



DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ZONING

301 King Street
Room 2100
Alexandria, VA 22314

Phone (703) 746-4666
Fax (703) 838-6393

www.alexandriava.gov

Meeting Notes

October 7, 2015

Ramsey Homes – Architecture Discussion

1. Review of Alternatives
 - a. Level of architectural development of alternatives
 - i. All alternatives (Option 1 – Plan that retain two buildings and complies with Braddock plan, Option 2 An option that retains one building and is 3-4 levels and Option 3 the current ARHA plan), are to be provided as colored hand-sketched elevations, with limited context to assist in public discussion.. Elevations will be one full site elevation from Patrick Street, one elevation from Wythe Street, one elevation from Pendleton Street (each of these extended just far enough to show the neighboring building to the east).
 - b. Unit mix
 - i. Unit mix worksheets provided by City Staff for both the 1 and 2 building preservation alternatives, confirming unit count provided
 - ii. KTG Y to work on configuration of ends to adjust for provision of all 2 bedrooms at either end of the single building of the 1 building preservation alternative
 - c. Architecture of 1-building preservation alternative
 - i. The exterior expression of the building would be very similar to that agreed upon for the north building (see below), with the potential partial fourth floor expressed as a dark/receding monitor – potentially using the dark panel treatment
2. Code Implications for Rehabilitation
 - a. Accessibility with preservation of 1 or 2 existing buildings, use as housing
 - i. Based on a variety of exemptions and exceptions, the existing buildings would not be required to have accessible units per City (and State) Code. Any accessible units would be provided in the newly constructed buildings
 - b. Accessibility with preservation of 1 building for office/museum use
 - i. As the buildings are under 3,000sf floor plate, they would not fall under additional accessibility standards. The first floor of the building could be made accessible, if used for a public purpose, such as museum/display space.
 - c. Code construction standards
 - i. Code upgrades would be limited to those areas or elements being constructed/directly renovated – renovation would not trigger the need to bring the whole unit or structure up to current code. An

example was given that if the kitchen is upgraded, all aspects of that direct work would need to be done to current code standards – this would not affect any other portion of the unit.

- d. Code discussion summary
 - i. A summary of the meeting with Code will be provided by City Staff
- e. Renovation of existing Units
 - i. P&Z will develop schematic plans and elevations to define general scope of potential renovations for residential use
 - ii. The combined team will undertake an additional site visit with a structural engineer to assess potential problems and costs
- 3. Architecture of 53-unit ARHA proposal
 - a. North Building
 - i. The building is to be patterned after a simple/honest expression as a multi-family building, similar to older Parker-Gray apartment buildings
 - ii. The corners of the building would remain as horizontal patterned fiber-cement panels, such as Nichiha.
 - iii. The remainder of the “ends” would be expressed in a light or cream brick with simplified detailing
 - iv. The central portion would have a base of light or cream brick, which would express upward at the center, either a full story or some other logical spot, but likely not the full height of the building. The remainder of the infill would be an orange brick or similar tone difference. All detailing would be simplified.
 - v. The parapet of the building would express the moves of the brick changes symmetrically.
 - vi. The rear elevation of the building would follow the same or similar materials and colors.
 - vii. It was agreed that the building would be predominantly masonry with corner accents in siding – other materials.
 - b. South Building
 - i. The building is to be expressed as a multi-family building with an overall pattern or rhythm of townhomes. This discussion did not reach a final conclusion on the method of the townhome pattern, however the following points were agreed.
 - ii. Colors would be compatible to the North Building. As the flat face is presented to Patrick Street at the South Building, some architectural detailing that breaks the flat plane is desired
 - c. Doorways
 - i. It was agreed per ARHA’s overall approach, to have individual door access to ground-level units wherever feasible and the door location would correspond to the building architecture. A main entrance to the buildings is to be provided, not associated with the access stairs, and clearly identifiable as the primary and visually prominent entrance.
- 4. Next Steps
 - a. South Building Architecture

- i. KTGy to provide sketches for the South Building, to be reviewed and discussed via teleconference or similar
- b. Schedule – City Staff will provide a projected schedule for the alternatives and DSUP process by the end of the week