

*******DRAFT MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, May 7, 2025

7:00 p.m., City Council Chamber
City Hall

Members Present: Andrew Scott, Chair
Nastaran Zandian, Vice Chair
Theresa del Ninno
Michael Lyons
James Spencer

Members Absent: Bud Adams
Margaret Miller

Secretary: Susan Hellman, Historic Preservation Planner

Staff Present: Brendan Harris, Historic Preservation Planner

1 Call to Order

The May 7, 2025 Board of Architectural Review meeting was called to order at 7:01 pm. Mr. Adams and Ms. Miller were absent; all other members were present.

2 Minutes

Consideration of the minutes from the April 16, 2025, Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing.

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Scott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes of the April 16, 2025 meeting as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5 - 0.

Consent Calendar

- 3** BAR#2025-00051 – Parker Grey
Request for alterations at 224 North Fayette Street.
Applicant: Harold Smith, architect

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Scott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00051 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5 - 0.

- 4** BAR #2025-00075 – OHAD
Request for alterations at 112 South Alfred Street.
Applicant: Shamika Godley, architect

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Ms. Zandian, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00075 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5 x 0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

- ~~1. That instead of approving the proposed rooftop screening, the Board approve a Waiver of Rooftop Mechanical Screening.~~

REASON:

The Board disagreed with the staff's recommendation. Ms. Del Ninno removed the item from the consent calendar since she believed that the proposed mechanical screen is the best option for the case, contrary to staff's recommendation to waive the screening requirement.

SPEAKERS:

Shanika Godley, the project architect, and Alana Dills, the business owner, were available to answer any questions.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Del Ninno stated that the project requires a guard railing or screening around the proposed rooftop mechanical equipment, and in her opinion, the screening will be visually more appropriate. The Board agreed with her and voted to approve the project without staff's recommendation to waive the screening. There was no further discussion.

- 5 BAR#2025-00094 – OHAD
Request for alterations at 330 N Saint Asaph Street
Applicant: Kim Murray represented by Harry Braswell, builder

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Scott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00094 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5 – 0.

New Business

- 6 & 7 BAR #2025-00072 – OHAD
Request for alterations at 430 South Washington Street.
Applicant: Toni Srour represented by Duncan Blair

BAR #2025-00073 – OHAD
Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 430 South Washington Street.
Applicant: Toni Srour represented by Duncan Blair

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Zandian, seconded by Mr Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00072 & BAR#2025-00073 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5 x 0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. That the windows and doors comply with the BAR Window Performance Specifications.

REASON:

The Board agreed with the staff's recommendation.

SPEAKERS:

Mr. Daryl Davis, the project architect, and Mr. Toni Srour, the property owner, were available to answer any questions.

Mr. Peter Lang, resident at 601 Wolfe St, apartment 403, spoke in concern of the lack of improvements being proposed to the building's rear. He stated that the rear of the subject property is in fair condition and in need of repair. Mr. Scott clarified that the rear of the property was not being taken into consideration since it was not part of the application, and the Board could not act on it. Mr. Srour clarified that he is considering improving the rear as well on a later occasion.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Del Ninno asked the architect for clarification on how the lighting strip will be installed under the proposed coping. Mr. Davis clarified that the LED strip lighting will be screwed in the proposed cornice coping and will not be visible from any angle. Ms. Del Ninno also asked what the depth of the coping from the brick wall was. Mr. Davis stated that it will be around four inches. Mr. Spencer was concerned that the depth of the coping would not be enough to provide the wall wash lighting effect proposed since a certain distance from the wall is required to accomplish the light to wash down the wall. Mr. Davis said that the depth of the coping will be four or maybe six inches to allow the wall wash effect. Ms. Zandian asked the applicant which was the applicant's preferred option, A or B. Mr. Davis stated that the property owner prefers option B with the straight cornice all around. There was no further discussion.

8 & 9

BAR #2025-00101 – OHAD

Request for alterations at 403 South Pitt Street.

Applicant: William Cromley, builder

BAR #2025-00106 – OHAD

Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 403 South Pitt Street.

Applicant: William Cromley, builder

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Del Ninno, seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00101 & BAR#2025-00106 as amended to approve the use of synthetic slate. The motion carried on a vote of 5 - 0.

Speakers:

Bill Cromley, representing applicant, introduced the project and explained the choice for the roof material. He suggested using synthetic slate as a compromise.

Discussion:

Ms. del Ninno asked about using the synthetic slate on the flat portion of the roof.

10

BAR #2025-00104 – OHAD

Request for alterations at 417 South Royal Street.

Applicant: Sean Murphy represented by Christopher Lyon, architect

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Del Ninno, seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00104 with the condition that the applicant work with staff on a slightly simpler design and address the items that Mr. Spencer mentioned regarding the cornice. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

Speakers:

Sean Murphy, the property owner, gave a quick summary of the project and was available to answer questions.

Discussion:

Ms. Del Ninno noted that the proposed structure is prefabricated with different options. Mr. Murphy felt that the proposed materials would be appropriate.

Ms. Del Ninno expressed the opinion that the ADU looks more elegant than the house and should be simplified, perhaps by removing the window muntins. Mr. Murphy was amenable to the idea but noted that the windows cannot really be seen from a public right of way.

Mr. Spencer noted that the door is breaking the cornice and should therefore be shortened. The same goes for the windows and their trim at the top – they die into the cornice making the building look “off.” He observed that this building would be minimally visible from a public right of way, but recommended a shorter door or a slightly taller building. Mr. Murphy said he would consider it.

11 & 12 BAR #2025-00114 – OHAD

Request for alterations at 910 King Street.

Applicant: 910 King St LLC represented by Romana Sanchez, architect

BAR #2025-00154 – OHAD

Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 910 King Street.

Applicant: 910 King St LLC represented by Romana Sanchez, architect

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by _____, seconded by _____, the Board of Architectural Review voted to accept the requested deferral for BAR#2025-00072 & BAR#2025-00073. The motion was approved unanimously

Speakers:

Romana Sanchez, architect, presented project including images of similar historic details, painted masonry, and approved adjacent development.

Gail Rothrock, HAF, summarized HAF plaque program requirements as relates to building across the street and existing conditions. Recommended restoration of masonry and not painting front façade. The front door at interior of the vestibule should be retained in place and if a new storm door is installed it should be full lite glass. Handrails at stoop should be a simple design mounted so as not to damage the historic fabric. Carriage lamps should be of a style compatible with the

existing architecture. No signage should be attached to the building, including at the roof deck. The proposed roof deck should be set back from the front edge and lowered as close to roof as possible with stair enclosure lowered as well. Encouraged deferral to restudy the proposal.

Steve Milone, 907 Prince Street, Front elevation should be carefully preserved. Painting should not be approved, they should be repaired as required. Proposed signage is too extensive, the existing blade and window signs should be used. No railing should be attached to the existing stone stoop. The proposed roof deck is too tall and highly visible, detracting from design of building. The proposed lights will encroach on the right of way. Recommend against installing carriage lights due to damage to the building.

Yvonne Callahan, OTCA, Yielded a portion of her time to Steve Milone. Flood lights are not appropriate. Encourage deferral in order to redesign proposal.

Discussion:

Michael Lyons asked for clarification on proposed painting. The applicant clarified that the sides and rear have been previously painted and are proposing painting these areas. In addition, the applicant is proposing to paint brick details on the front elevation.

Mr. Spencer asked for clarification on existing steps. The applicant clarified that the stoop is damaged, and they would like to repair and paint it.

Kahan Dillon, owner, repair to steps is being done for safety reasons. Design for metalwork has come from other locations in the district. The sides and rear of the building have remnants of paint on them currently. The railing design incorporates a design taken from the decorative brickwork.

Ms. Zandian asked what can be done with historic steps that have been damaged. Mr. Milone, clarified that the threshold should be replaced. Ms. Sanchez agreed that they intend to replace the threshold and paint the entire stoop.

Ms. Zandian does not agree with re-painting and that any paint should be removed. Does not support mounting signage and lights attached to the building. The railing should be mounted to the side of the stoop. The lanterns should not be attached to the face of the building. If windows are removed, the infill should be set back from the face of brick. The applicant explained that a building was attached to the west side of the existing building, so the windows are not original, and the brick was not intended to be exposed. She asked the applicant to work with staff to determine the date of windows on west side. She clarified with the owner that they plan to paint three sides. The applicant proposes to have paint match color of front. The railing at the roof should be set back from the edge at 1:1 ratio. She clarified the height of the proposed roof deck and railing. She asked the applicant if studies have been done regarding the design of the railing. The applicant referenced nearby metalwork as examples similar to the proposal.

Mr. Spencer wants to have damaged stone at stoop to be replaced as necessary with a red stone and not paint. He agrees that the sides and rear can be re-painted since they are currently painted. He would not want the color to match the front. The design for the railing is too ornate and should be simplified, particularly the center section. Does not agree with installing railing at entrance.

Ms. del Ninno cannot support application as submitted. The use of a symmetrical railing on the

asymmetrical building is not appropriate. The broken threshold should be replaced with stone. Can support a railing at the stoop if sensitive. Does not support the painting of any of the brick. Concerned about the massing of the roof deck and the stair enclosure. They are imposing over the building; would it be possible to relocate the stair? The roof deck should be set back from King Street.

Mr. Lyons does not support application as submitted. Does not support the painting of the sides and does not consider it to be a painted wall. Does not support the lighting or signage but needs more clarification. The railing is too decorative and prominent. The roof deck should be lowered and set back.

Mr. Scott noted the detail at the building cornice. Any roof deck railing should be set back from the edge to retain the cornice design. He asked staff regarding the ordinance for painting masonry. Staff clarified that the ordinance says that painted masonry can be repainted. He finds that the proposed modifications will detract from the integrity of the existing building. The railing design is not appropriate for the building.

Mr. Spencer cannot support the extent of lighting and signage.

The applicant requested a deferral which was approved unanimously.

Other Business

13

BAR#2025-00107 – OHAD

Request for a concept review at 3 Duke Street, 226 Strand Street, 210 Strand Street, 206 Strand Street, 208 Strand Street, and 0 Prince Street.

Applicant: City of Alexandria represented by Matthew Landes

BOARD ACTION: The Board of Architectural Review received a presentation and heard public testimony on the proposed concept plan for the renovation project of Point Lumley Park at 3 Duke Street, 226 Strand Street, 210 Strand Street, 206 Strand Street, 208 Strand Street, and 0 Prince Street

Speakers:

Sara Sepulveres, City of Alexandria, Introduced the project

Merideth Berry, Landscape architect, Presented the proposed design

Yvonne Callahan, OTCA, Stated support for the proposal and its reflection of the previously approved Olin Plan. She understands that climate change will require modifications to this plan.

Al Cox, 311 N Alfred, Noted the recently approved funding to enact the previously approved Olin and Waterfront Plan. Sculptor for shipbuilder statue intended for the statue to remain on its base.

Norman Leader, 14 Duke Street, Would like to see utility poles removed and lines buried. Asked for consideration to widen Strand Street in this area to improve traffic.

Steve Milone, Complimented staff for implementing the Olin Plan including the paving patterns. If roads can be raised to help deal with flooding that would be preferred. Where concrete pavers

are used, he suggests modules of 2x2 or 3x3.

Stephen Wintermayer, 225 Strand Street, Would like to see utility poles removed and utilities undergrounded.

Richard Janis, 225 Strand Street, Appreciated the presentation and requested that the utility poles be removed. He prefers the installation of the statue without the base. He does not support the expansion of Strand Strand Street.

John Rafielli, 225 Strand Street, Agrees with removal of utility poles.

Discussion:

Mr. Scott appreciated the quality of the Concept Review documents. He supports the idea of concrete paving and location of statue at south west corner of park. He asked about the potential liability of locating wood benches on the sides of the wharf.

Ms. del Ninno liked the simplicity of the proposed design and prefers the central location for the statue. She likes the idea of wood benches and asked about design solutions for the fall issue. She asks for additional kayak launches and ways for children to engage with the park.

Ms. Zandian likes the simplicity of the proposed design and would like exploration of raising sidewalks. She asked if raised planters could make benches safer.

Mr. Spencer asked about the direction for the shipbuilder. The designer mentioned that it will be facing the street. Mr. Spencer would prefer this location but facing the water and would prefer the sculpture not to have a base. He likes the seating at the wharf but is concerned about safety.

Mr. Lyons noted the importance of waterfront parks for the City. He supports the preferred location for the statue facing the river and with the base. He expressed concern about the movable furniture being stolen from the park.

14 Adjournment

The Board of Architectural Review meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.