



Board of Architectural Review

DATE: February 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 – Work Session**

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Relevant Regulations
2. Staff Report - Work Session 12/20/17
3. Meeting Minutes - Work Session 12/20/17
4. Plans - Work Session 12/20/17
5. Revised Plans
 - a. Townhouse Exhibit
 - b. Condominium Exhibit
 - c. Preliminary Landscape Plan
 - d. Lighting Fixtures

Nature of Request

1. Case Number:	BAR-17-00406
2. Address:	10675 Fairfax Boulevard, 10600 Cedar Avenue, 10606 Cedar Avenue
3. Request:	New mixed-use development
4. Applicant:	IDI Fairfax, LC
5. Applicant's Representative:	Enrico Cecchi
6. Status of Representative:	Manager
7. Zoning:	CR Commercial Retail, RM Residential Medium, John C. Wood House Historic Overlay District

BACKGROUND

The subject site is composed of 18.5 acres of land along one of the City's main commercial corridors, bounded by Fairfax Boulevard, McLean Avenue, Cedar Avenue, Panther Place, and Oak Street. The site currently contains the school building and grounds of Paul VI High School, and two single-family lots, one of which is a locally designated historic overlay district. The applicant is currently pursuing a

rezoning and a Comprehensive Plan amendment. For a more complete site description and history, and for a description of the land use case, see the previous staff report, attachment 2.

In the December 20, 2017 work session staff report, attachment 2, staff requested the following items from the applicant for a more complete submission:

- Elevations of all sides of all buildings on site
- Dimensions
- Specific material labels
- Door and window specifications
- Lighting fixture specifications
- Railing details
- Awning details
- Material sample boards
- Site amenities (benches, trashcans, other open space amenities, etc.)
- Appurtenances (HVAC equipment, meters, dumpsters and screening)

At the December 20, 2017 work session, the BAR made the following observations and recommendations:

- Townhouses lack identity
- Consider introducing materials that relate to the school building into the townhouse design, and relate all of the different types of townhouses to each other in some way visually
- The condominium building appears too flat
- Consider treating different elevations of the condominium building differently, based on what they face out toward
- Redesign the ground floor of the condominium building along the north elevation to invite pedestrian activity
- Maintain usable open space for residents
- Carefully consider the scale of this development in the context of the surrounding neighborhoods
- Improve pedestrian conditions at townhouse alleys
- Use the proportions of the school building in the commercial buildings to make them more unique to this development

Two members of the community addressed the BAR regarding this project at the December 20, 2017 work session. Observations and recommendations included:

- More of the Paul VI High School building should be preserved
- There is general concern about the scale of the development, namely the height of the condominium building, from surrounding neighborhood associations

For a more detailed account of the meeting, see attachment 3.

PROPOSAL

At this work session the BAR should focus on changes to the original proposal reviewed by the BAR at the December 20, 2017 work session, outlined below.

Architecture:

Townhouses:

The applicant has submitted new drawings for the townhouses more clearly identifying the design intent and materials. A major revision made to the design of the townhouses is that the front façade of all units is now principally brick. The rear elevations of certain units with high visibility would also incorporate brick into their designs. Most of the townhouse units have been staggered in compliance with §3.5.1.C., with the exception of the two sticks of units along Fairfax Boulevard.

The four 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 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 recessed front balconies with planters. The garage doors for these units are shown as a grayish color with a grid of panels. 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 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) feature the use of brick on their rear façades 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 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, and foundation material variety including brick and stone. Side elevations were also included with this submission for the Type 4 townhouses only, and include PVC columns supporting a gabled entrance canopy, fiber cement siding in the main gable with a curvilinear vent, traditional sash windows, and brick and siding for the façade. The garage doors for these units are shown as a grayish color with vertical panels and small square windows. 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. Staff has previously recommended and continues to recommend 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, and maintain consistent orientation of the other townhouse units along Cedar Avenue.

The new drawings are successful in explaining the design intent of the townhouses, but it is worth noting that the front and rear stick elevations on each sheet do not correspond. They seem to be mirror images of each other. The applicant has not yet submitted material samples or details on the windows, doors, railings, or canopies as requested by staff at the December 20, 2017 work session.

Condominium Building:

The applicant made several modifications to the design of the five-story condominium building, most notably the introduction of a variety of new materials and colors for different portions of the building elevations. The central portions of the north and south elevations, containing the main entrances, would be the most prominent and tallest sections of the building, substantially unchanged from the work session proposal. These monumental entrance bays, meant to draw material and architectural inspiration from the school building, would be composed of burnt red brick, “Shenandoah” by Cushwa, with straw-colored mortar, and yellowish cast stone surrounding the entrances. Both entrances are shown to have a curved bronze suspended canopy over them, although no detail is provided. Cast stone window headers and decorative banding would be found throughout the brick. The recessed fifth stories of the entrance bays, with terrace access for residents, would be fiber cement panel painted “Cobble Stone” (warm gray) with a silver aluminum reveal system and lighter rectangular accent panels.

Most of the remainder of the building would be fiber cement panel painted a variety of warm colors including off whites, beiges, tans, and browns. The base of the building (and extending up through the second floor in limited areas) would be brick in either gold “Madrid Blend” brick with brown mortar, or brown “Manhattan” brick with brown mortar. Other new design features introduced include projecting widow bays and increased roofline variety. The recessed balconies have remained an important design feature in this iteration. Balcony railings and window frames would have a beige finish.

Much of the ground floor right of the entrance on the north elevation was redesigned to incorporate tall storefront fenestration with bronze framing, per the BAR’s work session recommendation, aimed at improving the pedestrian experience along this part of the site.

The applicant has not yet submitted details on the doors or entrance canopies as requested by staff at the December 20, 2017 work session.

Landscaping:

Since the work session, the applicant has provided staff with a preliminary landscape plan. The plan includes mostly trees, with few shrubs concentrated in various areas, such as at the bases of electrical transformers and mechanical equipment. The applicant has stated that a more detailed plan with shrubs and groundcover throughout the site is forthcoming.

A Typical Lot Detail Landscaping sheet was included in the landscape plan (attachment 5c) that shows typical landscaping plans for townhouse units by stick. All rear-loaded units would have one category I (small) deciduous 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. tree, shrub, herbaceous groundcover) is included as a supplemental table.

Trees are proposed along the private roads throughout the site, and at the periphery of the site. There are no trees shown between the proposed slow lane at the north end of the site and Fairfax Boulevard, and there are no trees shown along the southern half of McLean Avenue. In email correspondence, the applicant has stated that the reason street trees are missing from these two locations is due to the presence of underground utilities and parking conflicts, and that as a result they are seeking a modification to the section of the Zoning Ordinance dealing with street trees (§4.5.6.B, attachment 1). In these two areas, the applicant has stated that the small ornamental trees and shrubs proposed in the front yards of the townhouse units would help continue the tree pattern.

The full landscape tree schedule as well as the supplemental species list for the Typical Lot Detail Landscaping can be found in the landscape plan included in attachment 5c. The illustrative site plan in attachment 5a is inaccurate in light of the new landscape plan, and should be adjusted accordingly. Additionally, staff finds that the rendering of the “View Along McLean Avenue” in attachment 5a misrepresents the substantiality of landscaping proposed along this road.

Lighting:

The applicant has submitted a cut sheet with two types of lighting, the City standard acorn fixture, proposed along Fairfax Boulevard, and a downcast pole-mounted LED fixture for use throughout the interior of the site (see attachment 5d). 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. 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.

Appurtenances and Amenities:

The applicant has indicated the locations of HVAC units for the townhouses in the landscape plan (attachment 5c) and dumpster locations and proposed screening in the townhouse exhibit (attachment 5a). The HVAC units would be placed mainly between the driveways of the rear-loaded townhouses in the service alleys, however a limited number of units on the interior of the site would be located in the front yards of townhouses whose driveways are too short to accommodate for them there. The Typical Lot Detail Landscaping of attachment 5c shows this condition under number 6. Herbaceous plants are shown around the bases of these units to provide minimal screening. 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.

The applicant has not submitted materials detailing site furniture, trash cans, bus shelters, bike racks (approximate locations are indicated), or other site amenities for review.

ANALYSIS

As this a work session with the BAR, this report does not contain any specific staff recommendations.

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).

This property, due to its depth and variety of contexts, is proposed to have several building styles, namely within the proposed townhouse models. Both traditional and contemporary designs are proposed for these units. At the December 20, 2017 work session, the BAR made several recommendations relating to the townhouses, including tying their materials and proportions more into those of the school building to give the development a unique identity. The newest town house submittals have introduced a variety of elements to differentiate each unit from one another, while tying their design into the rest of the proposed development with the use of a variety of brick, cast stone, and traditional cornices. The more contemporary units make use of traditional materials and design elements so that they do not appear out of place in the context of the overall project.

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

The condominium building, despite the various modifications to the design presented at the December 20, 2017 work session, still contains a large amount of fiber cement. The City has historically interpreted high quality material as being masonry, e.g. brick and stone, and so staff believes that an increased proportion of masonry on this building is warranted if the scale of the building remains as proposed (see discussion on scale below). Based on the illustrative elevations provided for the commercial buildings, a high proportion of brick is proposed which staff finds appropriate and fitting within the context of the school building, although material samples and labels are still needed. The townhouses in this proposal contain a high proportion of brick, which meets this guideline. Fiber cement is the primary rear elevation material, which is not uncommon for townhouses in the City. Limited use of brick on key rear elevations facing the condominium courtyard is an appropriate

treatment. The applicant should submit a material board for the townhouse units for final BAR consideration.

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 applicant has supplied material sample boards for the condominium building, which are thorough and rich in the variety of colors within a unified palette. The applicant should provide similar material boards for the townhouses, commercial buildings, and school building for final consideration by the BAR.

The underlying theme for improvement of the City's corridors is that these areas should look and function more like boulevards. The establishment of tree rows on both sides of streets and in the center medians is essential to achieve the boulevard effect (39).

The preliminary landscape plan, which shows gaps in street trees on both Fairfax Boulevard and McLean Avenue is not compliant with this provision of the Community Appearance Plan.

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

The applicant should provide a more complete set of lighting fixtures, with finishes indicated, for final consideration by the BAR.

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).

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

While the applicant has submitted a landscape plan that was missing for consideration at the December 20, 2017 work session, the applicant should submit a more detailed plan with shrubs indicated throughout the site for final consideration by the BAR. The landscape screening for any front yard HVAC units should be enhanced where practicable.

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).

Staff appreciates the efforts made by the applicant to increase the architectural interest and articulation of the condominium building since the December 20, 2017 work session, but believes its massing is still overpowering for the site and within the context of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Incorporating landscaping elements such as street trees, planters, bioswales and rain gardens not only improve the aesthetics of the City but also help curb stormwater runoff issues (Community Appearance chapter, 106).

The preliminary landscape plan, which shows a gap in street trees on both Fairfax Boulevard and McLean Avenue is not compliant with this provision of the Comprehensive Plan.

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).

The applicant will be providing historic structures reports for both Paul VI High School and the John C. Wood House for BAR consideration. Staff anticipates an analysis of the development proposal, a determination of eligibility for the state and national registers, and recommendations regarding preservation or rehabilitation.

SUMMARY

The following is a list of items not yet addressed that still require review by the BAR:

- Side elevations for all townhouse unit types
- Specific material labels for the commercial buildings and school building
- Lighting fixture sample images, finish detail, and general locations
- Door and window sample images and finish detail for the townhouses
- Door sample images and finish detail for the condominium building
- Railing detail and finish for the townhouses
- Canopy detail and finish for the townhouses and condominium building
- Material sample boards for the townhouses, commercial buildings, and school building
- Site amenity details and general locations (benches, trashcans, other open space amenities, etc.)
- More detailed landscape plan with shrubs
- Updated illustrative plan to correspond with actual landscaping
- Historic Structures Reports

RELEVANT REGULATIONS

- Attachment 1-

§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.

§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.