



Town of Vienna

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

Meeting Minutes Board of Architectural Review

Thursday, May 16, 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, Laine Hyde, Michael Cheselka, and Patty Hanley. Staff member Mike D'Orazio, 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, Laine Hyde, Paul Layer, Michael Cheselka, and Patty Hanley being present.

2. Approval of Minutes

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

Ms. Hanley seconded the motion.

Motion: Cheselka

Second: Hanley

Approved: 5-0

Ms. Hyde made a motion to approve the April 2019 meeting minutes.

Mr. Cheselka seconded the motion.

Motion: Cheselka

Second: Hanley

Approved: 4-0

Abstain: Baldwin

3. Regular Business

362 Maple Ave E - Starbucks

Request for approval of an exterior modification (revision) for Starbucks located at 362 Maple Ave E, Docket No. 16-18-BAR, in the C-1A Special Commercial zoning district; filed by Claudia Humphrey of Curry Architects, agent for Starbucks.

Ms. Claudia Humphrey was present to represent the application.

Ms. Humphrey stated there were structural columns discovered during the renovation that did not allow for the removal of building materials as anticipated. Due to that they were proposing the wood installation to match what had already been proposed for those elevations.

Mr. Layer asked if that was the only change and Ms. Humphrey stated yes.

Mr. Baldwin asked why the EFIS could not be mounted. Ms. Humphrey stated it wasn't a matter of feasibility, but the intent was that the EFIS would be in a singular plane and the wood would come out from the face. The columns found meant the EFIS would not be in the same plane it would be at the plane of the proposed wood finish.

Mr. Cheselka inquired about the top and bottom renderings. Ms. Humphrey stated the top was the original approved proposal and the bottom was the deviation.

Mr. Baldwin made a motion that the request for approval of an exterior modification (revision) for Starbucks located at 362 Maple Ave E, Docket No. 16-18-BAR, be approved as submitted.

Motion: Baldwin

Second: Hyde

Approved: 5-0

360 Maple Ave W Unit F - Dr. Goldberg & Associates

Request for approval of a new wall sign for Dr. Goldberg & Associates located at 360 Maple Ave W, Unit F, Docket No. 15-19-BAR, in the C-1 Local Commercial zoning district; filed by Dr. Noel Goldberg, business owner.

Dr. Noel Goldberg was present to represent the application.

Dr. Goldberg gave a brief description of his business as well as the marketing brand for his business that is becoming known in the area. Dr. Goldberg pointed out that surrounding business signs all have a type of logos on the building. He then stated that although he prefers a color logo, black and white would be fine.

Ms. Hanley asked if the landlord had any design constraints for signs. Dr. Goldberg stated no.

Ms. Hyde stated she still had concerns about visibility from Maple Ave. Dr. Goldberg asked if she meant lighting for visibility or did she want less visibility. Ms. Hyde stated that signs are most visible by sitting in traffic on Maple Ave, but that it's not 24/7 and the logo may not be big enough to be seen which was problematic. Dr. Goldberg asked if she wanted the sign bigger. Ms. Hyde said no, but that the logos don't seem to be identifiable as to what they are rather than two white spaces on Maple Ave. Dr. Goldberg stated they put a lot of time into depicting what mental health or counseling would be. Ms. Hyde stated she understood the message, but that she was concerned that it would not be understandable what the signs represent from the distance from Maple Ave. Dr. Goldberg stated they had adapted their logo for the sign as their brand logo on the marketing material is different than the sign logo.

Ms. Hanley stated she didn't have an issue with the logo and that the Board understands the importance of logos in promoting businesses in Vienna. Ms. Hanley asked if he had considered submitting a sign with better contrast. Ms. Hanley then stated that the sign can appear to be ears and that the lower submission with the negative space brings better

clarity to the words and the identification as well as allowing the logo to be there. Dr. Goldberg stated they hired Bob Hern, as he had been hired for the other signs, in hopes of synchronizing their sign with the others on the building. Dr. Goldberg stated that if the Board would approve a color sign, he would prefer that.

Mr. Cheselka stated he felt the logo was a bit cluttered, but that option C was a bit clearer. Mr. Layer asked if A3 was the preferred logo. Dr. Goldberg stated that B would be preferred per the feedback from the Board. Dr. Goldberg stated he preferred a larger version of A3 so it would be clear and seen. Mr. Layer stated logos were subjective and personal, showing what the business owner views as important to project their business. Mr. Layer stated he felt B was a good compromise and asked if anyone would like to make a motion to approve option B.

Mr. Baldwin made a motion that the request for approval of a new wall sign for Dr. Goldberg & Associates located at 360 Maple Ave W, Unit F, Docket No. 15-19-BAR, be approved as to alternative "B".

Motion: Baldwin

Second: Hanley

Approved: 5-0

118 Park St SE - Potomac Appalachian Trail Club

Request for approval of a new wall sign for Potomac Appalachian Trail Club located at 118 Park St SE, Docket No. 23-19-BAR, in the C-2 General Commercial zoning district; filed by Jake Ambrose, New Home Media, sign agent.

Mr. Tony Fredericks was present to represent the application.

Mr. Fredericks explained the mounting system for their logo sign. He also explained the materials that would be used for the sign.

Ms. Hanley asked if PATC was the only tenant as the logo sign and name sign were disconnected due to the architecture of the building. Mr. Fredericks stated they were the soul tenant.

Mr. Cheselka inquired about the edges of the sign so as not to compromise the wood sign with water. Mr. Fredericks stated he agreed and that it would take additional coats of primer.

Mr. Baldwin stated it didn't appear, in the computer rendering of the sign, that PATC logo sign was aligned with the Potomac Appalachian Trail Club sign to the right. Mr. Fredericks asked if the new logo sign was to be equal in height. Mr. Baldwin stated yes, he believed so as it may have been what was planned.

Ms. Hyde if there was a light fixture above the sign, Mr. Fredericks stated there was and existing light fixture and that it would stay.

Ms. Hyde made a motion that the request for approval of a new wall sign for Potomac Appalachian Trail Club located at 118 Park St SE, Docket No. 23-19-BAR, be approved as submitted with the proviso that the new sign be even with the Potomac Appalachian Trail words on the other side of the building.

Motion: Hyde

Second: Hanley
Approved: 5-0

128 Maple Ave E - Sundown & Rise Up

Request for approval of exterior modifications and permanent window sign for Sundown & Rise Up located at 128 Maple Ave E, Docket No. 24-19-BAR, in the C-1A Special Commercial zoning district; filed by David Sean McCarthy of Sundown & Rise Up LLC.

Mr. David McCarthy was present to represent the application.

Mr. McCarthy, 39 year resident of Vienna, gave a brief description of his business and the design of the exterior.

Mr. Layer asked if the color drawings of the pergola given at the meeting would look like the inspiration (Sheets in Vienna). Mr. McCarthy stated that would be the idea. Mr. Layer stated it needs to be exact and Mr. McCarthy said it would be exactly like Sheets as that is what he liked. Mr. Layer then asked about the wood deck in the drawing as it was 6x9, and in the drawing, it was perpendicular. Mr. McCarthy stated it was just like the drawing. Mr. Layer informed Mr. McCarthy that if everything proposed is what will be executed then there could be a motion, but if anything were to be changed then they would have to be redrawn. Mr. Layer then explained the submission process to Mr. McCarthy.

Ms. Hanley explained her concern with potentially attaching the deck to the building if that was in fact what Mr. McCarthy was proposing.

Ms. Hyde asked how far up off the ground the deck would be if it was covering the existing steps. Mr. D'Orazio stated it would be 24"-30" off the ground. Mr. Layer stated if it was over 30" then it would be kicked into a need for a railing. Mr. McCarthy stated it would be below the 30". There was continued discussion regarding the requirement for the deck and pergola. Ms. Hyde asked if there would need to be steps down from the deck. Mr. Layer explained that the deck would be adjacent to the stairs.

Ms. Hanley asked how the pergola would be attached as it may be an issue. Mr. McCarthy said the old awning was already taken down as it was rotted out metal.

Mr. Baldwin asked if Mr. McCarthy had looked into a longer lasting material such as TREX. Mr. McCarthy stated he liked the feel of natural wood. Mr. Baldwin asked staff if there was enough information to show that the applicant had fulfilled the requirements of the building application. Mr. D'Orazio stated that with the pictures provided there was enough for the BAR application, but if the applicant deviated at all he would have to go back in front of the Board. Mr. D'Orazio stated that Fairfax County was the building code officials and anything building code related would be up to them. There was continued discussion regarding the renderings of the proposed deck, pergola, and the site plan.

Mr. Cheselka commented to the applicant regarding the maintenance required with using pressure treated wood and Mr. McCarthy stated he understood.

Ms. Hanley asked staff if the old site plan could be eliminated as it contradicted the plan that was put together. Mr. Layer stated that if it was going to be approved it would need to be done using the more accurate drawings as part of the package.

Ms. Hyde if the stick on logo needed to approved as part of the application package. Mr. Layer stated it was a part of the review and Mr. D'Orazio stated yes it was. Mr. McCarthy stated he could paint rather than vinyl. Ms. Hyde stated it wasn't the material it was the

fact that it was a sign. Mr. McCarthy stated that the vinyl signs come in three millimeter and nine millimeter. The three millimeter would last two to three years and the nine millimeter would last seven to nine years. Mr. McCarthy stated he would use the nine millimeter.

Ms. Hanley made a motion that the request for approval of exterior modifications and permanent window sign for Sundown & Rise Up located at 128 Maple Ave E, Docket No. 24-19-BAR, be approved with clarification that the scale 1" to 20' plan is followed, the logo is 9" millimeter vinyl letters, and the deck and pergola are followed per the graphic.

Motion: Hanley

Second: Hyde

Approved: 5-0

4. Meeting Adjournment

Mr. McCarthy had inquired about the next steps after the approval. Mr. D'Orazio notified Mr. McCarthy of the steps he needed to take.

Mr. Layer spoke with the Board regarding the renderings they had for the pending work session. He stated they were the four compass points of the building. The renderings at the top of the paper were the recommended version the Board had approved, and at the bottom of the paper were the version that was being presented to the Board for the work session. The versions were in a 1" to 20' scale and should be nearly identical to each other in size. The reason for the renderings was to give the Board a clear understanding of where things were and where they are at the moment as being presented. Mr. Layer stated it was a work session and not a presentation so when the Board should look at the areas without color and understand the architectural articulation and what is intended to be discussed with the Board.

Mr. D'Orazio stated the materials for the work session were already posted including the renderings the Board had currently, there study, more hand sketch drawings, differences in the concept plan versus the approved site plan. Mr. Baldwin asked if all of the documents mentioned were on the town website, and Mr. D'Orazio stated that was correct. There was continued discussion regarding the site plan.

Mr. Layer stated the Board would only be looking at the elements that changed in the nature of the design as it related to the architecture and as it related to the purview of the BAR. Mr. D'Orazio stated he wanted to make the Board aware of the changes that did happen and landscaping was still under the purview of the BAR so if there was a desire for more landscaping that is up to the BAR. Mr. Layer asked if Mr. D'Orazio could star what was strictly zoning related so the Board does not comment on it if it is strictly a zoning requirement. Mr. D'Orazio stated that in the document he did reference those items, such as trees removed for site line issues.

Mr. Cheselka inquired about the rounded bay areas and that they appeared to be removed.

Mr. Layer stated that looking at a building being designed there are three phases referred to in the profession; schematic design, design development, and construction documentation. To be clear the original drawings were, in Mr. Layer's opinion, design development drawings. There are realities that take place when developing a building regarding how the detailing is treated when changes are made because of physical limitations. If something is developed and the system that was to be used doesn't make sense and a different system is used it could create a change in the exterior image. If a bay is changes from rounded, that is a change in the format of the elevation. The Board needs

to come to a conclusion as to where the drawings will end up and what is appropriately reconciled. Mr. Layer asked that the Board go through it quickly and to state any questions.

Ms. Hanley asked staff if the elevations were scaled. Mr. D'Orazio stated they were on the 11x17 so they were almost 1" to 20'. Ms. Hanley asked if the Board could get them PDF, but have a graphic scale. Ms. Hanley asked why the entry to the garage on page 1 seemed taller on the bottom rendering versus the top rendering. Mr. D'Orazio stated that the top elevation was taken a slight perspective for the top rendering. Mr. Layer stated the renderings penciled are the most developed. Ms. Hanley stated anything not penciled is not developed. Ms. Hanley stated her concern was if the renderings were working on the same scale. There was some continued discussion regarding the scale of the drawings. Mr. Layer stated that the drawings on the left were applicants trying to illustrate where they were trying to go. The drawings on the left illustrate the applicants foray into that effort. When the Board meets with the applicants there is an understanding that their drawings are a starting point. There would probably be another work session as the applicant would like feedback as to whether or not their efforts are going in the right direction. Mr. Layer gave some examples of questions that could be asked using the renderings given as a starting point. Mr. Layer stated that the Board will need to decide when the renderings reach parody and not exact. The drawings from design development phase would not be used as the construction document, but deviation of a significant amount would be something the Board would want to comment on with the applicant. Mr. Layer stated the datum he would consider and the Board could as well, would be the rendering recommended and the one that would be built.

Mr. Baldwin asked if there was a design concept that would describe the lower rendering. Mr. Layer stated the BAR doesn't entertain architectural style as it is not within the Board's purview. Mr. D'Orazio stated that when the state approved the creation of the Board of Architectural Review there was a stipulation that the Board could not dictate architectural style. Mr. Layer stated, from his point of view, the architectural style is less important than reaching reconciliation between the two respective elevations.

Ms. Hyde commented the process the Vienna Market project had gone through and the comment that what had been recommended by the BAR was whimsical. Mr. Layer stated the drawings were at design development, but not schematic which is what would be considered whimsical. Ms. Hyde stated she was struggling with what the Board has been presented as it is a long way from where they were. Mr. Layer stated he was encouraged at the statements being made by the applicant. There was continued discussion regarding the elevations and reconciling the differences. Mr. Layer had agreed with Ms. Hanley, that the applicant is being treated like any other applicant and although there is something that pre-exists the Board is trying to close the gap between the two.

Ms. Hanley asked about the Church Street elevation windows and if they were garden windows going into a basement. Mr. D'Orazio stated he believed they were windows to utility rooms.

Mr. Layer asked if a pointer could be brought to the meeting. Mr. D'Orazio stated the laser pointers do not work on the TV's, but a metal or rubber pointer would work.

Ms. Hyde asked, for procedural purposes, what would happen if the Board was not able to come to a resolution and Mr. Layer stated the Board would vote and it would be turned down. Ms. Hyde asked what could happen next. Mr. D'Orazio stated they could appeal to Town Council.

Ms. Hanley asked that when the Board denies an application is the Board required to come up with design criteria if the applicant did not want to appeal, but wanted to fix the issue and come back to the Board. Mr. D'Orazio stated that criteria is listed under chapter 4 that the Board would review for an application and that application is essential a normal application in terms of the criteria used. Ms. Hanley asked if they would be able to fix what was wrong and Mr. D'Orazio stated if the Board gave them the opportunity, discussion continued.

Ms. Hanley stated to the Board that she had received an email from a citizen regarding the 380 Maple MAC project. She did let the resident know that as a Board member it was not something they discussed after a recommendation had been made.

Ms. Hanley made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Baldwin seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 9:25 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.