



**LEESBURG BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES**

**Monday, 16 March, 2015
Town Hall, 25 West Market Street
Council Chamber**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Edward Kiley, Vice Chairman Reimers, Parliamentarian Dale Goodson (arrived 7:05pm), Richard Koochagian, Mark Malloy, Teresa Minchew, Planning Commission Representative Lyndsay Welsh Chamblin, and Town Council Representative Suzanne Fox

MEMBERS ABSENT: Dieter Meyer

STAFF: Assistant Town Manager Scott Parker, Planning & Zoning Director Susan Berry Hill, Attorney Liz Whiting, Preservation Planner Tom Scofield, Senior Engineer Anne Geiger, and Executive Associate Karen Cicalese

Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairman Kiley called the meeting to order at 7:00pm, noted attendance and determined that a quorum was present.

Adoption of the Meeting Agenda

Chairman Kiley noted Cases TLHP-2014-0115, TLHP-2014-0116, TLHP-2014-0117 and TLHP-2014-0118 would be moved to later in the agenda or until such time as County Administrator Tim Hemstreet can be present.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

- a. **December 15, 2014 BAR Meeting**
- b. **January 21, 2015 BAR Meeting Minutes**

Ms. Minchew indicated she would be abstaining as she was not in attendance for the December 15th meeting.

On a motion by Mr. Koochagian, seconded by Vice Chairman Reimers, the minutes were approved by a 4-0-1-2 vote (Minchew abstaining, Goodson and Meyer absent).

BAR Member Disclosures:

None

Public Comment and Presentations

None

Consent Agenda

- a. **TLHP-2015-0015, 338 W Market Street**
Project: Replace roof with new material

Ms. Minchew moved to approve TLHP-2015-0015, 338 W Market Street, as submitted.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Koochagian and approved by a 6-0-1 vote (Meyer absent)

Petitioners

There were no petitioners.

Continued & Deferred Cases in the H-1 Overlay District

- a. **TLHP-2014-0115, 112 Edwards Ferry Road NE**
Project: Demolition of primary structure as part of the Court House Expansion Project

- b. TLHP-2014-0116, 110 Edwards Ferry Road NE**
Project: Demolition of primary structure as part of the Court House Expansion Project
- c. TLHP-2014-0117, 108 Edwards Ferry road NE**
Project: Demolition of primary structure as part of the Court House Expansion Project
- d. TLHP-2014-0118, 106 Edwards Ferry Road NE**
Project: Demolition of primary structure as part of the Court House Expansion Project

Mr. Scofield stated the Board of Supervisors voted 5-4 at their recent meeting to “develop a scenario, including identification of issues and conflicts, time, and cost impacts to remove only 106 and 108 Edwards Ferry Road NE from the site and retain only the oldest portions of the structures at 110 and 112 Edwards Ferry Road NE”. He stated the Board of Supervisors’ action also included extension of the critical action date for review of the application to the May 18th BAR meeting. Further, he stated there were other actions taken, including establishing a Request for Inquiry for relocation of the structures and engaging the Town in what that might mean.

Tim Hemstreet, Loudoun County Administrator, stated there were some questions following the Board of Supervisors meeting regarding off-hand statements made by members of the Board of Supervisors regarding what work had been done by staff regarding the four buildings on Edwards Ferry Road and any potential designs that would’ve retained those buildings during the design process.

Chairman Kiley stated it was actually a comment by Mr. Yudd, not a member of the Board of Supervisors which prompted his inquiry. He stated he believes Mr. Yudd came up with the \$6 million figure from an early concept evaluation.

Mr. Hemstreet stated he had asked the design team to look at potentials to retain those structures. He stated they went through a series of exercises and there were three primary reasons why those concepts were not pursued with the Board of Supervisors. He stated first, in order to accommodate the size of the building as well as the stormwater needs on the site, the building height limit would’ve been exceeded by 20 feet or more to fit the stormwater infrastructure under the building. He stated secondly, the stormwater engineer stated they would not seal a design which had the stormwater underneath the building. He stated thirdly, there was the issue of cost. He stated he does not have information to date as to where the \$6 million figure came from; however, if you take the \$3 million figure from staff and add in the other elements it may reach that figure. Further, he stated this proposal was never presented to the Board of Supervisors and after hearing their comments at the meeting it does not appear they are interested in pursuing such an option.

Mr. Hemstreet stated the motion the Board of Supervisors did approve was to allow the design team to explore a potential compromise which involves retaining the oldest portions of 110 and 112 Edwards Ferry Road. He stated that was offered primarily because the design team is hopeful the stormwater infrastructure could fit under 106 and 108 Edwards Ferry Road, which would require full removal of those structures. He stated staff is also helpful that with the small footprints for 110 and 112 Edwards Ferry Road, the security and fire protection needs will be met. Further, he stated the studies resulting from the Board of Supervisors actions are anticipated to be presented to the Board on April 15th and a presentation will be made to the Board of Architectural Review prior to that time.

Chairman Kiley noted the Board would be willing to have a presentation as to the design team’s findings at the April 6th work session or a special meeting which could be scheduled for a mutually agreed upon date.

Mr. Goodson suggested that the design team present the information at the April 6th work session, if possible, so that feedback from the BAR could be available to the Board of Supervisors at their meeting.

Mr. Koochagian stated he is appreciative to have more time for review. He stated the Board needs to be presented with not just the pieces for the demolition, but also the pieces for the new construction. He stated the Board has repeatedly told the design team that retention of these four structures on Edwards Ferry Road will help to break up the massing of the new courthouse building; however, each presentation made to the Board continues to show a clear streetscape without the four structures and

a monolithic building which is not appropriate under the guidelines. Further, he stated demolition of the four structures may present a cost savings to the County in one area; however, there may be additive costs for architectural detailing of the courthouse structure to make it approvable under the guidelines.

Vice Chairman Reimers asked if the 4 Board of Supervisors members who voted against the study provided any reasons as to their dissention.

Mr. Hemstreet stated it was a combination of factors. He stated there is an active proposal before the Board of Supervisors regarding the location of the courthouse structure. He stated there is also the concern of cost; however, the reason the five Board of Supervisors members supported the motion was because staff indicated it may be possible to achieve the compromise proposed within the existing budget.

Ms. Minchew asked if the Board of Supervisors is under the impression that the Board of Architectural Review will approve the demolition of the structures at 106 and 108 Edwards Ferry Road.

Mr. Hemstreet stated the Board of Supervisors is not under that impression and they understand the Board of Architectural Review's obligation under the code to preserve contributing structures in the Old and Historic District. He stated the Board of Supervisors perspective is that we have a large building that needs to fit on a small site so what can we do achieve that while respecting your work at the same time.

Mr. Malloy asked what will be happening between now and May 18th and would the County's design team be looking at a smaller stormwater management solution in the meantime.

Mr. Hemstreet stated the Board of Supervisors has not authorized the proposed compromise; however, they have authorized a study into alternatives which would eliminate the need to demolish all four structures on Edwards Ferry Road either within the existing budget or within in a reasonable additional cost. He stated if the Board of Supervisors supports an alternative solution; the design team will present that information to the Board of Architectural Review after April 15th.

Mr. Malloy asked if a special meeting would be scheduled with the Board of Architectural Review in the coming weeks to discuss engineering solutions to accommodate the buildings on Edwards Ferry Road. He stated he would like to have the meeting include Dewberry's civil engineer to discuss a potential cost effective approach to the storm water management for the site which would allow for the retention of the structures.

Mr. Hemstreet asked if that would be appropriate for the April 6th Board work session.

Chairman Kiley stated the Board of Architectural Review would like to dedicate a meeting to the topic of these applications and is more than willing to schedule such a meeting outside of the regular meeting schedule if necessary.

Mr. Hemstreet stated the County would be amenable to a special BAR meeting regarding the storm water design and site constraints to include the project civil engineer.

Chairman Kiley stated he would like to have Department of Plan Review Director Bill Ackman present for this meeting.

Ms. Minchew stated any element of the project that could be brought to the Board of Architectural Review in work session prior to being presented to the Board of Supervisors would allow for a more efficient review and would save time and money.

Mr. Hemstreet stated the County design team was told to submit the applications for demolition first and then the application for building design.

Ms. Minchew stated the Board of Supervisors has already approved a design concept which the Board of Architectural Review has not had a formal review of.

Mr. Hemstreet stated the applications were submitted in the order suggested by staff.

Mr. Koochagian stated the Board of Architectural Review cannot approve demolition of these four structures without seeing what is going to replace them. He stated an approval for demolition typically includes a conceptual approval of what will be constructed on the site after demolition with a condition of approval that demolition does not occur until construction begins. He asked that the drawing concept for the proposed new building be provided to the Board.

Council Member Fox thanked the County for the time extension to allow the Board of Architectural Review to do their due diligence.

Chairman Kiley stated, speaking for himself, that he is not satisfied that any of these buildings need to be demolished. He stated between December and now, Dewberry Inc. has come up with a plan to relocate one stormwater vault that would've necessitated the removal of all four buildings. He stated there are alternatives to this stormwater vault issue to the extent that all four buildings with the non-historic and less historic additions removed could remain on site. He stated moving forward he personally would like to hear from the County whether you will not retain the structures or whether you cannot retain the structures. He stated this is a valued streetscape that will be destroyed forever even if only two structures are removed. Further, he stated the Board will discuss dates for special meetings and have Mr. Scofield coordinate with the County staff.

Ms. Minchew suggested that as many special meetings as possible be scheduled between now and May 18th with the knowledge that the County can cancel meetings if they need to.

Public Hearings on New Cases in the H-1 Overlay District

a. TLHP-2014-0122, Various locations on King Street

Project Description: Install new decorative grates on basement access doors in sidewalk

Chairman Kiley opened the public hearing at 8:53pm.

Mr. Scofield outlined the proposal to replace the existing metal basement access doors in the sidewalk at 1- locations along King Street with new doors and grates similar in appearance to the design included with the application as part of the North King Street Downtown Improvement Project. He outlined the proposed design highlighting grapevines and the Loudoun County Courthouse copula. Further, he recommended approval with the following condition:

1. The submitted graphic of the courthouse tower with the grapevine garland shall be enhanced by a professional graphic artist in such a manner that retains the integrity of the original design, but corrects unintended image distortions; allows proper manufacture in the proposed metal medium; promotes ease of installation; ensures safety in use; and provides a frame for the graphic, if needed.

The applicant, Anne Geiger, stated she is here tonight in her capacity as the liaison for the Commission on Public Art. She stated the Commission on Public Art engaged the CS Monroe Technology Center students to design the decorative grates and chose this design from the three submitted. She stated she concurs with staff's recommendation to finalize this design to be etched into the top of the access doors.

Mr. Goodson stated he appreciates the work of the students at the CS Monroe Technology center; however he is curious as to why the Town Seal was not used for the design.

Ms. Geiger stated the students were asked to provide their artistic design and this is what the Commission on Public Art found to be acceptable.

Mr. Goodson stated he did not wish to take anything away from the proposed design; however, sometimes the simpler design is preferred and the Town Seal is seen in many locations throughout

Leesburg. He asked if the shop owners wish to maintain the access doors or if there are some that could be sealed and covered.

Ms. Geiger stated she is not certain of the answer for that question.

Mr. Goodson stated in some cases the access doors present a tripping hazard and stated if the building owners are willing, this may be an opportunity to simply cover the doors with brick or remove them. He asked what is the plan for the door surround noting there is a concrete surround on some doors and not on others.

Ms. Geiger stated the intent is to continue the concrete outline.

Mr. Goodson stated there is no consistency with these elements and how they are embedded in the sidewalks. He stated his preference is to have the brick run directly to the inserted element without the concrete boarder which tends to draw attention.

Ms. Geiger stated she is not prepared tonight to answer that question; however, she is happy to bring comments back to the project manager.

Mr. Koochagian stated the design should incorporate, at a minimum, the founding date of the Town and preferably the name of the Town. He stated there are differing design elements in the sidewalks as mentioned by Mr. Goodson and expressed a desire to see the Town focus attention on the tripping hazards.

Ms. Minchew asked if information is available regarding the age or historic nature of the existing grates.

Mr. Scofield stated most have been replaced over time. He stated some may be close to 50 years old; however, he does not see any historic interest or integrity in them.

Ms. Minchew asked the approximate size of the largest logo to be etched.

Ms. Geiger stated she believes the largest is the 54"x52" access door in front of The Wine Kitchen. She stated the design parameter given was that the design needed to be at least 2" from the edge of the door.

Ms. Minchew stated she would prefer a standard size rather than various sizes on each door. She stated the need for consistency applies to other areas of Town and to the comment regarding the concrete surround, which provides visual distraction.

Ms. Geiger stated the doors were replaced and painted the color of the brick on one portion of South King Street. She stated she is uncertain as to who will maintain the paint on the doors.

Ms. Minchew asked if the color could be baked into the doors.

Ms. Geiger stated she does not believe the color could be baked in.

Ms. Minchew noted the doors have a rough, non-slip finish and stated she would like to see how the design will look on that finish.

Ms. Geiger stated the design will be laser etched into the doors. She stated she looked but was unable to find a similar product done elsewhere which could be provided as an example.

Ms. Minchew stated at first she was not in favor of the design as it is very much representative of Loudoun versus Leesburg; however, Leesburg is the County Seat so that concern has been mitigated. She stated the design is attractive; however, she wonders if it could be refined slightly to look more like the actual courthouse copula.

Mr. Malloy suggested that the students be given an opportunity to refine the design and bring it back before the Board for review.

Ms. Welsh Chamblin stated she is concerned about safety if some of the non-slip surface is removed to place a design in the center of the door. She stated this was a wonderful opportunity for student involvement; however, she concurs with the earlier comments regarding incorporating Leesburg into the design.

Council Member Fox asked what this will cost the Town.

Ms. Geiger stated the bid process is still underway and once the design is approved by the Board, the project will be forwarded to Council for review at which time the cost will be provided.

Council Member Fox asked what the cost was to replace the doors on the portion of South King Street adjacent to Windy City Red Hots.

Mr. Parker stated the cost to replace all of the doors in kind was incorporated in the original budget for the downtown improvements. He stated he does not have the information as to the cost for replacement of the individual doors given they are all different sizes.

Council Member Fox asked if the doors are to just be painted and not replaced.

Mr. Parker stated the original plan was to have the doors all black to match the street furniture with the non-slip diamond tread. He stated although the doors are in the right-of-way, they are the responsibility of the building owners to maintain. He stated the cost for this work is incorporated into the existing budget; however, the artwork will be an additional cost.

Mr. Koochagian noted staff has indicated the diamond plating is in the approved budget; however, that is not the material shown in the application.

Ms. Geiger stated the material provided in the application was selected by the students; however, the approved diamond plating could be used.

Mr. Koochagian asked how the design would look on the diamond plating.

Ms. Geiger stated she will provide a visual.

Mr. Koochagian stated he would be in favor of powder coating the doors versus painting.

Ms. Geiger stated the doors on the west side of South King Street were replaced and painted 9 months ago.

Mr. Parker stated the doors were simply replaced with the painted doors last year and will also receive the same treatment as the other doors when this project moves forward.

Chairman Kiley concurred with earlier comments that someplace within the design the date of the Town's founding should be incorporated.

Ms. Minchew stated it is so hard to find a place to incorporate public art and while the Town Seal, as suggested, would be approvable, she would like to see an artistic representation incorporated.

There was further discussion regarding the design and whether it is appropriate for the design to vary in size versus remaining uniform.

Ms. Minchew moved that TLHP-2014-0122 be continued until such time as the applicant wishes to return.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Goodson and approved by a 6-0-1 vote (Meyer absent).

New Cases in the H-2 Overlay District

a. TLHP-2015-0012, 309 Kelly's Ford Plaza (Oaklawn Land Bay D)
Project Description: Review for new office building construction

Chairman Kiley opened the public hearing at 7:05pm.

Mr. Scofield outlined the proposal to construct a new 50,000 square foot office and light manufacturing facility as allowed by right on two of the land parcels associated with Oaklawn, Land Bay D. He expressed concern with several aspects of the proposed building design including inconsistency with the South and East elevations as opposed to the North and West elevations, the appearance of size and scale, fenestration, separation between the floors, proposed reflective glass, proposed use of EIFS, and the need for additional information regarding materials, colors, vehicular access and location of HVAC equipment. Further, he recommended the application be continued to the April 6, 2015 BAR Work Session.

Jason Richardson, Blair Construction representing the applicant EIT, stated the tinting on the windows has been changed from reflective to bronze tinting. He stated an emergency center is proposed to be constructed adjacent to the East elevation of the building, which is why the façade does not have some of the same architectural elements as the North and West elevations. He stated, given the limited visibility and future construction plans, corrugated metal is proposed for the South and East elevations, which is the material used for the hangar buildings at the adjacent Leesburg Executive Airport. He stated the HVAC and dumpster areas will be screened from view. He stated the loading docks are located towards the rear of the building to facilitate access for large vehicles.

There were no petitioners.

Mr. Goodson asked for clarification regarding the wall depicted on the South side of the site plan.

Mr. Richardson stated that is a retaining wall due to the grade changes on the site. He stated there is another located on the East side.

Mr. Goodson asked the building setback between the retaining wall and the building.

Mr. Richardson stated the setback is 30 yards.

Mr. Goodson asked if a loading area could be located in that area.

Mr. Richardson stated that would impact access to the HVAC equipment proposed for that area. He stated most of the deliveries for the business are UPS or Fed Ex; however, there are some deliveries requiring large tractor trailers.

Mr. Koochagian asked if all of the HVAC equipment is located in the rear.

Mr. Richardson stated there is equipment located close to the front on the North side of the building which will serve the office area.

Mr. Koochagian asked if there is screening around the HVAC equipment. He stated all screening will need to be shown on the approved plans.

Mr. Richardson stated the screening material for that location will also match the screening material for the dumpster enclosure and HVAC equipment on the North side.

Vice Chairman Reimers asked the applicant's impression of staff's recommendations and how the applicant plans to address the lack of fenestration on the South and East elevations.

Mr. Richardson stated a smooth face panel in a complimentary color could be used to help break up the façade. He stated his goal is to demonstrate to the Board that the East elevation and a portion of

the South elevation will have limited visibility. He stated he will take comments provided by the Board tonight and make improvements to the elevations for consideration at the upcoming work session.

Ms. Minchew verified the site plan has not been approved for this site. She expressed concern that the East elevation will be visible in the event that the proposed emergency center is not constructed. She asked if the Old Tolbert Lane is still a public right-of-way.

Mr. Scofield stated he believes the right-of-way for that road has been vacated.

Ms. Minchew asked that staff have confirmation as to the status of Tolbert Lane at the work session. She verified the application will return to the Board regarding approval for the design and materials used to construct the retaining walls. Further, she verified there is to be no HVAC equipment placed on the roof of the building.

Mr. Malloy asked how the applicant feels about staff's comments pertaining to human scale and a classical orientation of architectural elements on the North façade.

Mr. Richardson stated he has been working with staff regarding this front façade for some time. He stated the various architectural elements put in place have been done so to reduce the visual appearance of the building height. He stated staff has recommended incorporating elements from the West façade into the North façade to create a wainscot stone façade continuous around the building. He stated the height of the windows was another architectural feature put in place to visually break the building up. He stated he will work with the elevation to incorporate more of the stone and bring the EFIS down so it does not appear overbearing.

Mr. Malloy asked if the applicant would consider breaking up the spandrels and creating punched openings similar to the bottom façade.

Mr. Richardson stated various elements have been taken from surrounding buildings to help this building fit on the site.

Council Member Fox verified the slope in the roof towards the East elevation is for rain water management purposes. Further, she expressed concern with the proposed East elevation and its visibility from the townhomes, particularly if the proposed emergency center is not constructed.

Mr. Richardson stated the change in grade and the landscape buffering will mitigate the visual impact for the townhome residents.

Chairman Kiley verified the size of the building at approximately 61,000 square feet. He asked if the stormwater retention vaults are located underground.

Mr. Richardson stated some of the stormwater utilities are already installed in the ground and the run off will drain into a sediment pond located elsewhere on site.

Chairman Kiley asked the degree of visibility of the East and South elevations from the public right of way.

Mr. Scofield stated the East elevation will be visible to the townhomes which is a concern. He stated there will also be visibility from Miller Drive; however, he is unsure as to the degree of visibility of these facades. Further, he stated it is obvious that the building was designed with more attention to detail for the façades with greater visibility.

Ms. Whiting stated she has verified the Town has abandoned the right of way for old Tolbert Lane, which covers the South elevation of the building.

There was further discussion regarding the material samples provided, the screening materials for the HVAC units, the impact of the East elevation with the sloped roof and metal wall panels and the need

for a more cohesive design in which the East and South elevations would appear closer to the proposed elevations for the North and West.

Mr. Koochagian requested that perspective drawings be provided for the work session to demonstrate the grade change on site and the level of visibility of the elevations, particularly from Miller Drive.

Chairman Kiley verified the applicant agrees to staff's proposal of continuance for this case to the April 6th work session and stated he would like the public hearing to remain open.

Vice Chairman Reimers moved to continue case TLHP-2015-0012 to the April 6th work session.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Minchew and approved by a 6-0-1 vote (Meyer absent).

Administrative Approvals

- a. TLHP-2015-0011, 209 Royal Street SE – porch repair
- b. TLHP-2015-0010, 209 Loudoun Street SE (Sunflower Shack) - sign
- c. TLHP-2015-0014, 1500 E Market Street (Clarion Hotel) - signs

Old Business

Mr. Scofield stated he will meet tomorrow with the owner's representative for Sunrise Assisted Living and anticipates the case will return for Board review on April 6th.

New Business:

Mr. Scofield stated in anticipation of the need to schedule special meetings regarding the Edwards Ferry Road demolition applications, staff has identified several dates when the Council Chambers are available.

There was further discussion regarding the dates and it was the consensus of the Board to tentatively move forward with a special meeting on March 27th to discuss the storm water issues.

Chairman Kiley stated at the meeting on the 27th, he would like a definitive answer from the County as to whether they cannot incorporate the four houses into the design or whether they won't incorporate the houses.

Mr. Malloy stated it is very important to ensure the civil engineer from Dewberry is present.

Mr. Scofield stated the County is also interested in giving an overview of the courthouse design as well as the post demolition plans in regards to size, scale and massing.

Chairman Kiley noted review of the design concept will be impacted by whether any of the houses remain.

Mr. Goodson stated if the houses are demolished he would hope the design team would bring forward a different design than what has been proposed.

Ms. Minchew asked if the design team ever considered coming forward for a height increase and seemed to have held fast to one section of the Zoning Ordinance while ignoring another.

Mr. Scofield stated they had not considered pursuing a height increase as they have viewed this as a hard and fast rule.

Ms. Whiting stated noted the County has received criticism for the height of their office building.

Ms. Minchew stated the County was granted a height increase in that instance and the criticism is also due in part to the design of the building.

Chairman Kiley stated tonight he was told that the cost of retaining the four structures was \$3 million; however, previously the design team at stated the cost as \$6 million.

Ms. Minchew stated it might be worth mentioning that if, for some unknown reason, the demolition of the four structures were approved; the building will need to be redesigned.

Ms. Berry Hill stated in conversation with the design team regarding the possibility of increasing the height, concerns were cited as to the process of amending the Zoning Ordinance as well as the difficulty in fitting the design plates for the courtroom sizes within a smaller footprint.

There was further discussion regarding topics for the meeting on the 27th. It was the consensus of the Board to schedule a separate special meeting to hold a work session regarding the building design in relation to post demolition plans.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Edward Kiley, Chair

Deborah E. Parry, Planning & Zoning Assistant