

For DRC (*circle those present*): **Robert Dudka, Charles Craig, Charles Matta**, Darren Hannabass,

For Arlington County (*circle those present*): **Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Rebecca Ballo**

Case #12 - 16 Agenda Item # No 4

Application Complete

Application Incomplete

Applicant(s): O'Sullivan

For Applicant(s): owner and architect Will Teass

(See attached application for applicant, address, name of property and property description, drawings, photographs, and proposed scope of work.)

Design Recommendations:

1. Look at options for lintels.
2. Prefer Light #2(elongated colonial style, gas box) in addition to the gooseneck lights.

Findings:

Return to next DRC meeting

Send to HALRB (see below for recommended actions)

If sent to HALRB, recommended action is:

Place on consent agenda

Place on discussion agenda:

Recommend approval of CoA, with DRC design recommendations and/or additional information provided

Recommend deferral of ruling on CoA (explanation):

Recommend denial of CoA (explanation):

No recommendation.

For DRC (*circle those present*): **Robert Dudka, Charles Craig, Charles Matta, Darren Hannabass,**

For Arlington County (*circle those present*): **Cynthia Liccese-Torres, Rebecca Ballo**

Case #12 - 16 Agenda Item # No

Application Complete

Application Incomplete

Applicant(s): O'Sullivan

For Applicant(s): owner and architect Will Teass

(See attached application for applicant, address, name of property and property description, drawings, photographs, and proposed scope of work.)

Design Recommendations:

1. Respect individuality of the different buildings.
2. Not wild about pilasters, continuous band of signage.
3. Come back with alternatives
4. Look at alternatives to colonial lighting. Like gooseneck.
5. Don't like extending treatment down Irving Street façade.

Findings:

Return to next DRC meeting

Send to HALRB (see below for recommended actions)

If sent to HALRB, recommended action is:

Place on consent agenda

Place on discussion agenda:

Recommend approval of CoA, with DRC design recommendations and/or additional information provided

Recommend deferral of ruling on CoA (explanation):

Recommend denial of CoA (explanation):

No recommendation.



CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS STAFF REPORT

TO: HALRB
FROM: Rebecca Ballo
DATE: July 6, 2012
SUBJECT: 3201/3205/3207 Washington Boulevard, Case 12-16, O’Sullivan’s

The subject property at 3201/3205/3207 Washington Boulevard is called out for frontage preservation as part of the Clarendon Sector Plan. This grouping of commercial buildings was constructed circa 1925. 3207 Washington Boulevard features a parapet with metal pantiles (designed to look like traditional terra cotta) and vertical brick, chimney-like extensions with concrete caps and diamond-shaped brick inlays. The vertical brick members reach above the roof line, separating the sections of pantiles. This is a rare example of the Spanish Colonial Revival/Mission Style in Clarendon. The adjacent 3201-3205 buildings have the same stretcher bond brick, but have no parapets. All buildings have flat roofs. The Sam’s Corner building at 3201 Washington Boulevard is the only one to have retained its original glass-bay front shop windows. All the buildings had these display windows, which can be seen in the historic photographs attached to the application.

Frontage preservation, as called for in the Clarendon Sector Plan, is intended to generally preserve the first 20’ feet of depth from the front building wall (Sector Plan, page 50). The owner of O’Sullivan’s pub, currently at 3207 Washington Boulevard, has secured the lease for multiple storefronts and intends to expand the business to all three buildings. Part of that will include a total interior and partial exterior renovation. As the buildings are called out for Frontage Preservation, the Sector Plan envisions HALRB guidance and comment on the alterations.

The owner plans to restore the brick and the small remainder of wood trimwork on the facades, and will be installing new windows, doors, lighting, and decorative woodwork. The goal will be to restore much of the original buildings, while still presenting a unified front for the single business that will be occupying all three addresses.

The DRC heard this application at their June and July meetings. After the June meeting, a number of recommendations were made to help simplify and unify the design, while also respecting the original window openings and other historic design aspects of the buildings. The July application was revised substantially and the DRC was largely supportive of the changes. There was discussion as to whether or not the lintels should be treated differently from the woodwork in terms of painting them or not. The DRC was split as to the correct treatment of the lintels. However, the DRC and staff stated that it would be the applicant’s discretion as to which they chose, as this is not a historic district, and the HALRB does not regulate paint.

The DRC recommended approval of this application. The DRC asked that this case be placed on the consent agenda for the July 18, 2012, HALRB meeting. Staff agrees with the DRC recommendation.