

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

Board of Architectural Review

Wednesday, June 17, 2026

7:00 p.m., 901 Wythe Street

Multipurpose Room

Members Present: Nastaran Zandian, Vice Chair
 Bud Adams
 Theresa del Ninno
 Michaela Robinson
 Margaret Miller
 James Spencer

Members Absent: Andy Scott, Chair

Secretary: William Conkey, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Julie Weisgerber, Historic Preservation Planner

1 Call to Order

The Board of Architectural Review was called to order at 7:03 p.m Vice Chair Zandian, Mr. Adams, Ms. Miller, Ms. del Ninno, Ms. Robinson, and Mr. Spencer were present. Chair Scott was absent.

2 Minutes

Consideration of the minutes of the June 3, 2026 Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing.

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Ms. Miller, the Board of Architectural Review approved the minutes of the June 3, 2026 meeting as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

Consent

- 3 BAR#2026-00160 - OHAD**
Request for signage at 615 King Street.
Applicant: King Arthur Baking Co, represented by Patience Shaffer, Contractor

BOARD ACTION:
On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2026-00160 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

- 4 BAR#2026-00188 - OHAD
Request for signage at 628 King Street.
Applicant: Van Pham, represented by Robert J. Sargenti, Architect

BOARD ACTION:

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2026-00188 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

Unfinished Business and Items Previously Deferred

- 5 BAR#2026-00130 - OHAD
Request for alterations at 409 South Royal Street.
Applicant: Moore Construction Group, represented by Rachel DeBaun, Contractor

BOARD ACTION:

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR#2026-00130. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

- 6&7 BAR#2026-00116 – OHAD
Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 428 North Union Street.
Applicant: Julia and John Acker, represented by Karen Conkey, Architect

BAR#2026-00117 – OHAD
Request for an addition and alterations at 428 North Union Street.
Applicant: Julia and John Acker, represented by Karen Conkey, Architect

BOARD ACTION:

On a motion by Mr. Spencer, seconded by Ms. Miller, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2026-00116 and BAR#2026-00117 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

SPEAKERS:

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

Julia Acker, the property owner, was present and available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Del Ninno was pleased with the revisions to the project; however, she finds that the proposed windows' light configuration is still a little busy.

Mr. Adams also stated that he would prefer larger window lights. He complemented the architect for the project's improvement.

Ms. Miller liked the fact that the roof material was replaced with metal instead of shingles and was pleased with the revisions.

Mr. Spencer and Ms. Robinson also agreed that the windows should be simplified, and they should have less lights. There were no further discussions.

New Business

8&9 BAR#2026-00181 – OHAD

Request for partial demolition and encapsulation at 401 North Lee Street.

Applicant: Case Design Remodeling Inc, represented by Gizem Ozkaya, Contractor

BAR#2026-00182 – OHAD

Request for an addition and alterations at 401 North Lee Street.

Applicant: Case Design Remodeling Inc, represented by Gizem Ozkaya, Contractor

BOARD ACTION:

On a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Ms. Robinson, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2026-00181 and BAR#2026-00182 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

SPEAKERS:

Gizem Ozkaya, the project contractor, gave a brief explanation of the project revisions and was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Miller stated that she liked the project. Ms. Del Ninno also complimented the project. There was no discussion.

Other Business

10 BAR#2025-00552 – Parker Gray

Request for concept review at 415 North Alfred Street.

Applicant: PT Blooms, represented by Kenneth W. Wire, Attorney

BOARD ACTION:

The Board of Architectural Review received a presentation and heard public testimony on the proposed concept review of 415 North Alfred Street.

SPEAKERS:

Patrick Bloomfield, applicant, presented the revisions to the previously reviewed design.

Wayne Neale, 405 N Alfred Street, described his credentials related to the design of new buildings within the historic district. He stated that the proposed massing and architectural style is inconsistent with the other buildings on the block. He agreed with staff regarding the use of brick on the rear of the houses and asked that the color of the windows be similar to the color of the adjacent brick. He noted that townhomes in the historic district typically have a taller stoop height.

Daniel Pereira, 410 N Alfred Street, stated that the character of the existing block is eclectic with a mixture of architectural styles. He asked the applicant to provide additional variation between the townhouses to be more similar to the existing architecture. He was also concerned about the height of the proposed townhouses relative to the neighboring buildings.

Deva Kyle, 410 N Alfred Street, described the proposed design as too monolithic, appearing to be a single building instead of individual townhouses. He also said that the modern detailing is not consistent with the historic context.

Mark Hamilton, 424 N Alfred Street, was concerned that the rear elevation of the ADU buildings appears to be a single building. He appreciated the revision and enhancement of the design of the stoops and suggested that some of the bays be reduced in height to two stories instead of the current three.

Jessica Lefevre, 901 Princess Street, appreciated the changes to the previous design. She remained concerned that the mass of the building will overwhelm neighboring structures. She agreed with previous comments regarding reducing the height of the bays to two stories and adding variation to the windows. She asked the applicant to include additional street trees.

Edward Luckett, 418/420 N Alfred Street, asked the applicant if there would be individual owners for each townhouse or if it would be a single owner. The applicant clarified that each townhouse will be a fee simple property. Mr. Luckett stated that the massing is not consistent with the neighborhood and that the rear of the ADUs lacks design details. He supported the idea of the lowering the bays to two stories.

Ralph Brooker, 422 N Alfred Street, stated that the building is too large and too uniform, instead it should read as five individual townhouses. He was concerned that the garages would be used for storage, leading to additional cars being parked on the street causing parking shortages.

Patrick Bloomfield, applicant, responded to public comments by stating that the tallest buildings in the block are adjacent to this site and that is why the proposed size is appropriate. He was open to additional variation between the townhouses while noting that there are many examples of multiple townhouses with a single design within the historic district. He clarified that the height of the stoops cannot be raised because of a code requirement that the buildings be accessible and that difficult site conditions make the construction costly.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Spencer asked Mr. Conkey whether parking, street trees, or construction cost are included in the standards to be reviewed by the BAR. Mr. Conkey responded by clarifying that these are not standards listed as being under the purview of the BAR.

Ms. del Ninno noted that at a previous hearing the Board had asked the applicant to reduce the height of the proposed buildings and asked the applicant how this comment had been addressed. The applicant responded by stating that the proposed height is appropriate for the existing context.

Mr. Adams asked about the proposed ceiling heights. The applicant stated that the first floor will be 10'-0" and that the other floors will be 9'-0".

Ms. Zandian stated her concern regarding the proposed height, noting that the three story building next door to the property are shorter than the proposed building. Reducing the height of the bays to two stories at the end units could help address the height compatibility issue. She stated that there should be more variety between the townhouses and that the window color should be consistent with the brick color. She said that the rear of the townhouses should be brick and that the ADUs could similarly be brick.

Ms. Robinson appreciated the level of brick detailing included in the proposal and noted that it is not uncommon for townhouses to be built in groups within the historic district. She would like to see the overall height reduced but generally supported the proposed mass and scale. She noted that the full glass entry door is not consistent with entry doors found in the historic district and would like to see a solid wood door instead. She asked the applicant not to move the mansard roof design to the end of the row as this may make the buildings look larger. She said that the design for the ADUs needs more development.

Mr. Adams agreed with previous comments stating that lowering the height of the bays on the end units would help to reduce the visual height of the proposal. He also agreed that the front door should be solid instead of glass. He suggested that the recessed brick panel not be included on all of the townhouses. He stated that the ground floor windows are not appropriate.

Mr. Spencer supported the proposed mass and height and agreed that reducing the height of some of the bays would help to make the design more compatible with the historic district. He asked the applicant to consider ways in which the fourth floor windows can be revised to relate to the lower floor windows. He suggested that variation in brick detailing and window configurations could achieve the variation that the other Board members were requesting. He stated that the rear of the townhouses should be brick and that the organization of the ADUs needs further study.

Ms. Miller stated that the proposed buildings are not right for this site. The density of the ADUs is not appropriate for the historic district. The proposed design does not fit into the historic context, lacking proper detailing and too large for the adjacent buildings. She stated that the architect is not designing within the context of the historic district.

Ms. del Ninno stated that the design revision is going in the right direction and that the bays help to break down the overall massing. She supported the idea of stepping the bays down at the north and south ends of the site. She appreciates the use of brick detailing but asked that it be continued and that brick be extended to the rear of the townhouses. She liked the idea of reducing the parapet height and installing a guardrail that is back from the edge of the roof. She noted that it is typical for an outbuilding like the ADU to have a different material than the main townhouse and supported the use of siding in this area.

11 Adjournment

The Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing was adjourned at 9:02 p.m.