



# Town of Vienna

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

## Meeting Minutes Board of Architectural Review

---

Thursday, September 20, 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 Andrea West, Planner, and Sharmaine Abaied, Board Clerk were present.

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

#### 2. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Cheselka made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from August 18, 2018

Ms. Hanley seconded the motion.

Motion: Cheselka

Second: Hanley

Approved: 5-0

#### 3. Public Hearings

155 Glyndon Ave E - On Edge Hair Salon sign

Request for approval of a façade sign (tenant replacement panel only) for On Edge Hair Salon at 155 Glyndon Ave SE (Docket No. PR-46-18-BAR), in the C-2 zoning district; filed by Yesoon Ham, business owner.

Ms. Yesoon Han was present to represent her application.

Ms. Hanley asked staff if there was an application to change the monument lettering. Ms. West stated the applicant had not made them aware of a change and was not sure if they would have a spot on the monument sign. Ms. Hanley stated that the former tenant was on the monument and wanted to ensure the applicant knew of the requirements going forward for the sign.

Mr. Layer asked the applicant if she was aware of the requirements for the monument sign. Ms. West stated the applicant was before the board currently because the sign had already been installed. Ms. West then stated she would be sure the applicant was aware of the requirements for the monument sign. Mr. Layer then asked that staff explain the requirement to come before the board for the monument sign.

Mr. Cheselka made a motion that the request for approval of a façade sign (tenant replacement panel only) for On Edge Hair Salon at 155 Glyndon Ave SE (Docket No. PR-46-18-BAR), be approved as submitted.

**Motion:** Cheselka

**Second:** Baldwin

**Approved:** 5-0

136 Maple Ave W - Panera Bread window sign

Request for approval of a façade sign (replacement) and window sign for Panera Bread at 136B Maple Ave W (Docket No. PF-48-18-BAR), in the C-2 zoning district; filed by Val Neitzey of Shane's Signs, sign agent.

Ms. Val Neitzey was present to represent the application.

Mr. Baldwin inquired about the location of the window sign and the colors of the letters. There was continued discussion regarding the color of the letters.

Mr. Cheselka asked about the kelvin level stating it shows 4000k. There was discussion regarding the kelvin level and that the light color would burn blue. It was decided that the kelvin level should be included in the motion.

Mr. Cheselka made a motion that the request for approval of a façade sign (replacement) and window sign for Panera Bread at 136B Maple Ave W (Docket No. PF-48-18-BAR), be approved with the condition that the kelvin level will match that of the existing lighting.

**Motion:** Cheselka

**Second:** Hyde

**Approved:** 5-0

155 Maple Ave W - Gem Tea façade sign, freestanding sign, exterior modifications

Request for approval of façade signage, freestanding sign (tenant replacement panel), and exterior modifications of Gem Tea at 155 Maple Ave W (Docket No. PF-49-18-BAR), in the C-2 zoning district; filed by Matthew Hawkins, Assoc. AIA of Helbing Lipp Recny Architects.

Mr. John Recny was present to represent the application.

Mr. Recny gave a brief explanation of the current state of the location as well as what was being proposed for the exterior modifications, lighting, and the signs.

Mr. Cheselka asked how many overhead lights were at the location. Mr. Recny stated there were currently fifteen and they would be replacing them one for one. Mr. Cheselka asked what they would be replaced with and Mr. Recny stated they would be LED with the same light level as the current lights with the same kelvin.

Ms. Hanley asked if the canopy would be only in the back. Mr. Recny stated the trellis would only be in the back over the doors. Ms. Hanley then asked if the hardi-board was only to be added to the face of the building for the existing restaurant and Gem Tea, but not the car wash. Mr. Recny stated that was correct.

Mr. Baldwin asked about the different fonts for the letter "G" in the two signs. Mr. Recny

had Mr. Wang, owner of the restaurant, come forward. Mr. Wang gave his explanation for why they want to use the different fonts for the letter “G”. Mr. Baldwin asked if the current tenant was in agreeance to the new siding. Mr. Recny stated they were ok with it. Mr. Baldwin inquired about the light in regards to the proximity of neighboring residents or businesses. Mr. Baldwin asked if the car wash compressor would be moved and Mr. Recny stated it would stay.

Mr. Layer asked how the canopy would be mounted and if any specifications were supplied to staff. Mr. Recny stated they would just be taking the existing board off and put a new board on and that the existing frame would remain. Mr. Layer asked if it would be capped with new flashing and coping and what the coping is made from. Mr. Recny stated it would have new flashing and coping which would be metal and the same color. Mr. Layer then stated the application was not complete and that there needed to be additional sections supplied due to the architectural alterations. Mr. Layer then asked for the types of paint. Mr. Recny stated it was Sherwin Williams. There was further discussion regarding the requirements for applications for exterior modifications as well as the signs. Mr. Recny stated he could provide construction documents. Mr. Layer stated he wouldn’t need a full set of construction documents just the portion showing how the systems are put in place. There was continued discussion regarding the types of systems and signs in reference to their specifications to ensure they are durable.

Mr. Baldwin asked if the equipment related to the car wash would be screened. Mr. Recny stated screening the equipment was not part of their application and that the car was uses the equipment.

Ms. Hanley inquired about the wall mounted canopy and the bolt used. She then asked how many bolts would be needed for the length of the proposed canopy. Ms. Hanley stated it appeared there were three, but asked what the length of the canopy would be. Mr. Recny stated the canopy length was 14 ft.

Ms. Hanley made a motion that the request for approval of façade signage, freestanding sign (tenant replacement panel), and exterior modifications of Gem Tea at 155 Maple Ave W (Docket No. PF-49-18-BAR), be approved with the condition that the structural specs for the panels are forwarded to staff and board reviews before the permit is approved and the exterior modifications in the rear of the building, including the canopy, follow the manufacturer’s installation guidelines.

Motion: Hanley

Second: Hyde

Approved: 5-0

362 Maple Ave E - Starbucks monument sign and exterior modifications

Request for approval of a freestanding sign, and exterior modification for Starbucks at 362 Maple Ave E (Docket No. PF-16-18-BAR), in the C-1A zoning district; filed by Scott Sanfilippo, Project Coordinator, of Curry Architects.

Ms. Claudia Humphrey was present to represent the application.

Ms. Humphrey reviewed the previous approved materials as well as the items that were proposed to change with the application. Ms. Humphrey also discussed the original monument sign proposed for Starbucks.

Mr. Cheselka asked what the sign would be set on and if there would be landscaping. Mr. Humphrey stated it would be set at grade with a foundation below and it would have low

landscaping.

Ms. Hanley asked about the power supply for the lights. Ms. Humphrey stated it would be from inside the brick base of the monument coming from the main buildings panel power source. Ms. Hanley asked if the sign would be on all the time and Ms. Humphrey stated that typically it times out when it is closed.

Mr. Layer asked about the construction of the monument sign. Ms. Humphrey stated it was concrete foundation with a brick veneer over stud framing. Mr. Layer asked if it was a full brick. Ms. Humphrey stated it wouldn't need to be due to the small footprint. Mr. Layer continued discussing the construction of the sign in reference to durability. Mr. Layer continued stating that he would like the board to go forward with the understanding of the construction. Mr. Layer also asked for more information regarding the lighting for the sign.

Mr. Cheselka discussed the construction of the sign and stated the sign would need to be capped so water would not make it inside the sign. There was continued discussion regarding the construction of monument signs.

Ms. Hyde made a motion that the request for approval of a freestanding sign, and exterior modification for Starbucks at 362 Maple Ave E (Docket No. PF-16-18-BAR), be approved with the condition that the applicant will provide follow up materials to staff for the freestanding sign including materials, sub straight, application, capping, and lighting attachment specifications for the monument sign.

Motion: Hyde

Second: Cheselka

Approved: 5-0

#### 234 Maple Ave E - Shin Se Kai Ramen exterior modifications

Request for exterior modifications for Shin Se Kai Ramen at 234 Maple Ave E (Docket No. PF-47-18-BAR), in the C-1A zoning district; filed by Ben Kim of Zion Construction Inc.

Mr. Ben Kim was present to represent the application.

Mr. Kim stated they were apologetic for not having brought their exterior modification application before construction. Mr. Kim then followed up with explaining what the exterior modification proposed plans were for Shin Se Kai Ramen.

Mr. Cheselka asked for clarification of the materials as what was submitted and what was in the rendering differs. Mr. Cheselka then inquired about one of the colors, as it appeared lighter. There was continued discussion of the colors and materials as well as where the materials belonged in reference to the renderings.

Mr. Baldwin commented about the landlord letter stating the applicant was allowed to put up the tiles, but would have 30 days to remove the tiles when the lease was up. He then asked about how much damage will be made when the tile is removed. Mr. Kim stated it would be light damage as they punched drill hole into the mortar. Mr. Baldwin then asked about what would be done to the sides of the building. Mr. Kim stated they would apply white latex paint. Mr. Baldwin asked if there were two gooseneck lamps. Mr. Kim stated there were four. Mr. Baldwin then asked what the two-gooseneck lamps on either side of the main door would illuminate. Mr. Kim stated they would lightly illuminate the bottom.

Ms. Hyde asked for clarification on whether the entirety of the columns would be wrapped in tile or just the front and she wanted to know where the tile would end and the paint begin. Mr. Kim stated they would be wrapping the entire column with tile. Ms. Hyde then asked if the landlord had approved the paint on the side of the building. Mr. Kim stated he had. Ms. Hyde stated she didn't understand how the front and side were cohesive at all. Mr. Kim asked how they would feel if it was just the front. Ms. Hyde stated she had reservations regarding the materials used on just the front of the building and how they were attached.

Ms. Hanley stated that the execution of work thus far was not to the caliber of what is in the concept drawing submitted. Ms. Hanley continued stating that there needs to be an understanding of where things stop and why they stop to make sense. Ms. Hanley then asked if the patio was not an option. Ms. West stated that a patio would require a site plan amendment.

Mr. Layer asked to see the original proposed sign drawing from July. He then asked if the sign rendering was with the gray EFIS or the existing. Ms. West stated that at the time of the sign and awning application there were no proposed changes to the building. There was continued discussion regarding the difference in the concept drawing for the exterior modification application and the drawing from the sign application.

Mr. Cheselka spoke with the applicant stating that it is not good to paint masonry work and that Behr paint is not good for exteriors, as it does not last more than a few years. Mr. Cheselka then commented that if he were to paint the exterior, white would not be the best color, as it does not make the other materials on the building come together. Mr. Kim stated he recommended to his client a gray color or to not apply a color at all. There was continued discussion regarding the proposed paint.

Mr. Layer asked how the building would be unpainted if the legal document, the lease, stated it has to be returned to its original condition. The board discussed another building in town that had been painted and the years of work, they went through to try to "un-paint" it and could not return it to its original condition.

Ms. Hanley asked how a person could enforce returning a building to its original condition if an LLC/business went defunct.

Mr. Layer commented that the fasteners that Mr. Kim had stated were stainless steel did not appear to be stainless steel, but more a coated steel. Mr. Layer then asked again if they were stainless steel and Mr. Kim stated they were blue and that the description said they were stainless steel. There was further discussion regarding the fasteners. Mr. Layer then asked what the name of the product used for the tile installation. Mr. Kim stated it was Mapei. Mr. Layer stated the need to have the appropriate product to apply the tile as there are only two that can be used for exteriors. Mr. Kim stated he purchased from Floor and Décor and stated he needed the product for exterior use.

Ms. Hyde stated that she didn't feel the current proposed changes would enhance the building or that particular portion of streetscape.

Mr. Layer asked what was going on the base of the columns as they were currently exposed. Mr. Kim stated the tile would go all the way down. Mr. Layer asked the board for their input on how to proceed with the application.

Mr. Baldwin stated the gooseneck lamps were an improvement.

Ms. Hanley stated she like the fixtures at the top of the pillar, as they were more substantial. Ms. Hyde also stated that she felt there were things that could be done to tackle the issues with the application, but thought they would not be able address them during the meeting.

Mr. Layer stated he felt the (wood-base laminate) band at the top would be acceptable. Mr. Layer asked if it was applied directly to the EFIS, Mr. Kim stated it was. Ms. Hanley asked what would prevent water from getting behind the laminate band. Mr. Kim stated there was a flashing strip over the top. The board continued discussing what would be suitable aesthetically and acceptable for the landlord. During the discussion

Mr. Kim stated his client had seen other buildings around Maple and wanted to modernize the building where his restaurant would be located. He also stated his client wanted to know why the exterior changes wouldn't be okay. Ms. Hyde explained that if they had requested a work session with the board or brought their concerns or designs before the work started they would not be in the current situation.

Mr. Layer concurred with Ms. Hyde that if they had presented their proposal before starting the work then the board could have expressed their concern regarding tile fastened to brick. Mr. Layer said the issue was not just aesthetics. He continued stating that it was difficult to find a way to help the applicant move forward as they started the work before applying for the proposed changes.

Ms. Hanley made a motion that the request for exterior modifications for Shin Se Kai Ramen at 234 Maple Ave E (Docket No. PF-47-18-BAR), be approved with the condition that the existing material (Aquaguard Waterproofing Wood-Base Laminate) covering the EFIS. Remove all other tile and additional material applied to remainder of façade and re-point the damaged mortar holes.

Motion: Hanley  
Second: Cheselka

Approved: 5-0

Ms. Hanley made a separate motion that the request for exterior lighting and new windows for Shin Se Kai Ramen at 234 Maple Ave E (Docket No. PF-47-18-BAR), be approved as submitted

Motion: Hanley  
Second: Cheselka  
Approved: 5-0

Ms. Hanley and Mr. Layer had mentioned to Mr. Kim that the board was amenable to have a work session regarding any future proposed exterior modifications.

#### **4. New Business**

Ms. Hanley inquired about the Orange Theory Fitness window decal with a phone number. Ms. West stated staff was aware and had been in touch with Orange Therory and that zoning enforcement officer is in process of applying zoning violations.

Ms. Hanley also asked about updating the business flyer to make new business aware of the requirements by the BAR. Ms. West detailed the different steps she is taking to make sure the website, and applications include all items the board needs for applications.

Mr. Cheselka mentioned a residents concern about lights left on at one of the shopping

centers.

## 5. Meeting Adjournment

Ms. Hyde made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Cheselka seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 10:03 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.*