

*******DRAFT MINUTES*******
Board of Architectural Review
Wednesday, January 7, 2026
7:00 p.m., City Council Chambers
City Hall

Members Present: Andrew Scott, Chair
Nastaran Zandian, Vice Chair
Bud Adams
Frances Pratt
Theresa del Ninno
James Spencer
Margaret Miller

Members Absent:

Secretary: William Conkey, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Marina Novaes, Historic Preservation Planner

1 Call to Order

The Board of Architectural Review was called to order at 7:02 p.m. All members were present.

2 Minutes

Consideration of the minutes of the December 17, 2025 Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing.

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. del Ninno, seconded by Ms. Pratt, the Board of Architectural Review approved the minutes of the December 17, 2025 meeting as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

Other Business

3 BAR#2025-00542 - Parker-Gray
Request for a concept review at 1609 Cameron Street.
Applicant: City of Alexandria represented by Sophie Topping Zimmerman

BOARD ACTION: The Board of Architectural Review was supportive of the overall design which includes the height, mass, scale, and general architectural character.

SPEAKERS:

Keith Leonard, architect, presented project and answered questions.

Melissa Burns, 126 Harvard St., inquired if the entrance path could be move to the north and if heat could be added.

Stephen Milone, 907 Prince St., representing Old Town Civic Association. He stated that the overall design was fine, but the architecture could be elevated. Prefers brick instead of wood and CMU and does not support connected kiddy pool.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Miller asked for clarification on the street configuration and pedestrian access.

Mr. Scott asked about the location of the lockers; the applicant stated they will be located on the pool deck.

Ms. Nastaran asked whether the wall openings would be screened; the applicant confirmed that they would be.

Mr. Scott asked what the glazed CMU blocks would look like, and the applicant provided a sample.

Mr. Scott also asked about the height of the proposed fence; the applicant stated that it will be a 6-foot wrought iron fence.

Ms. del Ninno asked whether solar panels would be used to power the pool equipment; the applicant stated that the panels would be able to power the pool.

Ms. Pratt asked whether the bathhouse capacity would be similar to the existing bathhouse; the applicant stated that the proposed bathhouse would have a higher capacity.

Ms. Pratt asked why the kiddie pool would be integrated into the main pool. Jack Browand (RPCA) explained that an integrated pool functions better operationally. He also noted that the artwork will be relocated to the Metro station.

Mr. Scott asked about the intended use of the event space. Mr. Browand stated that it will function as a large patio.

Ms. del Ninno asked whether louvers would be required for the pool equipment; the applicant stated that small louvers would be located on the east elevation.

Ms. Miller asked why the height of the building was being lowered; the applicant stated that the proposed functions can be accommodated within a smaller building footprint.

Ms. del Ninno expressed support for tying the building design to Jefferson-Houston School.

Ms. Nastaran asked for clarification on the brick detailing.

Mr. Adams asked about the interior finishes; the applicant stated that the interior will consist of painted CMU.

Mr. Spencer stated that the proposed gray CMU color could be problematic and expressed interest in reviewing additional details of the brick, wood, and CMU materials at a future meeting.

Mr. Scott expressed support for the overall design but raised concerns about the series of fences. He also asked whether greater variation could be incorporated into the landscaping.

Mr. Spencer asked about lighting elements; the applicant stated that they are working with a lighting consultant.

Ms. Nastaran recommended that the applicant further refine the fence design.

Ms. del Ninno asked whether permanent shade structures would be included; the applicant stated that options are being explored.

4 Adjourment

The Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing was adjourned at 7:52 p.m.