

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

Board of Architectural Review

Thursday, June 5, 2025

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

Members Present: Andrew Scott, Chair
Bud Adams
Margaret Miller
Theresa del Ninno

Members Absent: Nastaran Zandian, Vice Chair
Michael Lyons
James Spencer

Secretary: William Conkey, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Amirah Lane, Historic Preservation Planner

1 **Call to Order**

The Board of Architectural Review was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Chair Scott, Mr. Adams, Ms. Miller, and Ms. Del Ninno were present. Vice Chair Zandian, Mr. Lyons, and Mr. Spencer were absent.

2 **Minutes**

Consideration of the minutes from the May 21, 2025, Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing.

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. del Ninno, seconded by Ms. Miller, the Board of Architectural Review approved the minutes of the May 21, 2025 meeting as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

Consent Calendar

3 BAR#2025-00162 - OHAD
Request for alterations at 105 Franklin Street.
Applicant: Philip Saunders

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00162 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

- 4 BAR#2025-00174 - OHAD
Request for alterations at 10 Duke Street.
Applicant: Murray Bonitt, represented by Ben McGuirl, architect

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00174 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

Unfinished Business and Items Previously Deferred

- 5&6 BAR#2025-00139 - OHAD
Request for alterations and new construction at 802 & 808 North Washington Street.
Applicant: 808 Washington LLC represented by Ken Wire and Megan Rappolt, Attorneys

BAR#2025-00202 - OHAD
Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 802 & 808 North Washington Street.
Applicant: 808 Washington LLC represented by Ken Wire and Megan Rappolt, Attorneys

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to accept the applicant's request for deferral of BAR#2025-00139 and BAR#2025-00202. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

Speakers:

Discussion:

New Business

- 7 BAR#2025-00155 - OHAD
Request for alterations and signage at 277 South Washington Street.
Applicant: The Sign Company, Inc represented by Phillip Adams

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00155 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

REASON

The Board agreed with staff's recommendation.

SPEAKERS:

Phillip Adams, project representative, present project and was available for questions.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Miller asked about the leasing signs on the building and if there was an established coordinated sign plan for the building.

8 **BAR#2025-00151 - OHAD**
Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 617 South Royal Street.
Applicant: Ciara Collins and Colm Dillon represented by Karen Conkey, architect

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Chair Scott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00151 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

REASON

Staff recommended approval of the application as submitted.

SPEAKERS:

Karen Conkey, the project architect, gave a brief project description and was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION:

Approved with discussions.

9&10 **BAR#2025-00160 - OHAD**
Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 209 Wolfe Street.
Applicant: Habitat Homes LLC represented by Karen Conkey, architect

BAR#2025-00201 – OHAD

Request for alterations and addition at 209 Wolfe Street.
Applicant: Habitat Homes LLC represented by Karen Conkey, architect

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00160 and BAR#2025-00201 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. That the front/south elevation windows be single glazed.
2. That the applicant work with staff to investigate the existence of historic siding on the property's main block.

REASON

The Board agreed with staff's recommendation.

SPEAKERS

Karen Conkey, the project architect, gave a brief project description and was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Scott asked the architect if they were planning to use fiber cement siding only on the new addition. Mrs. Conkey explained that they are using wood siding on the main block and fiber cement will be used where not visible from the public right-of-way. There was no further discussion.

- 11 **BAR#2025-00150 - OHAD**
Request for signage at 1500 King Street.
Applicant: Scott Smith represented by Sarah Mullikin

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Chair Scott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to accept the applicant's request for deferral of BAR#2025-00150. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

REASON
The Board agreed with staff's recommendation.

SPEAKERS:
Scott Smith, the applicant was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION:
Mr. Scott asked the applicant if he was aware that staff recommended denial of the application.

Mr. Smith said that there is an existing sign just like the proposal, they are just proposing to replace it.

Ms. del Ninno asked staff if the existing sign was ever approved by the BAR. Mr. Conkey clarified that the existing sign wasn't approved by the BAR.

Ms. Miller stated that she would not support the application since the proposed sign is too big and cover the building's brickwork which is an important architectural feature. She would like to see a better sign solution.

Mr. Adams agreed with Ms. Miller. He thinks that this is an opportunity to enhance this important building with a signage that can accentuate its design. There was no further discussion, the applicant requested deferral.

- 12 & **BAR#2025-00167 – OHAD**
13 Request for alterations at 2 Prince Street.
Applicant: 2 Prince LLC represented by Paul Beckmann, architect

BAR#2025-00169 - OHAD
Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 2 Prince Street.
Applicant: 2 Prince LLC represented by Paul Beckmann, architect

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Chair Scott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00167 and BAR#2025-00169 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

REASON
The Board agreed with staff's recommendation.

SPEAKERS:

Paul Beckman, project architect, described the proposed design

DISCUSSION:

Ms. del Ninno asked the applicant if the two wall-mounted signs could be the same size. The applicant stated that they would work with staff on the details for the sign.

Ms. Miller stated that she prefers the current design to the previously approved version.

Mr. Scott asked about the difference in color for some of the letters on the sign. The applicant stated that they would be willing to make to sign monochromatic.

14 & BAR#2025-00175 - OHAD

15 Request for alterations at 702 Chetworth Place.

Applicant: Renu Pavate and Shomik Mehndiratta represented by Goldsborough Design Build

BAR#2025-00176 - OHAD

Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 702 Chetworth Place.

Applicant: Renu Pavate and Shomik Mehndiratta represented by Goldsborough Design Build

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00175 and BAR#2025-00176 with staff recommendations. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

SPEAKERS:

Renu Pavate gave a brief summary of the project. She and Shomik Mehndiratta were available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Scott asked Mr. Conkey if the proposed windows comply with the BAR guidelines. Mr. Conkey answered in the affirmative.

Ms. Del Ninno noted that this project is a reconfiguration of a previously approved addition and that she prefers this iteration to the prior design.

Mr. Scott noted that he is a neighbor and supports the project.

16 & BAR#2025-00111 – OHAD

17 Request for alterations at 221 Gibbon Street.

Applicant: Kai Anton Holdings Inc represented by Philip H Dorsey III

BAR#2025-00113 - OHAD

Request for a partial demolition and encapsulation at 221 Gibbon Street.

Applicant: Kai Anton Holdings Inc. represented by Philip H Dorsey III

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Chair Scott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2025-00111 and BAR#2025-00113 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

SPEAKERS:

Bob Audet, the contractor, was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Audet gave an overview of the project and stated that the purpose of the project is not to increase the floor area but to enhance the rear area of the house by building a small bump-out and patio.

Ms. Del Ninno asked whether the first floor would be extended by 21 feet as it appeared on the plans. Mr. Audet responded that it's about 20 feet in width and 10 feet in length, and it will not look like a big addition. He said that the visibility will be very limited due to its height. Ms. Del Ninno said her only concern is the constructability and shoring of the floors above and the columns adjacent to the existing historic house. Mr. Audet said the columns that support the structure will not be visible as they will be encapsulated. He clarified that temporary walls will be constructed inside the three floors while the first floor is being dismantled. Ms. Del Ninno recommended keeping the structural integrity of the existing house in mind as the work is being done.

Ms. Miller thinks it's a nice project that will enhance the house and garden area.

Mr. Adams said that this is a beautiful house and he's glad to see this project happening.

Mr. Scott thinks it's a nice project and complements the historic architecture.

Other Business

- 18 **BAR#2025-00172 - OHAD**
Request for a Concept Review of the Alexandria Waterfront Implementation Project at 2 King Street, 1 King Street, 0 Prince Street, and 1 Prince Street A.
Applicant: City of Alexandria represented by Matthew Landes

SPEAKERS:

Matt Landes, City of Alexandria, introduced the project

Meredith Berry, landscape architect, presented the proposed design for Waterfront Park

Dan Himmer, project architect, introduced the design for the pump station building

James Mackey, project architect, presented the design for the pump station building.

Joe Anderson, landscape architect, presented the design for the unit and 100 block of King Street.

James Norman, 216 Prince Street, discussed the function for the proposed pump station and stated that Waterfront Park is not the right location for this building.

Steven Wintermeyer, 225 Strand Street, stated that their HOA opposes this location for the pump station and recommends that the City find an alternate location.

Latane Montague, 207 Prince Street, representing HAF, described the function of a group called the Waterfront Alliance. He went on to state that the proposed location, materials, and design for the pump station are inappropriate. Mr. Montague was given extra time by the representative from the Old Dominion Boat Club. He stated that the proposed design is inconsistent with the OLIN plan and that the City should explore alternate locations that do not violate the deed restrictions with the NPS.

Yvonne Callahan, OTCA, appreciated the change to the bulkhead and the simplification of the design for the park. She stated that weathered metal is not appropriate for the surroundings. After showing a design for a pump station developed along with the OLIN plan, she noted that the design as being presented cannot be legally built.

Carol Black, representing HARC, read a letter from HARC in opposition to the project. She went on to note that Waterfront Park is not the appropriate place for architectural experimentation.

At this time the public hearing was closed

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Scott asked the applicant if the area currently covered in artificial turf will remain and what the surface will be for the area of public art. The landscape architect stated that the intention is for the artificial turf to remain in place and that the surface adjacent to the public art will be either asphalt or concrete.

Mr. Scott asked that infrastructure be added to the area near the public artwork.

Ms. del Ninno clarified the proposed location and size for the lawn portion of the park and asked that this area be maximized as the design progresses.

Mr. Scott stated that he would prefer to see an alternate location for the pump station building. Regarding the proposed design, he stated that it is greatly improved from the previous proposal and that he likes the use of a weathered scrim and board formed concrete. He suggested that the paving in the area of the public art be unit pavers that would support the necessary weight and could be removed to allow for the installation of infrastructure. He stated that an abstract design for the scrim perforation would be best so as not to draw attention to the structure.

Ms. del Ninno agreed that a location other than Waterfront Park would be best for the proposed pump station. She stated her support for the use of a weathered metal at the scrim but suggested something like Accoya or a vegetated screen for the lower portion of the building. She supported the idea of a covered overhanging portion of the building but asked the applicant to explore how the ceiling could be raised. She expressed concern regarding the skeletal section of the canopy, asking for it to be more functional. She suggested that the applicant explore ways in which the height of the scrim could be reduced. Regarding the design for Waterfront Park, she suggested that the open area be maximized and that the square hardscape in the middle of the park be eliminated. She asked the City to consider moving the linear drain to one side of the central King Street area in lieu of the middle as proposed.

Mr. Adams suggested that an alternate location to Waterfront Park be considered for the pump station. He suggested that the scrim be seen as an opportunity for artwork.

Ms. Miller stated that the pump station should not be located in Waterfront Park. Regarding the proposed design, she noted that the proposed design is not architecturally appropriate for the historic district.

- 19 Consideration of updates to the Signs Chapter and Awnings and Canopies Chapter of the Parker-Gray Design Guidelines
At staff's request, this item was not heard by the Board of Architectural Review.

20 **Adjournment**

The Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing was adjourned at 9:24 p.m.