LEESBURG BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

Monday, April 13, 2015
Town Hall, 25 West Market Street
Council Chamber

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Chairman Edward Kiley, Vice Chairman Paul Reimers, Parliamentarian Dale Goodson, Richard Koochagian (arrived at 7:00pm), Mark Malloy (arrived at 7:00pm), Teresa Minchew, Dieter Meyer, Planning Commission Representative Lyndsay Welsh Chamblin and Town Council Representative Suzanne Fox
MEMBERS ABSENT:	None
STAFF:	Planning & Zoning Director Susan Berry Hill, Attorney Liz Whiting, Preservation Planner Tom Scofield and Planning & Zoning Assistant Deborah Parry

Call to Order and Roll Call
Chairman Kiley called the meeting to order at 6:00pm, noted attendance and determined that a quorum was present.

Adoption of the Meeting Agenda
On a motion by Mr. Meyer, seconded by Ms. Minchew, the meeting agenda was adopted by a 5-0-2 vote (Koochagian and Malloy absent).

BAR Member Disclosures:
None

Continued & Deferred Cases in the H-1 Overlay District
a. TLHP-2014-0115, 112 Edwards Ferry Road NE
b. TLHP-2014-0116, 110 Edwards Ferry Road NE
c. TLHP-2014-0117, 108 Edwards Ferry Road NE
d. TLHP-2014-0118, 106 Edwards Ferry Road NE

Mr. Scofield stated the purpose of this meeting is to review details regarding the removal of noncontributing and less historic additions from the rears of the four houses. He stated this information is covered in the Board of Supervisors agenda package for Wednesday evening; however, a majority of the information covered in the report is in regards to the relocation study and request for interest which was completed at the Board's request.

Mr. Scofield stated using the 1899 and 1930 Sanborn Maps you can see the evolution of 106 Edwards Ferry Road NE and there is a recognizable footprint you can see in the building today. He outlined the historic contributing portions of the house as well as portions that were absorbed into later additions and cannot be seen in the existing footprint. Further, he also outlined the undetermined and non-historic additions.

Mr. Scofield stated the structure at 108 Edwards Ferry Road has been substantially altered over time, noting when compared to an early 20th century photograph of the structure it hardly looks the same at all.

Marlene Shade, Dewberry, Inc. stated there is also a postcard from 1900 which shows a log cabin on the street edge. She stated it is her belief that the cabin was torn down and the existing structure built in its place in the 1930's. She stated the design team has been working with a historian who is looking into that possibility.

Mr. Scofield asked if investigations had been done to see if the log cabin may have been absorbed into this building.

Ms. Shade stated it is very unlikely as the walls are not thick enough to have encased the cabin walls in siding.

Peter Hargreaves, Loudoun County Courthouse Project Manager, stated you would expect the walls to be approximately 1 foot thick to have encased a log cabin.

Mr. Scofield noted the structure depicted in the 1899 and 1930 Sanborn Maps shows a structure close to the street whereas today the structure is set back.

Mr. Goodson verified the courthouse design team believes the existing structure may have been constructed in the 1930's.

Mr. Scofield stated that is a likely scenario based on the information provided. He stated the existing structure seems to follow the width of the structure depicted in the Sanborn maps. He stated the possibility that this is an entirely different building does have bearing and warrants further investigation. He stated if the structure was built in the 1930's it would still qualify for contributing status. Further, he outlined the likely original portions of the house as well as the additions of undetermined age and the non-historic additions.

Mr. Goodson stated wood from the 1930's should be easily recognizable.

Mr. Scofield stated there has been a thick skin of siding applied to the building and investigations have not been done to look underneath.

Ms. Shade stated a look underneath the building may also offer clues; however, the structure at 112 Edwards Ferry Road is the only one with access under the house.

Mr. Scofield provided a view of the structure at 110 Edwards Ferry Road from the 1899, 1912, and 1930 Sanborn Maps showing its evolution over time. He outlined the likely original footprint as well as the additions of undetermined age and non-historic construction.

Ms. Welsh Chamblin asked for information regarding the dates of construction from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources documentation provided in the packet.

Mr. Scofield stated that information was received from an initial reconnaissance survey; however, the County's historic architecture consultant from John Milner and Associates has provided their date estimates of construction based on their analysis.

Ms. Shade noted the footprint of the structure at 110 Edwards Ferry Road overlaps the proposed footprint for the courthouse building.

Mr. Scofield provided an overview of the structure at 112 Edwards Ferry Road stating it is difficult to find historic material on the rear of this structure. He highlighted the additions which are undetermined as to status as well as the non-historic additions. He discussed the relation of each of the four structures along Edwards Ferry Road as to the proposed footprint of the courthouse building, acknowledging that the current footprint for 110 Edwards Ferry Road intersects with the proposed courthouse building footprint. He provided a perspective as to how the reduced footprints of the four structures would relate to the proposed courthouse based on the information provided as to the location of the lesser historic and non-historic additions. Further, he provided images as to how the proposed courthouse structure would be viewed if the structures at 110 and 112 were to remain as well as how it would be viewed if all four of the structures remained in their current configuration.

Mr. Hargreaves stated the design team will present scale, size and massing elements of the design. He stated it is their intent to demonstrate that they have tried to observe the Town's design

guidelines. He stated he hopes that the graphics showing the alternate streetscapes will open discussion.

Jim Beight, Dewberry, Inc. stated the overall courthouse project is composed of many different elements and will transform the underutilized property on Church Street. He highlighted several of the project elements including streetscape improvements from the proposed Pennington Lot garage to the building entrance, traffic improvements, utilities reconfigurations and the potential removal of the 1980's Valley Bank Building addition to connect the current courts campus to the new building. He outlined the project goals; ensuring the courthouse is representative of civic buildings throughout the State while incorporating elements from the Town of Leesburg, serving as a background building to the existing courts campus, responding to the needs of the courts, and staying within the established costs. He highlighted several areas outlined within the Old and Historic District guidelines; including, size, setback, scale, fenestration, massing and complexity of form and discussed how the proposed projects address those design criteria. He stated the difficulty is in the building footprint, driven by the function of the building, including four courtrooms, four judge's chambers and minimum public waiting and circulation space which results in a building that is115 feet wide by almost 300 feet long. He discussed the attempt to keep the setback for the proposed building consistent with the existing courts campus and the desire to ensure this is a background building to the historic campus.

Mr. Meyer stated he understands the approach to continue the setback of the campus by maintaining the green space along the street; however, in looking at the Valley Bank Building on the corner, he asked if the possibility was considered to bring the building out to mirror the footprint of the Valley building to frame the entrance into that section and create a streetscape with a green in between the historic buildings.

Mr. Beight stated there was a scheme which depicted the building up along Edwards Ferry Road; however, it was felt that this was more of a commercial approach as opposed to the courts campus where the prominent face is set back. He stated it was also felt that maintaining some greenspace around the building was important.

Ms. Shade stated there was also a scenario discussed to have the building dog leg to Edwards Ferry Road; however, that did not work from a programing perspective nor the 92,000 square feet they could build to. She stated the project has a budget for square feet as well as a budget for project funds.

Ms. Minchew verified the programming budget has been used within the existing design without having extra for additional public space; however, this is a function of the project program not of the site.

Mr. Beight highlighted the architectural articulation of the proposed building, lifting elements of the colonnades found on the 1990's addition as well as the Academy and Clone buildings. He stated the orientation of the building on the corner requires attention to two prominent sides, the South and West; however, the majority of pedestrian traffic will come from the proposed parking garage. He stated scale and proportion of the building are important in that it should relate to the existing courts campus. He stated the design team also looked to how the more recent and historic fenestration was handled on the existing campus and how the same modulation and rhythm can be applied to the new building. He stated in looking at material selection it was noted that there is no consistency in the current campus other than variations on red brick so the challenge is in finding a material that matches each while recognizing that the most immediate neighbor to the proposed building is the most recent addition. He stated in addressing massing and complexity of form, the design team looked for historic precedent in similar type buildings noticing a division beginning at about the 20th Century. He stated the design team looked mainly to the Washington & Lee campus as well as the Virginia Supreme Court building noting they rely on simplistic forms where the colonnade becomes the civic statement of the building with a simple cornice that wraps around. He stated in approaching this building the idea of additive massing was addressed by the varying surface planes, breaking up the roofline, the use of bay divisions on the elevations and the use of different materials. Further he

stated there is a higher level of glazing on the public corridor where people can see justice being carried out.

Ms. Welsh Chamblin clarified the glazing will allow people to see into the public areas, not the courtrooms.

Mr. Beight outlined the location of the public spaces and courtroom spaces within the building demonstrating how the building can meet the programming needs while maintaining a scale which is similar to the existing courthouse campus.

Ms. Welsh Chamblin verified the courtrooms will not be located on the entrance level.

Ms. Shade noted the greatest volume of traffic to the courthouse building will be to the offices of the Clerk of the Circuit Court and the Commonwealth's Attorney.

Mr. Beight stated this is why the addition is proposed to be removed from the Valley Bank Building, to visually connect the campus. He stated it is highly important for the building to participate with the historic buildings on the campus. He provided elevation drawings to show how he believes the proposed courthouse building integrates and pays homage to the buildings on the historic courthouse campus. He provided an elevation showing the four houses along Edwards Ferry Road in their current locations noting the existing footprint of 110 Edwards Ferry Road overlaps the proposed footprint of the courthouse. He noted concerns with scale given the size of the proposed building in comparison to the existing structures and stated the County feels the four structures detract from the civic nature of the courthouse.

Chairman Kiley stated he believes the proposed courthouse building will be a massive presence at the intersection without the four existing structures there to mitigate the impact.

Mr. Meyer noted the images are distorted as you will not read the structures as shown because of the context around it. He stated as you travel west on Edwards Ferry Road from Harrison Street the four houses will serve to mitigate the impact of the building because of the view sheds.

Mr. Hargreaves asked why a house, such as 106 Edwards Ferry in its current state would be seen to mitigate a structure behind it.

Ms. Minchew stated visually; it could mitigate a great deal.

Mr. Hargreaves stated visually; it could destroy the building.

Ms. Minchew stated it destroys the vision of what the design team would want to see there. She stated the design team continues to say the proposed building is a background building; however, you are hearing from several Board members that this is not a background building. She stated the lack of consideration to the houses on the street, which may be able to help the background, is a concern of the Board.

Mr. Meyer stated it was the design choice that was made in going with a bold statement with the glass section and column section. He stated the theory behind it is correct and well thought out; however, you are crossing into another section of the Town where the look and feel is different and will be changed by the proposed structure. He stated that may be alright; however, the proposed structure is not seen as a background building by this Board.

Mr. Beight stated he understands that this is a major civic building; however, the design team feels it is a background building to the historic campus.

Mr. Meyer stated he understands that this is an institutional building and you want to be true to that; however, if you preserve the four houses the Edwards Ferry façade may not require quite this level of articulation.

Mr. Hargreaves stated the Town's design guidelines request that major facades orient themselves to the road.

Ms. Minchew stated with the houses in place this would not be a major façade.

Ms. Shade stated this is the front door to the building. She stated it may not have a door on the façade; however, when people are walking up from the Pennington lot, Church Street and Edwards Ferry Road, they will see three facades.

Mr. Goodson stated the Edwards Ferry elevation was made into a major façade through the design choices. He sated some of the earlier designs shown to the Board in August provided much more of a background façade which would have fit better with the existing structures.

Chairman Kiley stated he does not believe this to be a background building, with or without the four existing structures. He stated he does not see the structure as being background to the historic courthouse campus.

Mr. Meyer stated the most recent addition was done very simply and won various design awards.

Ms. Shade asked that the Board consider the slope on this site and the additional story. She stated coming from the East, the proposed building has a certain presence which is beyond her control because of the volume of the building.

Mr. Meyer verified the height at the bottom of the hill to be approximately 53 feet. He stated if the first two houses at 106 and 108 Edwards Ferry Road were to be removed, he believes that the structures at 110 and 112 Edwards Ferry would mitigate the scale issue in a potential compromise.

Mr. Malloy stated the design team is constrained with the mass; however, the architectural treatment of the mass is something that still has the visual appearance of a campus building that has been transported onto this site without the next step to transform it into a 17th or 18th century courthouse. He stated the lines are very stark in a 1960's approach. He stated this façade does not respect, other than the material, the 17th and 18th century architecture.

Ms. Minchew concurred with Mr. Malloy's comments.

Mr. Meyer stated the proposed compromise of saving two of the structures would require some changes to the façade as it was not designed with the existing structures in mind.

Mr. Hargreaves stated the design team does not consider this to be the final building design. He stated the building was designed with the removal of the four structures in mind; however, there will be further opportunity for discussion of the building design when the application is filed after the current demolition applications are decided.

Chairman Kiley noted the four existing structures on Edwards Ferry Road are not in optimal condition; however, they are owned by the County and asked why they have not been maintained. He stated the current condition of the buildings should not be used as a reason to demolish them.

Ms. Shade noted the County replaced the metal roofs on the structure with a higher quality roof than existing. She stated on 112 Edwards Ferry Road the roof, cornice and trim was done in a respectful manner. She stated the roof on the structure at 110 Edwards Ferry Road was replaced on the left side only. She stated the structure at 106 Edwards Ferry had the roof replaced as well as the siding, which required close inspection for her and Mr. Scofield to determine which portions of the siding were original and which had been replaced. She stated it is a shame that aluminum windows and doors were installed; however, she is not certain as to whether that work was completed under the County's ownership.

Ms. Minchew stated she believes the structures are in good condition.

Mr. Koochagian stated he agrees with Mr. Malloy's comments in general. He stated he agrees that a decision needs to be made with regards to the four demolition applications; however, the Board needs to have an understanding of what will be constructed there next. He stated the current design is not appropriate for the site and he feels it is more in keeping with the Barrister Building than with the courthouse campus. He stated if you step back and look in front of Dodona Manor on Market Street, you will see all 50 feet of the side of a big brick building and these four existing structures will provide the transition needed into the much lower buildings.

Chairman Kiley stated he does not feel he can properly evaluate the design of the proposed building until he knows whether the existing structures will remain.

Mr. Hargreaves discussed some of the design conversations the team has had with the Loudoun judges. He stated Chairman Kiley makes a good point in that it is difficult for one item to move forward without the other. Further, he stated it was his understanding that a compromise had been offered by the Town, which was the two structures at 110 and 112 remaining.

Mr. Scofield clarified that was a staff recommendation, not a BAR decision.

Mr. Meyer asked whether the County would consider a compromise to preserve the historic core of the four structures.

Chairman Kiley stated the Board of Supervisors authorized Dewberry Inc. to study the removal of the rear additions on 110 and 112 Edwards Ferry Road. He stated the County has also issued a request for interest to see if a member of the public may be interested in relocating one or more of the structures off site.

Mr. Hargreaves stated there is some confusion in that the Board of Supervisors have used the words remove and relocate interchangeably. He stated he does not wish to speak for the Board; however, he believes when the Board uses the term remove they are referring to demolition whereas, when they use the term relocate it is in reference to moving the structures off site.

Ms. Welsh Chamblin verified the original concept cost estimate for this project only considered the full demolition of the four structures along Edwards Ferry Road.

Ms. Shade stated the design development cost estimate, which is being finalized, provides two alternative options; to relocate the four structures or to demolish them.

Chairman Kiley stated his assumption is that the County is not interested in covering the cost to relocate these four off site structures. He stated it would be a third party coming forward or they would not be relocated.

Mr. Hargreaves stated that is his understanding as well.

Mr. Meyer noted there is no interest from the BAR in seeing the buildings relocated off site.

Chairman Kiley confirmed that no cost estimate has been performed to look at the removal of the non-historic and less historic additions from the structures at 106 and 108 Edwards Ferry Road.

Ms. Shade stated she has only just started hear discussions from the County regarding the possibility of looking at a cost estimate for that work.

Mr. Hargreaves stated he was hoping to get ahead of the Board of Supervisors by taking information from this meeting tonight to bring them information beyond what is in their staff report.

Ms. Minchew asked if the stormwater management issues have been resolved. She stated if the County can say tonight that they will look at the removal of just selected rear portions from the four structures, the BAR might be prepared to take a straw poll on that tonight.

Mr. Hargreaves stated the design team is still working with the Town on the storm water issues. He stated it has been decided that the BMP credits will be taken so one vault is gone and the issue remaining is whether the other vault can be moved to the Pennington lot. He stated there are significant issues with the stormwater run-off into the existing pipe which is at capacity. He stated the rezoning application for this project is under review and these issues will not be fully completed until site plan review, which will be another year.

Chairman Kiley stated perhaps it is time to consider a straw poll; however, that would have to be done in two parts with a number of caveats. He asked if there is any member of the Board who could see a pathway to approving the full demolition of all four structures.

There were no members who indicated they would be in a position to approve the full demolition.

Mr. Meyer stated his decision goes to Council's desire to keep the courts in the downtown versus the fact that approval of these applications would be a full departure from the design guidelines and would set a precedent. He stated by necessity, this may become a Council decision.

Mr. Koochagian stated the Board takes its direction from the design guidelines and he has not seen any way forward through the guidelines to approve these demolition applications. He stated from a citizen's perspective, he is not convinced that the four structures need to be removed.

Chairman Kiely asked if there are any members of the Board who could see their way forward to approving the removal of the non-historic and less historic additions from the four structures.

Mr. Meyer stated he would caveat this decision by stating the most important thing in his view is preserving the streetscape versus being historically pure in where the line is drawn.

Chairman Koochagian stated enough of the mass of the street facing frontage must remain.

All 7 members of the Board indicated that they could potentially see a pathway to approving such a proposal.

Chairman Kiley asked if any member of the Board could see a pathway to approving the removal of the non-historic and less historic additions from the structures at 110 and 112 Edwards Ferry Road with the full demolition of the structures at 106 and 108 Edwards Ferry Road.

Mr. Meyer stated he would caveat the question in that if there was legitimate technical infeasibility of the project with being able to do that as the least desirable compromise position. He stated you would have to look at the four structures first before coming back to this option.

Mr. Koochagian stated he believes each structure has to be evaluated on its own and asked which portion of the guidelines would allow for the demotion of any of the structures.

Mr. Meyer stated the reason he could maybe see a way forward with this proposal is the questions surrounding 108 Edwards Ferry Road.

Chairman Kiley clarified there is a question as to whether the current structure at 108 Edwards Ferry Road was not constructed until the 1930's. He stated even if it was constructed in 1935 it is still historic.

Ms. Minchew stated removing two of the structures is the same to her as removing all four in that she does not see how the Board could issue that approval.

Chairman Kiley concurred with Ms. Minchew's comments.

Vice Chairman Reimers stated we cannot take the technical issues of the stormwater system into consideration.

Mr. Hargreaves stated there are other construction issues besides the stormwater management issues which impact the constructability of this site and which would make it extremely difficult to work around the four structures. He stated there have been internal discussions regarding the possibility of moving the structure at 110 Edwards Ferry Road forward because it is too close to the proposed building. He stated even with the stormwater vaults removed, there are still problems with site utilities.

Mr. Beight stated removing one of the two vaults will not allow the stormwater to be cleaned on site resulting in dirty water being dumped downstream which he disagrees with philosophically.

Chairman Kiley stated it does not appear that the Board is prepared to make a straw vote on that question.

Mr. Meyer stated it appeared that perhaps Mr. Malloy could potentially consider that proposal. He stated in his case it comes down to whether he could rationally justify such a proposal in his own mind versus whether he would feel that he could not support the proposal but could recommend it a as a potential consideration for the Town Council.

Mr. Malloy stated the difference for him is demolition versus relocation. He stated he lives on Edwards Ferry Road and has noted some “missing teeth” which could be improved by relocating one or more of these buildings.

Mr. Hargreaves stated the whole intent of this proposed building is to tie into the civic buildings further west and unite the campuses by removing the non-historic addition from the Valley Bank Building. He asked, given this proposal, does the Board really feel that the removal of these four structures would give the appearance of “missing teeth”.

Mr. Malloy stated his statement regarding “missing teeth” does not refer to the four structures in their current location, rather it is a justification he is using to consider retaining two structures and moving two structures.

Mr. Koochagian stated Mr. Hargreaves just mentioned the steps taken to making the transition from the proposed courthouse to the rest of the courthouse complex; however, he has not heard discussion regarding the transition from the new courthouse to the residential streetscape.

Mr. Beight stated it was discussed earlier in the meeting that there is not much the design team can do with the box where the courtrooms are; however, a portion of the building was dropped down in the back as a gesture to bring the scale of the building down moving North.

Mr. Malloy stated the houses where the courthouse building is at its highest elevation do provide a buffer for the mass. He stated the West end of the building is much more in keeping with the rest of the campus.

Ms. Minchew stated the removal of the four structures would completely change the Edwards Ferry Road landscape and these four modest contributing structures help to maintain that streetscape.

Mr. Hargreaves noted from his standpoint the easiest path forward is retaining the structures at 110 and 112 Edwards Ferry Road.

Vice Chairman Reimers stated retention of the structures at 112 and 110 Edwards Ferry Road is essential given their height and mass.

Chairman Kiley stated it is important to communicate to the Board of Supervisors that even if every member of the BAR were to refer to the structures at 112 and 110 as essential, it does not mean that a vote would pass to demolish 106 and 108 Edwards Ferry Road based on the guidelines.

Mr. Meyer stated the straw poll indicates there would potentially be three maybe votes for that proposal and 4 votes for most likely not.

There was further discussion regarding the impact the final decision of whether to retain all four structures on Edwards Ferry Road will have on the overall design of the proposed courthouse building.

Mr. Scofield asked the design team to explain what is to be expected from the Board of Supervisors Meeting on Wednesday.

Mr. Hargreaves stated all of the motions are included in the packet provided.

Ms. Minchew noted there is not a motion in the packet to approve the removal of just the non-historic and less historic additions from all four structures while keeping the historic core in place.

Vice Chairman Reimers stated he does not believe that he would vote to have the four structures moved to the Pennington lot.

Mr. Hargreaves noted the Board of Supervisors felt that a compromise had been offered from the Town to keep the historic core of the structures for 110 and 112 Edwards Ferry and demolish the structures at 108 and 106 Edwards Ferry Road. He stated the motions included in the package represent what they are thinking. He stated he felt that this discussion tonight was important to see if additional information could be brought forward from the BAR to the Board of Supervisors for their upcoming meeting.

There was further discussion regarding the review process, specifically that the BAR is not bound by Board of Supervisors decision on this matter. The Board of Architectural Review can act and that decision can be appealed to the Town Council, who has the ultimate authority, if the Board of Supervisors is not satisfied with the decision.

Mr. Meyer noted, regarding the potential compromise as citied by the design team, that at one point he had discussed the possibility of retaining only 110 and 112, as did staff; however, that was prior to the additional studies that were received which indicate a possibility for retaining all four structures.

There was further discussion regarding the fact that the BAR has not indicated support for retaining only the two structures at 110 and 112 Edwards Ferry Road and approving demolition of 106 and 108 Edwards Ferry Road.

Mr. Meyer stated, he is not stating a preference; however, there could be support in the guidelines for retaining the historic core of 110 and 112 Edwards Ferry Road in place and relocating 106 and 108 Edwards Ferry Road to another location off site.

Chairman Kiley stated he will attend the Board of Supervisors meeting on Wednesday evening.

There was further discussion regarding the County's request for inquiry regarding the potential relocation of the structures offsite. Additionally, there was further discussion whether any formal or information action should be taken at this meeting with regards to 110 and 112 Edwards Ferry Road.

Mr. Hargreaves asked if the BAR would like to hold an additional discussion prior to the critical action date of May 18th.

Chairman Kiley stated a special meeting is tentatively scheduled for April 22nd at 7pm.

Old Business

New Business:

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

_____
Edward Kiley, Chair

_____
Deborah E. Parry, Planning & Zoning Assistant