



**Board of Architectural Review**

DATE: March 21, 2018  
TO: Board of Architectural Review Chair and Members  
THROUGH: Jason Sutphin, Community Development Division Chief JDS  
FROM: Tommy Scibilia, BAR Liaison TS  
SUBJECT: Paul VI Redevelopment

- ATTACHMENTS:
1. Relevant regulations
  2. Plans package
  3. Hardware specifications
  4. Director of Historic Resources Memorandum
  5. Modified Historic Structures Reports
    - a. Paul VI High School
    - b. John C. Wood House

**Nature of Request**

- |                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| 1. Case Number:                | BAR-17-00406  |
| 2. Address:                    | 10675 Fairfax Boulevard, 10600 and 10606 Cedar Avenue                                     |
| 3. Request:                    | New residential and commercial  |
| 4. Applicant:                  | IDI Fairfax, LC   |
| 5. Applicant's Representative: | Enrico Cecchi   |
| 6. Status of Representative:   | Manager   |
| 7. Existing Zoning:            | CR Commercial Retail, RM Residential Medium, John C. Wood House Historic Overlay District |
| 8. Proposed Zoning:            | PD-M Planned Development Mixed Use  |

**STAFF COMMENTS**

**Background**

The subject site is composed of three parcels of land central to the City. The block is bound by Fairfax Boulevard, McLean Avenue, Cedar Avenue, and Panther Place, with Oak Street just to the west. To the north is the Shops at Fairfax shopping center, to the east are single family homes, to the south is Pat

Rodio Park and the American Legion building, and to the west are duplex homes, a daycare center, and a McDonald's restaurant.

The largest of the three parcels on site currently contains Paul VI Catholic High School, built in 1935 with subsequent additions, and its associated parking areas and athletic fields. The school building was included on the Historic Property Survey conducted by the City in 2004.

The two smaller parcels in the southeast corner of the site contain single family homes. 10600 Cedar Lane, at the corner of Cedar Avenue and McLean Avenue, is a Cape Cod style house, currently occupied, and was built in 1951. 10606 Cedar Avenue contains the John C. Wood House, and was designated a local historic overlay district in 2010. The Provisions of the Zoning Ordinance relating to this district restrict allowable uses on the property (see attachment 1). The vacant colonial style house was once home to the City of Fairfax's first mayor, and was built in 1911.

The applicant is currently pursuing a rezoning of the property from CR Commercial Retail (Paul VI), RM (Paul VI, 10600 and 10606 Cedar Avenue), and John C. Wood House Historic Overlay District (10606 Cedar Avenue) to PD-M Planned Development Mixed Use. The applicant is also requesting a Comprehensive Plan amendment to the Future Land Use Map from designations of Institutional (Paul VI) and Residential-Low (10600 and 10606 Cedar Avenue) to Business Commercial, Transitional, and Residential High. As part of these cases, the BAR will make a formal recommendation to City Council on the major certificate of appropriateness. If the rezoning is approved, the John C. Wood House Historic Overlay District would be removed, and a certificate of appropriateness for demolition would not be required. The BAR may choose to comment on this, however the Zoning Ordinance does not require a BAR recommendation on the rezoning or Comprehensive Plan amendment requests.

The applicant has had work sessions with the BAR on December 20, 2017 and February 21, 2018. The proposed plan is a mixed-use project that retains the original portion of the Paul VI High School Building (circa 1935) and has retail, condominium, live-work, and townhouse uses. Following are comments made by Board members at the most recent work session, pulled directly from the approved meeting minutes:

- The development would be very dense and crowded
- Renderings prepared may be deceiving regarding how open the development appears
- Corrections are needed to make the illustrative plan correspond to the landscape plan
- Consider the size of proposed trees and the areas in which they are proposed to be planted
- Too much cementitious panel was being used on the condominium building and more brick should be used instead
- Explore increasing variation in condominium balcony size and depth to add character
- Consider the scale relationship between the condominium building and the school building as it relates the feeling of pedestrian enclosure between the two

- The number of materials and projections on the condominium building as well as coloration creates a visually competing aesthetic that may look pleasing from far away, but needs to be rethought in close range
- The retail buildings should be rethought to be scaled toward the pedestrian (like the school building) rather than the automobile
- The rear façade of the school building should be rethought
  - A monumental central entrance mirroring the front may not be appropriate
  - Consider the pedestrian scale and relationship to the street
- The Madrid Blend yellow brick is too orange
- If the Pat Rodio Park units are to remain front loaded, the rears should be designed to look more like the fronts of the other units on Cedar Avenue (e.g. through revisions to the third floor, addition of roofline-varying elements) for continuity across the south side of the site
- Explore increasing the individuality of each unit, especially on the rear elevations
- Focus on the relationship of open space and the townhouses, and how the side elevations can be designed to emphasize this relationship
- Think of the linear green space as a narrow street to be enjoyed by residents, and the three dimensional interactions the buildings could have with it (e.g. projections, recesses, overhangs)
- Brick texture can be used to create visual interest on building façades
- Pay attention to material interaction that could cause maintenance issues
- Consider either delineating private rear space for Pat Rodio Park units with low walls or other design interventions, or else create a shared amenity space for residents here

## **Proposal**

The proposal is a mixed-use development consisting of three commercial buildings along part of the frontage on Fairfax Boulevard, a condominium building in the southwest portion of the site, and 137 townhouses on the eastern half of the site. The most recent submission to planning staff indicated 184 condominium units, however with the revised design of the building, staff estimates 165 units.

Several items typically reviewed by the BAR, mentioned throughout the remainder of the report, are missing from the applicant's submission materials. Staff has captured these items in a recommended condition of approval at the end of this report, and recommends that the applicant be required to return for final consideration of these more detailed items following Council action on the land use items and on the major certificate of appropriateness, prior to site plan approval.

### **Site:**

The BAR should focus its review on the architecture, landscape design, lighting, and amenities. The following section of the report provides a description of the proposed site design for informational purposes only.

The roadway design along Fairfax Boulevard includes a one-way slow lane that would provide parallel parking for retail uses and townhouses along the corridor. The main entrance to the site would be located at the existing signalized intersection across from the entrance to the Shops at Fairfax. Three other curb cuts are proposed along Fairfax Boulevard: one at the western end to serve the retail uses, one east of the main entrance, and a right-out exit at the eastern end. A secondary entrance would be an extension of Panther Place off of Oak Street into a parking lot that would serve the condominium building. Underground parking would be provided for condominium residents, with access from behind the retail buildings. Access to a small parking lot intended to serve the townhouses on the southern portion of the site is accessible from Cedar Avenue and Keith Avenue. No vehicular entrances to the interior of the site are proposed on the southern or eastern edges of the site, however a bike path is proposed along the adjacent lengths of both Cedar Avenue and McLean Avenue. The internal street network includes two north-south boulevards, one that ends before connecting to Cedar Avenue, and one that connects the main entrance on Fairfax Boulevard to the secondary entrance at Panther Place. Another road with perpendicular parking is proposed around the back of the retail buildings. Smaller private roads and alleys would provide driveway access to the townhouses. There is no east-west vehicular connection proposed through the site.

The proposed pedestrian network includes sidewalks fronting the retail buildings and townhouses on Fairfax Boulevard, sidewalks running parallel to the bike paths on Cedar Avenue and McLean Avenue, sidewalks along the internal boulevards, a nature trail meandering through the southwestern portion of the site near the condominium building, and sidewalks within the linear green space that cuts east to west from McLean Avenue to the condominium building.

The proposed open spaces, some with names given by the applicant, include:

- Village Green/Reunion Square: The expansion of the front lawn of Paul VI High School
- Tussica Park: The southwestern portion of the site where the nature trail would be located
- Leadership Park: A small pocket park off of Cedar Avenue
- Townhouse Green: The east-west linear green space
- Heritage Bike Trail: The aforementioned bike trail along McLean and Cedar
- The condominium building courtyard

A handful of smaller pockets of green space would be scattered throughout the townhouse development. Landscape concepts of the above locations are included in attachment 3 and described in more detail in the landscape section below.

## **Architecture:**

### *School Building:*

The applicant is proposing to modify the original 1935, two-story portion of the Paul VI High School building, converting it into a community space or retail use. The original portion of the building is located between the library and cafeteria wings in front of the gated lawn on Fairfax Boulevard. It is

seven bays wide and designed in the classical revival style by Raymond V. Long, the architect who designed many of the school buildings in Virginia at this time (attachment 5a).

The applicant has provided two alternate treatments to the building, Option 1 and Option 2. Option 1 is a more intensive redesign of the building which retains some key architectural features of the north (front) façade, while modifying the building to be more conducive to use by retail tenants. Features retained in Option 1 include the pedimented entry bay, modified cross-bond brickwork and decorative quoins, parapet, and cast stone entablature. Modifications would include:

- Replacement of all existing fenestration on the north façade with storefront systems on the ground floor and tall industrial style windows on the second floor
- Addition of suspended metal canopies
- Addition of a metal sign band around the perimeter of the building between the upper and lower fenestration
- Limited areas of decorative painted brickwork
- New south, east, and west façades reflecting the proposed architecture of the north façade
  - The south central bay would be surrounded by a face of white brick, “Palmetto Whitestone”, to mimic the color and scale of the existing north entrance
  - Brickwork (bond pattern, color “Shenandoah” red, and beige mortar), cast stone entablature, and parapet designed to match that existing on the front façade

Option 2 is much more sympathetic to the existing architecture of the school building, retaining all of the architectural features currently on the front façade of the building. The new south, east, and west façades would be designed to match the brickwork, cast stone entablature, parapet, and upper story windows of the north façade. The ground floor design would incorporate white-framed storefront to match the window frames of the existing fenestration. The south central bay would be redesigned as described above in Option 1 with the white brick surround.

---

*Retail Buildings:*

Two new one-story retail buildings are proposed to the east and west of the remaining school building, and would flank the open space. The architecture takes design cues from the school building, while introducing retail elements found more in Option 1 above. The design of these two buildings features:

- Tall retail spaces and a varied roofline
  - The maximum height of these buildings is 28 feet
- Black metal coping, storefront, and traditional wall-mounted sconces
- “Shenandoah” red brick with beige mortar to match the school building
- “Palmetto Whitestone” white brick with to match the cast stone elements of the school building
- “Continental Standard” pale pink brick, which relates to the proposed color schemes of the townhouses and condominium building (see below)
  - The elevation rendering presents this color more as tan than pink
- Cast stone headers

- Decorative EIFS cornices to mimic the cast stone entablature of the school building
- Decorative metal banding

The applicant has not supplied detailed information on the retail lighting fixtures at this time and staff recommends this be included as an item of which the applicant should return to the BAR for review following City Council action.

—

*Townhouses:*

In their most recent design, all 137 of the townhouse units on site have been staggered in accordance with §3.5.1.C. of the Zoning Ordinance (see attachment 1). All units are approximately 50 feet in depth. Middle units would be 20 feet in width, end units 22 feet, and the units closest to Pat Rodio Park, Type 2 described below, 24 feet.

The five unit types presented fall into a contemporary design language category and a more traditional one. The units proposed along Fairfax Boulevard (Type 1) fall into this contemporary category. These units would be either residential units like the rest of the townhouses on site, or live-work units, where a portion of the first level is reserved for a retail use. Please note that the BAR should focus their comments on design rather than use of these units. These 40-foot, three-story, rear-loaded units are shown with flat roofs, large ground floor windows, recessed rear balconies, long upper-story windows with contemporary mullion patterns, and a decorative stucco cornice. The units are differentiated from one another with decorative banding, brick color differentiation, window bays, flat metal entrance canopies, and five-foot recessed front balconies with planters. The rear elevations, which would not be highly visible from any right-of-way, would be cementitious siding. The garage doors for these units are shown as a grayish color with a grid of panels. The second floor cantilevered rear balconies are recessed between three and five feet and project out over the driveway another five feet. The side elevations would be mostly brick with decorative banding and windows matching those of the front façade, and a five-foot span of siding wrapping around from the rear elevation.

The majority of units interior to the site (Type 3A) carry much the same appearance as those on Fairfax Boulevard. The main difference is that these units, standing at 45 feet in height, have a fourth floor with a front terrace. The top of the third story still utilizes the stucco cornice found on the Fairfax Boulevard units, acting as a parapet to the terrace.

The two sticks of units proposed adjacent to the condominium building courtyard (Type 3B) are the same overall design as Type 3A, but feature the use of brick up through and including the third floor of their rear elevations, and for the entirety of their side elevations, to present a more materially rich view to these homeowners.

More traditionally designed units would be located at the periphery of the site along McLean Avenue and Cedar Avenue (Type 4). These 40-foot, three-story, rear-loaded units would be differentiated from

one another with decorative banding, brick color differentiation, window bays, a variety of traditional sash window types, various types of window headers and sills, shutters, roof elements such as dormers and gables, recessed front entrance vestibules, and foundation material variety. The rear elevations, which would not, in most cases, be highly visible from any right-of-way, would be cementitious siding. The garage doors for these units are shown as a grayish color with vertical panels and small square windows. The second floor rear balconies would project out over the driveway five feet and supported by thin square columns. Side elevations include PVC columns supporting a gabled entrance canopy, fiber cement siding in the main compound gable with a curvilinear vent, and traditional sash windows. Brick would make up the majority of the side elevation, with the rear portion inset approximately six inches faced in fiber cement siding.

The southernmost stick of units closest to Pat Rodio Park (Type 2) would have similar design features to the other traditional units, but would be front-loaded, with their rear elevations facing the park space. The rear façades of these units would incorporate brick up through and including the second floor, dormers to break up the roofline, and ground floor entrances to a covered space beneath the column-supported second floor balcony. Staff has previously recommended that the units at the edge of Pat Rodio Park be reoriented to face the park with a rear-loaded garage to better visually embrace the surrounding community, however staff recognizes that the applicant has made efforts to incorporate elements typical of front elevations on the rear, such as brick and roof dormers, in response to BAR feedback at the February 21, 2018 work session.

Materials and colors for the townhouses include:

- Brick
  - “Dolomite Grey” grayish yellow with similar mortar
  - “Shenandoah” red with beige mortar, to match that used on the school and retail buildings
  - “Blush Mist” pink with beige mortar
  - “Butternut” gold with beige mortar
- Cementitious siding
  - “Monterey Taupe” light brown
  - “Khaki Brown” medium brown
  - “Sail Cloth” beige
  - “Cobblestone” warm grey
- Cementitious trim
  - “Classic White” off white
  - “Navajo Beige” tan
- Cast stone headers and sills
  - “Crystal White” light grey
- EIFS cornice (contemporary units, Types 1, 3A, and 3B)
  - “Dirtwood” cool grey
- Metal canopy (contemporary units, Types 1, 3A, and 3B)

- “Zinc” dark grey
- Asphalt shingle roof (traditional units, Types 2 and 4)
  - Dark grey/black
- Vinyl windows and doors with various gridded mullion patterns (see elevations in attachment 2)
  - “Almond” beige
  - See detailed window and door information in attachment 3
- Metal railings with square balusters
  - “Almond” beige
  - Silver
  - See detailed railing information in attachment 3

---

*Condominium Building:*

The condo building is proposed to be a U-shaped building up to five stories in height. The building is planned to be constructed in two phases. Phase 1 would be five stories, with a max height of 58 feet and an average height of 55 feet according to the architect via email correspondence. This would be the leg of the building farthest north and closest to the retail block of the project. The north face of the building is particularly long, however working off of feedback from both the BAR and staff, the applicant has reworked the design of the building through several iterations, adding articulation through variation in material, color, and roofline height, as well as projecting window bays and recessed balconies. The northern entrance to Phase 1 would be across from the rear of the school building, and would incorporate design elements from the school building, including brick, cast stone elements, and vertically oriented fenestration. The ground level of this phase of the building would incorporate low-walled gated yards for ground floor residents, storefront window systems for interior condominium amenity areas, as well as human-scale articulation in the form of cast stone water tables and wall recesses to create transparency and reinforce the pedestrian scale along this corridor.

Phase 2, the portions of the building closest to Oak Street and Pat Rodio Park, would be four stories, at a maximum height of 45 feet according to the architect via email correspondence. It would incorporate many of the same articulating features of Phase 1, including projecting window bays, recessed balconies, and low-walled gated ground floor resident yards. The roofline is fairly constant across Phase 2, however the variety of projecting and recessed elements will create the effect of a varied roofline from street level. The southern entrance to Phase 2 would be a scaled down version of the Phase 1 entrance, using the same materials and incorporating many of the same design features.

The courtyard elevations are similar to the outer building elevations, if not slightly simplified with fewer overall projections, which staff finds appropriate as these elevations are less visible, but still thoughtfully designed on the whole. The most visible portion of the courtyard elevations would be that at the northeastern leg of the building on Phase 1. It is evident that the applicant incorporated more articulation at this end of the courtyard elevation due to its higher degree of visibility from south of the site.



The majority of the building is proposed to be brick in two colors, with cementitious panel acting as more of an accent at the top stories of the building and as the material for the window bays. Materials and colors for the condo building include:

- Brick
  - “Shenandoah” red with beige mortar, to match that used on the school and retail buildings
  - “Manhattan” reddish brown with beige mortar
- Cast stone (at the north and south entrances)
  - “Crème Buff” gold
- Cementitious panel
  - “Roycroft Vellum” cream
  - “Roycroft Mist Gray” warm grey
  - “Downing Sand” tan
  - “Hammered Silver” taupe
- Storefront
  - Dark bronze
- Metal canopies
  - Dark bronze
- Vinyl windows and doors
  - “Almond” beige
  - See detailed window and door information in attachment 3
- Metal railings with square balusters
  - “Almond” beige
  - Silver
  - See detailed railing information in attachment 3

Staff discussed phasing of the condominium building construction with the applicant. The applicant has stated that the underground parking structure, beneath both phases of the building, would likely be built all at once. They stated that the ground above the Phase 2 portion of the garage would be sodded and landscaped in the interim, although no plans have been presented showing this treatment. The edge condition of Phase 1, the “joint” to Phase 2, would, in the interim, be finished with mainly cementitious panel to match that used elsewhere on the building. The rooftop space of Phase 2, which would likely be accessible from the top story of Phase 1, would be used for HVAC equipment, and not as amenity space. There is currently no phasing plan, but the applicant will be required to submit one in accordance with §3.8.2.H of the Zoning Ordinance (see attachment 1).

**Landscaping:**

The applicant has provided staff with a preliminary landscape plan which includes mostly trees, with shrubs shown in specific areas as necessary to screen transformers, provide transitional yards as

required by the Zoning Ordinance (see attachment 1), and to screen certain views into alleyways from McLean Avenue.

Larger canopy trees (categories II-IV) are proposed throughout the site in the following locations:

- In front of and around the retail spaces and school building
- Along McLean and Cedar Avenue spaced approximately 30 feet on center
- Tightly spaced along the western property line
- Mixed in with category II and III evergreen species surrounding the open space at the southwest corner of the site, “Tussica Park”.
- Between the slow lane and the front yards of the Type 1 live-work/townhouse units on Fairfax Boulevard
  - Between Fairfax Boulevard and the slow lane there is an existing underground gas utility line on top of which trees cannot be planted, so shrubs are intended to be planted within this curbed area instead, while the street trees on the other side of the slow lane are intended to fulfill the intent of the street tree requirement of §4.5.6.B (see attachment 1)
  - The space between the slow lane curb and the front walls of the Type 1 units proposed along Fairfax Boulevard is on average approximately 20 feet. The tree species proposed in these locations will reach a mature (10-year) canopy diameter of approximately 18 feet, which should not create a spatial conflict
- On certain portions of the north-south roads throughout the site
  - As part of the land use case, staff has requested the applicant explore moving of proposed underground utilities to allow for canopy trees wherever practicable throughout the project

A Typical Lot Detail Landscaping sheet was included in the landscape plan which is part of attachment 2, which shows typical landscaping plans for townhouse units by stick. All rear-loaded units would have one category I (small) ornamental tree, a few shrubs, and herbaceous ground cover in their front yards. The front loaded units proposed facing Pat Rodio Park would have a category I tree and shrubs planted between the driveways. Species are not called out specifically in this exhibit, but rather a list of potential species by type (i.e. ornamental tree, shrub, herbaceous groundcover) is included as a supplemental table.

The applicant has submitted, as part of the landscape package, conceptual illustrations and “precedent study” photographs for the various open spaces throughout the site. Staff notes that the precedent study photographs may not convey a clear sense of the spaces, and that the concept illustrations are a more practical visual tool to accurately understand them. Design features include:

- Village Green/Reunion Square (front lawn of Paul VI): A grass lawn framed by retail and school building front walkways, triangular perennial beds, and seating areas surrounded by shrubs. A small patio with seating and a fountain is shown outside of the eastern retail building across the main entry aisle.

- Tussica Park (southwestern portion of the site): Winding paved paths, seating areas, a play area for children, a contemplative veteran's memorial space, benches, and heavy vegetation around the perimeter.
- Leadership Park (pocket park off of Cedar): A small grass lawn framed by six canopy trees and shrubs at the corners.
- Townhouse Green (east-west linear green space): A central grass lawn framed by evenly spaces canopy trees, with rain gardens and small hardscaped areas for benches.
- Heritage Bike Trail: An asphalt path surrounded by a swale and grass strip on the road side, and a raised grassed curb separating it from a concrete sidewalk on the inner side.
- Condominium courtyard: An amenity space with an outdoor pool and deck space, grass lawns, outdoor game space, and a patio with a fire pit.

The applicant has stated that a more detailed plan with shrubs and groundcover throughout the site is forthcoming. These items are required to be approved as part of a certificate of appropriateness, and so staff recommends this be included as an item of which the applicant should return to the BAR for review following City Council action, prior to site plan approval.

**Lighting:**

For the February 21, 2018 work session, the applicant submitted a cut sheet with two types of lighting fixtures, the City standard acorn fixture, proposed along Fairfax Boulevard, and a downcast pole-mounted LED fixture for use throughout the interior of the site. The City requires the use of a decorative style street light for use on residential streets, as can be found in the public facilities manual, and so this should be included in future submissions along McLean and Cedar. The applicant has not yet identified the locations of lighting on the plans, nor have they supplied information for other types of fixtures to be expected for a development of this scale, e.g. bollards, wall-mounted lights, security lights, and up lighting. These items are required to be approved as part of a certificate of appropriateness, and so staff recommends this be included as an item of which the applicant should return to the BAR for review following City Council action, prior to site plan approval.

**Amenities:**

The amenities are only shown in the illustrative landscape concepts for the open space mentioned above. There are no specific amenity locations indicated on the overall plans, nor are there details on specific amenity items included in the submission. These items are required to be approved as part of a certificate of appropriateness, and so staff recommends this be included as an item of which the applicant should return to the BAR for review following City Council action, prior to site plan approval.

**Appurtenances:**

The HVAC units for the site would be located in the following locations:

- School building: Not determined at this time
- Retail buildings: Roof mounted, screened by parapet walls

- Townhouses: Ground mounted, between unit driveways
  - All units are rear loaded with alley access with the exception of the Pat Rodio Type 2 units. These units incorporate additional landscaping between the HVAC units and the drive aisle to screen them from view at the front elevations. Most HVAC units located in the alleys would not be visible from the rights-of-way surrounding the site. Some of the alleyways that are readily visible have shrub clusters proposed at the ends to screen them from view.
- Condominium building: Roof mounted, screened by parapet walls

The two dumpster locations identified are at the southwest corner of the school building, and behind the south end of the eastern commercial building within the parking area. The dumpster enclosures would be brick to match the school building with cast stone caps and brown slatted gates.

## **Analysis**

### **Community Appearance Plan:**

The following excerpts from the Community Appearance Plan are relevant to this application.

*Because of the variety of existing styles and the lack of an historical architectural reference along the corridors, no single architectural style is favored over others. Both modern styles and traditional architecture are appropriate – if well-designed and appropriately sited (50).*

Staff finds the overall mix of design types, traditional and contemporary, found within this proposal to be appropriate for this part of the City. The applicant has worked off of staff and BAR comments that the architecture of the site should relate to the scale, materiality, and proportion of the preserved school building, and staff believes that the final design proposal achieves this.

*Traditional materials such as brick, wood, and stone have survived the various architectural trends over time and exhibit longevity and quality (51).*

The majority material proposed on all buildings in this project is brick. Staff believes this satisfies the guideline.

*Colors for use on buildings and signs should be selected for their compatibility with the natural features and existing development found in and adjacent to the corridors (51).*

The color palettes proposed throughout the site are cohesive and subdued, but have enough variation in lightness and darkness to produce the desired articulation and differentiation in the buildings.

*The design of lighting fixtures installed on-site should complement the architecture of the built features on the site (44).*

These items are required to be approved as part of a certificate of appropriateness, and so staff recommends that the applicant return to the BAR following City Council action for approval of a detailed lighting plan, including information on specific fixtures proposed.

*In general, deciduous trees should be used in parking and pedestrian areas to provide protective canopies. Evergreen trees should be used in conjunction with deciduous trees where an effective vegetative screen is needed (41).*

Staff recommends that the applicant incorporate additional ground plantings and shrubs along McLean and Cedar Avenue to help buffer these uses from the single-family homes across the street, as part of a detailed landscape plan to be reviewed by the BAR following City Council action on the project.

*...all outdoor utilities, transformers, meters, dumpsters and mechanical units should be screened from public view by fences, walls or plantings (52).*

Staff is concerned that the location and placement of elevator and HVAC equipment for the school building has not yet been determined, and recommends that the applicant return to the BAR following City Council action for approval of these items and their screening. Specifically, staff believes that rooftop elevator equipment for the school building (explained below) should be housed in a structure that is the minimum required height, located as close to the south elevation as possible, and clad in “Shenandoah” red brick with beige mortar to match the walls of the building. Also, mechanical equipment or other appurtenances visible from the right-of-way should be screened from view with landscaping or architectural features respectful of the design of the building, and that do not obscure or alter the features of the front façade.

**Comprehensive Plan:**

The following excerpts from the 2012 Comprehensive Plan are relevant to this application.

*Community Appearance objective CA-3: Encourage exemplary site and building design, construction, and maintenance (105).*

The treatment of the school building as recommended in the recommendations section below would respect the history of the school building while at the same time creating a vibrant commercial space. The retail buildings are designed in a way that speaks to the material and scale of the school building, flanking it and acting secondary to it in visual prominence.

The townhouses borrow material and color language from the school building, as well as architectural features and design proportions. The traditional and contemporary models relate strongly to one another in design and yet incorporate enough variation to provide different experiences within the site, along the Boulevard, and within the surrounding neighborhoods.

The condominium building, originally proposed as five stories for both phases, has been redesigned several times with commentary from staff and the BAR incorporated along the way. The taller Phase 1 portion of the building is located central to the site, while the four story Phase 2 section would be the most visually prominent from both Oak Street and Pat Rodio Park. At 45 feet in height, this portion of the building would be the same height as the townhouses in the center of the site, and only five feet taller than those at the periphery of the site. Staff finds the revised design of this building to be fitting with the overall aesthetic of the development in scale, material, and color.

Overall, staff finds the proposal to be in conformance with this provision of the Comprehensive Plan, keeping in mind that several additional, more detailed items related to design should be reviewed by the Board at a future date.

*Historic Resources objective HR-1 Preserve and promote the City's historic resources.*

*Strategy HR-1.8 Seek National Register nomination of additional historic resources, as appropriate.*

*The City should support individual property owners in seeking National Register designation for their properties. In addition, the City should initiate designation for publicly held properties, as appropriate. Examples of sites that may now or soon meet the designation criteria include Paul VI High School (formerly Fairfax High School), the Farr property, the Sisson House (currently used for School Board and Voter Registrar offices) on the City Hall grounds, and a potential residential historic district in the Fairfax Triangle area (114).*

See discussion on Paul VI in the analysis section below.

### **Modified Historic Structure Reports:**

The applicant supplied staff with two extensive modified historic structure reports for both the John C. Wood House and for Paul VI High School. The reports document the properties including their histories, conditions assessments, scaled plans, photographs, and other detailed information. The full reports are included as attachment 5 to this report, however staff's analysis will focus on the work and treatment recommendations included in the reports as they relate to the proposal.

#### *John C. Wood House:*

Constructed in 1911 and modified with additions throughout the course of its life, the John C. Wood House is believed to be significant from a National Register eligibility criteria perspective, mainly through the National Park Service's National Register Criterion B, for its association with a historical figure. John C. Wood, the first mayor of the City of Fairfax, and his wife occupied the home from 1959-1995. The house is in an ongoing state of disrepair and the modified historic structure report holds that the building has lost and would continue to lose material integrity with the work needed to bring the house back to a usable condition. The work recommendations in the report is to demolish the house as proposed by the applicant, but prior to this, document the property with scaled plans and photographs, much of which is already included in the report. The Director of Historic Resources has agreed with this treatment recommendation by the preservation consultant, and has provided staff with

a list of several more items he would like added to this report for the property to be deemed sufficiently documented. The Director's comments are included as attachment 4.

If the rezoning is approved, the John C. Wood House Historic Overlay District would be removed, and a certificate of appropriateness for demolition would not be required.

*Paul VI High School:*

Constructed in 1935 and modified through to the present, Paul VI High School, formerly Fairfax High School, is a snapshot of institutional architecture of the Great Depression era. The applicant's desire is to maintain a modified footprint of the original 1935 school building. The modified historic structure report specifies that this building, as it stands, would not be eligible for consideration for inclusion on the National Register due to its alleged loss of "physical integrity" (attachment 5a, page 31). The City disagrees with this claim, but the Department of Historic Resources and Historic Fairfax City, Inc. (HFCD) are agreeable with the proposed retention of the existing front façade of the 1935 building. They have commented that this treatment satisfies the spirit of the community desire for the preservation of this structure. Staff believes that the proposed work would deem the building ineligible for consideration for inclusion on the National Register due to the substantial amount of proposed change to the building's fabric.

Work recommendations included in the report include:

- Retaining a modified footprint of the original 1935 school building
  - Staff is in agreement with this recommendation.
  - It is noted that the signalized entrance to the site cannot be relocated due to transportation safety and intersection spacing requirements, and as a result the internal road's positioning would preclude the east wing from being preserved.
- Maintaining the lawn, walkways, and fencing in front of the building
  - Staff does not fully agree with this recommendation, as the preservation of this space as-is would preclude modified activation of the space for community use as illustrated in the landscape concept for the Village Green/Reunion Square area. Further, retaining the fence along Fairfax Boulevard would prevent this space from feeling like an open community asset.
- Preserving and repairing damage to the front façade
  - Staff is in agreement with this recommendation, consistent with Option 2 for the redesign of the school building.
- Redesigning the side and rear elevations of the retained portion of the school building in a modern way related to the classical revival style, and maintaining original openings where possible
  - Staff is partially in agreement with this recommendation. Staff believes that the redesign should not be limited to the original openings of the school building. Because so much of the original façades have already been altered or will be replaced with the reconstruction of this building, staff believes the new design for these elevations should

allow for more flexibility to accommodate for retail tenants or other uses that may occupy this space, consistent with the side and rear elevations shown for Option 1.

- New stairs should be located within the footprint of the building, stairs should provide roof access to meet fire code regulations, and the building should have an elevator for accessibility.
  - Staff is in agreement with these recommendations, but the housing of the elevator equipment on the roof should be designed to be as inconspicuous as possible from the right-of-way and should use building materials to match those proposed for use on the building (see discussion above in the Community Appearance Plan analysis).
- New mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems should be installed
  - Staff is in agreement with this recommendation, but recommends that any portion of these systems that are visible on the exterior of the building from the right of way be screened from view (see discussion above in the Community Appearance Plan analysis).

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The proposal is generally consistent with the provisions of the Community Appearance Plan and the Comprehensive Plan, and therefore staff recommends a recommendation of approval of the proposal to City Council with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall return to the Board of Architectural Review for final review and approval of a detailed landscape plan including an interim landscape plan for the site of the Phase 2 portion of the condominium building, as well as a detailed lighting plan, light fixture specifications, amenity locations and details, and final design and screening of any rooftop equipment or appurtenances associated with the school building.
2. The school building shall be designed as shown in Option 2 to preserve the front façade of the school building, and as shown in Option 1 for the side and rear elevations, modified as necessary to eliminate elements from the side elevations that would obscure or alter the architectural features of the front façade.
3. Damaged architectural elements of the front façade of the school building shall be repaired in a manner that does not alter their materials or appearance.
4. New brickwork on the school building shall match the existing brickwork in color, mortar, and bonding pattern.
5. The applicant shall create and implement signage design criteria for the school building in compliance with §3.8.2.F. of the Zoning Ordinance so that the architectural features of the preserved front façade are not obscured or altered.
6. The side elevations of Types 3A and 3B townhouses shall be all brick.
7. The modified historic structure reports for the John C. Wood House and Paul VI High School shall be revised and resubmitted to incorporate the comments included in the Director of Historic Resources' memorandum to the BAR, dated March 15, 2018.
8. The proposed changes shall be in general conformance with the review materials received by staff and modified through the date of this meeting, except as further modified by the Board of



Architectural Review, the Director of Community Development and Planning, the Building Official, or Zoning as necessary.

## RELEVANT REGULATIONS

### §3.5.1. Residential use standards

#### C. Townhouses

3. No more than two of any 10 or one of any three to five abutting dwelling units having the same front yard setback. Varied front yard setbacks shall not be less than two feet offset from adjoining units as measured at the principal foundation line of each unit and no setback distance shall be less than the required minimum.

### §3.7.2. Historic overlay district

#### A. General

1. Any structure, group of structures, site or area may be designated a historic district, provided such property is found to:

- (a) Have significant historic character, interest or value as part of the city's heritage;
- (b) Be the site of a historic event with a significant effect upon society;
- (c) Exemplify the cultural, political, economic, social or historic heritage of the community;
- (d) Portray an era of history characterized by a distinctive architectural style;
- (e) Be part of or related to a distinctive area which should be developed or preserved according to an historic, cultural or architectural motif;
- (f) Represent an established and familiar visual feature of the community; or
- (g) Be likely to yield information important to history or prehistory.

2. All structures and improvements erected, enlarged, or reconstructed in historic overlay districts shall be designed and constructed in a manner that will complement the unique character of the district with respect to building size, scale, placement, design and the use of materials.

3. Improvements within this district shall be subject to the approval of a certificate of appropriateness in accordance with the provisions of §6.5.

#### E. John C. Wood House Historic Overlay District

##### 1. Prohibited uses

- (a) Electric transformers and substations
- (b) Telephone repeater stations

### §3.7.4. Architectural control overlay district

#### B. Certificate of appropriateness required

Except as specified in §3.7.4.C, below, all development in the architectural control overlay district shall be subject to the approval of a certificate of appropriateness in accordance with the provisions of §6.5.

#### C. Exceptions

The architectural control overlay district shall not apply to signs, unless otherwise specified, or to the following uses:

- 1. Single-family detached;
- 2. Duplex dwellings, after initial approval and construction; and

3. Townhouses, after initial approval and construction.

### §3.8.2. Planned development districts – General provisions

#### F. Design guidelines and dimensional standards

1. Each planned development shall provide a comprehensive set of design guidelines that demonstrate the project will be consistent with the comprehensive plan. All dimensional standards shall be established by the city council at the time of approval.
2. Each applicant will be required to propose a master development plan to include design guidelines and all changes relative to the applicable, current general district. The city council can modify that plan in the review process; only city council can approve a planned development rezoning.

#### H. Phasing

If development is proposed to occur in phases, the master development plan shall include a phasing plan for the development, and if appropriate, with specific build-out dates. Guarantees shall be provided that project improvements and amenities that are necessary and desirable for residents and occupants of the project or that are of benefit to the city, are constructed with the first phase of the project, or, if this is not possible, then as early in the project as is technically feasible.

### §3.8.4. PD-M, Planned Development Mixed Use District

#### A. Minimum Requirements

1. The PD-M, Planned Development-Mixed Use District is an option provided to encourage coordinated mixed use developments.
2. Unless waived by the city council, the PD-M district is permissible on sites of least two contiguous acres.

#### B. Permitted Uses

1. All uses permitted or as special uses in those permitted in the R districts and in the C districts (see §3.3.1), subject to approval by the city council.
2. The mix of uses shall be established by the city council at the time of approval.

#### C. Project boundary transitional yards

1. No project boundary transitional yard is required where the width of the project's perimeter, residential lots is equal to or greater than the minimum lot width of the adjoining development or the minimum lot width required by the zoning district applied to any adjoining undeveloped parcel.
2. Unless modified by the city council, a project boundary transitional yard TY3 (§4.5.5) shall be provided along all site area boundaries.

#### D. Signs

Signs allowed in the PD-M district shall be the same as signs allowed in the residential and nonresidential districts in accordance with §4.6.8.

### §4.5.6. Tree requirements

#### B. Street trees

In all general districts except the RL, RM, RH and CU districts, a minimum ten foot wide landscaped strip shall be provided along all streets. Street trees shall be required along all streets at the rate of one canopy tree for every 40 linear feet and spaced a maximum of 50 feet part.

1. All street trees shall be planted no less than three feet or more than 15 feet from the back of the curb or edge of pavement.

2. No tree shall be planted within a safe sight triangle (§4.3.4) or closer than 10 feet from any fire hydrant.

#### §5.4.5. Powers and duties

##### B. Final decisions

The board of architectural review shall be responsible for final decisions regarding the following:

1. Certificates of appropriateness, major (§6.5)

#### §6.5.1. Applicability

Certificates of appropriateness shall be reviewed in accordance with the provisions of §6.5.

##### A. A certificate of appropriateness shall be required:

1. To any material change in the appearance of a building, structure, or site visible from public places (rights-of-way, plazas, squares, parks, government sites, and similar) and located in a historic overlay district (§3.7.2), the Old Town Fairfax Transition Overlay District (§3.7.3), or in the Architectural Control Overlay District (§3.7.4). For purposes of §6.5, “material change in appearance” shall include construction; reconstruction; exterior alteration, including changing the color of a structure or substantial portion thereof; demolition or relocation that affects the appearance of a building, structure or site;

#### §6.5.3. Certificate of appropriateness types

##### A. Major certificates of appropriateness

##### 1. Approval authority

###### (a) General

Except as specified in §6.5.3.B.2(b), below, the board of architectural review shall have authority to approve major certificates of appropriateness.

###### (b) Alternative (in conjunction with other reviews)

Alternatively, and in conjunction with special use reviews, planned development reviews, special exceptions or map amendments (rezoning), the city council may approve major certificates of appropriateness.

#### §6.5.6. Action by decision-making body

##### A. General (involving other review by city council)

After receiving the director’s report on proposed certificates of appropriateness, which do not involve other reviews described below, the board of architectural review (BAR) shall review the proposed certificates of appropriateness in accordance with the approval criteria of §6.5.7. The BAR may request modifications of applications in order that the proposal may better comply with the approval criteria. Following such review, the BAR may approve, approve with modifications or conditions, or disapprove the certificate of appropriateness application, or it may table or defer the application.

##### B. Other reviews

1. Prior to taking action on special use reviews, planned development reviews, and map amendments (rezoning), the city council shall refer proposed certificates of appropriateness to the BAR for review in accordance with the approval criteria of §6.5.7.

2. In conjunction with special use reviews, planned development reviews, special exceptions and map amendments (rezoning), the city council may review the proposed certificate of appropriateness in accordance with the approval criteria of §6.5.7. The city council may request modifications of applications in order that the proposal may better comply with the approval criteria. Following such review, the city council may approve, approve with modifications or conditions, or disapprove the certificate of appropriateness application, or it may table or defer the application.

#### §6.5.7. Approval criteria

##### A. General

1. Certificate of appropriateness applications shall be reviewed for consistency with the applicable provisions of this chapter, any adopted design guidelines, and the community appearance plan.
2. Approved certificates of appropriateness shall exhibit a combination of architectural elements including design, line, mass, dimension, color, material, texture, lighting, landscaping, roof line and height conform to accepted architectural principles and exhibit external characteristics of demonstrated architectural and aesthetic durability.

#### §6.5.9. Action following approval

- A. Approval of any certificate of appropriateness shall be evidenced by issuance of a certificate of appropriateness, including any conditions, signed by the director or the chairman of the board of architectural review. The director shall keep a record of decisions rendered.
- B. The applicant shall be issued the original of the certificate, and a copy shall be maintained on file in the director's office.

#### §6.5.10. Period of validity

A certificate of appropriateness shall become null and void if no significant improvement or alteration is made in accordance with the approved application within 18 months from the date of approval. On written request from an applicant, the director may grant a single extension for a period of up to six months if, based upon submissions from the applicant, the director finds that conditions on the site and in the area of the proposed project are essentially the same as when approval originally was granted.

#### §6.5.11. Time lapse between similar applications

- A. The director will not accept, hear or consider substantially the same application for a proposed certificate of appropriateness within a period of 12 months from the date a similar application was denied, except as provided in §6.5.11.B, below.
- B. Upon disapproval of an application, the director and/or board of architectural review may make recommendations pertaining to design, texture, material, color, line, mass, dimensions or lighting. The director and/or board of architectural review may again consider a disapproved application if within 90 days of the decision to disapprove the applicant has amended his application in substantial accordance with such recommendations.

#### §6.5.12. Transfer of certificates of appropriateness

Approved certificates of appropriateness, and any attached conditions, run with the land and are not affected by changes in tenancy or ownership.

#### §6.5.13. Appeals

##### A. Appeals to city council

Final decisions on certificates of appropriateness made may be appealed to city council within 30 days of the decision in accordance with §6.22.

##### B. Appeals to court

Final decisions of the city council on certificates of appropriateness may be appealed within 30 days of the decision in accordance with §6.23.