 feet of sidewalk. There was continued discussion regarding the sidewalk and the requirements for the sidewalk based on the MAC. Ms. Hanley commented that in the rendering the brick looks like the width of a bike path and that if people had been there and chairs it would give the impression that it is 5 feet wide rather than 2 feet wide.

Mr. Layer asked what the material at the base of the building was. Mr. Bell and Mr. Baker stated it was brick with fiber cement panels. Mr. Layer asked what the width of the non-brick part of the sidewalk was. Mr. Baker stated it was 9 feet (zone 3). Mr. Baker stated zone 1 was the planting strip; zone 2 was the brick sidewalk, and zone 3 which is the remainder of the sidewalk to the building.

Mr. Layer asked what the difference was for tree coverage currently to what the project is proposing. Mr. Baker stated there were currently 15 trees on the site and those would be replaced with 29 trees total. Mr. Bell stated nothing in the back along the wall is proposed to change other than adding more. Mr. Bell also stated the wall belonged to them and it would stay and be maintained.

Mr. Baldwin stated Ms. Belisle emailed concern about varying building heights to lighten the mass. Mr. Baker stated that it's tough to show elevation to be viewed as it will be. There was continued discussion regarding elevation. Mr. Layer asked when the metal roof stops being interior space. Mr. Baker showed the roof line and stated a foot above the windows was the roof with a 2 foot roof truss. Ms. Hanley asked about the left most side looking at the building with the arched windows and if it was at the top of the arch and Mr. Baker stated yes. There was discussion regarding recesses, offsets, and projections.

Ms. Hanley commented that first level of apartments could have opportunity for balconies. Ms. Hyde commented on the rear setback, way in excess of the requirement and that it leaves potential for a more interesting space. She also commented about their addressing the modulation.

Mr. Layer discussed how the residents would like to see the building and stated he was giving opportunity for ways to meld and assuage the concerns of residents.

Mr. Baldwin stated a concern of a resident for the dining area immediately adjacent to the parking area and asked if they would comment. Mr. Baker stated the parking is 4 feet lower than the dining area. Mr. Bell also stated the outside dining areas are further away from parking than those by the old Magraders. There was continued discussion regarding where the vehicle are allowed to park.

Ms. Hanley asked about the air quality or air handlers on the plans. Mr. Bell stated there were 4 intakes that would be for the downstairs and that the entire backside was open and that there may be circulating fans, but not necessarily exhaust fans.

Mr. Cheselka stated that although it may not be under the board's purview he wanted to know if there were traffic studies addressing the potential issues for Nutley and Maple. Mr. Bell stated that there was a traffic analysis done and that a lot of what was found was that it all depended on the time of day. Ms. Hanley stated that the turning right on red from Nutley onto 123 may need to be reevaluated.

Mr. Baldwin stated that the board was being asked to vote on whether the project meets the requirement of the Maple Ave Corridor (MAC) from a design standpoint which means the project promotes Vienna's small town character and does not comprise residential neighborhoods abutting the corridor. That it encourages a pedestrian friendly human scale design of streets buildings and open spaces, and that it encourages the incorporation of a variety of design elements. Mr. Baldwin asked how they felt it did that. Mr. Bell stated he believed their project does follow the guideline. Mr. Baldwin asked if they were willing to make any substantial changes regarding comments made. Mr. Bell stated they will absolutely look at what the chairman suggested.

Mr. Layer stated there was opportunity for several things, first to modulate the façade greater at the area where the tunnels are. He also stated the planting Nutley Street should be increased and do something against the building. Enhance the back architecture and could also be achieved by recessing the building located at the tunnels along the column line. The back could be correspondingly cantilevered and enhanced architecturally to achieve increased interest on the back facade. The lushness and texture of the

development of the landscape plan. Mr. Layer asked the species of the largest trees. Mr. Baker stated they were Maple, Birch, and Sycamore. Mr. Layer then asked their final height and Mr. Baker stated 25 feet. There was continued discussion regarding trees. Mr. Layer encouraged them to focus on the perspective and the stepping of horizontal plain moving outward.

Ms. Hanley wanted to reiterate the goals of the MAC regarding open space and public access to the courtyards or something instead of the courtyards. She continued stating that for a mixed-use there may be competition between the commercial and residential regarding parking if residential tries to overtake the commercial parking. Ms. Hanley stated her concern for trash. Ms. Hanley reiterated the concerns of the residents concerning the building heights on the front and back. Ms. Hanley stated she would like there to be a way to move through the parking garage better. Ms. Hanley asked about the landscaping and the wall. She also reiterated the commercial delivery concern, trash trucks, and school buses and where children would wait. Mr. Bell stated he would be surprised if the school had a bus stop at their site. Ms. Hanley then asked about the lighting plan and the height of the pole and Mr. Bell stated they would be short poles (8 feet).

Mr. Layer asked about the Kelvin for the lamps. Mr. Baker stated it would be the town standard. Mr. Layer stated there is not a standard, but to look at 3,000 or below.

Ms. Hyde walked through the process with the board. BAR makes a recommendation if it meets the MAC, the Planning Commission would see it next, then it would go to Town Council, and then back to BAR for all the comments relating to aesthetics. Mr. Baldwin asked if they should defer their vote and the board stated no.

Mr. Baker commented on the water and Mr. Layer stated that they would be subject to the storm water control across the board which began in 2014.

Mr. Layer asked for any other comments. The comments are as follows:

Natasha Perkins, 403 Roland St:

Concerns:

1. Seeing lights from the windows of the residents.
2. Not enough trees
3. Desire for a taller wall.

Jim Crestwall, 404 Millwood Ct SW:

Concerns:

1. The lights
2. 6-foot high wall not high enough.

Stephen Potter, 400 Roland St SW:

Concerns:

1. The size of delivery vehicles and ability to maneuver in space provided.

Tina Cardenas, 214 Surret Ct:

Concern:

1. The traffic signals not in the drawings for scale and for what is currently there and would stay there.

Mr. Baker stated that they have a set up for 30 foot box truck with no semi's onsite. Mr. Baker showed the images in 3-D that they inserted into google earth. There was

continued discussion regarding the 3-D images.

John Pott, 134 Wade Hampton Dr:

Concerns:

1. Felt the drawings were misleading and that it had to be resolved.

Mr. Layer stated the board cannot resolve that issue and continued stating that when a professional does work it has to be assumed that they are professionally projecting that work.

Tina Cardenas, 214 Surret Ct,

Concern:

1. Requested, again, that future drawings show the traffic lights and wires that will be there when the building is constructed.

Ms. Hanley asked if the board could vote separately or do all together regarding things found lacking. Mr. Layer stated it would be looked at again so there should be no need to break it up and the recommendation should be for the project as it stood.

Ms. Hyde made a motion to approve the request for recommendation to Town Council regarding compliance with requirements of Article 13.1 of the Town Code for the proposed 444 Maple mixed-use building, as part of Maple Avenue Commercial (MAC) Zone application, located at 430-444 Maple Avenue, W, (Docket No. PF-08-18-MAC), with the following comments: the applicant moving forward consider additional landscaping, architectural modulation including roofline variations: further modulation at the façade and all the way to the roof, scope of the planting increased, specifically at Nutley, as well as two areas where trees front the building, enhance the architecture of the rear façade, and comments based on the minutes of the meeting as well as the comments of the chairman and board members.

Ms. Hanley asked to add the open space (private/public) be part of the motion and be reevaluated. Ms. Hyde asked if the open space currently met the MAC requirement and Mr. D'Orazio stated yes. Ms. Hanley then stated she prefer it be part of the board comments. Ms. Hanley stated (in error) the code did not allow open space to be private which is why she wanted it to be reconsidered. Mr. Layer stated that was an issue for the code itself and not the purview of the BAR. Mr. Layer stated he would decline the motion as well. Ms. Hanley stated she respectfully disagreed so she would not support the motion.

Mr. Baldwin seconded the motion.

Motion: Hyde

Second: Baldwin

Nay: Hanley

Approved: 4-1

New Business:

Ms. Hyde commented about the dumpsters at the Inova site of Vienna Shopping Center are always open.

Mr. Layer stated that the BAR and other organizations have discussed that it is

inappropriate to discuss technical issues about the code at the BAR meeting and it can be checked with Steve (towns attorney). Mr. Layer continued by asking members to decline from doing that. He continued stating it was not appropriate to talk about the legality of the MAC program which was a consideration that happened with those who approved it and the board does not litigate. Mr. Layer also stated the BAR is to stay within the purview of the BAR's charge. He continued stating it was important the board does not move beyond their charge and try to make legal rulings. Mr. Baldwin stated that the issue of open space was brought up and Mr. D'Orazio stated 15%. Mr. Layer stated that Mr. D'Orazio stated it was in conformance. Mr. Baldwin stated we (BAR members) don't have the right or responsibility to ask if open space is or is not open to the public and that it's for others to decide. Mr. Layer stated that the members are there to apply the code as it relates to the BAR's charge.

Ms. Hanley stated that the town's attorney memo stated it was their opportunity to talk about the site plan and how it achieves the MAC. Mr. Layer stated that the memo and email from the attorney stated we (BAR) do not review for general requirements and only as it relates to aesthetics. Mr. Layer stated they could speak with the town's attorney if Ms. Hanley would like. Mr. Layer also pointed out that the attorney on the board confirmed that was not in the purview of the BAR.

4. Meeting Adjournment:

Mr. Cheselka made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Baldwin seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 11:15 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.

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.